



Minutes of the Spalding Town Board Meeting held on Monday 27 October at 5pm MR1, South Holland District Council Offices & via Teams

Present: Robin Hancox (Chair), Jacqui Bunce - NHS, Councillor Nick Worth, Councillor Gary Taylor, Stewart Elderkin - Pedals, Alistair Main - Lighthouse Church, Simon Wright - LCC, Dr Batul Dungarwalla - Lincs CVS, Sarah Fletcher - Spalding BID, Emma Tatlow - Active Lincolnshire, Claire Foster - Boston College, Sir John Hayes, MP, Petronella Keeling & Dustin Frazier Wood - Spalding Gentlemen's Club

Officer Team: Pranali Parikh, Michelle Gant, Jon Burgess, Michael Dow, John Mullen and Luisa Stanney
Adam Parker & Illjana Eggert - Greig & Stevenson
Heather Frecklington - Focus Consultants

1 Chair's Welcome

RH welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Marc Jones, Jo Davison and Councillor Rob Gibson.

3 Declarations of Interest

There were no new declarations of interest.

4 Minutes of the Spalding Town Board meeting held on 29 September 2025

The minutes were agreed as a true record.

5 Feedback of Pride in Place Consultation & Engagement

MG provided a comprehensive update on the consultation process, which had generated a strong response from the community. The consultation officially closed at midnight on 27 October and a full report would be compiled. The report would include feedback from surveys, social media, community events and the Zen survey. Over the past 18 months approximately 1,000 pieces of feedback had been collected, shaping the proposals significantly. MG highlighted the community's passion and engagement, noting that 36 individuals had expressed interest in ongoing involvement.

NW had engaged with students during Local Democracy week and had talked to them about being involved in the next stage of engagement. CF had engaged with students to ensure young people were included in future planning. All feedback and engagement would be incorporated into the final report and circulated to Board members.

GT commended the Board's efforts in conducting the consultation and emphasised that comments made on social media should not be considered formal feedback. He raised concerns about safety, including the need for improved CCTV coverage and a hybrid crossing near Ayscoughfee Hall, which had been discussed at a recent Lincolnshire County Council meeting. A site visit with the Highways Manager was scheduled and updates would be shared with the Board. He also noted the need to address misconceptions around the enforcement of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs), suggesting a communications campaign to clarify these issues.

6 Pride in Place Update

MD introduced the Pride in Place Investment Plan. He outlined the delivery scenarios and explained how consultation responses had informed the development of key principles. Three models were considered: a public realm-led approach, a commission-led model and a hybrid model. The hybrid model was recommended as the preferred option due to its flexibility, capacity-building potential and ability to foster partnerships. It would allow for co-funding, in-kind delivery and shared ownership among local organisations, many of which had expressed interest in working with the Council.

MD presented a spreadsheet detailing priorities for town centre revitalisation, including shopfront improvements, business support, events, placemaking and programme management. The budget was phased over four years, with realistic cash flow assumptions and recognition that some activities, such as grant allocations, would not begin immediately. Quantity surveyors had costed priority areas such as the Market Place and the plan was designed to be responsive to consultation themes and adaptable to future opportunities.

PP thanked MD for his presentation and asked the Board to consider specific questions outlined in the meeting papers. RH invited comments on the draft vision document, noting that the language could be strengthened. NW supported the vision but emphasised the need to reflect community feedback. ET expressed support for the document overall but raised concerns about the tight timeline and the need for more creative collaboration. She suggested that more time would allow for better integration of ideas and partnerships.

JB echoed ET's concerns and stressed the importance of articulating what the funding was intended to achieve. She noted that some proposals felt transactional and called for clearer alignment with Pride in Place objectives, particularly around health and wellbeing. JB emphasised that the Board should walk alongside local people, ensuring the plan was co-created.

RH reassured members that there would be time for refinement after submission and CF agreed, noting that the success of the plan would depend on the partnerships it unlocked rather than the funding alone. CF questioned whether investment in lighting and paving would genuinely increase footfall and urged the Board to consider systemic issues such as young people and crime and employment gaps. She called for anchor organisations to be involved and for infrastructure investment to support events and community engagement.

AM raised concerns about the emphasis on public realm improvements and suggested more focus on empty units and creative grant funding. He also noted that cultural elements, such as music, had been raised in workshops but were not reflected in the document. NW agreed and highlighted the potential for quick wins through regular events and engagement with young people. He shared positive feedback from recent sessions with local schools, which had provided valuable insights into young people's visions for Spalding.

BD emphasised the need to reach difficult-to-engage groups and suggested that local organisations could support this effort. MD outlined the proposed first-year spend of £600,000, which would focus on visible, tangible improvements to build community confidence and encourage further engagement. He stressed the importance of ensuring that projects were sustainable and supported beyond the initial funding period.

JB returned to the theme of thriving communities and questioned whether the three core objectives were clearly articulated. MD agreed and committed to strengthening the strategic case by identifying key metrics, such as satisfaction measures and equality gaps, to guide future evaluation. He confirmed that all projects would be assessed against the core objectives and that the assurance framework would be used to ensure alignment, impact and deliverability.

The Board agreed to adopt the assurance framework and include the hybrid approach in the Investment Plan. Members were invited to email any concerns and MD would circulate the final document. Next steps included internal consultation with members, an all-member briefing and compilation of consultation responses, Cabinet approval on 24 November and submission of the plan by 28 November. RH asked whether another meeting was needed before submission or if feedback could be provided via email. JH emphasised the importance of early wins to maintain public enthusiasm. It was agreed that draft plan would be shared well in advance to allow for meaningful review prior to submission on 28 November. MD confirmed his availability for further discussions and individual meetings if required.

PP confirmed that Cabinet approval was required prior to submission and RH expressed interest in attending the meeting on 24 November. NW noted that the meeting was public and open to all Board members. GT added that Cabinet members had been briefed on the process to date.

SW raised a query about lease assistance referenced in the hybrid spreadsheet, asking whether it referred to grant subsidies or negotiations with landlords. He noted that CIPFA guidance allowed for lease support as part of capital programmes, subject to approval by the Section 151 Officer. The Board discussed the importance of including social value and sustainability in the assessment framework and agreed that all grant-funded projects should demonstrate long-term viability.

JB reiterated the need for exit strategies to avoid cliff-edge funding and maintain social trust. MD agreed and confirmed that lessons from UKSPF would inform the next stage of project scoping.

Following on from discussions the Board agreed that the 10 year regeneration plan submission document would be updated and recirculated to members for final comments, along with the delivery model rationale document. The allocation of funding to priorities for years 1-4 and assurance framework were agreed.

7 Update on the Use & Status of Capacity Funding

A capacity funding update was shared, showing a £90,000 uncommitted balance that could be rolled forward into the delivery phase. This funding would support business development and future business cases. Further updates would be provided at each Board meeting.

8 Any Other Business

Policing - concerns were raised about the next phase of policing in Spalding. Feedback had been given to the Police about improving their visibility within the town centre and more engagement with the public. SF noted ongoing communication efforts and the importance of tackling and reporting anti-social behaviour.

RH acknowledged SF's positive engagement with Springfields and thanked SF for her work. SF shared that Simon Stone, the retail director at Springfields, was keen to support Spalding town through initiatives such as a vintage bus and promotional materials.

RH closed the meeting by thanking all attendees for their contributions. Final documents would be circulated for review and any outstanding issues would be addressed via email prior to submission.