

Minutes

Meeting Title: St Ives Town Deal Board

Date: 7th 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 – left between 18:00 and 18:38), Sarah Stevens (SS), Rowena Swallow (RS), Linda Taylor CC (LT – left between 18:00 and 18:10), Gareth Tudor (GT)
Officers: Beth Briggs (BB), Lucy Davis (LD), Emily Kent (EK).

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

Minutes

Action

2 Declarations of Interest

- GJ declared an interest in item 3(3) due to LiveWest being his employer.
- SS declared an interest in item 3(15) due to the proposer being a family friend.
- AM declared in interest in item 3(1) due to his position on the Tate Advisory Board.
- SC declared an interest item 3(6) due to his position as BID representative.

4 Project Proposals

1. Tate St Ives

- AM reiterated his interest in this item and left at 17:06.
- Members wondered how contingent this project was on funding that was currently unsecured.

- The community use aspect was discussed, with Members appreciating that commercial viability was important but that community use was very important in order to reflect a strategic fit with the TIP.
- Members agreed this project in principle, subject to more detail as to the community use aspect.
- AM returned to the meeting at 17:17.

2. Community Orchard and Nature Reserve

- Members felt this project had merit and were largely supportive, but that the level of detail as to what the money was to be used for was inadequate.
- Members would like sight of a business plan.
- Members agreed this project in principle, subject to more detail and provision of a business plan.

3. LiveWest

- GJ reiterated his interest in this item and left the meeting at 17:20.
- Members felt that this was a worthwhile project and offered a good fit to the TIP in terms of reducing the carbon footprint of properties.
- There was discussion as to the recent Government announcement offering grants of £5k per household for this. It was noted that the proposal may have been produced prior to this announcement, and that this might not be applicable to the properties in the proposal, but Members would like LiveWest to address this issue.
- SS acknowledged that they were proposing to upgrade the worst performing properties but wondered if the proposal could consider all their properties.
- Members agreed this project in principle, subject to discussion around widening the project, and confirmation that they have considered the Government grant scheme.
- GJ returned to the meeting at 17:26.

4. H Tempest

- Location of the business in terms of the boundary map was queried, with LD advising that this project could be included.
- Members felt there was merit to this project but that more information was required.
- It was noted that this formed part of their fleet replacement plan, but that the green vehicles were more expensive.
- Community use was discussed, with Members feeling that the commitment to facilitating community use was necessary in order for this to be a strategic fit.
- The possibility of increasing the proportion of co-funding was queried.

- Members agreed this project in principle, subject to confirmation of figures, further discussion around co-funding, a commitment to support of community use (including minibus training for community groups) and information about car ownership within the boundary map.

5. Riva holdings

- It was noted that this was the old Nat West building, and that work had already commenced on this project.
- It was felt that adequate funding and a business would have been established prior to work commencing.
- Members were not clear on what the contribution would deliver or how this project would fit with the TIP.
- Members agreed that this project would not progress to scoring.

6. St Ives BID

- SC reiterated his interest in this item and left the meeting at 17:41.
- The phase for which they were requesting funding was queried. It was noted that they were seeking funding for both phases, but that the costs of phase 2 was dependant on delivery of phase 1.
- Members felt that the sum of money in this proposal could alternatively be used to employ people to control traffic which would provide employment in the town.
- There were concerns around whether this was a capital, rather than revenue, project. It was noted that the initial development work was revenue spend.
- It was noted that the existing Town Deal capacity fund would not be able to support the development work required.
- Members were concerned that strategic fit was not outlined in the proposal.
- Members agreed that this project would not progress to scoring.

7. St Ives Train Station (Cornwall Council)

- LD, EK, VL, AM and LT, as Cornwall Councillors/Officers, left the meeting at 17.51
- There was discussion about the extent of the project put forward, with Members understanding from feedback from previous meetings that Town Deal contribution would be limited to the Station refurbishment at this point, with the passing loop being a later phase of the project.
- There was discussion around the possibility of a multi-storey carpark, with the bus terminal at the top, possibly with access limited to residents working in the town centre to facilitate employment in the centre, however there were concerns about this not aligning with Cornwall Council's environmental impact approach.

