

Newhaven Town Deal Board

Minutes of Board Meeting

Friday 18th September 2020

9:00 – 10:30am 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)
 - Ian Fitzpatrick (IF), Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Regeneration and Planning
 - 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:**
 - Iain McNab (IM), Cities and Local Growth Unit
- **Local Enterprise Partnerships:**
 - Graham Peters (GP), Chair, Team East Sussex (SELEP)
 - Jo Simmons (JS), Business Development Manager, SELEP
- **NHS East Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group**
 - Keith Hoare (KH), Senior Manager Primary Care Network Delivery
- **Greater Brighton Economic Board**
 - Andy Hill (AH), Greater Brighton Business Manager
- **Newhaven Enterprise Zone:**
 - Corinne Day (CD), Programme Director
- **Community and Business Representatives:**
 - Dan Shelley (DShe), East Sussex College Group
 - Duncan Kerr (DK), Wave Leisure
 - 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

- Nigel Stewardson, Cities and Local Growth Unit
- Max Woodford, Greater Brighton Economic Board
- Trevor Beattie, South Downs National Park Authority
- Penny Shimmin, Sussex Community Development Association
- Mike Shorer, Newhaven Chamber of Commerce
- Dick Shone, Boutique Modern
- Chris Rasmussen, Jasfic Ltd
- Martin Harris, Brighton & Hove Buses

Agenda Item		Action
1.0	<p>Welcome, Introductions & Apologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CK confirmed the primary purpose of the meeting which was to progress the TIP ahead of the 2nd Cohort submission date - 31/10/20. ● CK and the Board congratulated DCW for his new role as Port Manager. 	
2.0	<p>Minutes of Last Meeting</p> <p>Minutes from 13/08/20 approved by all.</p>	
3.0	<p>Stakeholder Engagement Sub-Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CK relayed RCol's counsel which stressed the importance of stakeholder engagement which must be adequate and robust in order to inform our TIP. ● LR gave a presentation focusing on planned engagement for our TIP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We need to prepare a Stakeholder Engagement Plan as part of the TIP and provide clear evidence of buy-in from local businesses and the community. ○ We also need to confirm how we have engaged with stakeholders and how we will continue to do so. ○ The delivery partners have confirmed that we can highlight the extensive engagement already carried out to date. ○ There is however a need to undertake more focused engagement with the community and hard to reach groups. ○ Because time is limited for submission of our TIP, we are proposing an initial online survey in the next six weeks – Board members will be asked to help reach out to their networks to publicise the survey. ○ We are proposing to ask the community to rank and comment on shortlisted projects and welcome suggestions for alternative projects, asking the question: What would you spend £25m on? ○ We can also include suggestions and comments received via the #MyTown campaign. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of ongoing engagement, there are currently two online platform suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Arup Virtual Engage provides a virtual public consultation space. Grimsby used this software as part of their engagement: https://virtualengage.arup.com/grimsby-town-centre/ 2. Commonplace offer a Community Heat Map which allows suggestions and comments to be pinned to geographical locations. Blackpool used this as part of their engagement: https://blackpooltownsfundengagementmap.commonplace.is/ Commonplace also offer a Design and Feedback tool for presenting proposals and related content. Greenwich Liveable Neighbourhood engagement provides an example: https://greenwichtowncentreproposals.commonplace.is/overview ○ A meeting is planned with Arup to go over costings, time frames etc. of a Virtual Engage exhibition for Newhaven. ○ In order to manage engagement effectively, a stakeholder engagement sub-group has been proposed consisting of PS, CD and SM as they 'work on the ground' and have already been involved in detailed engagement including Newhaven Story work via the EZ, the Neighbourhood Plan and other regeneration and community based projects. ○ LR invited comments on proposed engagement and emphasised that sub-group decisions will be brought back for Board approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ JW suggested most members of the community would benefit from some financial guidance – how much does 'x' cost, before they comment on or make project proposals. CK referenced Agenda Item 4 (Project Prioritisation) and the inclusion of cost estimates which would be included in any engagement documents. ➤ MC added to JW's point on costs and the need to ensure consultation managed expectations (particularly in relation to A259 / ring road). Supportive of virtual presentation format but concerned that Newhaven has already had extensive engagement over decades and rather than asking open-ended questions, residents want to see this acknowledged and that proposed projects are linked to prior engagement, particularly #MyTown, and see it as moving on discussion and an opportunity to review proposals and provide alternative suggestions. ➤ JH had been involved in similar discussion during Hastings Town Deal Board meeting the day before. They were also conscious that the capital funding element of Town Deals should be highlighted as part of the general need to manage expectations. ➤ JM encouraged innovative use of virtual consultation, moving beyond physical 'town hall' presentations. ➤ GA was supportive of the members chosen to be on sub-group but would have liked to see a Board member included that lives in the town. Also had been sceptical of previous funding proposals with Newhaven not benefitting as expected but has faith in the Town Deal Board and planned investment. GA also acknowledged that 	<p><u>Action:</u> <u>Stakeholder</u> <u>Sub-Group</u> <u>to meet</u> <u>and agree</u> <u>content for</u> <u>online</u> <u>survey</u></p>
--	---	---

