

Meeting of the Ryde Neighbourhood Board of Directors

Held on Friday 2 May 2025, 12:00 - 14:00

No. 11 St Thomas's Square, Ryde, Isle of Wight PO33 2PJ



Present	Joe Robertson (JR)
Steven Holbrook (SH)	Also in attendance
Carol Jaye (CJ)	Lisa Dyer (LD) (RTC as Secretariat)
Louise Dandy (LDa)	Allan Bridges (ABr) (Interim Programme Manager)
Lisa Gagliani (LG)	Ann Barber (AB) (IW Council)
Phil Jordan (PJ)	Peter Fellows (PF) (IW Council)
Rachael Randall (RR)	Fiona Capewell (FC) (IW Council)
Richard May (RM)	Chris Ward (CW) (Section 151 Representative)
Jim Pegler (JP)	Rebecca Outing (RTC as Secretariat)

Item		ACTION
1.	Apologies for Absence Received from Geoff Underwood, Karen Lucioni and Trevor Nicholas. Joe Robertson will be leaving the meeting at approximately 13:00.	
2.	Declarations of Interest There were no declarations of interest.	
3.	Meeting Notes - To agree the notes of the meeting held 16 April 2025 The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true record, subject to the following amendments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In future, the notes are referred to as 'minutes'. - Item 4, paragraph 4: revision as below: 'Officers from the Isle of Wight Council (the Accountable Body) should act as observers and facilitators. However, the S151 Officer, who holds a distinct statutory role, should always have a major responsibility for overseeing the proper administration of the Board's financial affairs'. - Item 7, bullet point 3: The word 'pints' to be revised to 'points'. It was requested that once minutes have been amended, they are uploaded to the Neighbourhood Board website (currently RTC).	

4.	<p>IWC proposals for undertaking project management and Secretariat functions</p> <p>Discussion focused on the future direction regarding who would take over the Secretariat and project management responsibilities. PF reported that RTC is happy for IWC to assume these roles. Fiona Capewell (FC) would be brought on board under PF's guidance. The finer details will be handled by the Finance Subcommittee.</p> <p>RR supports this approach but asserted her preference for an RTC representative to remain involved. LG noted the significant advantages of RTC continuing as a member, while also acknowledging the value of having IWC on board, given their skill set.</p> <p>Following discussion, it was agreed in principle for IWC to proceed with project management and Secretariat roles, pending financial review by the Finance Subcommittee. It was also decided that ABr is to be made a non-voting member of the Ryde Neighbourhood Board. Final details to be presented at the next board meeting.</p> <p>Proposed: RR ii: LDa</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>That IWC proceed with the proposed course of action to take over the Secretariat and project management, and that ABr be appointed as a non-voting member of the Ryde Neighbourhood Board.</p> <p>ACTION: Arrange a meeting with the Finance Subcommittee</p>	PF
5.	<p>Approach to / aims and objectives of community engagement activity</p> <p>PF referred to the consultation previously undertaken, noting it now needs to be built upon and refined. The approach will involve addressing social and economic challenges by working with groups and organisations already active within these communities to understand the issues and identify how support can be provided. This engagement will be ongoing to ensure that all voices are heard, particularly those of hard-to-reach groups.</p> <p>PF and FC will develop a community engagement plan and then consider the methods of delivery. SH noted the importance of timelines and also highlighted the need to include areas that may not have been adequately targeted in previous efforts.</p> <p>ACTION: Present the draft community engagement plan at the next meeting.</p>	PF
6.	<p>Approach to producing a 10-year Regeneration Plan and 4-year Investment Plan</p> <p>It was noted that the balance lies in building upon the work already undertaken by Place Spark. While their previous work was not a formal</p>	

