

Newhaven Town Deal Board

Minutes of Board Meeting

Friday 8th January 2021

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
 - Cllr Zoe Nicholson (ZN), Deputy 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:**
 - Cllr Graham Amy (GA), Mayor of Newhaven
 - **Members of Houses of Parliament and Lords:**
 - Maria Caulfield MP (MC)
 - Baroness Janet Whitaker (JW)
 - **Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy:**
 - Nigel Stewardson (NS), Cities and Local Growth Unit
 - **Local Enterprise Partnerships:**
 - Graham Peters (GP), Chair, Team East Sussex (SELEP)
 - Jo Simmons (JS), Business Development Manager (SELEP)
 - **Newhaven Enterprise Zone:**
 - Corinne Day (CD), Programme Director
 - **Community and Business Representatives:**
 - Dan Shelley (DShe), East Sussex College Group
 - Duncan Kerr (DK), Wave Leisure
 - Penny Shimmin (PS), Sussex Community Development Association
 - Captain Dave Collins-Williams (DCW), Newhaven Port & Properties
 - Dick Shone (DSho), Boutique Modern
 - Keith Hoare, NHS East Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group
 - Patrick Warner (PW), Brighton & Hove Buses
 - Chris Rasmussen (CR), Jasfic Ltd
- Secretariat (provided by Lewes District Council):**
- Lisa Rawlinson (LR), Strategy & Partnerships Lead for Growth & Prosperity
 - Guy McQueen (GM), Regeneration Project Manager

Apologies

- Iain McNab, Cities and Local Growth Unit
- Max Woodford, Greater Brighton Economic Board
- Susie Mullins, Newhaven Town Council
- Adam Bryan, SELEP
- Trevor Beattie, South Downs National Park Authority
- Mike Shorer, Newhaven Chamber of Commerce
- Martin Harris, Brighton & Hove Buses

Agenda Item		Action
1.0	Welcome, Introductions & Apologies <ul style="list-style-type: none">● CK acknowledged both Newhaven Port receiving £6.2m from the Port Infrastructure Fund as well as the £5m of in principle funding from the Future High Streets Fund (FHSF).	
2.0	Minutes of Last Meeting <p>The minutes of our previous meeting were agreed.</p> <p>LR and GM confirmed that engagement carried out by other SELEP towns bidding to the Towns Fund had been viewed and considered in relation to our own; the findings for which were very positive.</p>	
3.0	FHSF update <ul style="list-style-type: none">● PSha provided an update on LDC's bid to the FHSF and the next steps which will be taken:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The Board were reminded of the three core elements of the bid:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Creative Hub – converting the former Co-op building in Newhaven Square to provide flexible workspace for the digital and creative industries. Capitalising on the growing creative cluster in Newhaven which has been identified and as part of the Greater Brighton Area2. Urban Living Room – enhancing the existing Dacre Road Car Park. Transforming the upper deck into a multi-purpose events and community space. This should provide space for a night-time economy as well as market space in the daytime during bad weather. It should also help tackle antisocial behaviour by providing more use, better lighting, and security for the car park.	