LD

- **ACTION:** LD to enquire with Cornwall Council as to consideration of a multi-storey carpark as part of the station plans.
- Members considered the level of financial contribution from the national organisations compared to Town Deal funding request.
- There was a discussion around timescales and what could be delivered within the Town Deal timeframe. It was noted that the whole project would be phased over 8-9 years.
- It was felt that this opened an important debate around transport infrastructure.
- In terms of best fit with the TIP, Members felt that the focus should be on the Station and what could be done in terms of refurbishment of the station and creation of the multi-modal hub.
- PN noted her support for the project and left the meeting at 18.00.
- Members agreed the project in principle, subject to confirmation that the station improvements/multi-modal hub creation would form the Town Deal component of the project and with a request for more detailed costings of this part of the project.
- LD, EK, VL and AM re-joined the meeting at 18:00

8. Coast B&B

- Members did not consider this project a strategic fit.
- Members could not see the community interest or wider benefits of this project.
- Members agreed that this project would not progress to scoring.

9. CLT green pantry

- Members considered that this project could link in with the Orchard project.
- It was noted that the Board had previously agreed in principle a project for Richmond Park and that this would need to be considered.
- It was noted that the price for acquisition of land was not included in the proposal.
- Members agreed the project in principle, subject to further information regarding land acquisition.

10. St Uny

- AM noted that, although he had not declared an interest in this item and was not directly involved with the organisation, he would abstain from voting on this item due to the proposer's connection with Churches Together.
- Clarification was sought as to whether this was within the boundary. LD advised there was a good case to include.

- It was suggested that this project might be better suited to a smaller grant scheme.
- Members considered that more details were required, including the benefit to the community of the proposed facilities.
- Members considered whether these projects could be considered as part of the proposed discretionary fund being investigated by LD and LT.
- Members agreed the project in principle, subject to information on business plan and explicit fit with the matrix criteria.

11. Combined Churches

- There were three projects included in this proposal.
- It was noted that there was not much detail in these proposals.
- First project: Methodist Church Carbis Bay – it was queried as to whether Cornwall Council had been consulted as there may be planning considerations.
- It was noted that there were projects within Richmond Park agreed in principle so these would need to be linked up.
- Members wondered if the school holiday activities included childcare for working parents.
- Second Project: Bedford Rd Methodist Church – the concept of a credit union was viewed as positive, but it was noted that the sum of money required might better fit into a smaller grant fund.
- Third project: Anglican Church Carbis Bay – the use of the phrase ‘young mothers’ was highlighted as exclusionary and it was felt that ‘parents’ would be a better choice.
- There was discussion around the management and deliverability of these projects within the Town Deal.
- EK advised that the arrangements for distributing the funding would be the same for any size of project, so Members needed to consider the staff time involved in these arrangements compared to the size of the grant.
- Members considered whether these projects could be considered as part of the proposed discretionary fund being investigated by LD and LT.
- Members agreed the project in principle, in order to keep the projects ‘on the table’ for further consideration.

12. Soggy’s Story House

- Members considered that, due to the size of the building, there would be an issue with social distancing and that, even when any distancing measures were lifted, the capacity would be very limited.
- Members also felt that the community benefits were not explicit and that this appeared to be largely a tourist attraction.
- It was felt that this was an expensive way to achieve this offering.

- Members agreed that this project would not progress to scoring.

13. Salvation Army

- AM noted that, although he had not declared an interest in this item and was not directly involved with the organisation, he would abstain from voting on this item due to the proposer's connection with potential partner organisations.
- Members were concerned that the land had not been secured and they were aware that this land was potentially high in price.
- Members noted that they were supportive of affordable housing in principle but were concerned about the deliverability of this project about would require more information regarding discussions with landowner.
- Members also noted the possibility that the land would not be available to purchase by the time the Town Deal funding had been released.
- Members agreed the project in principle, subject to confirmation of an agreement with the landowner of acquisition of the land on viable terms.

