

## **Newhaven Town Deal Board**

### **Minutes of Board Meeting**

Friday 27<sup>th</sup> November 2020

3.00 – 4.30pm via MS Teams

#### **Attendees**

- **Chair:** Chris Ketley (CK), Knill James LLP
- **Towns Coordinator for Newhaven:**
  - Rebecca Collings (RCol), Nichols Group
- **Lewes District Council:**
  - Cllr James MacCleary (JM), Leader
  - Rob Cottrill (RCot), Chief Executive,
  - Ian Fitzpatrick (IF), Deputy Chief Executive
  - Peter Sharp (PSha), Head of Regeneration
- **East Sussex County Council:**
  - James Harris (JH), Assistant Director - Economy
- **Newhaven Town Council:**
  - Susie Mullins (SM), Head of Strategic Development
- **Members of Houses of Parliament and Lords:**
  - Maria Caulfield MP (MC)
  - Baroness Janet Whitaker (JW)
- **Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy:**
  - Nigel Stewardson (NS), Cities and Local Growth Unit
- **Local Enterprise Partnerships:**
  - Graham Peters (GP), Chair, Team East Sussex (SELEP)
  - Adam Bryan (AB), Chief Executive, SELEP
- **Community and Business Representatives:**
  - Dan Shelley (DShe), East Sussex College Group
  - Duncan Kerr (DK), Wave Leisure
  - Penny Shimmin (PS), Sussex Community Development Association
  - Dave Collins-Williams (DCW), Newhaven Port & Properties
  - Chris Rasmussen (CR), Jasfic Ltd
  - Patrick Warner (PW), Brighton & Hove Buses
  - Martin Harris (MH), Brighton & Hove Buses
  - Dick Shone (DSho), Boutique Modern

#### **Secretariat (provided by Lewes District Council):**

- Lisa Rawlinson (LR), Strategy & Partnerships Lead for Growth & Prosperity
- Guy McQueen (GM), Regeneration Project Manager

#### **Apologies**

- Cllr Zoe Nicholson, Lewes District Council
- Cllr Graham Amy, Newhaven Town Council
- Corinne Day, Newhaven Enterprise Zone
- Trevor Beattie, South Downs National Park Authority
- Max Woodford, Greater Brighton Economic Board
- Mike Shorer, Newhaven Chamber of Commerce

Agenda item		Action
1.0	<p><b>Welcome, Introductions &amp; Apologies</b></p> <p>CK welcomed all to the meeting and acknowledged the tragic sinking of Joanna C, a 45ft fishing dredge, off the coast of Seaford. In more positive news, congratulations to SCDA were noted following the Sussex Heritage Trust Award for the Youth Centre on Denton Island. Thanks were also given to Dick Shone for circulating a video which documents the new Palmerston House development by Boutique Modern for Lewes District Council: <a href="http://boutiquemodern.co.uk/casestudy/fort-road/">boutiquemodern.co.uk/casestudy/fort-road/</a></p>	
2.0	<p><b>Minutes of Last Meeting</b></p> <p>The previous minutes were agreed.</p>	
3.0	<p><b>Stakeholder Engagement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LR reported back on behalf of the Stakeholder Engagement Sub-group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Newhaven Town Deal Resident Survey opened 12/11/20 and will be closing on 04/12/20</li> <li>○ Board members were thanked for sharing details of the survey across their networks and were encouraged to continue doing so</li> <li>○ Responses as of 27/11/20 were tabled for consideration. A positive response had been received for all questions so far, ranging from 70% to 92% positive. 84 responses have been received so far, and all were asked to promote again through their networks.</li> <li>○ This feedback will help inform the next stage of our engagement which is a virtual exhibition.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ JH asked if we were aiming for a particular rate of response to the survey. LR explained that no targets had been set, particularly given current constraints. Prior engagement and our planned Online Exhibition will also be included in our Town Investment Plan (TIP).</li> <li>➤ AB suggested that the Stakeholder Engagement Sub-group should view Town Deal engagement carried out by other towns in the SELEP region for a point of comparison.</li> <li>➤ NS confirmed that Newhaven is seen as having carried out a good level of resident engagement and it is excellent that it is ongoing.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action: LR and GM to review engagement carried out by other SELEP towns</b></p>

