

# Minutes

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

**Date:** 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2020

**Time:** 17:00 to 19:00

**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 – joined at 19.07), Rowena Swallow (RS), Derek Thomas MP (DT)  
Officers: Beth Briggs (BB), Lucy Davis (LD), Emily Kent (EK), Phill Woods (PW).

**1. Apologies:** James Butterworth (JB), Tony Harris (TH), Linda Taylor CC (LT)

## Minutes

## Action

### 2 Minutes of Last Meeting

- The minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2020 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

### 3 Declarations of Interest

- ND declared an interest in Item 4, where Metro Dynamics was to be discussed. It was noted that LD would also leave the meeting during this discussion.
- AB declared an interest in any discussion relating to the Rugby Club as Chairman of the club.
- SC declared an interest as BID representative, if their proposal is discussed.
- RS declared an interest due to her involvement with the Workstation CIC.
- GJ declared an interest as an employee of LiveWest

- EK, PW and AM to leave during any items relating to Cornwall Council.

#### 4 Projects subgroup

- SS advised that this was an opportunity for Members to review the recommendations to the Board and discuss the projects which should go forward for inclusion in the TIP.
- **BID proposal** – AB raised the possibility of reconsidering the BID traffic calming proposal which had previously not been progressed.
- SC reiterated his interest in this item and left the meeting at 17:09.
- It was noted that, although this project had not progressed to scoring when originally considered by the Board, now that the project shortlist for the TIP had been considered in more detail and the themes were emerging, it was worth revisiting this proposal as a good strategic fit with the TIP.
- Members noted the complexity of shaping the projects for the TIP and that this was in iterative process with the project list needing to be revised in line with developing clusters/themes of projects, as required by Government.
- The project was originally turned down based on concerns over revenue vs capital spend and necessity for development revenue, and the fact the proposal was not explicit in terms of strategic fit.
- However it was noted that the project would have benefits for town centre businesses, Covid recovery and improvement of air quality.
- There had been a positive response from residents to the recent pedestrianisation initiative, although it was noted that a number of exemptions had been issued for residents and businesses, something which would need to be carefully considered.
- AM felt that this project would require a referendum in the town.
- LD provided an overview of the BID proposal to remind Members of the content.
- Members felt that a resident consultation would be required.
- Members considered that the barrier system could be flexible and adapted to the town's needs at different times of the year.
- It was noted that Stage 1 of the proposal entailed feasibility work that would include public consultation and planning.
- Stage 2 estimate was subject to change based on the outcomes of stage 1.
- It was noted that this initiative would fit with the larger scale plan at Cornwall Council in terms of keeping road traffic down post-Covid.
- VL advised that her understanding was that costings had been built into the estimates for 15 years' upkeep. She also advised that Cormac would conduct feasibility work to establish suitable locations.

- It was noted that this project aligned with the transport strategy drawn up previously, as well as the Neighbourhood Plan.
- EK clarified that the feasibility work would likely be required during business case development and, as such, the Town Deal funding would not have been released. She noted that up to 10% of the TIP could be made up of revenue spend, but that a careful look at resourcing development of Stage 2 was required, as well as any use of the capacity fund should there be any remaining funds available at that stage.
- Members considered whether BID or Cormac could assist with resourcing this work.
- EK noted that a wider strategic conversation with Cornwall Council colleagues would be required in terms of a contribution to development work across a number of projects.
- It was agreed by the Board that this project would progress to scoring, subject to clarification by BID regarding deliverability, resourcing and strategic fit.
- **ACTION:** LD to go back to BID with this information/request for feedback.
- **ACTION:** LD to obtain a copy of the transport strategy.
- SC re-joined the meeting at 17:40
- **Acquisition of town centre building** – the details of the building in question were not made public due to commercial sensitivities.
- Members considered the inclusion of exploring the purchase, with the possibility of tying in projects that had previously been considered but had deliverability concerns due to lack of identified space such as the archive, hospitality training facility and Kids R Us.
- The Board agreed in principle to explore this project in further detail.
- DT noted an offer of assistance should it be required.
- **Palais de Danse** – EK related this proposal back to the ‘tippex test’ which should be borne in mind when writing the TIP, in that removal of the name of the Town should still leave a clear town identity.
- There was concern over the lack of community focus in the proposal, and also potential competition with the Guildhall. Members also noted the low level of match funding in the proposal.
- Members considered that the proposal could be funded via other routes and did not wish to take it forward.
- **Sport Hub** – RS noted her concern with overlap between this project and the Workstation CIC project.
- SS felt that the level of detail received regarding the Workstation CIC proposal had not allowed Members a full understanding of the potential overlap and felt that the sharing of information from both sides was important.

