

Minutes

Meeting Title:	Truro Town Deal Board
Date:	Thursday 9 th May 2024
Time:	15:00 – 17:00
Location:	Trelawny Room, NCH
Chaired by:	Alan Stanhope (AS)
Attendees:	<p>Voting members: Phil Allen (PA), Bert Biscoe (BB), Cllr Chris Wells (CW) Alun Jones (AJ), Nigel King (NK), Cllr Loic Rich (LR), Nick Seaton-Burrige (NSB), Rachel Hammond (RH), Simon Hendra (SH), David Harris (DH), Nigel Knuckey (NK2), Cheryl yn Mackrory MP (CM), Rob Nolan (RN), David Walrond (DW), Karen La Borde (KB), Lisa Smith-Walker (LW), Sarah Wetherill (SW), David Pollard (DP)</p> <p>CC Officers: Helen Nicholson (HN), Matt Pitt (MP), Danielle Hunt (DH1), Mark Harvey (MH), Melinda Brown (MB), Vicky Fraser (VF), Christopher Jones (CJ), Jon Mitchell (JM), Robert Orchard (RO),</p> <p>Presenters: Glenn Caplin-Grey (GCG) Rachel Foster (RF), Kieren Couch (KC)</p> <p>Other: Mark O'Brien (MB), Paul Maycock (PM), Thomas Rees (TR), David Rodda (DR), Tim Wood (TW)</p>
Apologies:	None

Minutes		Action
1	Consent of all present to record the meeting	
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consent was given by all to record the meeting. 	
2	Welcome and Apologies	
2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No apologies for absence were received. 	

Minutes	Action
3 3.1	Declaration of potential conflicts of interest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No potential conflicts of interest were declared.
4 4.1 4.2 4.3	Minutes and action tracker <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACTION: DH to add Board members Karen La Borde and Lisa Smith Walker to the attendee list from the February 2024 meeting. The previous minutes were otherwise agreed as an accurate record of the meeting. The actions were noted by Board members.
5 5.1	Matters arising not covered on the agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No matters not covered on the agenda were raised.
6 6.1 6a.1 6a.2 6a.3 6a.4 6a.5	Programme Overview Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MH highlighted the key points within the programme overview report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was only one remaining project within the Town Deal which was yet to sign its contract, There was a target for the end of May 2024 for the agreement with the Methodist Church to be signed, MH signalled that following the decisions made at the Board meeting, the focus of the Board would move away from strategic decision making on projects and more towards an overview of the programme delivery, More focus would be given to the delivery elements of the projects going forward, The PMO were developing additional reporting tools.
7 7.1 7.2 7a.1 7a.2 7a.3	Communications Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board welcomed Melinda Brown, the new Engagement Lead for the Town Deal portfolio, Rachel Foster provided an overview of the progress made on the Town Deal communications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social listening reports had been submitted to Board Members prior to the Board meeting for review and information on the social activity that had developed recently, One statement on the Lighterage Quay Lifting bridge had already been released to the press in liaison with the Chairman, A Board Member raised concerns regarding comments made in the media article by another Board Member. It was clarified that

Minutes	Action	
7a.4	<p>these comments had been taken from the public minutes of another meeting and did not reflect a direct interaction with the media.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There had been some media interest ahead of the Town Deal Board meeting and Rachel was liaising with media leads to provide an update following the meeting, 	
7.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ACTION: RF to provide the quarterly report on comms activity to Board Members. 	RF
7.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ACTION: RF to inform Board members once the statement following the Board meeting was made public. 	RF
8	<p>Project Updates</p> <p>Truro Harbour & Lemon Quay</p>	
8.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GCG delivered a presentation on Truro Harbours and Lemon Quay which outlined the PMO recommendations on the way forward given the current position on the projects: 	
8.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In June 2023, the Board approved the business cases for the three respective elements of the Truro Harbours and Lemon Quay projects with reference to the Town Investment Plan vision of ‘reconnecting with the water’, 	
8.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GCG acknowledged that the value of the Town Deal had decreased across the portfolio due to a number of factors, 	
8.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The estimated cost of the bridge stood at £6.495m which was £1.1m over the previous £5.39m indicative budget, 	
8.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The three main factors responsible for the cost increase in the bridge were inflation, the required material for the bridge as stipulated by the Environment Agency and the commuted sum to manage the maintenance of the bridge over a 120-year period, 	

Minutes	Action
8.6	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The feedback from Natural England had been more encouraging as outlined in a written statement on April 29th, 2024 which was shared with the board. 	
8.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NE's formal view could only be confirmed following the Planning application process, and this could not be known in advance. It therefore remained a risk. 	
8.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the inclusion of the Lighterage Quay Lifting Bridge, there would still be available budget to complete the improvement works to Lemon Quay and Town Quay, 	
8.9	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the Board voted for the exclusion of the bridge from the programme, then there would be 3 million pounds available in the budget to be utilised, 	
8.10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was currently no allocated budget to complete the removal of the Compton Castle, 	
8.11	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were associated expected outputs to regenerate the adjacent area of the Compton Castle with a cost estimate of £750k, 	
8.12	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project elements that would not be included in the recommended approach would be: 	
8a.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Garras waterside path, min £340k 	
8a.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Town Quay Bridge, £1.85m 	
8.13	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The feedback received by local bodies such as Truro City Council and Truro River Working Group, demonstrated an overall support for the bridge to proceed. Newham BID were neutral on the construction of the bridge but concerned about the associated and adjacent road developments. This was set out in their letter to the Board which was attached in the papers. 	

