# **Margate Town Deal Board Minutes**



**Date:** 14 July, 2021 at 1pm - 2pm

**Venue:** Virtually, via Google Hangout

**Membership:** David Smith CBE (DS), Cllr Reece Pugh (RP), Madeline Homer (MH),

Sir Roger Gale MP (RG), Adam Bryan (AB), Lesley Game (LG), Victoria Pomery OBE (VP), Eddie Kemsley (EK), Sam Causer (SC), Richard

Ash (RA).

In attendance: Louise Askew (LA), James Clapson (JC).

# 1. Welcome

DS welcomed RP as a member of the Board. RP gave a brief overview of his interest in the work of the Board and advised that the new Council Administration was keen to see as many investment opportunities come to Thanet as possible.

## 2. Declaration of Interest and Confidentiality

There were no declarations of interest.

DS reminded members of the Board of their duty to ensure confidentiality regarding the details of what was said at meetings of the Board, in particular when the Board had been asked to keep confidences on a subject. It was noted however that it was important that communication of the minutes and what had been agreed by the Board must be effectively communicated to the public through the appropriate channels.

# 3. People's Panel Update

EK advised that, following the recent recruitment of new members, the People's Panel now had 66 members. The aim had been to recruit some younger members, under 30, and that this had been achieved and there were now a broad range of people on the Panel. Board members were invited to join the next meeting scheduled for 21 July.

It was hoped that there would be a face to face meeting in August and the Panel would be introduced to the projects at meetings thereafter.

It is expected that the Panel acts as a conduit for the views of the people of Margate, and that the Panel will help to shape the projects as they evolve.

DS noted the Panel should be given assurance that the Board would be listening, and a standing item would be added to each agenda to receive an update on the work of the Panel.

SC asked why the Board did not know who all the People's Panel members were, SC understood from a Panel member that they did not know who all of the other members were either, and that they had no way to engage between meetings. SC also asked if the Peoples Panel meetings were minuted. . LA answered that the Panel is not a decision making group but to represent the views of residents in Margate, which is why it is important that the group is representative of the residents. The Panel had already been asked if they would like to engage between meetings, either through meetings, social media groups or a texting group and the majority did not want that. Due to the nature of the Panel and for GDPR reasons the names of all Panel members would not be shared.

### 4. Updates: MHCLG, Business Cases and the Creative Land Trust (CLT).

#### **MHCLG**

LA provided a verbal update, noting that the list of projects and associated documentation had been submitted to MHCLG.

Questions had been asked in the submission regarding the Winter Gardens revenue project, however no response had been received. This had been followed up with Iain McNab who offered to make enquiries.

#### **Business Cases**

LA advised that meetings had started to take place with project sponsors about the business case process, in order to identify where external specialist support was needed. Some of the information needed in the business cases would need to be driven by the organisations that put the projects forward. LA had been pleased by the proactivity demonstrated by the sponsors.

MHCLG had put together a timeline for funding that had been shared with sponsors. If a business case was submitted in October 2021, funding would be received in December 2021, if a business case was submitted in January 2022, funding would be received in March 2022. The Project Team is waiting for further detail and guidance on this.

## **Creative Land Trust (CLT)**

LA had been in discussion with the consultants about the possibility of expediting the project for submission in October 2021.

An update report would be circulated to the Board regarding the position of the Creative Land Trust.

Work Wild Ltd and PRD Ltd would be undertaking the work, there had recently been an inception meeting during which they also visited key sites in the area. LA

was to meet with them next week (week commencing 19 July) to hear their feedback, with regular Project Management meetings scheduled.

The governance arrangements and asset strategy would be key to the success of the Trust. Work Wild Ltd and PRD Ltd would be invited to the Board to give an update on their work.

Some Board members asked for a meeting in August about the CLT on the basis of aiming for an October deadline, however it was felt best to bring the consultancy team to the September meeting so they had more time to develop the project.

#### Other comments

Some members of the Board wanted more detail about the projects at the meeting. LA informed the Board that there is a report document the Project Team is putting together which will provide an update on each of the projects, including their position. This would be circulated to the Board to discuss when Projects are identified as an agenda item.

LA would provide a forward plan of activities for the Board, so that Board members knew what decisions were coming up. This would help clarify the role and responsibilities of the Board.

#### 5. Governance

LA advised that she had wished to present a report on governance, however this had been delayed as she was waiting for some feedback from MHCLG and the Towns Fund delivery partners.

Phase one had been very prescriptive about what the Board was to do, however there was very little guidance for phase two. The delivery partners had given some advice on the things that the Board should consider, however the emphasis was on the need for the Board to be fit for purpose locally.

LA would update the Terms of Reference and would share them with the Board for comments.

It was proposed that representatives from the Hospital and Jobcentre Plus be removed from the Board as they had been unable to engage with the Board to date. It was proposed that the Project Team and Project Sponsors would work with Jobcentre Plus at a more practical level on project delivery.

The role of the Accountable Body would become more significant in phase two, and it was the Accountable Body's responsibility to ensure that the Board had members with the relevant skills and experience to effectively embark on the second phase.

MH noted that the Government had stipulated that some organisations/sectors must have a representative on the board.

Some work needs to be done to establish exactly what skills and experience were needed to allow the Board to fulfill its function in phase two of the Town Deal process.

Either an independent review of the current members could be conducted and additional members found to fill any shortfall in skills, or the Board could be disbanded and members would be recruited who had the required skills or experience.

DS suggested that an independent review could take place once the permanent Chair was in position as the new Chair could have many of the skills needed to take the Board into phase two. He felt that recruitment should start immediately.

LA advised that recruitment of the permanent Chair had been delayed pending information from MHCLG and the Towns Fund delivery partners.

The Board would be provided with an update in the following week about how it was to proceed regarding the skills review and appointment of Board Members and Chair.

Actions	Responsibility
People's Panel Update to become a standing item on the agenda.	NG
An update report on the Creative Land Trust (CLT)to be circulated to the Board.	LA
An update report on each of the projects to be circulated in preparation for the next Board meeting.	LA
To create a forward plan of activities for the Board.	LA
To update the Terms of Reference and share with the Board for comments.	LA
To provide the Board with an update on how it was to proceed regarding the skills review and appointment of Board Members.	LA and MH