**Kirkby Town Board Meeting**

**Friday 19th July**

**9am – 11am**

**Hybrid – Main Committee Room, Council Offices, Urban Road & Microsoft Teams**
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<AI8>

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ATTENDEES | | | |
| Name | Position on Board | Position/Organisation | Present |
| Martin Rigley | Chair | Project Manager, Alliance Procurement Solutions Ltd | √ |
| Alan Cooke | Board Member | Business owner, Showstoppers Ltd | √ |
| Amy Fox | Board Member | Senior Marketing & Fundraising Manager, Portland College | √ |
| Angela Bentley | Sub for Lee Anderson | MP Office |  |
| Angie Peppard | Board Member | Our Centre |  |
| TBC | Board Member | Police and Crime Commissioner |  |
| Chris Baron | Substitute for Lee Anderson | MP Office | √ |
| Cllr Chris Huskinson | Board Member | Kirkby Member, Ashfield District Council | √ |
| Cllr Matthew Relf | Board Member | Executive Lead Member for Growth, Regeneration and Local Planning, Ashfield District Council | √ |
| Cllr Zadrozny | Board Member | Member for Nottinghamshire County Council (Leader of Ashfield District Council) |  |
| Daniel Howitt | Sub for PCC | Police and Crime Commissioner |  |
| Dianne Holmes | Board Member | Head of Curriculum, Academy Transformation Trust Further Education (ATTFE) | √ |
| Eva Trier | Observer | Mutual Ventures |  |
| Fiona Johnson | Sub for Kelvin Eatherington | Associative Director, Civic Engagement, Nottingham Trent University (NTU) |  |
| Gill Callingham | Observer | Mutual Ventures | √ |
| Helen Davis | Observer | Strategic Lead, Active Notts. | √ |
| Katie Roberts | Board Member | General Manager, Kirkby Leisure Centre, Everyone Active |  |
| Kelvin Eatherington | Board Member | Enterprising Ashfield Project and Interim Economic Programme Manager, NTU | √ |
| Lee Anderson, MP | Board Member | MP for Ashfield and Eastwood |  |
| Louise Knott | Board Member | Vice Principal, West Notts College | √ |
| Mark Bandalli | Observer | Mutual Ventures | √ |
| Mark Cawar | Board Member | Feather Partnership | √ |
| Melanie Phythian | Observer | Business and Trade, City local Growth | √ |
| Olivia Bestwick | Observer | HR Advisor, Van Elle | √ |
| Pauline Stojanovic | Sub for Angie Peppard | Our Centre | √ |
| Paul Dobson | Board Member | Head of Training, Van Elle | √ |
| Pete Edwards | Board Member, Vice Chair | Chair, Ashfield Health and Wellbeing Partnership | √ |
| Peter Cribb | Board Member | District Manager, Inspire - Culture, Learning and Libraries |  |
| Peter Gaw | Sub for Peter Cribb | Chief Executive Officer, Inspire – Culture, Learning and Libraries | √ |
| Roy Lewis | Board Member | KARA (Kirkby Area Residents Association) | √ |
| Ritchie Fox | Substitute for Stewart Nubley | Ashfield Spartans Boxing Academy |  |
| Simon Martin | Sub for Dianne Holmes | Vice Principal, Academy Transformation Trust Further Education (ATTFE) |  |
| Stewart Nubley | Board Member | Ashfield Spartans Boxing Academy | √ |
| Teresa Jackson | Board Member | Trustee, Ashfield Voluntary Action | √ |
| Toby Metcalf | Board Member | KARA (Kirkby Area Residents Association) |  |
| Andrea Stone | Supporting Officer | Wellbeing Manager, Ashfield District Council | √ |
| Christine Sarris | Supporting Officer | Assistant Director – Planning and Regulatory Services | √ |
| Hollie Maxwell-Smith | Supporting Officer | Discover Ashfield Lead, Ashfield District Council | √ |
| Tracey Bird | Supporting Officer | Wellbeing Officer – Place, Ashfield District Council |  |
| John Bennett | Supporting Officer | Executive Director, Place, Ashfield District Council |  |
| Paul Crawford | Supporting Officer | Investment Manager, Ashfield District Council | √ |
| Sarah Daniel | Supporting Officer | Assistant Director - Regeneration, Ashfield District Council | √ |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** |  |
| **1** | **Welcome / Introductions / Apologies** |
|  | * Introductions were made round the meeting. * Apologies were given for Cllr Zadrozny, Katie Roberts, Peter Cribb and Toby Metcalf. |
| **2** | **Reflections of Previous Meeting – Martin Rigley** |
|  | **Meeting Minutes** |
|  | * The minutes from the previous meeting are due to be sent out week commencing 29th July. |
| **3** | **High Streets, Heritage and regeneration: Kirkby Current Regeneration projects – Cllr Relf / Paul Crawford** |
|  | * Cllr Relf presented on the current and recent investment in Kirkby (attached). * He explained Moor Market is a completed project with a café and now includes a Banking Hub which recently opened. |
|  | **North Kirkby Gateway (NKG)**   * This is the land opposite the plaza across Ellis Street, which will be redeveloped to have a fresh frontage onto the plaza, which will support the plaza being used more for events. * A potential new building at NKG will be used by a variety of groups and conversations are ongoing, including education, community and private sector organisations. * There are also plans for housing at the site which are being developed. |
|  | **West Kirkby Gateway (WKG)**   * This is located on Lane End where the Wyvern Club was situated, which the Council has acquired. There has been a delay on demolishing the property as there have been surveys to conduct, which have been completed and the demolition order has now been placed. * The plan was to have a café/ticket office at the site however as train companies are predominantly selling tickets online and no longer have a commitment to onsite provision this plan is no longer possible. * It is potentially an attractive location for a food and beverage site, however further investigation is being undertaken to ensure it is a viable project. * The building will be designed around heritage and the interior is flexible. |
