



Glastonbury Town Deal Board
DRAFT Minutes of the Board Extraordinary Meeting held on
23 February 2024 15.00 – 16.00 hours
at Glastonbury Town Hall and on Teams

In Attendance:

James Heappey	Vice Chair and Member of Parliament
Michael White	Vice Chair, Glastonbury Town Council
Jon Cousins	Community Representative
Jacqueline Cross	Community Representative with NHS background
Indra Donfrancesco	Mayor of Glastonbury
Jessica Jefferies	Department for Work and Pensions
Paul Knight	Business Representative
Cllr Liz Leyshon	Somerset Council, Deputy Leader and Lead Member for Resources and Performance
Paul Manning	Glastonbury Chamber of Commerce
Kama Mackenzie	Community Representative
David Ralph	Heart of the South-West LEP
Richard Winterbottom	Business Representative
Cllr Ros Wyke	Somerset Council, Lead Member for Economy, Planning and Assets

Apologies:

Emily Bunn	Associate Member
Samantha Cullen	Business Representative
John Revill	Strode College
Dr Lynne Sedgmore, CBE	Chair (resignation offered)
Ian Tucker	Business Representative

In Attendance:

Helen Bowen	Somerset Council
Jackie Gill	Somerset Council
Conor Ogilvie-Davidson	Glastonbury Town Council
Peter Paddon	Somerset Council
Jane Sharp	Somerset Council
Jethrow Smith	DLUHC
Scott Wooldridge	Somerset Council

Agenda Item	Discussion	Actions
<p>1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies</p>	<p>James welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received from Emily Bunn, Samantha Cullen, John Revill, Lynne Sedgmore and Ian Tucker.</p> <p>Introductions were made by Helen Bowen and Scott Wooldridge from Somerset Council's Democratic Services team. Helen was present to minute the meeting and Scott to advise on any governance issues.</p>	
<p>2. Declaration of Interests and Gift Register</p>	<p>Liz Leyshon mentioned her link to the Community Sports and Leisure Hub as she had done a lot of work with this project over the last few years.</p>	
<p>3. Chair's Opening Remarks</p>	<p>The Vice-Chair said that he was pleased with the impressive progress made on a number of projects. He was aware that few Town Deal Boards around the country had made as much progress as Glastonbury had. Members were to be congratulated and should be very proud of what had been achieved thus far.</p>	
<p>4. Statement on Chair's Position</p>	<p>The Vice-Chair said there had unfortunately been some disagreement and issues regarding the proposed reallocation of Towns Fund grant and this had led to the Chair offering her resignation at the last meeting. The current position was that the Chair resignation has not been formally accepted by Somerset Council.</p> <p>After discussions with the CEO of Somerset Council, some ministerial colleagues and the Chair herself, it was evident that good work had been achieved thus far, but that there was concern that the Board's composition and involvement in projects had become merged.</p> <p>As a result, Democratic Services at Somerset Council would consider the Board's terms of reference and concerns. The outcome would be discussed at the next Board meeting.</p> <p>Liz Leyshon recognised the pressures and constraints on Somerset Council officers due to departures within the team, and that the Chair should be able to support officers and have the time and resource to do so.</p> <p>The Vice-Chair asked the Board members present and online if they were content with the explanation given and if they were happy to move on to the next agenda item. All were content to do so.</p>	<p><i>Peter to arrange a review of Board governance and composition and for the findings to be presented to the next Board meeting.</i></p>

