

Newhaven Town Deal Board

Minutes of Board Meeting

Friday 2nd October 2020

1.30 – 3.30pm via MS Teams

Attendees

- **Chair:** Chris Ketley (CK), Knill James LLP
- **Towns Coordinator for Newhaven:**
 - Rebecca Collings (RCol), Nichols Group
 - Mira Torres (MT), Arup
 - Maria Vitale (MV), Arup
- **Lewes District Council:**
 - Cllr James MacCleary (JM)
 - 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
 - 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)
- **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
 - Chris Rasmussen (CR), Jasfic Ltd
 - Dave Collins-Williams (DCW), Newhaven Port & Properties
 - Patrick Warner (PW), Brighton & Hove Buses

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
- Rob Cottrill, Lewes District Council
- Ian Fitzpatrick, Lewes District Council
- Adam Bryan, Chief Executive, SELEP

- Max Woodford, Greater Brighton Economic Board
- Trevor Beattie, South Downs National Park Authority
- Mike Shorer, Newhaven Chamber of Commerce
- Dick Shone, Boutique Modern
- Martin Harris, Brighton & Hove Buses
- Keith Hoare, NHS East Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group

Agenda Item		Action
1.0	<p>Welcome, Introductions & Apologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CK thanked members and officers for the work carried out in recent weeks to progress project proposals and gather relevant information. A number of challenges have been identified and it is suggested that Newhaven move to Cohort 3 to ensure a robust Town Investment Plan (TIP) can be submitted and the full £25m of funding can be asked for – further discussed in Agenda Item 3. ● As such, the scheduled Project Workshop format has been amended to instead focus on strategy. 	
2.0	<p>Minutes of Last Meeting</p> <p>JW asked for a minor amendment (JW attributed instead of JM for points made in discussion of Fort Road Recreation Ground).</p>	<p>Action: GM to amend minutes</p>
as	<p>Projects and Cohorts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PSha gave a presentation focused on the process undertaken to assess the suitability of proposed projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TIPs must align with Towns Fund Intervention Themes ○ Identified projects must be realistic, deliverable and address identified local issues ○ Need must be evidenced, incl. where there is market failure ○ The Board were shown an example of a flow diagram sourced from Warrington's TIP submitted as part of Cohort 1. The context, inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts of an All Electric Bus Fleet Depot were considered. ○ Two more published project examples (Barrow Learning Quarter & Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure) were presented (Barrow's TIP). Barrow included a project description, project rationale, strategic alignment, action, ask and match funding, major interdependencies, timescales/spend profile, outputs, outcomes and estimated benefit-cost-ratio. This level of detail is required and must be 	

obtained in order for projects to be included in our TIP.

- NS acknowledged the relevance of the points made by PSha. Barrow's TIP was commended for story-telling element and visual presentation. Projects were referenced and there was a golden thread throughout.
 - RCol suggested that the Newhaven TIP in its current draft form might benefit from increased ambition and the impact of projects should be articulated.
 - PW discussed some of the challenges which had presented themselves when trying to develop proposed projects and provide relevant details on schedule. Suggested a move to Cohort 3 would be of benefit and allow wider impacts to be achieved, linking with ESCC Highways department in particular.
- RCol presented TIP development guidance:
 - Theory of Change must be evidenced in TIP (as exemplified in Warrington TIP). HM Government's Magenta Book stipulates that "good policy-making necessitates a thorough understanding of the intervention and how it is expected to achieve the expected outcomes."
 - The problems faced and wider context for Newhaven is well-documented, as are the town's strengths. Detailed evidence and specific long-term outcomes (impacts) need to be presented.
 - It is recommended that the Board agree on the key impacts projects are proposed to deliver, working back through the theory of change from this end point in the logic chain.
 - PSha outlined the process followed by officers carry out initial project proposal assessments, the key questions being:
 1. What will be delivered and how much will it cost?
 2. What are the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts?
 3. Is the project deliverable?
 - 3.1 Is planning permission required?
 - 3.2 Has a site been identified?
 - 3.3 What are the key risks and can they be mitigated?
 4. Is there clear evidence of need (data-led)?
 5. Is there any co-funding? Secured or TBC?
 6. Does it fit with the Towns Fund Intervention Framework?
 7. Does it fit with our Visions and Themes for Newhaven?
 - Initial project prioritisation assessment, based on the information provided as of 30/09/20, resulted in the scoring provided to the Board in advance of the meeting using a simple traffic light methodology. Some additional information was received which has led to adjustment. The Board were informed of any changes and it was emphasised that initial assessment is an indicator of current feasibility which may change as more information is provided.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other challenges of assessment at this stage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need for feasibility studies for some projects Impact of other funding streams (as yet unknown), in particular Newhaven’s FHSF bid 2. No specific skills infrastructure/digital connectivity projects, although this can be justified in TIP 3. Community engagement for specific project ideas needed ○ Norton Road Business Park has been added but deliverability is firstly dependent on planning permission being granted (a pre-application request has recently been submitted). ○ The Board need to agree whether to group certain projects together or not as assembling into project ‘packages’ might strengthen proposals and make it easier to present the wider ambitions of our TIP. ○ Officer recommendation to Board: Move submission of TIP to Cohort 3 (new deadline 31/01/21). ➤ JH suggested it is time to focus more acutely on a particular theme and/or geographical area. It is a challenge within the timescales, even when moving to Cohort 3, to achieve this and produce a coherent list of projects instead of a ‘wish list’. ➤ JH reiterated that there is a need to assess feasibility and that capacity funding has been provided for such purposes. ➤ DK asked if any projects might be adversely affected if submission delayed – specifically, if any match funding might be lost as a result. ➤ DK highlighted the difficulty of converting existing project proposals for Newhaven Fort for the purposes of the Towns Fund and considered what resource is available to assist. ➤ DShe asked if there is a risk of increased competition if moving to Cohort 3. NS reiterated that the Fund is non-competitive; TIPs are assessed on their own merit. ➤ SM suggested that there is a need to refocus on the Vision, Themes and prescribed assessment criteria in order to ensure proposed projects are aligned. NS suggested the packaging of projects proposed by officers could help achieve this. ➤ GP and JW both supported the proposed move to Cohort 3. ➤ JW asked how achieving the maximum ask was being considered and believes there is a need to progress stakeholder engagement. ➤ JH highlighted the success of the Newhaven Enterprise Zone (EZ) which has been a galvanizing force for the town and led to increased occupancy of commercial space in particular. To what extent can the EZ be a focus for Town Deal investment and if we should be making more of it through TIP? NS agreed that this should strengthen TIP. Alignment with wider funding and strategy is part of the assessment criteria. ➤ MV sought to remind the Board that a Project Prioritisation Tool has been provided. PSha confirmed that Officers have 	
--	---	--

