

# MEETING NOTES

<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	70056211	<b>MEETING DATE</b>	28 May 2025
<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	NWRR	<b>VENUE</b>	MS Teams
<b>CLIENT</b>	Shropshire Council	<b>RECORDED BY</b>	AM
<b>MEETING SUBJECT</b>	NWRR Executive Board		

<b>PRESENT</b>	Andy Wilde (AW) James Walton (JW), Nigel Newman (NN), Matt Johnson (MJ), Rob Wilson (RW), David Vasmer (DV), Roger Evans (RE), Anna McCoy (AM)
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	Andy Begley (AB), Donna Payne (DP)
<b>DISTRIBUTION</b>	As above plus: Fay Rayward, Jo Hardie
<b>CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	<b>Confidential</b>

ITEM	SUBJECT
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome and Introduction / Apologies</b>
1.1.	Donna Payne and Andy Begley. AW acted as Chair.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of Previous Meeting – Actions update and content review in advance of publication</b>
2.1.	Notes from the previous meeting were reviewed.
2.2.	MJ reported that at the previous meeting the Board agreed that as the NWRR Impact Report had been commissioned internally and was commercially sensitive, it would not be shared publicly. The Information Governance team have since advised that the report would be issued in response to a Freedom of Information Request, subject to appropriate redaction.
2.3.	MJ reported that AW had given new members a high-level update of the project in new member sessions.
2.4.	AW noted that the project review by Kier proposed in the previous meeting, could be discussed in the future depending on the outcome of the letter to the transport minister.
2.5.	AW was satisfied with the review and that the notes were a reasonable reflection of what was discussed in that meeting.
<b>3.</b>	<b>Current Programme Update</b>
3.1.	Planning and S106 Agreements

	<p>MJ said the project is still pending issue of full planning notice, intent to grant is subject to the signing and completion of three s106 agreements.</p> <p>MJ asked the Board to consider escalation to enable the s106 agreements to be finalised as soon as possible. MJ noted that all legal activity is being paid for by the scheme which means increasing costs. MJ proposed scheduling meetings with the LPA and landowners.</p> <p>AW highlighted that dialogue has been ongoing for months to conclude the planning process and submit the FBC (subject to support from the new administration) to ensure a robust position for the scheme to be progressed or closed.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about increasing legal costs.</p> <p>NN advised that Cllr Kidd has received a communication from [REDACTED], indicating that a meeting will be arranged to discuss the scheme. A press release has been drafted.</p> <p>RW instructed that stakeholders should be informed that the scheme is paused in anticipation of the meeting with the transport minister.</p>
3.2.	<p><b>Consultant Support</b></p> <p>MJ reported that there continues to be a small amount of spend for WSP support.</p> <p>Internally, MJ is still active on the project for 0.5 FTE (costs to be charged back to capital budget).</p> <p>MJ advised that one other retained consultant, [REDACTED], is still active on the project. MJ requested approval from the Board to retain [REDACTED] for another two months (FTE) to finalise and close the account with Kier, and to assist DP with financial management of project.</p> <p>RE raised concern about finances.</p> <p>MJ confirmed that the assumption would be for [REDACTED] to be FTE but this could be flexible.</p> <p>The Board agreed that [REDACTED] could be retained for up to two months, fulltime initially but to be reduced if possible.</p> <p>A schedule of tasks to be shared with the Board at the next meeting for approval to continue with [REDACTED] support for the second month.</p>
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Updated Draft Executive Board Terms of Reference</b></p>
4.1.	<p>MJ explained that the terms of reference and proposed project governance structure have been drafted in response to external and internal audits.</p> <p>JW said that due to the scale of the project, it was recommended that the Leader should be sighted on decisions and progress. Options suggested were for the Leader to attend the executive board meetings, for the portfolio holder to attend and then brief the leader (meeting minutes to also be taken), or for the members to have a separate briefing after the meeting.</p> <p>JW requested clarity and a decision about the governance structure, to avoid confusion with further audits.</p> <p>RW said that as the Leader has been involved in the project already, in terms of writing to the government, it would be appropriate for the Leader to attend the executive board meetings.</p>

	<p>DV agreed and noted that the Leader should be involved as well as portfolio holders, due to the significance of the project.</p> <p>AW confirmed the governance structure and terms of reference would be updated to reflect this decision.</p>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Finance Update</b>
5.1.	<p>DP is not available to join meeting today due to annual leave but would normally provide a detailed update as the main finance contact.</p>
5.2.	<p>JW confirmed that current expenditure is minimal.</p> <p>If budget limit is reached, a decision about future spend will be required from the Board with involvement from the Leader.</p> <p>Agreed that there is little intention to increase the current budget during the standstill period.</p> <p>JW to arrange a detailed financial update for RE with DP.</p>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Risk Update</b>
6.1.	<p>MJ proposed, subject to agreement by the Board, to defer for a month, a full review of the risk register, and in particular the cessation or not of the scheme in relation to external funders, until the outcomes of the meeting with the transport minister are known.</p> <p>MJ noted that the project risk register currently assumes continuation of the whole alignment but there are separate risks associated with each scheme, particularly with external funding (Marches Joint Committee for OLR).</p> <p>MJ noted that OLR is subject to multiple s106 agreements in the SUE West area; SC are obligated to provide infrastructure along the alignment of the OLR.</p> <p>If the schemes were split, a new planning application would be required for the OLR.</p> <p>The OLR has a materially different design iteration than NWRR and would reduce traffic on Welshpool Road and increase cycle/pedestrian links which would be beneficial with multiple developments in the area.</p> <p>MJ proposed drafting a paper on the risks of disaggregation of the two projects and the re-phasing of the OLR.</p> <p>RW instructed that this task is not currently required as spend should be kept to a minimum until the meeting with transport minister.</p>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Comms Update</b>
7.1.	<p>A press release will be issued to acknowledge confirmation of the meeting with transport minister. Officer representation may be required for technical queries.</p> <p>NN recommended preparation of press releases in advance of the meeting to ensure a reactive response.</p> <p>Agreed that clear comms are needed about the current standstill period.</p>
7.2.	<p>NN highlighted capacity concerns within comms team and requested approval to use Counter Context for NWRR related PR support, noting that this would incur costs.</p>

<b>8.</b>	<b>AOB</b>
8.1.	No other matters raised.
<b>9.</b>	<b>Actions and Decisions Summary</b>
9.1.	Decision: The Board agreed for [REDACTED] contract to be extended for up to two months – full time initially but to be reduced when possible. Review of work profile at next meeting.
9.2.	Decision: The Board decided that the finalisation of s106 agreements is not to be pursued as a priority.
9.3.	Decision: The Board decided that the Leader should attend the executive board meetings.
9.4.	Decision: The Board decided that stakeholders should be informed that the scheme is paused in anticipation of the meeting with the transport minister
9.5.	Action: MJ to update the project governance chart and terms of reference