

# Minutes

**Meeting Title:** Penzance Town Deal Board

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

**Time:** 08:15 to 10:30

**Location:** Microsoft Teams

**Chaired by:** Martin Tucker

**Attendees:** Voting Members: Nicole Broadhurst (NB), Dick Cliffe (DC), CC Tim Dwelly (TD), Henry Garfit (HG), James Hardy (JH), Hester Hunt (HH), Emmie Kell (EKell), CC Jim McKenna (JMck), Cornelius Olivier (CO), Rob Parsons (RP), Sarah Shaw (SS), Susan Stuart (SSst), Martin Tucker (MT), Tim Wotton (TW)  
Non-Voting / Officers: Claire Hurley (CH), Phill Woods (PW), Jess Morris (JM), Emily Kent (EK).

**Apologies:** Voting Members: Nick Hood (NH), Derek Thomas (DT), CC Roger Harding (RH) Rachel Yates (RY).

<b>Minutes</b>	<b>Action</b>
<p><b>1 Welcome and Apologies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apologies noted above</li> <li>• MT noted the substantial workload on CH due to Accelerated Fund, and noted that the Board would support her in any way possible.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2 Declaration of Interests</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RP noted his pecuniary interest in Newlyn Harbour due to his position as Harbourmaster.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3 Minutes of the Last Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matter of accuracy – Item 12, Page 8 – EKell reported that £1.27 Billion had been released for Arts and Culture support. The Minutes incorrectly stated £1.2 Million.</li> <li>• The minutes were agreed by Members.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4 Matters arising not covered on the agenda</b></p>	

- Item 3, Page 2 – It was noted that a proposal had been received offering to work with Penzance, and a paper had been circulated to the Enterprise subgroup.
- Item 5, Page 3 – Minutes to reflect who has voting rights. It was noted that this had been actioned. CH noted that the previous minutes had also been updated for clarity.
- Item 7, Page 4 – CH confirmed that the guidance had been uploaded to the Teams site.
- Item 8, Page 4 – It was noted that subgroups were formed and meetings had been arranged.
- Item 12, Page 8 – It was noted that this item was on the agenda.

## **5 Accelerated Funding**

- MT reiterated concern over impact on CH workload and noted that although the Board wanted to take advantage of all available funding, It was important not to lose focus on main TIP.
- It was noted that projects under this funding should be delivered by March 2021 and therefore needed to be 'shovel ready' to be considered.
- The aim of in this meeting was to produce and agree a prioritised shortlist of projects.
- CH commented that she had worked to maximum estimates and that, once full costing were available, it might be possible to add a 'stand by' item to the list. Alternatively, if costs came in above estimate, it might be necessary to drop a lower priority item.
- CH shared the draft priority list in table format, which had been agreed at the Accelerated Funding prioritisation meeting the previous week, with the Board and each item was discussed in turn with their merits and deliverability being considered in producing the final list.
- Prom works – CH reported that she had received more detailed costings since the prioritisation meeting from Cormac/Transport, as included table. It was noted that works were already being undertaken and this was a shovel ready project.
- Acorn Theatre – It was noted that this project had already been costed. Some Members were concerned as to whether this project fitted the criteria and that assurances would be required that these funds would be used for capital expenditure. There were also concerns about other community groups feeling that they also deserved funding. It was considered that these groups had the opportunity to apply for the funding. It was noted that this organisation was not only for actors but offered many services to the community by way of youth groups etc.

- Shopmobility – Costs were queried. CH advised that this was currently a best-guess estimate. JH reported that he was waiting for cost information from various companies, was also in discussion about management/ownership. It was hoped that options and costs could be narrowed down very soon.
- It was also noted that a modern approach to this would consider alternative types of vehicles.
- It was noted that DT worked with someone who had been involved in the previous Shopmobility scheme and may be able to provide insight into why that scheme had not been successful.
- Green Gym – question over responsibility for management. It was noted that NB was to ask the Town Council if they would be willing to support the project and that this matter would be taken to the next meeting of the Council.
- Bike storage – it was noted that this project was scalable as there would be a cost per unit.
- TD commented that he was concerned about revenue costs associated with these projects and that the challenges associated with planning and procurement needed to be considered.
- CH noted that the bike storage, and likely the Green Gym could proceed under permitted development rights.
- It was noted that responsibility for the Prom Huts would sit with Cornwall Council.
- It was proposed by RP, seconded by JMCK and agreed by the Board that the list of interventions be approved, with CH to have the flexibility to remove/replace items based on detailed costing information.
- Thanks was noted to the group who had discussed the list at the prioritisation meeting.

