Minutes of the Goole Town Deal Board Meeting
held on Friday 8 January 2021 2.00pm to 4.00pm

Attending: ERYC Portfolio Holder for Economic Development & Inward Investment (VA Councillor Victoria Aitken), Goole Civic Society (MHC Margaret Hicks-Clarke), ERYC Goole North Ward (AH Councillor Anne Handley), Hull & East Yorkshire Smile Foundation (AB Andy Barber), Jos Richardson & Sons (JR Chair Joseph Richardson), Environment Agency (PS Paul Stockhill), York North Yorkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (DK David Kerfoot), Croda (MC Martin Chapman), Constituency MP (AP Andrew Percy), Kishor Tailor (KT Humber Local Enterprise Partnership), Link Agency (PJ Phil Jones), Public Health (LF Laurie Fergusson), Siemens (FD Finbarr Dowling), Goole Town Council (BR Brian Robertson)

Present: ERYC Head of Economic Development (PB Paul Bell) ERYC Head of Bridlington Renaissance (NA Nigel Atkinson), ERYC Town Deal Programme Manager (HH Helen Hoult), ERYC Regeneration Project Coordinator (CHM Charlotte Howe-McCartin)

Guests: ARUP Technical Team Khrishanthi Carfrae (KC), Anna Collinge (AC).

1. Welcome
The Chair welcomed everyone. He clarified the purpose of the meeting was to consider the Town Investment Plan document previously circulated by HH for the Check and Challenge session on 11 January and to agree which Board Members would attend the session. He explained the Check and Challenge session would be an opportunity to hear how the Town Investment Plan stands up against the assessment criteria and listen to how to improve the document before final submission. No decisions would be made at the session. Any Board Member could attend the session although it was not essential for the entire Board to participate.

2. Apologies
Lisa Quinn (Nichols Group - Associate), Josie Head (Goole Town Council), Leigh Johnson (ERYC).

3. Declaration of Interests
None declared that differ from previous declarations

4. Minutes of the Board meeting held on 11 December 2020
Proposed as a true and accurate record by MHC, seconded by AH.

5. Matters Arising not on the Agenda
The Chairman informed all that he had given an interview for BBC Radio Humberside regarding Town Deal advanced funding projects, predominantly focused on Oakhill, and the Town Investment Plan. The interview would be available to listen to via BBC Sounds.

6. Submitted Check and Challenge Town Investment Plan and project profiles
JR informed all present that HH would talk through the TIP and project profile document sheets submitted for the Check and Challenge session. HH said the Panel required time to appraise and assess for feedback and she was aware additional refinement of the document would be required following Check and Challenge. She also referenced the word limit on each section and the need to wait until feedback was given in order to clarify certain sections to ensure they complied with the word count limitation.

HH ran through the content sheet and each page of the document relaying the importance of 'place' and 'identity' within the Town Investment Plan. Part Two, the full Spatial Strategy, will be included within the final version. The key aspect in Part one is outlining the story – strengths and challenges along with engagement and projects, to give context and an understanding of the place. The document outlines Goole's history, the Port aspect, the 'DNA of the place', its people, industries and connectivity along with growth potential and regional value in Goole 36. The document considers what Goole offers now with visioning about the future offer with a focus on the town centre and how this aligns the growth of Goole 36 with the growth of the town centre. Images capture the strong sense of community and reference the issues faced in 2020 with the inability to conduct traditional on street community engagement.

This detail gives a lead into where the projects fit. The Town Investment Plan structure is concerned with place, what issues are prevalent and what interventions will address these. This brings in the Market Hall, Clock Tower public realm, concerns around leisure, connectivity and utilising assets to build in culture and industrial heritage to renew the town centre. HH said a key point to remember was the opportunity and advantages the bicentenary of Goole in 2026 would bring when changes had been delivered within the town.

She continued to outline the opportunities having a digitally advanced town centre would bring along with connectivity within Old Goole and a town centre ready for the future. Cultural activities within the town centre were also referenced. Green Energy was thought to be incredibly exciting for Goole with the planned energy network development, community benefits from the wind farm and investment businesses are making in a green future thought to be important. HH outlined the challenges around the town centre, the population growth, increasing birth rate, economically active proportion of residents and issues stemming from unemployment due to the impact of COVID 19 and the response required, all of which have an impact on the purpose of the town centre.

HH then referred to Goole’s retail and service centre function leading to challenges around flood risk and employment. She focused on the issues Goole had experienced with low skill, low economy, how things moved in the town, the economic travel to work area, Goole’s role with the train industry and water networks. The importance of these to health and leisure responses were also referenced in relation to recovery from COVID 19. The importance of small business sectors working together with global representatives within Goole was also thought vital and highlighted in detail with the document. HH referenced the COVID 19 survey work conducted by East Riding of Yorkshire Council and the impact of changing future retail habits in reference to scene setting and the key strands that require tackling. Civic pride, the historic areas of the town centre, the flat landscape and greener transport were all referenced.

HH highlighted the extra challenges lockdown had created for engagement and consultation. She informed the Board of the fact that many people in Goole want to see actions and funding come out of the many years of consultation that has occurred. A résumé of the various chapters of Goole’s regeneration journey over the past twenty years is included in the document. This is then peppered with comments from the community taken from the MyTown portal page for Goole and the Facebook page, highlighting what issues matter to residents and businesses. Comments from the rail consultation survey work have also been included. Spatial context is then given to projects in development of the vision and strategy for the town.

