



HM Government

Glastonbury Town Deal

Glastonbury Town Deal
Minutes of the Board meeting held on 1 March 2023
12:00 – 13:00 hours using Teams

Name	Role/Representation
Attending	
Dr Lynne Sedgmore, CBE	Chair
Jill Barker	Glastonbury Chamber of Commerce
Jacqueline Cross	Community Representative with NHS background
Paul Manning	Glastonbury Chamber of Commerce
Ian Tucker	Business Representative
Apologies	
Richard Bates	Mendip District Council (Section 151 Officer)
Ian Black	Department for Work and Pensions
Cllr Simon Carswell	Mendip District Council
Cllr Jon Cousins	Community Representative and Mayor of Glastonbury (Glastonbury Town Council and Mendip District Council)
James Heapey	Vice Chair and Member of Parliament
Paul Hickson	Somerset County Council
Paul Knight	Business Representative
Cllr Liz Leyshon	Somerset County Council and Mendip District Council
Kama McKenzie	Community Representative
David Ralph	Heart of the South West LEP
John Revill	Strode College
Cllr Michael White	Glastonbury Town Council
Richard Winterbottom	Business Representative
In Attendance	
Anna Blackburn	Mendip District Council
Jan Errington	Mendip District Council
Jenna Hunt	Department for Levelling Up, Homes and Communities
Tina McEwen	GTD Support Team
Connor Ogilvie-Davidson	Glastonbury Town Council
Sheridan Robins	Parliamentary & Comms Aide to James Heapey MP
Julie Reader-Sullivan	Mendip District Council

Minutes:

	Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
1	Welcome and Introductions and Apologies	<p>Lynne welcomed everyone to the meeting and notified all that the meeting was being recorded.</p> <p>Apologies had been received as above.</p> <p>The meeting had been called by a group of Board Members who had been contacted by an individual regarding the provision of land for the Enabling Project.</p>	
2	Declaration of Interests and Gift Register	<p>No-one declared any gifts that required declaration on the Risk Register. There were no additions to the Project Declaration of Interests form.</p> <p>Ian Tucker and Jacqueline Cross declared that they knew the Proposer of the alternative solution well.</p>	
3	Presentation and Discussion on the Enabling Project	<p>Julie shared slides relevant to the discussion, after setting the context. She covered the background, including the funding make-up of the project and the alternative proposal, along with suggestions for the Open Day.</p> <p>Lynne commended Julie and her team on their response to Board Members' concerns.</p> <p>Paul wanted to know, given the Proposer would be opposed to a likely Planning Application, what would the impact be of a delay in implementing the Enabling Project, particularly on other projects. Any delay would inevitably mean that costs could be much higher due to inflation and rising costs.</p> <p>Julie confirmed that the Enabling Project would still happen and that all other projects can continue to deliver.</p> <p>Jacqueline felt that the alternative proposal was generous and indicated their support of the community.</p> <p>Julie confirmed that she had made it clear at the meeting that she appreciated the detail provided and also that a response from MDC</p>	<p>Tina to send the Powerpoint Presentation to the Board.</p> <p>Julie and her team to progress discussions with the Proposer of the alternative solution and to keep the Board updated.</p>

	Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
		<p>could not be quick as there were many issues that would need to be explored.</p> <p>Lynne also felt that the Proposer wanting to work with us in a constructive manner was positive and equally confirmed that we have processes and rules to deal with.</p> <p>Ian described the situation in the Town regarding rumours about this matter which should be addressed to avoid unhelpful PR. In his view, the best solution needed to be found. The Board needed to be clear that this is a priority in terms of getting a resolution for the Beckery area. He recognized that the new site proposed is not ideal for housing, but it has the advantage of, in his view not flooding and is equi-distant between Glastonbury and Street. Added to this, the fact that the Proposer is prepared to invest is incredibly generous and shows their determination to resolve the issue.</p> <p>They could spend the money to fight a Planning Application instead. Ian felt that the GTD Board should be as pragmatic as the Proposer in seeking a solution and that we needed to be clear with the public that we are addressing the non-bricks and mortar issues.</p> <p>Lynne reminded the Board that we have already started working with the Proposer and their alternative solution and can be clear about that at the Open Day on 18 March.</p> <p>Julie confirmed that we will be clear about all aspects of this matter at the Open Day. The location of the alternative site cannot be put into the public domain as it is still being discussed. Additionally, MDC would probably need to gain ownership of both parts of the site because of access and as well as the extent of possible additional costs.</p> <p>There was a discussion as to, whether or not, any other land might be for sale and Board Members were asked to notify Julie if they knew of any.</p> <p>Although the original message had been relayed through Board Members, it was agreed</p>	

	Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
		<p>it was best and more professional, that discussions with the Proposer were handled by officers and that they needed to proceed cautiously so that any issues could be dealt with. It was noted that there were more factors than availability of land to be dealt with.</p> <p>There was a discussion about the need to understand the implications of potential delays that could be caused by the Planning Process, concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The possible length of any delays caused by legal challenges. - Being able to deliver the Town Investment Plan by 31 March 2026. - Dealing with a large number of objections to any Planning Application. Julie pointed out that all such Applications received objections, which would be taken into account. There are only two houses as near neighbours, although there are of course businesses located nearby. <p>Jill expressed the view that wherever the Enabling Project is located, people need somewhere to live and it should be on an attractive site.</p> <p>Julie confirmed that the design of the site had been informed by consultation and will be attractive within legal limitations and will hopefully include the opportunity for people to grow their own food.</p> <p>Lynne questioned the implication for the delivery of the Town Investment Plan if there is a change of site and Julie confirmed that outputs and outcomes would still be delivered.</p> <p>Ian emphasised the importance of dealing with any PR issues and that it was challenging for Board Members to face the public on matters like this particularly as the Proposer was speaking to many people in the Town.</p> <p>Lynne summarised the debate and reiterated her thanks to Julie and her team for moving quickly in meeting with the Proposer and listening to their concerns. Key issues resulting from the discussion were:</p>	

	Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time - PR issues to consider - The need to be clear at the Open Day on 18 March <p>Lynne stated that the Board steers Officers to work constructively to find the best solution to meet the objectives and outcomes that are in the Town Investment Plan.</p> <p>Julie to keep the Board updated and, if necessary, another Board meeting will be called.</p>	
7	Minutes and Matters Arising from meeting on 3 February 2022	<p>These were agreed subject to the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Checking that Ian had left the meeting for a period due to a conflict of interest. - Under Any Other Business, Jacqueline had raised the issue of flooding on the Proposer's land. <p>These changes will be made and the Minutes recirculated to the Board.</p>	Tina to make changes to the Minutes of the 3 February 2022 meeting and recirculate to the Board.
9	Confidentiality, Feedback	<p>Lynne thanked everyone for attending.</p> <p>It was agreed that Officers would provide a briefing for Board Members on this matter.</p> <p>Julie advised Board Members to respect the fact that the Proposer had asked that the other location was not disclosed. If there are any questions/comments at the Open Day on 18 March, please refer them to Jan or Julie.</p> <p>Julie confirmed that she will work with the Proposer and tell them that the location of the proposed new site will not be disclosed.</p> <p>Board Members should encourage people asking questions about this issue to attend the Open Day.</p> <p>Lynne welcomed Jenna – Erin has gone to another team and she has taken over, welcoming this opportunity to meet everyone and to hear the discussion of such a complex issue.</p>	Tina to send out a Briefing Note on the Enabling Project.

	Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
		<p>Lynne, interface with community is important.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 12:56.</p>	
10	Future Board Dates	<p>Lynne asked the Board to take note of the new meeting dates, which will now take place every 6 weeks.</p> <p>All at 2pm in person and by Teams (unless otherwise agreed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 17 March 2023 b. 28 April 2023 c. 9 June 2023 d. 21 July 2023 e. 22 September 2023 f. 1 December 2023 	Regular email updates to continue between Board meetings