	<p>used this as a basis for the initial project assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CK summarised that the current meeting was an opportunity to consider the current position of proposals to ensure there is coherence and a strategic fit. The Board should continue to work towards a £25m bid, as previously agreed. ➤ JM considers there to be a clear, established narrative which based on public and stakeholder consultation and proposed projects are well-linked geographically. The emphasis should now be on working with LDC officers to ensure proposed projects align with the prescribed Towns Fund criteria in order to create a short list of projects which are both feasible and eligible for funding. 	
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Next Steps & Date of Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PSha outlined the proposed next steps and timelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Projects <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed deadline for pro formas 16/10/20 2. Feasibility studies to be commissioned ASAP to enable thorough assessments (as needed) 3. Officers to explore project ‘packaging’ in order to group projects together to maximise benefits 4. ‘Red’ projects to be discounted ○ Timeline <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to progress as a priority with early Cohort 3 submission preferable 2. Next Board meeting to be held 23/10/20 and to include final ‘long list’ of project ideas ➤ MC recognised the need to progress the TIP but suggested that until clearer outcomes and impacts have been agreed, it would be remiss to remove projects from the long list at this stage, particularly if the primary issue is a current lack of information. ➤ JW highlighted two projects marked red which would be of considerable benefit and match with Towns Fund objectives. ➤ DShe asked whether fit with FHSF and EZ objectives had been part of the assessment criteria. ○ PSha reminded the Board of the agreed Themes and reconfirmed the process which was undertaken and their basis/linkage to existing strategies and consultations. ○ Example impacts and outcomes linked to Themes were presented with discussion of how projects might achieve them. ➤ JW suggested the marine aspect of the Themes is of particular importance and that the impact of development on all operations including that which uses the slipways must be carefully considered. This discussion related to a recent enquiry from a commercial fish operation that would be designed to add value to the existing fleets’ operations. ➤ PSha sought to reassure JW that any Town Deal investment 	

	<p>would be designed to enhance marine use and not detract from existing operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ DCW reported that there may be some funding from Central Government being made available for the port with details being confirmed soon. ➤ JM reiterated the need to return to specific project discussion at a later date and focus on the process and next steps being proposed. ➤ CK agreed with JM and added that the focus over the next few weeks should be on developing more detailed project proposals. ➤ JM drew attention to the FHSF bid, assessment which is still ongoing, and asked how this might impact on project shortlisting and TIP 'ask' (£25m+). Is it conceivable to include FHSF projects in our TIP if the FHSF bid has not been assessed in time? PSha confirmed that FHSF projects are currently included in our TIP but a decision is expected by end of November so The Board will then need to consider whether to submit FHSF projects if unsuccessful. ➤ GP asked if The Board should be considering whether to bid for more than £25m and what the implications are for assessment. NS explained that bids in excess of £25m would be subject to greater scrutiny and would need to meet more demanding criteria. ○ PSha explained that officers will be in contact with members who had proposed projects to help gather more detail and will look to combine projects into packages as discussed. ➤ PW has had productive and positive discussions with ESCG and welcomes further and wider discussion to best combine and develop projects. ➤ NS backed Board decision to move to Cohort 3. ➤ PS hoped that officers would also be able to highlight the gaps that exist in project proposals and the packages which emerge. PSha suggested that this may be achieved by the next Board meeting (23/10/20). ➤ SM returned to the point made by RCol in terms of ambition for our TIP and that this should be articulated in time for 23/10/20. 	<p><u>Action:</u> <u>PSha/LR/GM</u> <u>to contact</u> <u>members</u> <u>and gather</u> <u>project</u> <u>details</u></p>
<p>6.0</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CK thanked members of the Board for attending and contributing. 	