<p><b>4.0</b></p>	<p><b>Finalising Our Strategic Programmes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CK reiterated the steps taken so far with the Board having agreed 7 Strategic Programmes on a preliminary basis with resident engagement and further project information being factored in. The Board are now tasked with reducing the total ask which currently exceeds the £25m being sought.</li> <li>• PSha presented an updated overview of the projects being considered for inclusion in our bid which will be contained within our 7 Strategic Programmes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Since the last Board meeting, officers have been in contact with project sponsors to gather further information to refine proposals and confirm costings where possible</li> <li>○ The Board were reminded of the good geographical spread of projects being considered and how they fit across the themes of our TIP</li> <li>○ Each programme was presented with their estimated outputs and identified risks discussed. Spend profiles and match funding were also provided for each project</li> <li>○ A briefing note had been circulated in advance which summarised a preliminary feasibility study which had been conducted for the proposed Pedestrian and Cycling Bridge project, the key details of which were reiterated. It was proposed that this project be removed from the bid.</li> <li>○ Given LDC's current bid to the Future High Street Fund is still awaiting a decision, it was also suggested that the Board approve the removal of this project from the Towns Fund bid for the time being but with the possibility of re-evaluating, should the FSHF bid be unsuccessful</li> <li>○ All other projects were recommended to remain but with a clear need to monitor identified risks and develop business cases before including in our TIP. A new total figure of £23.8m has been calculated, with a 10% contingency included</li> <li>○ NS was asked to reconfirm the view likely to be taken if Newhaven were to exceed a bid of £25m (bids of up to £50m are permitted in exceptional circumstances but are subject to increased scrutiny and additional criteria). NS considered this very difficult to achieve, particularly as there is a need to evidence impact on a national scale. RCol agreed that this would seem appropriate but would support efforts should the Board wish to exceed £25m. Discussion was then opened to the Board.</li> <li>○ NS also highlighted that a decision on FHSF funding is expected imminently.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ PW suggested detail would be emerging from the Government Spending Review 2020 which could be a significant benefit when seeking additional funding for the bus fleet required to operate from the proposed Hydrogen Hub. ‘Shovel-ready’ projects would be well-placed to submit bids. The Government Spending Review 2020 has wide implications for future funding schemes; AB and GP acknowledged the benefit of having well-advanced project proposals in place when funding opportunities arise.</li><li>➤ JH commended proposals and praised the travel-related schemes in particular. ESCC are looking at the potential allocation of road space as part of Major Road Network proposals. It is suggested that this work is referred to in our TIP. Traffic signals are also due to be upgraded to pelican crossings as part of a new ‘Urban Traffic Control System’ for the ring road which is designed to improve traffic flow and efficiency.</li><li>➤ JW reflected on her previous involvement with bidding processes where the full amount has not been awarded. Is there any allowance for towns to include some margin of excess in case their bid is reduced without being subject to increased scrutiny? PSha reported that Cohort 1 Towns have bids in the region of £21 to £27m with the exception of Blackpool which was focused on their visitor economy which is seen as having national recognition and impact. Cohort 1 Towns had typically seen their asks reduced by around £2m. NS confirmed this but highlighted that the issue with including the bridge, specifically, would be that it is likely to bring a significant increase above £25m. Any alternative projects would be difficult to include at this stage due to timeframes for the TIP.</li><li>➤ JW also saw a clear opportunity to quantify the positive effect on Bridge Street trade and access were the Bridge Project to be included.</li><li>➤ AB advised keeping the ask below £25m and highlighted the importance of articulating broader funding within our TIP; both the funding which has already been received and the strong argument which can be made for funding of projects which have not been included through alternative schemes</li><li>➤ SM asked whether port-specific projects might be considered as significant for the region and the national economy. MC noted that there will be investment in Newhaven Port as part of Brexit. It is unlikely that an argument could be made in our TIP for recognition on a national scale. MC and NS reported that free-port status is likely to only be awarded to a small number of the many</li></ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>ports in the South East. Newhaven's chances are therefore relatively small.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ JM acknowledged the importance of and support the Board have had for the Pedestrian and Cycling Bridge but supports the removal of the project based on the feasibility study findings and limitations of this fund as felt it could weaken our bid. JM would like to look at alternative funding streams and progress feasibility work to ensure we are in an informed position to bid for investment in the future</li> <li>➤ JH asked for further detail on the Newhaven Fort spending profile. DK explained the balance and origin of match funding in place and the details of the Heritage Lottery Funding Bid through which this project and business case has been developed. This includes a legacy of much-needed repairs and maintenance, but also the 'Renaissance' project to drive new visitor numbers and community engagement.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board agreed to accept officer recommendations for the removal of the Bridge and FHSF projects for the reasons noted in the presentation.</li> <li>• The Board thanked PSha, LR and GM for all the work carried out to date. CK thanked the Board for their considerable time, diligence and input to date.</li> </ul>	
<b>6.0</b>	<p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers will commence drafting the Newhaven Town Investment Plan</li> <li>• The Virtual Exhibition will be drafted and shared with the Board for comment and approval.</li> <li>• The Virtual Exhibition launch will be scheduled and promoted in advance</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action: GM to share draft documents for the Virtual Exhibition</b></p>
<b>7.0</b>	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>Board agreed to schedule next meeting 08/01/2021 at 3.00pm.</p>	
<b>8.0</b>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>RCol shared details of Arup's Social Value Support Offer which Newhaven was encouraged to consider being involved in: <a href="http://townsfund.org.uk/blog-collection/career-and-transition-skills-support">townsfund.org.uk/blog-collection/career-and-transition-skills-support</a></p>	

	Board Members to consider whether they would like to explore this in more detail and liaise with PSha, LR and/or GM to progress.	<b>Action: Members to contact PSha/LR/GM as needed</b>