## MINUTES

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | **Introductions & Apologies** | **Action** |
| **1.1** | Apologies were received from Callum McGinnis (CM), Elizabeth Spence (ES), Emma Hext (EH), Laurence Frewin (LF), David Ralph (DR), Andrew Robertson (AR), Jack Thompson (JT) |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2.** | **Declarations of interest** | **Action** |
| **2.1** | No Interests declared. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3.** | **Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising** | **Action** |
| **3.1** | Actions from previous minutes are to be covered in matters arising in this meeting |  |
| **3.2** | DOI to be added to future agenda | **RW** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4.** | **TIP Highlight Report** | **Action** |
| **4.1** | **Strand Land Assembly (VTC3)**  CB splitting procurement into 2 stages (1 asbestos & 2 demolition) |  |
| **4.2** | CL asked if there is an opportunity to sell the building/land without any works being completed. CB confirmed there are several options: joint venture/dispose/increase mass. CB in dialogue with consultant to undertake market research. AD advised there is potential to market but not dispose of the interest. |  |
| **4.3** | VF asked if DLUHC would be open to moving the funding from Debenhams to another project. CB attended a DLUHC forum where this question was asked by other Councils present and DLUHC appeared to be sympathetic to the issues. |  |
| **4.4** | JB asked that there was a TC or TDA representative at their next forum meeting  The concern would be that if disposal was agreed, there would need to be a guarantee/clause to ensure works are completed so we do not find ourselves in a position where the site sits undeveloped for an extended period of time. CL confirmed there would be a stipulation to any sale that this will not be permitted. |  |
| **4.5** | JB reported that there are similar sites in other towns that have used the buildings for creative centres. AD responded that a challenge with that use is the generation of sufficient rental income.  SC asked if we could go back to the original developer that was interested. AD advised this would add no value as they were offering development management services rather than bringing an occupier or funder. SC referred to the interested party who wished to purchase and queried if TDA was an appropriate project lead. AD advised that their scheme was not compelling and was not a project that would work for Torquay town centre which was confirmed by CL. AD disagreed with the comment concerning TDA who has the skill set to take this scheme forward. |  |
| **4.6** | CL clarified that some towns have been able to find alternative solutions but we are not a university town or close to London and there is ongoing antisocial behaviour associated with the site. VF summarised that the options review was in train and asked on timeframes as a Board. AD hoped he can bring the decision from the option paper to the July meeting. | **CB/AD** |
| **4.7** | **Harbour Public Realm (VTC4)**  CB reported that there has been a preferred bidder appointed.  The works are due to start in Sept-23 and should take 12mths. KF asked if it could be reduced to 9mths, CB reported that it may be possible, AD suggested considerations should be given to a reduced scope.  SC asked why the price had not been fixed at the time of tendering. CB said due to the complexities of the project the contractor couldn’t commit to a fixed price so provided an indicative figure. CB also advised that contractors are now very selective based on project risks. This scheme entails significant risks below ground with unknown issues.  The scheme was tendered through a framework, with four contractors showing an interest initially however only one contractor completed the process. |  |
| **4.8** | JB mentioned Fleet Walk pedestrianisation which CL confirmed this will not be supported under the new administration. The Community Board to take this up direct with the Council. |  |
| **4.9** | VF asked where the high costs have come from? CB responded that traffic management is a significant part of the cost. Construction cost has increased substantially over the last two years, owing to inflation and the budget was created in 2020.  JP asked for timescale for Option B, CB said this will be 4/8wks. Once the options have been reviewed at Capital & Growth Board, these will then be tabled at this Board. Consideration will be given to interface this scheme with Debenhams regarding road closure, avoiding the summer months. Access will be retained for pedestrians and retail. |  |
| **4.10** | TC advised that the Community Board would prefer that we do ‘less’ but do it ‘well’ |  |
| **4.11** | **GPO Roundabout (VTC5)**  The design is now complete, CL asked if this can go ahead now: CB confirmed it was ready to go out to tender – if the returns come back within budget we can agree to appoint and proceed without further delay (aspiration Sep/Oct start) |  |
| **4.12** | JB stated that as it was a small project, the messaging needs to show this as the first step in the larger journey. Messaging could be linked to the other associated projects to help engage the community.  JB asked that the planting be improved between the GPO and Union Square. CL agreed this would be well received as the largest complaints are around the planters and bins. It has a high impact for a low cost for the community and visitors to the area. |  |
| **4.13** | **Pavilion (VTC6)** |  |
| **4.14** | VF asked when we would have an outcome, AD confirmed this will be July. |  |
| **4.15** | KF said that the building has stood closed for 10 years with little maintenance, the outcome could be fire or collapse. CL said we will continue to spend for essential maintenance for it to stay as it is with no use or end user. VF asked if there was any plan/decisions in the pipeline, AD confirmed there are none currently. |  |
| **4.16** | KF said that neither Oldway nor Pavilion have any options for being sold or being taken over by Heritage England currently. |  |
| **4.17** | **Edginswell Station**  The works are ongoing with planning expected Nov/Dec23  A detailed cost plan is expected Sep23 which will inform the funding gap  KF would like to get together with rail providers to talk separately from this meeting to ensure all options are known.  VF reported that this Board revisit in Sep23 when more information is known. | **KF** |
| **4.18** | **Stronger Futures:** There is nothing to bring to the Board’s attention |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5.** | **Town Deal Responsibilities Paper** | **Action** |
| **5.1** | VF requested this be put on the agenda for the next meeting | **RW** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6.** | **Any Other Business** | **Action** |
| **6.1** | AD reported that Torbay has been invited by Government to join a Levelling Up Partnership. The detail of this is not yet known but there may be some additional funding available which would prove to be very welcome. | **AD** |
| **6.2** | VF asked if monthly meetings would be beneficial. It was the consensus the meeting format remains as current until the Autumn. The meeting in July will be face to face in the Board Room of the Town Hall, with a hybrid option. |  |
| **6.3** | VF thanked the Board for their attendance. |  |

**Date of Next Meeting: 21 Jul 23 0930-1100**

**Minutes recorded by: Rebecca Woolley**