Minutes	Action
8.14	
8b.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next steps if the recommendations were supported would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lighterage Quay planning App to be submitted by 7th June,
8b.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Progress procurement in parallel with Planning consideration,
8b.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engagement on Lighterage Hill Transport scheme had been undertaken directly with key businesss and via the public engagement in December. Further statutory consultation would commence in June,
8b.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Next steps if recommendations not supported:
8b.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of how to spend additional funding presented to next TD Board in September 2024 and/or an extraordinary meeting.
8.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TW confirmed that the estimated cost was the most accurate cost that could be provided by the design team based on the information available and that there was no guarantee that this price may not change, however, this was the case across all projects.
8.16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phil Allen, presented alternative recommendations on the Truro Harbours project to the Board:
8c.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PA acknowledged the TIP vision of reconnecting Truro to the waterfront and suggested that the area around the Compton Castle needed the most amount of focus from the Town Deal to enable the reconnection to the water to happen,
8c.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PA highlighted that the funds allocated for the Lighterage Quay Lifting bridge could be utilised to build the Town Quay bridge,

Minutes	Action
8c.3	<p>improve the Harbour Office and the surrounding area, update the Harbour and dredge certain areas,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PA noted that local organisations and groups in that area wished to see a winding river to the sea and not a lifting bridge.
8.17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PA proposed that the Board should endorse the recommendations to:
8d.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The residual element of funding previously allocated to the Purchase of the Penrose building on Town Quay, be reallocated to the redevelopment of the Compton Castle site on Lemon Quay, <p style="text-align: center;">And,</p>
8d.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Kenwyn bridge project be urgently reevaluated to deliver the optimum package of measures to support the element of connectivity.
8.18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All Board Members present at the Board meeting, were given an opportunity to voice their opinion on the Truro Harbours & Lemon Quay project.
8.19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was a strong consensus for the Compton Castle vessel to be removed as soon as possible.
8.20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A number of Board members expressed the importance of achieving the safe and pedestrian-led connectivity between the projects.
8.21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A number of Board members highlighted the positive impact the Lighterage Key Lifting Bridge would have on connecting the Harbours and the City with the Town Deal Boscawen Park project.

Minutes	Action	
8.22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of Board members recognised that the ability to complete a significant project with the costs associated with the lifting bridge, may not present itself in the near future and it would be a testament to the Town Deal's work. 	
8.23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some Board Members shared a concerned view that the cost estimate for the bridge was too high for the expected benefits from the bridge and there was a further concern voiced that the current estimated cost may increase further. 	
8.24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern was raised regarding the lack of available funding for improvements to the Riverside path behind Tesco in either the Harbour or Green Transport project. GCG and CM undertook to reapproach Tesco to explore options including the attraction of match funding. 	
8.25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACTION: GCG and CM to reapproach Tesco to review the options to improve the riverside path. 	GCG
8.26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACTION: GCG to continue engagement with Newham Bid in the ongoing Town Deal works, there was an upcoming meeting with GCG, Newham Bid and Cllr Rob Nolan. 	GCG
8.27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACTION: KC to update the Board on how pedestrians will safely access Town Quay. 	KC
8.28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following careful consideration of the alternative recommendations, delivered by Phil Allen, the Board:- 	
8e.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Voted against these proposals, 	
8e.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 5 Board members voted in favour of the recommendations with a majority voting against or abstaining. 	

Minutes	Action
8.29	
8f.1	
8f.2	
8f.3	
8.30	
8.31	
	<p>CM left the room at 17:00.</p> <p>Green Transport</p>
8.32	
8.33	

Minutes	Action
8.34	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project was making good progress, 	
8.35	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project was forecast slightly over budget and this would be addressed at the next stage of the design process. 	
8.36	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board Members noted the report. 	
8h.3	

Minutes	Action	
8h.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Public consultations would be held with potential users and local residents of the Hub, 	
8h.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transport consultant would be engaged with as per negative feedback on transport issues raised by the public to mitigate any issues. 	
<p>New Life for City Buildings</p>		
8.41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● David Rodda provided an update to the Board on the project’s progress: 	
8i.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There had been a flurry of interest in the project and some applicants had been to the Board for their consideration to invite to a full application, 	
8i.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some applicants that had met the aims of the NLFCB project had been invited to submit a full application, 	
8i.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some processes were yet to be setup in order to allow the issue of grants, 	
8i.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The NLFCB Board had recently confirmed that they wanted to focus on the purchase of buildings that had been out of use for some time rather than buildings that would be purchased by the private sector. 	
8i.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City Council were due to employ extra resource to address the purchasing elements of the project. 	
9	<p>“A.O.B” – 3 days’ notice to be provided in writing to the Chair. Please send all A.O.B to Danielle.hunt@cornwall.gov.uk.</p>	
9.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No A.O.B was submitted. 	
9.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The meeting concluded at 17:09. 	

Minutes	Action
10	Date of Next Meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Thursday 26th September 2024, MS Teams• Thursday 21st November 2024, MS Teams

DRAFT