



# Minutes

**Meeting Title:** Penzance Town Deal Board

**Date:** 4<sup>th</sup> May 2020

**Time:** 0815 to 1030

**Location:** Microsoft Teams

**Chaired by:** Martin Tucker

**Attendees:** Emmie Kell (V), Nicole Broadhurst (V), Susan Stuart (V), Sarah Shaw (V), Derek Thomas MP (V), Rob Parsons (V), Cllr Tim Dwelly (V), Cllr Jim McKenna (V), Cllr Roger Harding (V), Henry Garfit (V), Tim Wotton (V), Dick Cliffe (V), Rachel Yates (V), Jess Morris (O), Hester Hunt (O), Emily Kent (O), James Hardy (O), Claire Hurley (O), David Krohn (V) and David Rodda (O)

**Apologies:** Cllr Cornelius Olivier, Nick Hood

(V) – Voting Member (O) Non-Voting / Officer

## Minutes

## Action

### 1 Declarations of Interest

- None were declared

### 2 Minutes of the last meeting

- These were checked for accuracy by those present and agreed unanimously as a true and correct record of the last meeting.

Minutes	Action
<b>3 Matters arising from the minutes</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was pointed out that some of the names of board members were spelt incorrectly on the circulated agenda and should be corrected in future to read Cornelius Olivier, Rachel Yates and Roger Harding. DR apologised for this and said he would correct future versions.</li> </ul>	DR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S Stuart asked for an update on the shared area that members could access all relevant past documents and papers relating to Place Shaping in Penzance. A “SharePoint” site is the most likely member only portal and is being investigated. CH would provide an update at the next meeting if not before.</li> </ul>	CH
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were reminded that the secretariat is required to have signed copies of the code of conduct and declaration of interests from all members. Whilst many had been submitted some were still outstanding. DR was actioned to contact those who have yet to submit their forms.</li> </ul>	DR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact of Covid 19 was raised and in addition to the version of the LEP survey focussing on Penzance which was circulated with the calling papers EK agreed to circulate a copy of the wider impact work being undertaken by her team.</li> </ul>	EK
<b>4 Update on Towns Fund</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DR updated the board that due to the appointment of a dedicated Place Shaping and Regeneration Manager within the Economic Growth Service the responsibility for the Towns Fund work and the management of the Town Deal Leads would move to that person from the 1<sup>st</sup> of June. He reiterated that the Policy and intelligence Team would continue to support the work as necessary.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DK provided an update on the fund from the perspective of MHGLG. Key points are as follows: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MHCLG team working on the Towns Fund are now returning from their work on Covid 19 and whilst the detailed guidance on how the fund will operate, eligibility, etc has still to be issued it is with the Secretary of State for consideration.</li> <li>The progress being made in Penzance is noted and the board were urged to keep moving forward with their work on developing the TIP.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

## Minutes

## Action

- Whilst it is likely that the Towns Fund will in part need to focus on helping eligible Towns to recover from the impact of Covid 19 the exact scope and scale of this (as opposed to longer term regeneration proposals) is likely to be left to each Town Deal Board to decide.
- The timescales for submission and decision making are likely to slip from those outlined in the prospectus but the board were urged to bring their TIP forward when they are ready so that it can be considered rather than wait for a specific deadline.
- Linkages and co-ordination with any aligned spending by Cornwall Council, Public and Private match funding and the Future High Street proposals are vital to ensure that together they present an holistic vision for the future of Penzance.
- Post Covid 19 Economic recovery - will require a pan Cornwall approach in addition to activity focussed on Penzance.  
Interventions from the board at this point included: -
  - E Kell stated that the LEP Board were meeting on the 5<sup>th</sup> of May to discuss and asked board members to send her any concerns so that she could feed it into their discussions She also asked whether any member had any specific comments to the proposed response to the DCMS select committee consultation.
  - E Kent informed the board that she is starting work on a Covid 19 economic recovery plan and that this is likely to have a place-based approach to analysis and proposed responses. The work of the board will be useful to inform that work.
  - RP stated that the British Ports Authority had met to discuss the impact of Covid 19 on cargo and/or fishing ports and that it was vital that the specific issues relating to ports was considered, especially in Penzance and Newlyn.
- DT commented that he had written to Robert Jenrick MP, Secretary of State at MHCLG seeking clarity on how the funds can be used but has yet to receive a response. He undertook to keep pressing for a response.

**Board  
Members**

**Minutes****Action****5 Project Priorities/Criteria**

- CH informed the board that she is working on a matrix that identifies the different projects that had already been identified in Penzance and Newlyn and the different funds available in order to demonstrate how the FHSF and the Towns Fund can complement each other.
- In addition, she is working on a standard pro forma that all projects seeking inclusion in the Town Investment Plan would be asked to complete so that they could all be assessed/scored. This approach and the draft proforma was unanimously supported by the board as it would help to ensure that an open and transparent project selection process is followed. More detail can be added later as projects progress through the process, but it was agreed that any activity supported should create new economic activity rather than just prop up existing activity.
- A discussion ensued about the need to have a mix of “shovel ready” projects and more medium to long term regeneration projects in the TIP. Various examples were cited by members of the board that included specific capital investments and more general business support “delegated grant schemes”. It was noted that whilst suggestions are welcome that all projects would have to be put through the same process.
- It was felt by the board that having a clear vision to underpin the TIP would help to set the context for the boards work and that trying to please everybody was not a viable approach. Therefore, the board acknowledged that they faced some hard decisions ahead.
- CH also informed the board that she had started discussions with the Environment Agency who have planned expenditure as well as additional projects they would like to deliver in the area that might contribute to the objectives of the TIP. The proforma mentioned above will also help to capture information on possible co and match funding.
- The National Trust had also been in touch to discuss public transport options in order to improve the links between their various properties in the area and Penzance as a wider sustainable transport initiative. S Stuart agreed that a wider transport policy for the town and the surrounding area was required as it could open up employment opportunities as well as reduce car travel.