	<p>consultations should be a limited period of time – a current consultation on High Street parking appears to have been going on for an inordinate amount of time.</p>	
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Projects and Prioritisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PSha provided a short summary of progress for prioritising the project ideas submitted by Board Members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PSha reminded Board of key principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Up to £25m in funding ○ Primarily capital funding (90%) with revenue funding needing to be used to enable capital projects. Standalone revenue projects could not be included unless Board can develop such projects into capital projects. ○ Must align with Town Fund Intervention Themes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local Transport 2. Digital Connectivity 3. Urban Regeneration, Planning and Land Use 4. Arts, Culture and Heritage 5. Skills and Infrastructure 6. Enterprise Infrastructure ○ Identified projects must be realistic, deliverable and address identified local issues – e.g. 1st Floor Library project would provide new community facilities and footfall to support town centre businesses. In TIP we would have to demonstrate a need for community facilities and that town centre is struggling (based on data). ○ We must evidence need, including where there is market failure. ○ RCol advised that where possible, we would show other investments have not met identified needs/markets. ○ Reminder of agreed Themes for our TIP: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Thriving and Vital Southern Gateway for the UK 2. Re-imagining our Town Centre as a Focus for Community Life 3. Valuing Creative Freedom 4. Making the Most of the Town’s Maritime Heritage 5. Celebrating the Energy of Industry ○ Proposed projects were shown in table form, with their funding ask checked (capital or revenue). This ruled out a small number of projects. ○ Two additional projects were discussed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FHSF bid which has yet to be assessed but which could be considered for Town Deal if FHSF not successful 2. Facilities at Newhaven Football Club – MC has been in discussion with the club who are trying to improve facilities to meet demand. A 4G pitch has been proposed with additional sports catered for and an educational partnership being invited to cohabit. The site is on Fort Road. PS acknowledged potential of project and possibility of combining with existing Fort Road proposals. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PSha shared a second table, checking projects fit Themes, Towns Fund Criteria and whether a site has been identified and/or is available. ○ PSha emphasised the difficulty in fully assessing viability at this stage and that this process is an initial sift. ○ From grouping projects based on their most obvious fit with identified Themes (while acknowledging many projects fit multiple Themes), Energy of Industry is less well-represented than others, which is something the Board should consider. ○ A third table presented officers' current recommended projects with 11 recommended projects (estimated total Towns Fund ask £22.95m) and seven potential projects which are currently considered to not quite meet the prescribed criteria (but potentially could with some adjustments). ○ A number of projects need their costs to be confirmed and fairly rapid costings will need to be calculated if they are to be included in our TIP. Board Members will need to support Officers in developing these. ○ A number of projects could potentially be combined to increase impact of project(s). ○ Based on information from MCHLG, the average number of projects included in Cohort 1 TIPs was seven. Combining projects may help reduce our current number which exceeds this figure although there is no set limit. ○ An allowance of 5% for revenue costs (programme management, due diligence and feasibility) has been included; this is not a fixed amount but has been estimated to help calculate total ask. This spend could cover planning applications, design work and other necessary work for delivering projects. ○ A limited amount of matched funding has been identified so far; Government have stressed that towns should try to accurately assess how Towns Fund spending will attract additional investment from private and public sources. Currently, a number of projects are solely reliant on Towns Fund investment. The Board must ensure additional funding streams are sought and accounted for in TIP. ○ In terms of project outcomes, RCol explained that assessments of Cohort 1 TIPs are still being moderated so not yet able to cite them but will glean information from them, hopefully by early October. Projects need to be both deliverable and impactful with specific outcomes identified within each project proposal. Some towns have focused on a small number of high-impact, larger projects where other towns have favoured a larger number of smaller projects. If the latter course is taken, there is perhaps even more need to present outcomes. ○ The Board were asked the following questions in relation to the project prioritisation process: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you agree with the process undertaken? 2. Are any projects missing (are there any which members have not yet 	<p><u>Action:</u> <u>Members who have proposed projects need to provide additional information to Officers ASAP and no later than 28/09/20</u></p>
--	---	---

