

# Minutes

**Meeting Title:** St Ives Town Deal Board

**Date:** 11<sup>th</sup> November 2020

**Time:** 17:30 to 18:30

**Location:** Microsoft Teams

**Chaired by:** Sarah Stevens

**Attendees:** Members: Andrew Baragwaneth (AB), Libby Buckley (LB), James Butterworth (JB), Steve Cross (SC), Neil Davis (ND), Gareth Jones (GJ), Vanessa Luckwell (VL), Ian McChesney (IM), Andrew Mitchell (AM), Sarah Stevens (SS), Rowena Swallow (RS) Linda Taylor CC (LT), Derek Thomas MP (DT), Gareth Tudor (GT – joined at 18:09)  
Officers: Beth Briggs (BB), Lucy Davis (LD), Emily Kent (EK), Phill Woods (PW).  
Other attendees: Josie Gough (JG – CLGU), Matthew Pound (MP)

**1. Apologies:** Poppy Naylor (PN), Linda Taylor CC (LT)

## Minutes

## Action

### 2 Declarations of Interest

- JB and MP both declared an interest in item 4, as contributors to the proposal. It was agreed that they would leave for the duration of the discussion and be invited back later in the meeting in order to address any questions raised by the Board.

### 3 St Ives School Sports and Well-Being Hub

- JB and MP left the meeting at 17:35
- SS advised Members that the meeting had been called due to the receipt of more information on this project proposal which had been shared in advance of the meeting and the need to discuss it in detail before considering its inclusion in the TIP.

- Members undertook extensive discussion about the project, noting the positive aspects and benefits of the project and their will to support the project in some way.
- However, there was concern over the eligibility of the project against the intervention framework, and the large proportion of the fund that this project would require.
- The following questions/considerations were identified:
- Could costs be reduced (potential removal of digital/office, and possibly also pastoral hub at first stage), would the proposers be content with this and, if the project scope were to be reduced, would it fit with the town deal criteria?
- Planning permission, land ownership – concern over risks of gaining permissions and costs of acquiring necessary land.
- Overlap between centres included in proposal needs to be rationalised.
- Ownership of project – it was not clear that TD Board cannot manage delivery/ongoing costs and maintenance of the project and the school/TPAC would need to confirm willingness to do this.
- Concern costs could escalate from estimate – the Board felt that more accurate costs were required.
- Level of engagement with TPAC to date and commitment going forward to be clarified.
- Match funding availability – including whether there could be any DfE contribution forthcoming? JG noted that she could have an informal discussion with DfE colleagues as to potential of this.
- **ACTION:** JG to feed back comments from DfE.
- Integration between school and town – previously discussed as an aspiration, concern that having all these facilities on the school site would not serve to foster integration.
- Consideration of any potential impact on the leisure centre.
- Tennis centre – it was originally thought this redevelopment was not to be included (potential use of covered court by Porthminster club was noted).
- Need to be certain of fit with intervention framework and deliverability, risk of losing £15m of TD funding if the project were to be included in the TIP and subsequently scored low. JG confirmed that funding would not be reallocated to other projects, the level of funding awarded would be reduced.
- There was concern as to whether these questions could be addressed in time to include the project in the TIP bearing in mind internal sign off process prior to Jan submission.
- The initial key questions were identified as follows:
- Is the project eligible against intervention framework?

- Is the project what the school actually want and need (or has it been further developed and expanded to fit the TD framework)?
- Is the project deliverable and, if so, by who?
- JB and MP re-joined the meeting at 18:22.
- SS advised that there had been extensive discussion and that follow up discussions would be required after the meeting.
- DT stressed his commitment over the past few years to working with the school to build a sport facility. He enquired as to whether the current proposal had been developed to match the fund and whether the school would be happy with simply producing a sports facility.
- JB advised that this had, to a certain extent been the case to ensure the criteria were met, but that they felt there was a strong identified need for a pastoral hub. He advised that they would be very willing to work with the Board to produce a workable proposal.
- MP added that they would seek to answer the Board's questions and re-work the proposal to minimise the risk to the Board.

#### 4 Next Steps

- **ACTION:** LD to follow up with JB and MP on questions raised by Board.