	<p>3. Wayfinding, Access, and Connectivity – this will integrate with wayfinding and place making investment being sought as part of our bid to the Towns Fund.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Match funding also delivers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community Healthy Living and Sustainability Hub 2. Events Programme 3. Acquisition Fund 4. Monitoring & Evaluation Costs ○ Original bid to FHSF was for £7,240,557 supported by £3.2m of public sector co-funding (primarily LDC). ○ LDC has been offered £5,000,439 of ‘in principle’ funding which is equivalent to approx. 69% of our ask ○ LDC must now identify what can be delivered / secure additional match funding to make up shortfall of £2,235,618 ○ Overall: a positive result and a better position than many other towns. ○ Options are now being assessed and include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Value engineering 2. Secure additional funding 3. Removing or reducing elements of bid ○ Need to consider impact of Benefit Cost Ratio and Value for Money for any changes ○ Deadline for submission of revisions is end of February. ➤ GP acknowledged the competitive nature of the fund with many towns having received no award, including Hastings. GP also congratulated the work of officers and partners including the Enterprise Zone. 	
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Stakeholder Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LR summarised the engagement so far for the current Virtual Exhibition which is running between 22/12/20 and 18/01/21. ○ LR thanked the Board for sharing details for exhibition across their networks. ○ The analytics results were as follows at 10am on 8th January 2021: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Total users: 1149 ➤ 33% of respondents 18-34 years old ➤ 49 Feedback forms received ➤ 75% support for the seven strategic programmes ➤ 72% of user traffic from Facebook ○ Other data being collected includes comments on programmes (reasons for non-support), ranking of projects (by indicated priorities) and the responses to an open comment section. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LDC have scheduled further social media engagement for 11th, 14th, and 18th January. ➤ NS acknowledged the good level of engagement which has been generated. ➤ CK gave thanks to LR and GM for their work and to the project sponsors for providing the information used in the exhibition. CK also encouraged the Board to continue pushing engagement up until the deadline for responses which is Monday 18th January 2021. ➤ DShe noted that 49 responses over a short time frame, over the Christmas period, and during lockdown, was a good level of initial engagement. DShe also complemented the look, feel and design of the exhibition. ➤ DShe and PK suggested LinkedIn should be used to engage with the local business community. 	<p>Action for All: Continue promoting the Virtual Exhibition.</p> <p>Action: GM to organise LinkedIn engagement.</p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Town Investment Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CK introduced the main agenda item and described the work which the team have been putting in to progress our Town Investment Plan (TIP). CK also reported that he had attended a Chair’s workshop organised by Arup (Towns Fund Delivery Partner) and the need to avoid ‘having too many cooks’ as wordsmiths with too much involvement in the layout/writing of the TIP having been highlighted as a potential final delivery complication risk. The creation of a limited and appropriately knowledgeable sub-committee to bring the TIP to its written conclusion was what had worked best for other towns and was thus to be encouraged. ● PSha informed the Board that LDC have enquired with the Towns Fund team to see if an extension might be provided in light of the impact of the 3rd lockdown, distribution of business grants and revision of the FHSF bid on staffing capacity. However, officers are still aiming to submit the TIP on 29th January and are confident of being able to do so. Only enquiries are being made with no formal request to delay at this stage. MC and NS confirmed that they are in contact with ministers and LDC officers in order to assist with this enquiry. ● PSha also reported on the ‘Check and Challenge’ session which officers had attended. This allowed NS and the delivery partners to scrutinise the current draft TIP. The session was positive, and the engagement plan was well-received in particular. RCol agreed but added that there had been some questions relating to particular projects, which officers will be ensuring project sponsors can supply 	<p>Action: PSha & LR to contact project sponsors for further information</p>

	<p>further information for; particularly projects which involve public investment in private enterprises.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PSha presented an overview of the TIP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is seen to be a good strategic fit with themes linking to programmes and an evidence base being provided ○ A map has been developed for inclusion in our TIP, building on previous documents, to clearly present the areas and strengths of the town and its surroundings. The Board were invited to provide additional input for features of the map. ○ Structure of our TIP (following government guidance): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Foreword / Executive Summary (no word limit) 2. Context and Analysis – to include history and geography of the town 3. Analysis and Rationale - evidence base 4. Strategy – our Vision, themes, and strategic fit 5. Engagement – what we have done 6. Project proposals- what we want to do 7. Delivery plan – how we will do it ○ Evidence base will follow a thematic approach identifying challenges (e.g. low-skilled workforce), strengths (e.g. Enterprise Zone which has attracted significant investment), and opportunities (e.g. increased port operations). Focused on evidence that links to our strategic programmes to provide a rationale for investment. A few gaps still remain which will be filled e.g. visitor numbers for some established events. Further evidence provision is welcomed. ○ Particular opportunities which will be highlighted in TIP are to build on existing successes e.g. Newhaven Enterprise Zone and FHSF bid. Also, to establish Newhaven as a centre for green and sustainable technologies. ○ Strategy section will show how our TIP is based on and/or aligned with local, sub-regional, and national policies and existing strategies. Our Vision and themes will be discussed in terms of their strategic fit and the role of delivery partners will be explained and emphasised. Logic maps will also be included to demonstrate the theory of change for programmes. An example of one of the programmes was shown to the Board and it was stressed that programme details would be linked to our evidence base throughout. ○ Our TIP has been adapted to consider the impact of COVID-19 restrictions and related economic recovery plans, with particular reference to the <u>East Sussex Reset</u> strategy. SELEP’s Local Industrial Strategy and ESCC’s Transport for South East are also key documents which have been referred to. ○ Total Towns Fund bid remains at £23,815,609 with match funding of £16,815,446 – totalling over £40m investment in 	<p>Action for All: To provide additional supporting evidence</p>
--	--	---

