

## Notes to the Meeting of the Ryde Neighbourhood Board of Directors

Held on Wednesday, 16 April 2025, 12:00 - 14:00 at No. 11 St Thomas's Square, Ryde, Isle of Wight P033 2PJ

Present	Also, in attendance
Steven Holbrook – Chair (SH)	Allan Bridges (ABr) (Project Director)
Carol Jaye (CJ)	Jon Baker (JB) (RTC Note taker)
Jim Peglar (JP)	Chris Ward (CW) (IWC/S151 Officer)
Phil Jordan (PJ)	Alex Minns (AM) (IWC)
Joe Robertson (JR)	Colin Rowland (CR) (IWC)
Donna Jones (DJ)	Pete Fellows (PF) (IWC)
David Redrup (DR)	Ann Barber (AB) (IWC)
Rachael Randall (RR)	
Trevor Nicholas (TN)	
Lisa Gigliani (LG)	
Richard May (RM)	
Louise Dandy (LD)	
Karen Lucioni (KL)	

ltem		ACTION
1.	Apologies for Absence	
	Received from Luke Kerr, Geoff Underwood and James Hinton.	
2.	To agree the notes of the meeting held 7 February 2025	
	The notes of the meeting held on 7 February 2025 were agreed.	
3.	Declarations of Interest	
	None declared	
	Introduction of representatives from Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MCHLG)	
	Representatives from the MCHLG thanked the Board for inviting them to the meeting. They believed that Ryde's Neighbourhood Board had put together an exciting programme for the Town over the coming ten years and stated that ministers were keen to see it succeed.	

The Board was advised that the MCHLG were keen to offer assistance with any networking matters and answer any questions as well as address any areas of feedback. A Networking Event was also being planned for June.

Regarding expansion of the Board, the MCHLG advised that this would be a matter for the Board itself but believed that it could evolve as it moved from a strategy to delivery. The key to success was that there would be a high consensus from members and partners and having the right people on board.

Officers from the Isle of Wight Council (the Accountable Body) should be observers and facilitators, although the S151 Officer would always have a major role, overseeing the proper administration of the Boards financial affairs.

Whilst the IWC could not instruct on how money was spent, it did need to agree with any financial decisions. In theory, the IWC could veto any decision, but such a scenario was not likely. Spend on a project would be discussed in detail by the board before any decision was made and providing that a proposal was viable and beneficial to Ryde and followed all due process, a veto from the IWC would not happen. The IWC was a facilitator for the non-political Neighbourhood Board and would not wish to obstruct progress. The only person who could possibly veto a Board decision would be the S151 Officer in the event CIPFA rules were not followed as their responsibility was to the local tax payer.

The key to a successful Neighbourhood Board was for a collaborative and Cooperative approach with equal partners with a level of give and take on all sides.

Regarding any decisions that involve exceeding any annual allowed spend to speed up any projects, this would be acceptable as long as such forward funding projects adhered to an understood arrangement with the S151 Officer.

Regarding the setting up of a establish a charity or CIC, ministers would be very supportive, and it was envisaged that it would be running by April 2026. It would need to go through the usual checks to ensure it was viable (such as probity and viability etc), before it could be given the go ahead.

The MCHLG advised the Board that they could forward names from other Neighbourhood Boards such as Grimsby regarding examples of Neighbourhood Plans.

5. Board Membership Confirmation – \_Members to confirm intention / willingness to remain on the Ryde Neighbourhood Board (RNB) JR raised the issue of the Board needing better representation, particularly but not solely from young people.