|  | * Pete Edwards raised concerns on online ticketing and that many people within Ashfield do not have access to online. |
|  | * Cllr Relf explained the ticketing and machines are owned by the railway and there is a ticket machine at the site. He agreed having to book a ticket online prior to travelling is an unnecessary addition to a journey. * He added that getting step free access to Kirkby Railway Station is a priority and is a repeated conversation that is being had with Network Rail however as a minimum this would be a £5m project. |
|  | * Roy Lewis asked how the WKG plans fit with the masterplan for Kirkby Railway Station. * He explained that the masterplan included a hub that linked the buses and train station from both sides of the road on Lane End. |
|  | * Christine Sarris thanked Roy for his comments. * She explained a masterplan is there to guide, and a problem which has been raised is getting buses into the site. The council wanted to deliver a transport hub with bus access however the county council and bus company do not support this. She added that a flagship building at this location would be an asset in her opinion but would obviously go through the planning consultation process. |
|  | * Cllr Relf added he agrees with Roy’s aspirations for bus pull-ins but that this needs agreement from the bus operators, including the highway authority. The aspirations within the masterplan will still be pursued where possible and practical. |
|  | * Roy added the masterplan had been submitted to the secretary of state as a supporting document for the emerging Local Plan and that proceeding with this project contradicts that. |
|  | * Cllr Relf brought up a plan view of the site. He explained there is opportunity for a bus layby if this can be pursued with the transport operator and highways. * There has not been any planning application submitted for this scheme to date. |
|  | * Paul explained there are conversations regarding a bus layby however there are many stakeholders to consider with this. |
|  | **Library Innovation Centre (LIC)**   * A project which has been delivered is the LIC at Kirkby Library bringing enhanced digital facilities for residents. |
|  | * Peter Gaw added this has been a successful offer as it has revitalised the offer for the library. He was in the library recently and all of the spaces were being used, as well as formal classes being taken up well. |
|  | * Mark Cawar asked Peter if any businesses are involved in using the space. |
|  | * Peter advised the take up hasn’t been great and is keen to promote this. |
|  | **Kirkby Sports Hub**   * New changing and pitch facilities at Kingsway Park. * This would bring the changing rooms up to current standards and also provide a new pavilion for Bowls. * Some of the unused grass area at the bottom of the site is having drainage improved. There is also new floodlighting and car park expansion. |
|  | **Walking and Cycling**   * A range of off road routes have been identified which can be upgraded to improve walking and cycling connectivity. * Paul explained the key on the map and route locations. * There are junctions identified where offroad meets road so there can be continuity for walking and cycling. * The orange lines are the long-term plan for towns routes which are more of a challenge due to the complexity of the routes and there are highway works needed. The feasibility and consultation work for these routes are much longer which is why these could work with the long-term plan timeline. * Roy Lewis commented that he had previously raised getting a link to Kirkby Station from Annesley and Nuncargate. * He expressed that the route on Lindley’s Lane is a dangerous site to walk down due to high hedges and vehicles travelling down this route. * He suggested a scope for a parallel route to the West which runs down Lane End and connects with Portland Park, then loops round, as this could connect with the park on the housing estate. * This would need a small bridge across the railway line to connect with the statutory footpaths. * He did not feel the Lindley’s Lane route is a safe route and felt it should not be included as a walking route. |
|  | * Paul explained both the routes discussed are on the map. * He agreed to send Roy the map so he can see this in detail. |
| **4** | **Draft 10-year vision – Sarah Daniel** |
|  | * Sarah presented on the Long-Term Plan for Kirkby-in-Ashfield 10-year vision. * She explained the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communitues (DLUHC) has now reverted back to Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG). * The vision for the plan is to increase the number of residents who feel happy, safe, healthy and proud to live in Kirkby. * The themes are safety and security, high streets, heritage & regeneration and transport & connectivity. * The key outcomes would be more people feeling safe, regularly visiting the town centre, people benefitting from the green spaces, increased spend across town and fewer vacant shops.   The interventions highlighted included are:  **Safety and Security**   * S3 Measures to prevent anti-social behaviour, crime and reduce reoffending.   **High streets, heritage and regeneration**   * H1 Funding for place-based regeneration and town centre and high street improvement. * H3 Creation of, and improvement to, local green spaces, community gardens, watercourses and embankments. * H5 Support for local arts, cultural heritage and creative activities. * H6 Funding for the development and promotion of wider campaigns which encourage people to visit and explore the local area. * H7 Funding for impactful volunteering and social action projects. * H8 Funding for local sports facilities, tournaments, teams and leagues. * H9 Investment in capacity building, resilience and infrastructure support for local civil society and community groups.   **Transport and connectivity**   * T1 Support for active travel enhancements in the local area. * T4 Funding for new, or improvements to road networks to improve access within and to the town. * T5 Funding to improve rail connectivity and access. |
|  | * Martin thanked the board for their work to get to this point. |
|  | * Teresa noted she was impressed with the information which has been gathered and established a good basic plan, which is still broad so it can be flexible. |
|  | * Pauline Stajanovic expressed that she had engaged with many people who felt there could be more community transport in the area and she felt this was not included. |
|  | * Sarah asked the board if they would like to reference community transport provision within the vision. * She will include this within the plan. |
|  | * Pauline also spoke about knife crime and how there is a perception of this within Kirkby and not based on actual crimes. |
|  | * Hollie Maxwell-Smith explained the Council’s community safety team had presented some data at the meeting the week before and this too showed that carrying an offensive weapon crime statistic showed Kirkby to be lower than the national average. * She also noted there will be a Safety and Security funding subgroup set up for board members and community safety to have a focus on what they feel the funding could be spent on to make a difference. |
|  | * Roy expressed he did not feel the vision statement relates to Kirkby well and could be describing any other town. * The government have agreed to spend £20m in Kirkby so they would likely want some more detail on how this money will be spent and feels there should be more focus on this within the vision statement. * He agreed with supporting community transport to bring people into the town. * He felt it there should be reference to making the best of Kirkby train station included within the vision statement. |
|  | * Sarah agreed to include some wording to include these points. |
|  | * The board discussed funding and the complexity of applying for funding as being a main issue for groups and businesses. |
|  | * Christine explained Paul Stoppard in business support can assist with forms and applying for funding. |
| **5** | **Suggested Funding Allocation – Sarah Daniel** |
|  | * Sarah explained the funding allocation document (attached). |
|  | * The government submission needs to include the allocation for funding for the first 3 years. * The spend is lower in year 1 as there will be a wait for funding following the submission and we are already well into the first year. |
|  | * Martin asked if, following the submission, there is still flexibility for the spend. |
|  | * Sarah confirmed this, and that there needed to be some spending noted down. |
|  | * Mark Cawar looked at H1 and the proposed spend of £20,000 in the first year and wondered why it was a low figure. |
|  | * Sarah explained that the first year has already begun and the board will need to wait for the submission to be approved before this can be committed. |
|  | * Mark questioned why £20,000 would be spent in the last quarter of the first year and only £50,000 in the full second year. |
|  | * Sarah explained nominal numbers were input and there is flexibility. * The Council are also still waiting on the three-year template from government. * With the new government there is a review of programmes in place, so Sarah recommends the board continue to do the work as usual and have a base for spend before receiving the template. |
|  | * Mel Phythian reiterated Sarah’s points that she has not been given any further guidance and Sarah’s work on the template is giving the board a picture of what is possible. * She referred back to the UKSPF programme where there was flexibility whilst the programme was running to move money around between interventions. |
|  | * Sarah added that the total for each theme is included within the proposal and asked the board if this felt about right to them for each. |
|  | * The board discussed the safety and security intervention being too focused on knife crime, where they have had feedback that this is not a cause for concern in Kirkby. |
|  | * Sarah agreed to amend the text to reflect this. |
|  | * Mel added that there will be continued community engagement so the board will be working continuously on this. |
|  | * Pauline asked if it was easier to spend capital spend at the beginning for the funding rather than splitting over the 10-years. |
|  | * Sarah explained the same amount of capital is received each year. However, if the board decided to use capital on a project this can potentially be pulled from other funding at the time and replaced after. |
|  | * Roy commented that revenue can be spent relatively quickly however capital projects will take longer due to design and going to tender. His view was that commissioning an architect or designer would be a one-off capital payment. * The first few years would be for planning and design with the project commencing around year 4. |