14. Sailing School

- Members queried the potential premises as this was not identified in the proposal. There was concern that such a property would not be available.
- Members felt that there were other facilities in the county but appreciated that people had to travel.
- It was considered that this project could link with other projects.
- Members agreed the project in principle, subject to further discussion regarding potential property and consideration of a link with other projects.

15. Language Tree

- SS reiterated her interest in this item and left the meeting at 18:48. SC took the chair.
- Members considered what impact this project would have on St Ives and the community.
- It was also noted that the costs of staying in St Ives may prove prohibitive to international students.
- It was considered that this was a commercial proposal and did not provide a good strategic fit with the Town Deal.
- Members agreed that this project would not progress to scoring.
- SS returned to the meeting at 18:53

Additional project – Ver Facil (deferred from Board meeting held on 6th October 2020, item 4(7) refers)

- Additional information relating to this project had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting.
- Members considered the potential benefits and risks of this project.
- It was noted that implementation relied on buy-in from local organisations, who were required to acquire their own sensors and software package and there was therefore a risk that, following initial installation, the network may not be utilised.
- GT advised that, from an educational perspective, this was an exciting opportunity in terms of access to a data cloud and building of own sensors. He also noted that uses may extend beyond those already identified due to innovation by students.
- The potential to encourage young people into digital jobs and the potential of digital tech companies generating jobs in the town were considered a good fit with the Theory of Change.
- The life of the system was queried, with ND advising that the proposer intended to support for 5 years.
- ND advised that the company was planning a network across 10 Cornish towns which would encourage wider connectivity.
- Members agreed the project in principle.

Additional project – delegated fund

- LD advised that in conversation with other Cornish Town Deal Leads, she had established that this type of fund could be included in the TIP.
- If the Board was supportive of this idea, then a delivery mechanism needed to be established.
- SS noted that previous feedback suggested that there was not adequate time to establish a new delivery body for this purpose and therefore the way to deliver this was via an existing body.
- It was noted that CDC had indicated they were able to provide this service. EK advised that existing community-based organisations or the Town Council may be interested in such a project.
- It was noted that this project could fill an identified strategic gap in terms of enterprise infrastructure.
- Members considered it appropriate for this to be progressed through the business subgroup.
- LD advised that the business group had not met for some months and requested Members take the lead on arranging a meeting of this group due to the pressures on her time at present.
- **ACTION:** SS to liaise with LT to arrange a meeting of the business subgroup.

SS / LT

- It was noted that this item was not on the agenda so no sum would be voted on at the current meeting, but Members were in agreement in principle with the concept of the fund and would consider further in due course, following feedback from the business subgroup.

5 Stage Two Project Prioritisation

- It was noted that there was a meeting the following morning, 8th October with Arup to consider this in more detail.
- SS proposed the creation of a subgroup of three Members, who did not have any conflicts of interest in any of the projects, as well as GJ due to level of previous experience in such matters (but noting that he would not be involved with scoring the LiveWest project).
- SS noted that she had spoken with GT, ND and IM in this regard, who had indicated their willingness to undertake this process.
- SS advised that Arup had confirmed this process was acceptable and noted that it was similar to that being conducted in other towns.
- RS noted her concern and did not support the idea as she felt the scoring should take the form of a wider democratic process.
- SS confirmed that this subgroup would make recommendations, not decisions, which would come back to the Board for consideration, interrogation and final decision. She noted that the purpose of this process was to streamline the scoring process.
- SS advised, in line with advice from Arup, that whole Board scoring was an impossible task but that the Board would have final decision on all proposals.
- Members agreed that a subgroup consisting of ND, GJ IM and GT would be convened to score the projects, with recommendations being brought back to the Board.
- **ACTION:** SS to liaise with subgroup to arrange first meeting.

SS