	There was not one member of the Board under the age of 40 and after engaging with the public it had become very evident that the young people of Ryde needed to have representation on the Neighbourhood Board.	
	However, there was also a need for there to be a voice representing Health and statutory education matters. Concerns were also raised that there needed to be more than one Ryde based business represented.	
	The original community engagement at the start of the process of establishing the Town Board now needs to reflect the new guidelines and address issues such as health and matters delve further into areas regarding the towns youth. Any future public engagement has to establish if the current membership reflects what the Ryde residents want.	
	The MCHLG stated that any refresh of the Board would be welcomed by ministers and any new representatives could be added ahead of 22 April. Submission to the MCHLG.	
	Regarding the representation of the towns youth, both Network Ryde and the IOW Youth Trust were suggested. The Youth Trust was about the wellbeing and mental health issues whereas Network Ryde, whilst offering similar support also offered activities and a safe place to meet.	
	Regarding the issue of local businesses feeling frustrated at being left out, this should be regarded as a positive matter as it shows they care. It could therefore be an opportunity to set up an Ambassadors Board of local businesses where the Neighbourhood Board could provide updates to.	
	The Board needed to confirm ahead of 22 April how many additional members would be added. Whilst the Terms of Reference stipulated a maximum of 16 members, they could always be amended. They could perhaps state that the Board aspires to include membership of local youth, health, statutory education and additional businesses.	
	The Chair suggested that an agenda item for the next meeting could be to go through everyone's role and what each member brings to the Board.	
	The Board therefore agreed that four new places would be for Youth, health, Statutory Education and an additional Ryde Business. One member could cover more than one area (such as Youth and Education combined).	
<b>U</b> .	<b>Review of New Guidance</b> Owing to time constraints this item would be discussed at next meeting.	
7.	Review of revised ToR's for the Board (as requested by Steve Holbrook	
	and Joe Robertson)	
	DJ suggested the following amendments:	
	<ul> <li>Section 2 Board Membership – Differentiate what must and may be represented on the Board.</li> </ul>	

	<ul> <li>Section 2 Board Membership ("A Board Member shall cease to be a member of the Board in the following circumstances") – Second bullet point should state that if not a councillor, then the position would be advertised, specifying attributes required.</li> <li>Section 2 Board Membership – Third and fourth bullet pints combine into one.</li> </ul>	
	• Section 4 Role of the Chair – sixth bullet point should add that a stated reason must be given for suspending a meeting.	
	<ul> <li>Section 8 Frequency of Meetings – Should specify a minimum of four meetings per year, with an aim of meeting 12 times per year or as agreed by the Chair in partnership with the S151 Officer of the accountable body.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Section 11 Attendance by Others – First paragraph, change Board Members to read "the Board".</li> </ul>	
	The Chair reminded the Board that the Terms of Reference can be revised and amended at any time	
8	<b>Information required for submission to MHCLG by April 22</b> PF advised the Board that the following was required for the submission on 22 April:	
	<ul> <li>Any additional members (names not required but areas were)</li> <li>Revised Terms of Reference</li> <li>Name of Board (Town or Neighbourhood)</li> <li>Revised Town Expanded Boundary</li> </ul>	
	Regarding the revised expanded boundary, it was agreed that the whole of Puckpool should be included, as well as Westridge.	
	On the issue of the name, it was noted that as Ryde was included in the Plan for Neighbourhoods programme, the name must reflect this and therefore use the Neighbourhood Board name as opposed to the former <i>"Town"</i> .	
9	IWC proposals for undertaking project management and secretariat functions This needed to be addressed as soon as possible. ABr stated that RTC could help out whenever needed and could make capacity available if it was for the benefit of Ryde.	
	However, the IWC had more expertise in many areas and where perhaps better placed to lead.	

	A core and virtual structure needed to be formalised and agreed along	
	with who would be the secretariate.	
	PF to generate proposals	
10	Developing a brief for the Regeneration Plan and 4 year Investment	
10.	Plan	
	Owing to time constraints this item would be discussed at next meeting.	
11.	Developing proposals for community engagement activity	
	The Board agreed that the initial public engagement was not great. Whilst	
	everything was done to tick all the boxes in the limited time there was, there	
	was little involvement from local businesses owing to no real means to do	
	so.	
	However, there has been one on one conversations with local stakeholders	
	and improved online availability.	
	Any future community engagement does not have to be about formal	
	questionnaires. A more flexible and / or targeted approach can be adopted	
	Engagement events could be held allowing members of the public to talk	
	directly to the Board.	
	A structured approach would be required using a list of all consultees	
	resulting in a decision on the best way to consult.	
	ABr and CR would discuss on who would be the best to lead on the new	
	engagement activity.	
12.	Procurement for items 1 and 11	
	Owing to time constraints this item would be discussed at next meeting.	
13.		
	proposal discussed in the Charity meeting	
	Owing to time constraints this item would be discussed at next meeting.	
14.	Any other business	
	None.	
15	Next Meeting	
	The next meeting is set for Friday 2 May at 12pm.	

## Meeting closed at 14:00