

UK SHARED PROSPERITY FUND ADVISORY PANEL (Via Teams)

Friday 13th June 2025

Present:

Councillor G Marshall (Chair)
Councillor G Bunn
Councillor R MacRae
Councillor P Owen

Apologies:

Milan Radulovic
Councillor Bales
Ruth Hyde

Officers:

Mr Z Darr
Mr J Little
Ms C Gault
Ms R Sharp

1. Declarations of Interest

RM is the Chair of Broxtowe Youth Homelessness and GB is the co-founder of Broxtowe Community Projects and has an interest in food banks and will abstain.

2. Minutes

2.1 Year 4 UKSPF Business Grants

A total of £160,000 has been ringfenced for business grants-nearly £100K less than last year. Two types of scheme are being supported. £148,000 allocated specifically for Business Growth Grants. Grant values range from £2,000 to £7,000, with varying match-funding requirements. Eligible improvements include shopfront enhancements, increased productivity, and job creation.

Decision: The panel endorsed the business grants scheme with the agreed amendment to include a wider impact assessment in the application form. Agreement was recommended to the S151 Officer who has overall sign-off.

£12,000, ring fenced for a "Start Your Business with Broxtowe" grant. Funding of up to £1,000 is available for new startups. Applicants should attend a Broxtowe LEA workshop and not be in receipt of other EMCCA start-up grants such as those run through NBV. Economic Development will liaise with NBV to ensure there is efficiency.

Decision: The Panel endorsed the pilot- start-up scheme. Agreement was recommended to the S151 Officer who has overall sign-off. The main grant scheme will launch before end of June, start-up to follow.

2.2 Reports and Information

The Panel considered a report from the Head of Economic Development and Regeneration and the UKSPF Programme Manager considering an update on the business cases from all funding projects, considered at the previous meeting but requiring more information for final decision. Most projects were endorsed for the S151 Officer (overall sign-off), but subject to the following notes comments and further actions.

2.3 UKSPF Place Capital Projects

2.3.1 Beeston Bandstand

Costs have been investigated, and a covered pergola structure might now be too expensive for the funds available. The Markets Manager has been exploring a retractable or bespoke cover. The events Friday 18 events programme showed the usefulness of the stage area. Cllr Bunn suggested a permanent, low-maintenance design would be preferable. Officers are to continue to explore solutions and report back.

2.3.1 Wayfinders and Visitor Signage

Cllr Owen asked for his opposition to be recorded and voiced concerns about the signs in his ward and the process. Part of this year's funding is to explore an interpretation board for Nuthall as well as other visitor attractions which were not obvious to visitors and people passing through the Borough. The Head of Economic Development & Regeneration agreed to review this project and work with all members on phase II.

2.4 UKSPF Place Revenue Projects

2.4.1 Food Bank Projects.

There are two separate food bank projects which had both applied for funding. The smaller project the 'Food Bank Co-ordination' has commenced, continuing from last year, this was noted.

'Food Banks - targeting CAB and Futures referrals' was discussed the problem here being that there was still insufficient information to determine a sensible way forwards. The sponsors had been exploring three options for a six-month pilot Sep-Feb at different estimated costs mixing volunteers and staff. (Precise figures had been promised by 20 June); Cllr MaCRae favoured a middle-ground approach but It

was thought sensible to see what the actual costs were and to circulate these with a recommendation for the panel to consider under written procedures. There was a potential “knock-on” impact on the funds available highlighted for decision in the Community Grants paper. This could also be explained in the paper.

2.4.2 Lime Bikes

All Cllrs discussed concerns about theft, vandalism, collections of stranded bikes and the visual impact. Cllr Bunn noted the mixed feedback as some people were finding the service valuable, she suggested a stronger relationship with provider. The £1,000 for this was to be paused pending further discussions to be undertaken with the service provider. The HoS agreed to engage with the company directly.

2.4.3 High Level Mine Water Heat Recovery Feasibility Project

Two quotes received the Mining Remediation Authority had a more extensive data source and experience but were slightly more expensive. This is a feature of the Walker Street project.

DECISION: Members recommended continuing to the S151 Officer and to proceed with the project at the revised costs of £13,962.62

2.4.4 Events Budget

The Proms in the parks were well supported but there was a discussion as to why only town centres were chosen. There was widespread agreement to propose Proms in a broader range of locations diversifying beyond town centres. The green festival element was not supported, it was not a new activity, and the amount suggested for this element was too much. There was a preference for more Proms etc. and a need to ensure new activity underpins UKSPF objectives and economic and community activity. HOS to speak to Communications Team and report back to the panel.

2.4.5 Parking Loyalty Card Scheme.

Cllr Owen opposes the Parking Loyalty scheme. The scheme was explained in some more detail and that with the funding this year there may be some opportunities for subtle improvements and different incentives. Cllr Bunn reported that Broxtowe was still providing the cheapest parking in Nottinghamshire. Cllr Owen requested more information on the businesses taking up the scheme and the number of cards that had been issued. The rest of the panel supported the revised budget proposals for 2025/26.

Action: Head of Service to provide a noting report.

2.5 Community Grants Decisions

Applications have been assessed on value for money, community benefit and reliability. Total Allocation is £160,000 split equally between capital and revenue projects. The scheme was 3.3 times oversubscribed in a ratio of funding available to funding requested. The list of successful applications was endorsed in full (for S.151 Officer).

The panel requested that officers check that awarding UKSPF funding to the top-rated project, Transform Training's anti-ASB project, would not jeopardise the organisation's ability to apply to the recently announced Police & Crime Commissioner's Nottinghamshire-wide fund.

This left some very high scoring reserve projects and difficult choices. Two strong revenue projects were highlighted for decision, as only one could be supported with funds remaining. After much deliberation the Panel agreed to recommend supporting 50% of the ask from the Broxtowe Women's Project. .

DECISION: Support half of BWP scheme and recommend to S151 Officer.

2.5.1 Options for Capital only schemes.

There was a grant balance of £24,000 remaining. Cossall, Kimberley, Attenborough Village Hall, Chilwell Memorial Hall and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust had all supplied smaller capital only bids, that could in part or as a whole be supported. The Panel wished the funds to be spread around the smaller groups excluding Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. There were some issues which required some further investigation, including whether the schemes could be scaled to support more projects and if they were deliverable.

DECISION: A further written options paper provided and recommendations/preferences by written procedures.

2.6 Distribution of Remaining Revenue

The overall Year 4 Programme having been allocated as per the discussions and decisions within the last 2 Panels now left just under £24,000 still to be allocated. There were several options ranging from completely allocating it amongst several projects, through to funding one extra project and maintaining a Programme reserve, (revenue can be converted to capital). Three strong projects were discussed. Your CVS, NCVS and Ridewise. There were concerns as to whether to fund a new CVS (Yours local but new over an established Nottingham based one. Ridewise provided good services but lacked sustainability once the funding was gone. There were information gaps, and it was not possible to determine an outcome with the information available. **Action:** officers to gather further information and circulate a recommendations paper for further consideration by the Panel.

3. AOB

Cllr Marshall thanked officers for their work. GB highlighted the Sea Scouts project as a valuable initiative. Should any budget be released later, consider revisiting support for this project.

4.Date of Next meeting: September TBC