

Barry Plan for Neighbourhoods Board Meeting
Thursday 19 February 3pm-5pm
Signal Room, The Engine Room, Hood Road, Barry

Present: David Stevens (DS); Fay Blakeley (FB); Shirley Hodges (SH); Matt Blumberg (MBg); Jane Hutt (JH); Cllr Bronwen Brooks (BB); James Scorey (JS); Joe Castle (JC)

Apologies: Ch Supt. Marc Attwell, Innes Robinson, Kanishka Narayan; Cllr Lis Burnett, Phil Chappell, Marcus Goldsworthy

In attendance: Mererid Velios (MV); Emma Bradshaw (EB); Natalie Nolan (NN); Louise Davies (LD)

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Chair opened the meeting and apologies for absence were noted.

2. Notes from last meeting agreed

3. Procedures for:

- **Bringing projects to the Board**

MV explained a draft flow chart for discussion. It was agreed that a process needed to be established and formally agreed.

Proposed Process:

As well as from the Action Groups, project ideas will come from other individuals or a community group/organisation or Council department. They will be able to bring their ideas to either the Chair of an Action Group or PfN staff. Assistance would be provided if necessary to support them in making their case to the relevant Action Group.

Official EOI forms to be available online and guidelines to complete it (such as basic criteria, eligibility). If the idea doesn't form part of the UK Gov interventions/5 board objectives, a business case should be made. Once submitted to the relevant Action Group, feedback on the project proposal should be given to the EOI contact. The individual/community group would have the opportunity to improve or develop the project proposal to re-submit to the Action Group. It would be up to the Action Group whether to forward the project proposal to the Board for consideration.

There was a discussion around the right to appeal the Action Group's decision. It was decided that there would be a right to appeal in exceptional or compelling circumstances. This would entail the PfN staff bringing the project proposal directly to the Board.

Action Group Updates

DS asked for 'Action Group updates' to be added to the Board agenda going forwards.

Most action groups were reported to have good attendance, engagement and motivation. JC newly appointed Chair of Barry Thriving Communities reported less consistent attendance and lack of cohesion of the group.

A common concern from all Action Groups was raised regarding the responsibility/accountability of a project once agreed by the Board. Who would deliver? Who would monitor? Sustainability of a project? For any income generation, where would that revenue sit (back into the PfN pot)? If asset based, who would own, maintain?

MV confirmed that approved projects would either be managed internally by the PfN team, or managed by the group or organisation in receipt of funding and monitored by the PfN team. Each project would be looked at on an individual case by case basis, perhaps requiring a different model of delivery.

NN explained that they were developing a Network of Neighbourhoods and would be providing further advice around different legal entities and how to own assets. There were many options and Boards could decide whatever is best for that project, for instance there could be a CIC established just for one building asset.

Another reoccurring concern raised in the Action Groups was speed of delivery, projects yet to be agreed, perceived lack of action and outcomes. Chair requested that Action Group Chairs should manage the expectation of the groups and share realistic time frames for much larger project ideas and to also reiterate that Action Group meetings are held more frequently than PfN Board Meetings (currently quarterly).

Terminology and use of the word 'grant' was discussed. The Board was clear that the PfN funding would not offer open calls to individual grant applicants in the traditional sense. NN commented that other areas were also focused on 'action not extraction'. The Chair reiterated the Boards vision for creating a collective impact between Action Groups, that would leave a positive legacy beyond the 10 years of funding.

NN highlighted a process that might grant funding more quickly under an umbrella subsidy control offer. Further information could be given if requested.

DS requested that a presentation be given to Board members on the budget/finance/monitoring of PfN funding at next meeting.

- **Project scoring/prioritisation**

DS asked for comments on the scoring matrix to be sent to MV separately

4. Project proposals (EOIs) discussion

Barry Together – Chair: Matt Blumberg

Power Supply to Outdoor Venues – approved in principle pending detailed costings to be provided and confirmation of maintenance arrangements and charges for using the power supply.

Overall, positively received by Board members. Proposal was for Romilly Park, Central Park, Victoria Park and Barry Island. Approx £10k per site for the power supply. It was queried why Pencoedtre Park was not included (was there a need as there are currently no events taking place there, so a business case would be required.) FB suggested prioritising the parks in more deprived areas and then rolling out to the other parks.

Safer Barry – Chair: Ch.Supt. Marc Attwell (absent)

Temporary CCTV – approved in principle pending further research/investigation – does the Council currently have a mobile CCTV to deploy? Which areas would be prioritised?

The question was raised about whether it would actually solve the problem. This project relies on effective enforcement and support from the Police to deal with what the CCTV captures. DS requested that the Safer AG compare notes with those in the Council responsible for an existing mobile CCTV scheme in Barry to understand learnings (frequency of use , practical challenges, effectiveness etc) and to ensure that we don't duplicate or trip over each other.

Estimate quotation to install a CCTV unit would cost £5800 for 12 months and be linked to the central control in Cardiff.

StoreNet Radios for Holton Road – approved proving Holton Road as pilot

It was questioned why High Street, a location of small independent shops with many being female managed was not included. If the Holton Road pilot was a success, it could be rolled out to High Street in the future. Stoke-on-Trent have done this successfully. The Community Warden employed by the VoG on a 6 month

contract was discussed but Board members were unfamiliar with this role and further work was needed to promote awareness to utilise presence within Holton Road.

Bleed Kits – rejected

The Rotary Club of Barry is currently fundraising for bleed kits for schools and possibly other places. Barry Town Council have funding that the Rotary could apply to for this project to develop it further. SH suggested we liaise with the Rotary to support a joined-up approach to avoid duplication. MV suggested if the project needed any top-up funding or capital funding (e.g. for cabinets) they could come back to the Board at a later date.

NN said that these projects could be packaged together along with the Community Warden as measures to 'Design out crime'.

Barry Future – Chair: Innes Robinson

Real Skillz – unable to approve at this point due to too many open questions

The project raised many questions. Further information was needed – e.g. who pays for materials and the other revenue costs? What are the revenue costs? DS asked that a revised EOI with further details and costings to be prepared for the next meeting.

Vibrant Barry – Chair: Fay Blakeley

Street Art Festival – accepted, confirmed costings to be provided

Events manager needed to co-ordinate it professionally and look at possible exhibition after the event. Legacy mural could be done at the Treharne basketball court, 'Birdcage' wall opposite Barry train station. Proposed summertime launch at either Central Park or another available park in Barry.

Barry 'App' – approved in principle pending further research

All groups were in favour of this idea. Further investigation needed into cost, governance, who would own it, update it, free to use? Possible collaboration with Bro Radio or/and sponsorship model. DS said that many functionally rich apps fail due to the challenge of persuading potential users to actually download the app. He suggested a marketing plan (and a marketing budget) including possible incentivisation of download/usage be included. Additionally the Board noted the presence of other local apps and wondered if there was scope for a useful cooperation DS also suggested we need to research apps that have failed to learn from mistakes.

Broad St public realm improvements – approved pending response from Earl of Plymouth Estate.

The land in question was not public realm but owned by the Earl of Plymouth Estate, MV to contact.

5. Any Other Business

DS reported on the UK Government event in London on the 12th Feb and how some places were rewarding volunteers for their time by sometimes providing food at meetings or taking them out for dinner. Action Group chairs to consider doing this for their groups.

MV said that some further work was needed to barry.cymru to develop project pages and asked to use some of the capacity funding for this. This was agreed.

6. Date of Next Meeting - 28th April 2026