|  | * Sarah confirmed it would be capital spend used for this if the project is going ahead. |
|  | * Stewart Nubley commented on the funding allocation for parks however his group has a high volume of young people in the evening showing these young people do not want to go to the parks. |
|  | * Sarah confirmed this was part of the safety and security theme and people not feeling safe on the parks. * There is also funding allocated for local sports clubs and community spaces. |
|  | * Pete Edwards commented that he finds the funding proposal useful as a baseline and starting point for the three years of planning and the actual funding will become clear as the projects are built on. * He is supportive of the safety and security subgroup and felt other subgroups for the themes would be beneficial. |
|  | * Peter Gaw expressed he is comfortable with the funding proposal and added a comment that this funding can also be used as match funding for other provisions. |
|  | * Mark Cawar wanted to ensure it was minuted that the funding can be flexible throughout the whole period. * He added to Pete’s point that he is aware there is planning but also is nervous there won’t be any delivery for a few years. |
|  | * Sarah explained the main delivery would likely commence in April 2025 at the start of year 2. |
|  | * Mark voiced concerns of worrying about wasting funding due to not being agile with this. |
|  | * Martin explained this proposal will get the board through the submission deadline and once this is approved the programme will start to take shape and start gaining momentum. |
|  | * Roy understood Mark’s point and as the year started in April and we are now in July then there is a danger of not delivering much within the first year. * An idea of an approval date would be helpful. |
|  | * Sarah pointed out that funding would not be lost, and the funding from each of the first 3-years can be carried into the following year. |
|  | * Amy Fox gave her support for the funding proposal and noted that it pulls together discussions had over the last few months. * She expects any detail to be ironed out further down the line. |
|  | * Louise also gave her support for the proposal. * She expressed that with her experience for getting approval through government funding streams she expects delivery to commence in year 2. |
| **6** | **Next Steps – Sarah Daniel** |
|  | * There will be three subgroups set up, one for safety and security, a second for high streets, heritage and transport and a separate one for a funding subgroup. * The funding subgroup will get in place a local assurance framework which lays out how money is distributed to groups in a fair and accountable way. * The council will be acting as the accountable body. * Sarah asked the board to let Hollie know by Friday 26th July which subgroup they would like to be part of and then these meetings will be put in. * These groups will then feed back into the board. * Sarah suggested cancelling the August board meeting as a decision on the submission will likely not have been made by then and the board can focus on the subgroups. |
|  | * Cllr Huskinson asked if the subgroups will have an authority to make a decision, as he finds across the board there are separate views of where they want the funding used. |
|  | * Sarah explained the subgroups would make a recommendation where the board would make a decision to be signed off. * The boards’ role is to sign off any decisions and work together to ensure the best use of the funding. |
|  | * Pete added that as long as the board is representing all of our residents, no matter their differences, then the right decisions will be made. * People have varying agendas, and the board will come to agreements for everyone. |
|  | * Teresa agreed with Pete’s point however does find the community play a vital role within the town. |
|  | * Martin reminded the board they had signed the declaration of interest forms and from the next board meeting onwards there will be an agenda item to declare any new declarations from board members. * Where any decisions are being made and a board member has an interest, they will not be able to be part of the decision voting process. |
|  | * Roy asked if each theme is mutually exclusive for projects or if they can cross over into multiple themes, as he feels some of the project ideas can cross over into two themes. |
|  | * Gill Callingham confirmed that within the guidance from government a project can only be put within one intervention. |
|  | * Sarah presented on the capacity funding proposal. * There is a request to part fund a post for an officer at ADC for administration support and community engagement at £20,000 a year over 2.5 years. * Training and mentoring of board members, the type of training is up to the board and what they feel will support the process, at £10,000. * Voluntary and community sector grants for engagement to continually engage with the community over the 2.5-year period at £140,000. * There is a contingency of £11,425. |
|  | * The board is asked to approve the submission of the vision plan, the funding allocation proposal and the capacity funding. |
|  | * The board all agreed the decision. |
|  | * Martin thanked all attendees for their hard work to get to this point within the process. |
| **7** | **Date of Next Meeting – Wednesday 11th September** |