presented to officers)?

3. Do you agree that the projects will deliver our stated Vision and fit with the agreed thematic principles?
4. Is the Board in agreement that officers should explore the feasibility of recommended projects?
 - JW asked if the pedestrian cycle bridge is intended to lead to Bridge Street (does the bridge cross over the A259).
 - JW also questioned the costing for Deep Water Berth with much higher figures quoted. DCW explained that the deep water berth was originally costed at £52m but re-assessed this year with a cost of £49m estimated.
 - JW also acknowledged that many projects fit with more than one theme. JW reflected on her previous work with local economies and investment in education. More work is needed to try to ensure the TIP targets education and skills.
 - JH asked what the £40k would be spent on Enhanced Pedestrian Access to Ferry Port & UTC Access. PSha explained that it is an estimate and more feasibility work needs to be carried but it is intended to provide a safe pedestrian crossing to and from the port. DCW added that the crossing is also intended for UTC and Railway Quay access.
 - JH asked how the figure of £10m had been derived for the New Pedestrian Cycle Bridge over river, if it is robust and if a specific site had been identified. SM explained that this scheme had been identified in the [Newhaven Neighbourhood Plan](#), so is in planning policy, and with a site located. Costings need to be investigated as part of feasibility study.
 - SM raised her concern that projects didn't align particularly closely with Energy of Industry Theme and also discussed the process involved in costing Newhaven Library (1st floor) project, discussion with Arts Council and others has identified the need to also access additional funding with the possibility of a public works loan.
 - PSha added that BBP Regeneration provided a [Physical Development Vision for Newhaven](#) in 2010 which includes plans for the proposed bridge. Their estimate was £3m which we consider to be an underestimate as there is a need for the bridge to raise to allow commercial shipping traffic to pass underneath. A higher figure of £10m has been presented, partly based on the figure for the [Lille Langebro Bridge](#) in Copenhagen, Denmark, but more detailed feasibility work needs to be conducted. The bridge should also look to address the impact of the A259 indirectly.
 - PW explained that there is the potential to convert the bus fleet serving Newhaven to hydrogen fuel with the idea of partnering with local councils to build a Hydrogen Hub in Newhaven. This project was not initially included as it was not deemed to be feasible given constraints and issues around scale in particular. Brighton & Hove Buses operate a fleet of over 500 and have strong buying power. They are currently working with Metro Bus to deliver such a [scheme](#)

[in the Crawley area](#). MC registered her support for a potential project and recognised the importance of meeting objectives of the Air Quality Management Area in Newhaven and the opportunity for the town to help lead such innovation. IF has had some initial discussion with PW and asked for further detail to be developed and emphasised the potential impact it could have. The Board were strongly supportive of this potential project.