	<p>proposal, it constituted a regeneration plan. The discussion centred around how best to collaborate with Place Spark and the IWC Regeneration team moving forward.</p> <p>LDa emphasised the importance of continuing community engagement and suggested that Place Spark remain involved in the process. Place Spark have already conducted significant groundwork and produced a digestible and useful document. It was suggested that Place Spark should be recommissioned to enhance their original research, with findings to be brought back to the Board.</p> <p>SH highlighted the importance of working closely with the IWC Regeneration team. It was agreed that PF and FC would liaise with Place Spark to move this forward. A specification for the required work will be developed, alongside a procurement approach. SH noted that a review of this work does not need to wait until the next meeting, a session could be scheduled once the work is completed.</p> <p>LG requested that any decisions made between meetings be formally noted. LD confirmed that all such decisions must be ratified at the following Board meeting, in line with governance procedures.</p> <p>LDa raised the point that documentation should be paced appropriately, considering upcoming holiday periods. She suggested that care be taken to avoid overwhelming members with large volumes of material on short notice. It was agreed that PF would be responsible for managing this aspect.</p> <p>CW (Section 151 Officer) underlined the importance of ensuring that all projects are grounded in evidence. He expressed support for the current approach and stressed the need to build on existing work rather than duplicate or replace it.</p>	
7.	<p>To receive a proposal from the Local Business Task Force</p> <p>LG introduced two key recommendations from the circulated papers. In response to growing speculation around local projects, LG proposed launching “business cafés” - informal engagement sessions using a selected sample of the 24 Place Spark report projects. These six sessions would be well-publicised, held at various times, and explore both simple and complex projects to gauge their potential benefits, such as job creation.</p> <p>The second recommendation involved creating a Ryde Events Manager role, potentially evolving into a Town Centre Manager post employed by a new charitable body. A Town Centre Management Company (TCMC) could support this structure.</p>	

	<p>JR noted the current inactivity of the Ryde Business Association and proposed revitalising a Business Forum for Board engagement. RR questioned the need for two separate business groups and called for a more coherent and representative structure.</p> <p>13:08, Joe Robertson left the meeting.</p> <p>ABr supported the proposal, noting it aligned with ongoing efforts and could help unify fragmented business engagement. He acknowledged that this would not be a short-term fix but agreed it would provide long-term cohesion.</p> <p>FC suggested that this could be reviewed by their Project Management team. SH agreed with FC to present the proposals along with the community engagement plans and collect feedback.</p> <p>ACTION: Arrange for Project Management team to review the Local Business Task Force proposals alongside the community engagement plans and gather feedback for review.</p>	FC
8. Charity Set-Up Recommendation - Finance Committee to present proposal discussed in the Charity meeting	<p>The Finance Committee was expected to present their proposal regarding setting up a charity. Due to changing circumstances, this did not take place. It is now proposed that the matter be referred to the Secretariat to review and consider the proposals.</p> <p>ACTION: The proposal for the set-up of the new charity to be referred to the Secretariat for review and consideration.</p>	RR
9. Any Other Business	<p>JR: Clarification is needed on a reference in the Business Task Force update, stating that the Task Force Terms of Reference (TOR) were agreed on 16 April. SH confirmed the TOR had not been officially ratified by the Board and will be included in next month's agenda for review.</p> <p>LG: Requested a small capacity-building investment (under £2,000) into a town map. PF suggested exploring ways to move it forward. With no objections, it was agreed PF would take this on, with LD and PF to follow up.</p> <p>RM: Attended his final meeting, wished everyone well, and offered to share his educational expertise if helpful. The Board expressed their thanks, recognising him as a very valuable asset.</p> <p>RR: Raised concerns about a perceived 'them and us' dynamic between Board Members and officers, particularly around seating. RR suggested everyone who attends a meeting is seated together and requested better</p>	

	<p>communication about invitations shared via social media to ensure everyone stays informed.</p> <p>SH: James Hinton had resigned due to a public perceived conflict of interest related to a project he is involved in. SH expressed concern about the challenges of appointing a developer without similar conflicts but emphasised the importance of retaining that expertise on the Board. SH proposed that the Board define the skill sets currently required, with a view to appointing another developer who brings value while avoiding potential conflicts.</p> <p>CJ: Pointed out the lack of health sector representation on the Board. CJ mentioned she has a contact who has a strong background in health, and they may be a good fit.</p> <p>CW: Recommended proceeding with an open recruitment and selection process to ensure transparency and avoid criticism.</p>	
11.	<p>Details of next meeting</p> <p>Friday 6 June 2025, 12:00 - 14:00 at No. 11 St Thomas's Square, Ryde</p>	

Meeting closed at 13:47