LD

LD

- **ACTION:** LD to arrange a meeting with Workstation CIC to discuss the Sports Hub proposal, inviting the Board so that all interested parties could attend.
- SS enquired as to whether RS could provide a business case regarding the Workstation CIC for that meeting.
- **Project list** – in terms of the overall project list, Members considered that the ‘top half’ projects were a good starting point but that, until the TIP was drafted, the final list of projects was still moveable.
- As such, no proposers should be told categorically that their project would not be included, to allow for clustering and movement as the TIP themes developed.
- SS considered that PN could work with Cornwall Council to put together comms to update community on progress, and to get their feedback.
- **ACTION:** PN/officers to work up general community feedback comms.
- **Metro Dynamics Limited** – SS raised the matter of engaging Metro Dynamics Limited (MDL) to assist in drafting the TIP, as per her email the previous week.
- LD and ND left the meeting at 18:38.
- SS advised that the additional resource was required in order to produce the TIP prior to the deadline.
- Members considered the roles MDL and LD would be responsible for in terms of TIP development.
- EK noted MDL’s track record of producing robust evidence data and that they have a lot of information at their fingertips.
- PW advised that he would have an offline discussion with LD in terms of any change in working hours to allow for this arrangement and would liaise with SS to resolve this discussion.
- There were concerns over the current level of the capacity budget, but Members considered this to be an investment to support LD in producing a high quality TIP.
- PW noted that officers were currently looking at the possibility of providing additional funding to assist with feasibility studies.
- It was agreed to engage Metro Dynamics Limited at a total cost of £24,900 to provide assist with drafting of the TIP.
- **ACTION:** PW to discuss arrangements with LD.
- **ACTION:** LD/PW to progress with MDL procurement.
- LD and ND re-joined the meeting at 18:56.

LD

PN /  
LDPW /  
LD

## 5 Delegated Fund

- LD advised that she had spoken with CDC to establish their capability in this regard. She noted that this was alongside the work LT had undertaken on this item.

- Members noted that CDC was working with the Penzance Board on a similar fund and were therefore in a position to adapt that proposal quite easily.
- LD advised that CDC would be able to manage the fund, including monitoring of projects etc. and could also assist the Board in developing the focus of this fund, particularly around Covid recovery.
- Members were keen to progress this discussion, feeling concerned that this needed to progress at speed in order to be considered for TIP inclusion.
- It was agreed that a meeting be arranged with CDC in order to progress discussions.
- **ACTION:** LD to arrange meeting between Board and CDC.
- It was noted that a future action would be consideration as to level of funding to be allocated to this fund.

LD

## 6 Budget Update

- A budget update had been circulated with the agenda pack.
- LD noted that the £30k factored in for feasibility studies were for the known requirements to date.
- LD noted she was currently working with the accounts team to confirm the level of spend within the comms budget.
- SS enquired as to the level of additional funding. PW advised that this was not known at present.

## 7 Any other business

- EK was asked for clarification on the suggestion of ringfencing an amount for project management.
- EK advised that, looking at Cohort 1 TIPs, some towns had factored in a sum to allow the appointment of a team to manage the distribution of the £25m and associated co-funding as a single revenue cost. However, this could also be wrapped up in each individual project, which had been previously advised by Government.
- It was agreed that this matter would be put onto the agenda for the next meeting to discuss in more detail.
- **ACTION:** LD to add project management fund to agenda.

LD

## 8 Date and time of next meeting

- It was felt that fortnightly meetings were still necessary at present.
- Next meeting – 17:00 to 19:00 on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2020