	<p>the town. The larger £40m figure will be emphasised in the TIP as well as the importance of unlocking this additional investment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outputs for projects are being revised to ensure no double counting occurs. ○ An initial Benefit-Cost Ratio assessment has been undertaken for each programme with an overall BCR of 3.02 estimated. BCRs do not need to be presented in our TIP (this is required during Stage 2 of the Towns Fund process). However, some or all programme BCRs may be presented as initial estimates. ○ Project Proposals and delivery plans will ultimately define our TIP. LDC's existing project management practices will also be used to explain deliverability. Key project milestones will be included along with headline risks and dependencies. ○ Board members have previously raised matters concerning our Terms of Reference. Officers propose that these are updated to reflect progress through the Towns Fund process and that this is discussed in suitable detail after submission of the TIP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Items for Discussion were presented to the Board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Board was asked if bidding for Towns Fund investment to meet part or all of the shortfall for FHSF proposals (£2.2.m) should be explored as an option. PSha reiterated that LDC are exploring multiple funding options for the FHSF shortfall and that the impact on BCRs needed to be carefully considered. ○ BCR assessments need to be updated as more evidence is presented, and analysis carried out. Match funding opportunities can also be revised by delivery partners ○ GM shared a list of Board members who are asked to supply high resolution logos for inclusion in our TIP. ○ PSha proposed a sub-group for sign off our TIP. This sub-group comprises SM, CD, PS, DShe, PW and DK. ● CK thanked PSha for his presentation and reiterated Arup's support, for limiting to a sensible but accountable degree, the involvement of Board members in the final preparation and signing-off stage of TIPs. The Board were then invited for questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ JW offered her congratulations for the successful FHSF bid, launch of the Virtual Exhibition and our draft TIP. JW asked for press publicity in hard copy media e.g. local newspapers. 	<p>Action: Officers to include review of Terms of Reference at future Board meeting</p> <p>Action: Identified Board members to provide logos to GM</p> <p>Action: LR and GM will inform the Board of future press coverage</p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ JW suggested there should be clearer mention of Brexit and Newhaven Port – impact and opportunities. The impact on Enterprise Zones would also be of interest and importance. PSha sought to assure the Board that this has and will be covered in our TIP. This had been brought up in our Check and Challenge session also. ➤ JW supported the commissioning of further transport impact assessments in terms of economic impact of better connectivity, particularly for businesses within the Enterprise Zone. ➤ JW also supported the slogan ‘grit becomes the pearl’ which PSha had alluded to in his presentation. ➤ PW sought to assure the Board that Brighton & Hove Buses are seeking further supporting evidence which will be supplied to LR. ➤ PW also reflected on previous discussion with ESCC and encouraged wider discussion of transport improvements and their link with Newhaven Town Deal proposals to be articulated within our TIP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objections were received to the in-principle agreement to explore part-funding of the FHSF • The Board agreed to create a sub-group for the final development of our TIP. 	
<p>6.0</p>	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CK reflected on the work which will need to be undertaken once the TIP has been submitted and the ongoing engagement and meeting of the Board which is expected. CK asked for RCol and NS to explain how Town Deal Boards in earlier cohorts had been operating after submission. RCol and NS highlighted the importance of developing business plans and having clear plans in place to manage this and ensure there is appropriate resource. ➤ GP asked for there to be a dedicated Board meeting for the formal sign-off and launch of our TIP before submission from full Board membership. ➤ CK responded with agreement that this would be desirable but with concern that this might be a stretch for officer resource on the day of submission. It would also be impractical to look to include any refinement of our TIP on the final day. ➤ GP agreed and did not see this as being an opportunity for amending or rejecting our TIP. ➤ PSha suggested that circulation of our TIP which has been signed-off by the sub-group, though not in their final design 	

	<p>form, combined with a brief meeting close to submission might achieve this goal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ MC saw no issue with sub-group sign-off and favoured the prioritisation of officer time for submission of the strongest document possible on the final day. ➤ GP did not wish to force the issue but thought a passionate submission with all Board members involved at the end of the submission might meet the calls for passion which seem to be favoured. ➤ PS agreed that a final meeting of the Board before submission would be favourable and show the level of involvement and passion from partners. ➤ CK and PSha confirmed that a final short (c.30 mins) Board meeting would be scheduled for 4.30pm on Friday 29 January. No agenda will be provided but the final TIP will be shared as soon as it is available. The meeting will seek to celebrate and merely ratify the Plan prior to submission. 	
<p>7.0</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>No other business was raised. CK brought the meeting to a close, reconfirming his thanks for the work carried out so far by PSha, LR, GM, RCol and NS in particular, and also for the Board’s input and involvement throughout.</p>	