<p>5. Paper 2, Section 3: Reallocation of Grant Funding from the Enterprise and Innovation Hub</p>	<p>Jane Sharp and Peter Paddon introduced the paper using a PowerPoint presentation.</p> <p>Jane said that the purpose of the presentation was to explain to the Board the background of the proposed reallocation of grant funding from the Enterprise and Innovation Hub. Somerset Council, as the Accountable Body, was looking for the Board to endorse the recommendations to reallocate grant. The next steps would be to seek formal approval from Somerset Council as the Accountable Body and send a Project Adjustment Request to DLUHC for their final decision.</p> <p>Jane outlined the strategic approach which was to ensure the successful delivery of the most 'ready to deliver' projects. Four key criteria had been set to prioritise the projects, these were:</p> <p>Priority 1 – Projects that were immediately ready to deliver, been through the tender process and had met the 4 criteria to be allocated as a priority 1 project.</p> <p>Priority 2 – Projects that were similarly ready as Priority 1, except the tender process was still being developed and would go live in the next 3 months.</p> <p>Priority 3 – Projects which had already received extra grant from demise of the Transport and Travel project.</p> <p>Priority 0 – Projects which did not need additional grant funding.</p> <p>Jane explained the Priority 1 projects were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Brigid's Chapel and Field • Glastonbury Abbey Piazza • Glastonbury Sports & Leisure Hub. <p>She explained the figures for each of these projects and what the revised grant allocation would be.</p> <p>The Priority 2 projects were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food & Regenerative Farming Centre • St Dunstan's House Community Health and Wellbeing Centre. <p>These projects would also receive additional funding via the reallocation.</p> <p>Jane then went on to explain the reasons why the Priority 3 and 0 projects would not be receiving any reallocation of grant. In summary these were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Roberts Richard Initiative – this project did not need any additional funding and would continue with the budget already allocated to it. 	<p><i>Jane to seek formal approval from Somerset Council as the Accountable Body and submit a Project Adjustment Request to DLUHC for their final decision.</i></p> <p><i>Jane to distribute slides to Board members.</i></p>
---	---	---

- Glastonbury Clean Energy – it was not appropriate to allocate more to this project at the present time, this project will come back to the May Board for discussion.
- The Bailys Building – this project had already received just over £1m from reallocations.
- The Life Factory – this project was not ready for any additional funding from the reallocation.
- The Enabling Project – this project was not set to receive any reallocation funding due to some uncertainties with the project. Homes England funding is possible subject to funder caveats including having planning consent.

During the discussion that followed, questions and comments included:

Q – There is a lot of synergy between the projects and the end result would be greater than the sum of their parts. How will we ensure the same outcomes will be delivered?

A – Having spoken to the DHLUC, they have made it clear that projects need to be delivered. There are only 2 years left for the Programme and so when a project fails, it is important to ensure other projects are successful.

- There was concern that this approach could set a precedent. Would like to see projects working together to deliver outcomes of the failed project.
- Noted that nearly half of the grant funding sits with just 2 projects – Bailys Buildings and The Life Factory - there needs to be urgency to get on and deliver these projects.
- Need to get projects delivered, then others can be revisited. A pragmatic approach is required.

Q – Is the £520k grant reallocation being split equally across 4 projects the best approach? Concern that other projects are not being allocated anything.

A – There were many ways the reallocation of the fund could be made. After comments made at the previous meeting, this proposal is a fairer recommendation, but ultimately it will be the Government that will decide.

Q – If it isn't urgent to decide on the reallocation immediately, maybe more time should be taken to decide. How does the Glastonbury Town Deal compare to others around the country?

A – Glastonbury has taken a different approach to many other Town Deal towns in that it has many projects rather than just one or two large projects. However, all Boards are facing the same issues including time and resource. We don't have time to sit back and wait to

	<p>“see what happens”, as delivery is key.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommendations make sense. Would like to see a consensus from the Board that it is acceptable. • The proposal is much fairer, and the Board should press ahead and approve the recommendations. There is no time to sit and wait. • An alternative suggestion was made to allocate £400k to the 4 projects proposed and keep the remaining £120k as a contingency. <p>Q - Would the proposed reallocation to any of the Priority 1 or 2 projects allow any of them to start work quickly?</p> <p>A – Yes, Priority 1 projects can commence immediately.</p> <p>At the conclusion of the debate, the Vice-Chair proposed to endorse the recommendation to allocate the funds as described and to seek formal approval to do this from Somerset Council. He asked if there was any opposition to the proposal. None was forthcoming so he declared the Board’s support for the recommendation as follows:</p> <p><i>Recommendation: That the Enterprise and Innovation Hub grant is reallocated according to Table 1 and Table 2 and that formal approval is sought from Somerset Council as the Accountable Body and a Project Adjustment Request is sent to DLUHC for their final decision.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed that a copy of the slides would be circulated to the Board. • It was noted that the composition of the Board would be addressed at the next meeting. 	
6. Close	The meeting closed at 4pm.	