CH

## 6 Forward Plan

- A copy of the plan had been circulated to Members.
- CH noted that although Cornwall Council would be waiting for CLG approval of the TIP funding, they had indicated they would be prepared to begin at risk in order to assist progress of works.
- Cormac to begin procurement process for bikes project.
- CH noted that she would be looking for volunteers from the Board to assist with assessing Expressions of Interest in August and scoring and assessing projects in September.
- CH noted that a decision should be received in January, at which point there was 12 months to conclude green book business cases.
- Members agreed to add an item to future agendas to cover items other than the TIP, in order to maintain an overview of the bigger picture of initiatives in Penzance.

- It was noted that, in exceptional circumstances, more than £25m would be granted by Government. Members felt that Penzance was exceptional in terms of economic modelling and high reliance on seasonal work which had been significantly affected by the pandemic. Members felt that this issue should be highlighted, to include evidence of level of jobseekers in the town.
- SME scheme – CH noted that, in order to capture small businesses under this scheme, it was important to consider deliverability models.

## 7 Theme Updates (TIP Structure)

### Update – Communications Group

- JM reported that the Town Deal website was due to go live this coming Wednesday as a microsite on the Love Penzance website.
- A competition had been launched to encourage involvement asking residents aged 10 to 19 to submit a video or photos showing their vision for Penzance. The prize was a GoPro Hero 8.
- The website would also include the contact form for Expressions of Interest.
- There was also a program of takeovers on the Love Penzance social media accounts, coordinated by Conscious Creatives.
- MT requested that an announcement be sent to all Members when the site goes live. It was noted that Mark Roberts (MR) at Conscious Creatives should be asked to do this.

CH / MR

### Update – Transport Working Group

- CH noted that there was significant crossover with other groups, which was a good indication that the Board was moving towards comprehensive plan.
- CH noted that the fact Towns Fund is a capital fund which makes delivering skills problematic but that the plans for Newlyn Harbour included skills facilities and there was interest in the project from Seafood Cornwall.
- CH reported that there were ambitious plans with regards to long term sustainable travel.
- CH reported that St Ives was keen to work on the bay to bay cycleway linking the towns' red lines. It was hoped that, despite falling outside each town's red line, the link serving two towns applying for the Fund would be considered by the CLG.
- It was noted that there were also discussions around the Tin Coast Partnership.

- CH noted that there was a lot of work progressing in the background, investigating previously mooted ideas.

### **Update – Enterprise/Skills Working Group**

- HG reported on the Discretionary Fund. He noted that much of the economy was driven by microbusiness and that capital spend on facilities and equipment could make a significant difference.
- HG felt that this fund should not be reduced to achieve larger projects and that it should be an aspiration of the Board to support sectors outside of tourism such as specialist manufacturing, and the film and creative industries.
- It was noted that, although there were other sources of funding available in the arts, it should not be assumed that all organisations were able to access them.
- There was a conflict between the wish to be flexible in providing funding to various organisations, whilst having to state the sectors the fund would be used for. It was considered that the requirements would not necessarily be known until applications were received.
- It was noted that the administration and management of the fund was being investigated. CDC and other providers were being consulted, 10% revenue funding could be used for lifespan costs.
- CH advised that St Ives were trying to encourage a Tech Cluster and Penzance representatives had agreed to meet with them the following week to look at ways of work together and support each other.
- JMCK commented that he would like to see community organisations represented within this fund, particularly those who had facilitated the response to the pandemic in terms of sustaining services and assisting healthcare and the Government.
- TD advised that administration of discretionary funds could be very complex and would need a clear definition in order to prevent people challenging decisions around which organisations were supported, sums provided etc.
- Members noted that the Board must continue to bear in mind the objectives of the Fund.
- EKell recommended that all Board Members revisit the latest Towns Fund guidance and Members concurred.
- SS indicated her interest in joining this group.

