

Minutes

Meeting Title: St Ives Town Deal Board

Date: 6th October 2020

Time: 17:00 to 19:30

Location: Microsoft Teams

Chaired by: Sarah Stevens

Attendees: Members: Andrew Baragwaneth (AB), Libby Buckley (LB), Steve Cross (SC), Neil Davis (ND), Gareth Jones (GJ), Vanessa Luckwell (VL), Ian McChesney (IM), Andrew Mitchell (AM), Poppy Naylor (PN), Sarah Stevens (SS), Rowena Swallow (RS), Linda Taylor CC (LT), Gareth Tudor (GT – joined at 17:28)
Officers: Beth Briggs (BB), Imogen Day (ID), Lucy Davis (LD), Emily Kent (EK), Phill Woods (PW).

1. Apologies: James Butterworth (JB), Tony Harris (TH), Derek Thomas MP (DT)

Minutes

Action

2 Minutes of Last Meeting

- Agreed as a true and correct record of the last meeting
- Matters arising:
 - LD confirmed that she had not yet received the requested information from JG and had chased for this.
 - Members to feed back on ideas for reaching 18-25 and 80+ demographics – no feedback had been received but PN advised that KH's view was that this was representative of the local demographic.
 - Bay to Bay – LD confirmed she has spoken to Transport and was awaiting cost estimate for feasibility study by end of week.
 - Affordable Housing – EK advised she had spoken with Property team who were working with Housing colleagues in relation to a number of sites. The approach would be for LD and EK to be involved in those conversations and include the relevant Eols.

- Feasibility studies – LD advised that the Board needed to decided on projects before incurring costs on too many studies.

3 Declarations of Interest

- SS declared an interest in item 4(2) due to the proposer being a family friend.
- AM declared an interest item 4(3) due to his position on the Town Council and also in item 4(9) due to his position of church warden.
- AB declared an interest as Chairman of St Ives RFC.
- RS declared an interest in items 4(11) and 4(12) due to her position at the Workshop CIC. She also noted that, whilst she didn't have a direct interest in item 4(8), she had been in discussion with the proposer as part of the considerations of the Workshop CIC proposal for the Malakoff.
- PW advised that, especially at this stage in the process when projects were being considered for TIP inclusion, it was important to ensure a robust approach to code of conduct/declarations of interest and advised that those declaring an interest should remove themselves from the meeting for the duration and voting on the relevant items.
- PW reminded Members that their register of interest forms were open to inspection at any time and that it was Members' responsibility to ensure they were up to date.
- PW advised that Cornwall Council could offer support in terms of advice on the code of conduct and asked all Members to ensure they were familiar with the document.
- PW also reminded members that Board papers were confidential and should not be shared outside the Board.
- PW noted that any prior knowledge of projects Members had about projects, which was not included in the EoI should not be considered as part of discussion and only information presented to the Board formally should be considered in the decision-making process.

4 Project Proposals

- **Overview project list** – LD advised that the purpose of this item was to consider each project and for the Board to decide if each one should progress to the scoring stage.
- **Expressions of interest:**
 1. **Cear'du Digital Media**
 - Members felt that there was not adequate information to consider this project in detail.

- EK advised that there was a question as to whether this constituted capital rather than revenue spend.
- It was felt that, at this stage of the process, the Board did not have the available resource to work up projects that were too light on detail.
- Following discussion, Members did not agree to this project in principle.

2. Surf Life-saving Club

- SS reiterated her interest in this item and left the meeting at 17:24, with SC taking the Chair.
- Members considered this to be a strong proposal and that the proposer could look to link with other proposals.
- It was clarified that this was a separate project to the Surf School.
- Risk of flooding was noted as a concern with developing the West end of the beach.
- Overall, Members agreed that this project was of merit.
- This project was agreed in principle by the Board.
- SS returned to the meeting at 17:36 and retook the Chair

3. St Ives Town Council

- AM reiterated his interest in this item and left the meeting at 17:36.
- Members requested clarification on the potential to increase the maximum capacity within the premises to allow for more events to be commercially viable.
- Clarification on ownership of the lighting within the building was also requested.
- This project was agreed in principle by the Board.
- AM returned to the meeting at 17:40.

4. St Ives Community Energy Cooperative

- Members felt that there was not adequate information provided.
- Members were unsure as to whether there would be adequate output from this site to make it viable.
- It was not clear from the proposal whether the EA had been consulted.
- LD noted that further information provided by the proposer indicated that a feasibility study could be conducted for a cost of approximately £4k.
- Following discussion, Members did not agree to this project in principle.

5. Manna Food and Training CIC

- Members felt that more information was required in terms of land ownership, lease arrangements and specifics around what the costs were for.

- It was felt that there was merit in the project and that a café at the site was a good idea.
- However there was some concern about this site for a training café.
- Members felt that sight of a business plan was required to gauge the viability of the project.
- PW noted that strict timetables must be adhered to when requesting further information on this and all other projects in order to make decisions on TIP inclusion.
- This project was agreed in principle by the Board, subject to further information from the proposer regarding deliverability (including any track record of similar projects), land ownership and size.

6. St Ives Climate Action Group

- SS noted that there was a meeting with SICAG arranged for the following day to discuss bigger picture vision.
- Members questioned the role of the CAG in this EoI and wondered if it would be more appropriate for the housing associations to make a direct approach for their properties. The question of whether the CAG was a constituted body that could receive the money was questioned.
- There was concern over the deliverability and mechanism of this project considering the involvement of multiple asset holders.
- Engagement with all potential partners (asset holders) was required before this project could be progressed.
- The concept of this project was agreed in principle, noting that the first step was a conversation with all local housing associations.