## Minutes

## Action

- The board then discussed how the TIP development process could be opened up to the wider community (businesses and residents). DR reminded the board that Government will be looking for evidence to demonstrate that there has been meaningful community and business engagement in the process.
- It was also suggested that part of project selection process should include sustainability (e.g. Carbon emissions) and Inclusive Growth (e.g. real Living Wage) metrics and the Sustainable Penzance Matrix tree was suggested as a possible basis for any scoring criteria.

## 6 Communications and Engagement

- CH outlined the discussions of the Communication sub group and outlined their recommendation that some of the capacity building budget should be used to procure external support to help the board to both communicate its work and drive deeper levels of engagement in the process with businesses and residents in the coverage area.
- A draft “Request for Quotation” was circulated for discussion and if agreed would be issued by the end of the day. There was general agreement in this proposed approach with the following comments:-
  - T Dwelly commented on the need to ensure that existing communication channels (e.g. PZ Facebook page) were used as they have a good following.
  - CH stated that the Communications Group had considered this and other existing channels but felt that if the work of the board is to reach out to young people and families different channels would need to be used in addition to existing channels that are used in the town. The central messaging would be developed by the external support and then existing communication channels would be asked to push it out to their cohorts in addition to new activity therefore developing a one message, multiple channel approach.
  - The ultimate aim is to demonstrate to Government that in developing the TIP the board had generated a “proper” discussion with businesses and residents in the Town that adds value to all existing work.
- An outline budget of £17,500 was agreed by the board for this work and CH was instructed to issue the RFQ asap.

CH

**Minutes****Action****7 COVID 19 SWOT**

- CH raised the possibility of creating a dedicated Covid 19 recovery subgroup to discuss and agree how focussed the Penzance TIP should be on the immediate impacts of Covid 19. If Government are going to leave the decision on this to the board then there needs to be some work carried out on which to base a position.
- The board agreed that there was an obvious and immediate need in the Town but recognised that Government have created numerous support packages that would help to deliver support to the majority of businesses/residents. Whilst there are still gaps the LEP and Cornwall Council should lobby for these to be filled by central Government.
- Therefore, the Towns Fund should as much as possible be focussed on the medium and long term regeneration of the Town in order help build resilience and should not be used as a “sticking plaster” for unviable businesses/projects/activities.
- There was a consensus from the board that the TIP should indicate an appetite for a more sustainable (economic, environment and social) town as part of the investment approach by adopting the UN Sustainable Development Goals as part of the project scoring criteria.
- The general view was that Covid 19 should be used as a catalyst for reform and renewal as it is clear that a very different high street will emerge in the coming months. Bold plans for things like traffic management should be considered. J Hardy offered to see if he could obtain any proposals from the Cornwall Council Highways team that might help inform these discussions further.

**JH****8 Budget**

- It was suggested that in addition to the £17,500 agreed earlier in the meeting for the external communications work that a further £2,500 should be allocated for printing materials for the consultation, etc. DR suggested that rather than have numerous budget lines the board could allocate a budget of £20,000 to the communications work and then let CH manage the expenditure within this overall allocation. The board agreed to this suggestion.

**Minutes****Action****9 Future Remote Decision Making**

- CH outlined the need to agree a process that allows for decision making to be more agile that allows for clear Governance over decision making but that also enables quick decision making to be made between board meetings if necessary. DR reminded the board that section 7 of the Terms of Reference allows for written procedures to be used.
- MT stated that he was supportive of the use of written procedures as a mechanism to be used only when decisions cannot wait until a board meeting and that in order to progress some structure around these processes would be useful.
- TD suggested that the decision process should rest with the chair and vice chair based on recommendations made by CH on the basis of her work or recommendations coming through the various subgroups.
- The board agreed that a written procedure structure should be created and requested that DR and CH should develop a draft to be discussed and agreed at the next meeting.

**CH/DR****9 AOB**

- JMorris suggested that the Covid 19 SWOT work could be something that the Communications Subgroup take on as it could form part of early engagement activity.
- JMck stated that the Chief Executive of Cornwall Council is working on a Covid 19 recovery plan and that the work of the board should link into that work.
- DT gave an update on what Government is doing to help support business that are falling through the gaps between existing support. Key points: -
  - Bounce Back Loan – 100% loan of £2k up to £50k for micro and small businesses that cannot access any of the other Government schemes. Interest paid by Government for the first year and then 2.5% after that with a 6-year repayment period expected.
  - National scheme to assist BID's who are vital to help drive regeneration but who are seeing their income reduce from their members. JMck also indicated that Cornwall Council was looking at what it could do to assist BID's in Cornwall to add to the national support on offer.

## Minutes

## Action

### 5 Date of Next Meeting

- 1<sup>st</sup> June 2020 – 0815 to 1015. Venue Microsoft Teams