**ALL  
MEMBERS**

### **Update – Regeneration/Land Working Group**

- SSt reported that this group had held three meetings and had started to focus on outcomes. It was becoming clear that there was crossover with the Transport group.
- Vital areas being picked up by transport included:
  - Maritime – clear need for properly functioning harbours including improved infrastructure.
  - Larger movement project – enhance ability to get around, improved public realm, Bay to bay cycleway, and park and bike.
- With regards to maritime, RP advised that he was lobbying DFT to get maritime investment plan and could advise on this under the additional agenda item discussed earlier in the meeting.
- With regards to town centre public realm, the aim was to encourage pedestrians from the waterfront into the centre by improving was of access. The importance of green space in the town centre was also noted.
- Market House and green market was a focus, due to architectural importance and increasing property vacancies and the Board needed to consider a more mixed use town centre (other than retail) with a focus on repurposing buildings.
- SSt asked the Board to consider authorising the subgroup to commission Lavigne Lonsdale to add to the existing spatial strategy and focus on where redundant buildings or areas could lend themselves to shared or green spaces. She noted that contract value had not been discussed but proposed £5,000 would be an appropriate figure.
- It was noted that matters were progressing with CBRE staff who were meeting with Lloyds this week to discuss their tenancy.
- SSt reported that, in order to produce a business plan, a survey of the building would be necessary. She was aware of a survey that had been conducted three years ago which was available for £5,000 and would inform the group in terms of building layout. She advised that a new survey would cost in the region of £12-15,000.
- In terms of potential occupants, it was noted that Tevi may be interested in expanding outposts, and could explore its potential as flexible work space Exeter University.
- The former Lidl site was mentioned with a potential to explore in terms of a creative economy hub with a focus on film.
- In terms of budget for the £5,000 to commission Lavigne Lonsdale and £5,000 to purchase the existing Market House survey, CH advised that there was currently £90,000 remaining in the revenue budget.
- It was noted that the way people work is changing an caution was advised in assumptions regarding filling office space.

- SS commented that estate agents were reporting a lack of domestic properties within the mid-price range.
- HG noted that there was a demand for space within the creative industries and he felt it was important for each complex to have a clear identity and an idea of the type of users it was looking to attract.
- It was proposed by SSt, seconded by TD and agreed by the Board that the Regeneration and Land Use subgroup be given authority to spend up to £5,000 to commission Lavigne Lonsdale.
- It was proposed by SSt, seconded by TD and agreed by the Board that the Regeneration and Land Use subgroup be given authority to spend £5,000 to purchase the existing survey of Market House.

SSt / CH

SSt / CH

## 8 Project Criteria

- A draft document was circulated to Members with the agenda.
- CH advised that Cornwall Council would like all four towns to establish a standardised approach but tailored to include local objectives and outcomes.
- CH asked for two Board Members to review and feed back under a delegated process, to be taken back to the Board to approve.
- JMck and EKell volunteered to assist with this process.
- CH also noted that, towards end of August, she would be selecting three random Board members to assess each project. She noted that, should someone with an interest in the project be selected, she would pick again.
- CH asked that any Member with an interest in a project allocated to them please inform her.
- Each project would be scored and brought back to the next Board meeting, with recommendation for inclusion.

CH / JMck  
/ EKell

## 9 Budget

- CH advised that, with the expenditure agreed earlier in the meeting, there was £80,000 available in the revenue fund.
- CH noted that this fund was to take the Board through the process of producing business plans after submission of the TIP and therefore as much of this budget as possible should be preserved for that purpose.
- PW reported that he was due to speak to the finance team about getting more itemised budget for the Board. He noted that, once he had received this information and was happy with the level of detail included, this would be circulated to the Board.

PW

## 10 Terms of Reference

- It was noted that the issue of publishing agendas and minutes was soon to be resolved with publication of the new website.
- It was also noted that the issue of clarity around voting members in meetings had now been addressed on the minutes.

## 11 Any other Business

- CH reported that West Cornwall CLLD was looking for private sector volunteers to sit on their Board. She had offered to spread this information via her networks and was therefore informing the Board in case this was of interest.
- JMCK advised that he sat on this Board and that entailed a meeting every six weeks for approximately 90 minutes.
- HG raised the issue of comms, and ensuring that the message was clearly communicated that the Penzance Board does not have the money in question, and that decisions are down to the Fund.

## 12 Date of next meeting

- **8.15am on Monday 7<sup>th</sup> September via Microsoft Teams.**
- MT noted that there was a lot of work to be done in the meantime.
- MT thanked the Board for their contributions.