- DCW offered a potential project idea linked to road infrastructure which he will send to PSha.
- IF suggested opportunities such as enhancements to Newhaven Fort may well be more relevant given COVID-19 impact on amenities.
- GP has been involved in multiple project prioritisation processes, reflecting on past experience, some concern that in trying to meet deadlines there is the possibility that more impactful projects are left out e.g. Hydrogen Hub. There is the option to delay and instead submit in Cohort 3. CK and RCol acknowledged the option to delay submission although there is still a need to maintain momentum. A number of Cohort 2 towns have already moved to Cohort 3.
- GP and DS raised concern over the fact that two projects on the current recommended list total £20m+ with the remainder being made up of large number of smaller projects. It is recognised that this is an initial list and considerable further work is needed to finalise project lists. JM referred to FHSF bid and the need for a decision to have been made before the TIP is submitted.
- JM gave special mention to the importance of the New Pedestrian Cycle Bridge over river which should be viewed in terms of its impact as a connectivity and wayfinding enhancement but also as a positive place-forming landmark.
- JM also highlighted the importance of Fort Road Recreation Ground and related projects – the links to the surrounding area should also be considered including Castle Hill Nature Reserve as well as Newhaven Fort which should be safeguarded as an iconic feature and asset.
- JM considered whether some of the smaller projects e.g. Newhaven Social Club would be better considered outside of the Town Deal as part of wider Regeneration work for LDC while still utilising the Board's engagement.
- DS submitted project proposals linked to UTC and wider STEM offering and the logistics of training.
- DS posed the question in relation to the proposed virtual exhibition: how will the public respond to projects, will they be excited? Can the exhibition include the wider Regeneration work taking place e.g. EZ and FHSF?
- DK added to Fort discussion and pointed to the feasibility which has been undertaken in the past and will be sent to PSha.
- DK sees potential in combining Seahaven Swim and Fitness Centre with Fort Road Recreation Ground, moving the current facility out of the centre. GA raised the issue of parking as occurred recently when

	<p>emergency access was restricted during a popular match at the Newhaven FC ground.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ GP asked if we will be using consultants to work on project proposals and if there is capacity funding provided for this. Also, how new and revisited projects can be included. PSha confirmed that any new projects proposals should be sent to PSha/LR and a revised shortlist will be supplied to the Board as soon as possible. There is capacity funding for delivering the TIP which will include consultancy and feasibility work. The issue is timescales for Cohort 2. ➤ DS asked for more detail on the Newhaven Body, Paint and Trim Facility, particularly as there are potential links with related ESCG operations. DS and PW will continue discussion outside of the meeting to progress proposal. ➤ Board in agreement with proposed action for officers and feasibility to be carried out. GP suggested it would be useful to provide regular updates as prioritisation work progresses which was acknowledged by PSha and will be carried out. 	
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Next Steps & Date of Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MC suggested that regular meetings will be required to ensure TIP is progressed by Board and acknowledged the workload officers are presented with between meetings. DS asked scheduling to consider other commitments. • LR and PSha will continue with prioritisation and request further information from Board as needed. Quotes for feasibility studies will also be sought and commissioned. • A check and challenge session is scheduled for 28/09/20 between officers and the Towns Fund Delivery Partner and feedback will be shared with Board. • The next Town Deal Board meeting will take the form of a workshop, focusing on the detail of recommended projects. After some discussion of possible dates, 02/10/20 was selected. • Two further meetings were also scheduled on a preliminary basis for 16/10/20 & 23/10/20, bearing in mind the possibility of moving to Cohort 3 which may allow the meetings to be moved back. 	
<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. • CK also mentioned recent research results which ranked Seaford as second best coastal town in the UK to relocate to. This highlights the appeal of Seaford Bay (including Newhaven) and the opportunity for the TIP to improve quality of life locally through new capital investment: https://www.countryliving.com/uk/homes-interiors/property/a34038697/best-coastal-towns/ 	