

# Minutes

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

**Date:** 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2021

**Time:** 17:00 to 18:45

**Location:** Microsoft Teams

**Chaired by:** Sarah Stevens

**Attendees:** Members: Andrew Baragwaneth (AB), Libby Buckley (LB), Steve Cross (SC – joined at 17:24), Neil Davis (ND), Gareth Jones (GJ), Kirsty Kilmurry (KK), Vanessa Luckwell (VL), Poppy Naylor (PN), Sarah Stevens (SS), Rowena Swallow (RS), Linda Taylor (LT – left at 17:58), Derek Thomas MP (DT- left at 18:00).

Officers: Beth Briggs (BB), Emily Kent (EK), Iain Mackelworth (IM – left at 18:04), Louisa Philpott (LP, Arup – left at 18:04), Maria Vitale (MV, Arup – left at 18:04), Phill Woods (PW).

**1. Apologies:** Tony Harris (TH – subs. Kirsty Kilmurry, KK), Derek Thomas MP (DT)

## Minutes

## Action

### 2. Declarations of Interest

- None.
- SS advised that James Butterworth had resigned from the Board. She noted that Board membership would be discussed later in the meeting.

### 3. Minutes of the last meeting

- ND noted two minor errors to be corrected:
- Item 6, second bullet point – ‘now’ to be corrected to ‘no’
- Item 6, bullet point 14 – sentence to be completed.
- **ACTION:** BB to correct errors on final version.
- The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting, subject to the minor amendments above.

### 4. Arup presentation – support package for business case development

- LP and MV shared a presentation with the Board regarding the next stage of TIP development, that of producing business cases.

- LP noted that the slides would be made available to the Board after the meeting.
- There was discussion around what action could be taken whilst still awaiting decision from Government on award of funding.
- LP advised that speaking with project leads/applicants to establish their level of experience in terms of producing business cases and understanding of the Green Book 5 Case Model would be helpful in preparation.
- LP advised that Arup was able to assist projects that needed additional support, and that these should be identified.
- There was a lot of guidance including webinars available on the Towns Fund website that was accessible to all.
- A template for the 5 Case Model was available, along with guidance as to how much detail would be required dependant on the project size/scope.
- A Leadership Programme was also available with restricted numbers and LP would share the link.
- PW advised that Officers were scoping a Post Submission Assessment to be conducted on behalf of Cornwall Council, as accountable body, which would assess deliverability all projects against the 5 Case Model.

#### **5. Programme Management Office (PMO) – Presentation**

- IM presented information regarding the proposed PMO.
- It was noted that the slides would be circulated to the Board.
- IM noted that the PMO was in line with Cornwall Council's responsibility as accountable body within the governance in the original guidance from Government.
- IM noted that all four towns were being presented with this information and would benefit from the specialist expert functions the PMO could offer.
- IM advised that Cornwall Council would be looking to commence recruitment of a Town Deal Delivery Manager of as early as Easter to be in place from May onwards.
- IM clarified that, as per the information included in the TIP, the PMO would be funded by a 1.5% allocation of the awarded sum from each of the four town deals.
- IM advised that there would be bottlenecks during the course of the delivery process, such as contracting which would be a significant and time-critical task. The PMO would allow for a core team of staff with the ability to bring in specialists to assist with these distinct areas of delivery as required from the local supply chain and in line with the Council framework.
- IM noted that Board level support also continued to be available from Arup until October 2021.

- The issue of Board specific coordinators was discussed and IM advised that, through the delivery process, the emphasis would be on a central, specialist led team which would have the ability to adapt and evolve throughout the process, rather than the town-specific support that had been required to get towns through the submission process.
- IM advised that there would be a clear reporting structure and the Board could expect a quality of engagement equal to that received to date.
- IM advised that a post submission assessment was being carried out by Arcadis which would assess all projects across all four towns which would inform the PMO as to resourcing for full business case development.
- PW advised that this interim period was about understanding the needs of individual projects and, following the creation of the PMO and announcements from Govt. re. funding awarded, the Boards and Cornwall Council as accountable body would be in a strong position to move forward with the next stage.
- EK advised that Boards were welcome to input into the functions and scope of the PMO.
- **ACTION:** Board members to review slides and feed back thoughts.

## 6 Recruitment of new Board Members – consideration of required skills

- SS noted that following two resignations from the board, there was an opportunity to recruit new Members.
- Members considered any skill gaps that new members could fill.
- Experience around adult learning, training and skills were considered important as was the option of giving younger people a voice (with safeguarding issues to be considered with anyone under 18 being involved).
- More business representatives would also be welcomed, as would people with a legal background or experience with fundraising/grant funding applications.
- PN suggested this was an opportunity to conduct an audit of Board skills.

## 7. Pipeline Projects and Place Shaping – Town Deal Subgroups

- It was noted that the focus had, quite rightly, been on the TIP but that the wider place shaping aspirations for St Ives should now be considered.
- SS noted that she would discuss the Town Clerk to find out about any Town Council plans. KK advised that this would be a focus of the Town Council following purdah and she would pick up this conversation.
- SS noted that the role of the subgroups would need to be re-evaluated now the TIP had been developed and submitted and could consider wider place shaping functions and consider future possible funding streams.
- EK advised that place shaping should be driven by the town rather than Cornwall Council in the longer term, however there were members of PW's team who were working with towns in developing their list of

projects ready for future funding becoming available, and could offer some initial advice.

**8. TIP project costs**

- SS advised that ND had requested this item, and information from Metro Dynamics regarding project costs had been circulated in advance of the meeting in order to address his query regarding breakdown of costs in the TIP.
- The availability of all potential match funding identified by project leads was also queried.
- PW advised that this was specifically the kind of thing that the post submission assessment would be looking at, that all project costs would be appraised and would also be firmed up as part of business case development. Funding was a specific element of the PSA.

**9. Comms – purdah**

- It was noted that purdah was now in place until after the May 6<sup>th</sup> elections.
- It was noted that comms would be minimal during this time.

**10. Accelerated Fund Information Report**

- A report and accompanying photos had been circulated with the agenda pack.
- SS advised she had been informed that both projects were on track and due to be delivered within the specified timeframe.

**11. AOB**

- None.

**12. Date of next meeting**

- 5-7pm on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> April.