7. Ver Facil Ltd

- ND explained the concept of this project as some Members were unclear as to what it was offering.
- This would take the form of a network of low power, low frequency monitoring devices which would create a network across the town.
- Those wanting to take part would have to buy/build sensors and acquire the software and could then use the network to monitor outputs. Uses include monitoring pedestrian traffic for shops, the Council etc.
- GT noted the potential interest in the project from an educational point of view.
- It was noted that a more detailed proposal had been sent alongside the EoI and should be circulated to Members for consideration.
- It was agreed to defer this item to the Extraordinary Board meeting to be held on 7th October, following circulation of the additional information relating to this proposal.

8. St Ives eBikes

- Members felt this to be an important project and one that fit well with the vision of the TIP in terms of sustainable transport.
- It was noted that this would link well with other projects.
- This was a three-part proposal and Members felt that the focus should be on the first two parts and felt that the infrastructure should be put in place before this business was developed.
- Projects 1 and 2 of this EoI were agreed in principle.

9. St Ia and St Johns in the Field

- AM reiterated his interest in this item and left the meeting at 18:20.
- Members felt that this project was deliverable and worth further exploration.
- It was noted that Manna Food was mentioned in this proposal (see item 4(5) and that the current proposed site might be a more appropriate site for the training facility mentioned in the earlier proposal.
- There was a question around the accessibility of the two-bedroom flat and use of that outside the church.
- This project was agreed in principle by the Board, subject to clarification on the use of the flat and discussion about the siting of the Manna Food training facility.

10. Cornwall Council – Rugby Club site

- AB reiterated his interest in this item and left the meeting at 18.30
- As Cornwall Council Officers, the Board agreed that LD, EK and PW should also leave the meeting and that AM should remain out of the meeting. All left at 18.30.
- The Board agreed that ID should remain in the meeting to offer any planning advice that might be useful to discussion.
- Members felt that the proposal was a good fit as a key strategic site for the St Ives TIP.
- It was noted that more detail would be required and that visuals of proposed development would be useful at TIP stage.
- It was felt that match funding would be key to this proposal. This project was agreed in principle by the Board.
- LD, EK, AM and PW returned to the meeting at 18.39.

11. St Ives CLT – Malakoff

- RS reiterated her interest in this item and item 4(12) and left the meeting at 18.39
- It was noted that there were aspects of this proposal that would also be considered in relation to item 12 below. It was noted that, should Members wish to, both projects (items 4.11 and 4.12) could be agreed

in principle, at which point the merits of each project would be objectively scored.

- Members felt that this proposal was strong, but that it was the building that was a concern.
- Members agreed that a structural survey would need to be provided to offer assurance that the building was sound, otherwise the sum being requested was unlikely to be enough. There was concern over commercial viability of the building.
- Members felt that the proposal was not clear on what the sum being requested would deliver and that there was concern over deliverability within the timeframe.
- It was noted that the proposal included housing of the archive, which was an attractive prospect.
- Members considered that the project itself certainly had merit, and perhaps an alternative venue might be more appropriate.
- Following discussion, Members did not agree to this project in principle.

12. St Ives Workstation CIC - Malakoff

- It was noted that there were similar concerns as above to this project in terms of the viability of the building.
- Members also felt that the nature of this project may be out of date in consideration of the changes created by covid and the lack of requirement for workspace.
- Members felt that they would need to see more information about the business case.
- AB re-joined the meeting at 18:59
- EK noted that the Board may wish to reflect on the hugely complex nature of this building, and the significant risk in investing public funding. She also noted that, in relation to all projects, the Board should consider track record of deliverability by proposers.
- There was consensus among Members that the need to be ambitious in order to be transformational needed to be balanced with risk.
- The possibility of the Board commissioning a survey was discussed, with EK noting that the timeframe was tight and it was unlikely that the Board would be able to achieve enough certainty in time for TIP submission.
- It was noted that the last survey to be conducted was not publicly available and had not been made available to the Board or Officers.
- It was noted that, due to the level of public funding that would be required to refurbish the building, any surveys should be in the public domain for transparency.
- EK noted that the Board could consider other options around the building, but that there was now very limited time to have these conversations on future strategy.

- Following discussion, Members did not agree to this project in principle.
- RS returned to the meeting at 19:05.

5 Draft Vision and Objectives

- It was noted that LD would cover this in the workshop due to be held on Thursday 8th October.

6 Theory of Change – October Session

- As above, it was noted that LD would cover this in the workshop due to be held on Thursday 8th October.

7 Budget update

- LD reported that there was £74k of the capacity budget remaining.

8 AOB and Next Steps

- **Edward Haines hospital** – it was noted that this matter was not going to progress through Towns Fund and was instead being progressed via other means.
- **Discretionary Fund** – LT advised that she had been investigating the possibility of ringfencing some of the funding (£1m was suggested).
- LT sought an indication from the Board as to whether they were in support of this idea before investigating further.
- LD noted that she, along with Leads from other Cornish Towns, were seeking clarification from Government and that she had chased JG for a response.
- It was agreed that LD/LT investigate this idea further.
- **Accelerated Fund** – LD noted receipt of the confirmation of the accelerated fund from Government.
- PW advised that the Economic Growth team was currently working up contracts with the delivery bodies in order for projects to progress.

LD / LT

9 Date and time of next meeting

- Extraordinary Board meeting to be held at 5pm on 7th October.
- Next Board meeting to be held at 5pm on 20th October.
- It was noted that, following the above meetings, there would be a move back to monthly, rather than fortnightly meetings.