HH ran through the eight key principles within the vision. Wider links are made within the vision and principles with reference to 2030, a ten year life span and the masterplan for Goole that will wrap around the Town Deal. Graphics outline these and highlight the building blocks that help to create critical mass and wider intervention. HH continued by saying details of each start to create a story that leads into project interventions. The next section in the document is Town Investment Plan specific relating to the process the Board has gone through from evidence to assessment, how a short list was created and a longer list of ideas and proposals established against specific assessment criteria. Graphics indicate the process and various stages the Board went through along with a summary of each interventions financial spend.

HH explained that once Heads of Terms are agreed there will still be a need for much more detailed work to be completed on each individual business plan. Some slight tweaking may be required. Current figures are those available as the best assessment for now. A visual demonstrates how all of the interventions sit together and have impact. Goole is a compact town, the visual highlights how the projects work together to create critical mass. A brief summary of each project follows and indicates how it aligns with the Theory of Change. HH ran through the full collective of projects indicating how they each fit within the Theory of Change and how they are going to make a difference and deliver the Vision for Goole. Two options for the Leeds to Goole rail link were included. One indicated the full scheme at £28m and the other with the feasibility study at £25m so appraisers could understand how either would work if the scheme was chosen.

The document then outlines implementation and delivery plans for the whole scheme including the role of the Board and the Lead Body in terms of governance and delivery. Milestones and Assurances are also covered with a timetable indicating the process followed once the Town Investment Plan is submitted and Heads of Terms agreed. Business cases would then be developed, a delivery plan produced followed by delivery of the scheme. Individual projects sheets go into greater detail for each of the interventions. HH said these were formatted to slot into an excel document as required for final submission. The Chairman said it would be helpful to go through one of the sheets so members were aware of the content for each. Prior to this he asked if any Member would like to ask a question or comment on the detail HH had provided. He also asked if the level of detail included in the document was standard for the submission. HH explained that the application process requires the content to be delivered in the template provided with a limit of ten thousand words to cover vision, delivery and strategy and that is what has been produced. The Chairman asked DK and AP for their thoughts on the length and structure given they have been involved in submission of Town Investment Plans in other areas.

DK suggested reshaping certain elements of the document including the Engagement section which indicates resident's thoughts from 2008 onwards in relation to occurring themes included in the Town Investment Plan. He suggested the map used on page four was too complicated and did not give justice to Goole. He appreciated much work had taken place to create the document and time must now be spent on pushing forward following some refinement. He also informed those present that towns submitting in cohort two in October 2020 had received indication that Heads of Terms would not be agreed until after March 2021 suggesting Quarter One for Heads of Terms agreed for Goole may not be achievable and require amendment.

AP agreed with DK that delays in approval may not be unexpected. He took the point that documents of this nature can be seen as word heavy. He suggested a more succinct approach be taken to expressing the overall vision for Goole, how this ties together and thought the Haven of Opportunity information could be used to describe the vision of Goole in 2026. JR suggested a precursor of the vision for the town could be included at the beginning of the document as the vision and strategy aren't currently referred to until much later. AP asked if the Lower Valley Rail Action group had been contacted for 2019 rail survey evidence. KC said that evidence had been incorporated.

FD asked for consideration to be taken of the strategic impact Goole's inclusion in a Humber Freeport could have. Although the decision was thought not to fit with the timing of the Town Investment Plan submission it was still vital to link the bigger picture and the impact on the town, the surrounding area, housing and the exciting linkages that could be made as a result. The Humber Freeport bid includes 136 hectares in Goole so could have a huge and compelling impact on the Town Deal. PB agreed and said Steve Silvester of Inward Investment was providing the narrative for inclusion in the Town Investment Plan. He also added that devolution would be factored in to strengthen the case for Goole and that strategic alignment was an important factor in the document.

PJ said he was very impressed with the Town Investment Plan and thought it delivered real insight into what the ambitions are for Goole. He found it difficult to be critical and believes the document delivers the message. He agreed the Freeport opportunity was exciting but thought advice should be taken on whether or not each document (Town Investment Plan and Humber Freeport submission) had to reference each other in great detail. He added that the document had obviously taken a great deal of work to achieve and that he was wowed by its feel good message and thanked HH for its production. VA echoed PJs view. She then suggested the graphic on page 81 to 82 could be tidied up as it seemed over complicated. KC informed all that the Magenta Book (Government's guidance for evaluation) required the inclusion of the information in this exact format and it could not be amended. KC said each project had been broken down into its own Theory of Change model and been given a different colour to aid follow through but together it is difficult to read. VA added that things were moving along in the right direction, she congratulated all for the massive amount of work that had taken place and said she looked forward to the next step.

PS agreed with what had been previously said and added his appreciation for the amount of work that had taken place and the great effort that had gone in to capture the story and vision for Goole. He suggested a two page executive summary at the beginning of the document would be ideal to share with others. He also agreed with the strategic linkage and included the zero carbon work taking place as an additional benefit to Goole. KT agreed a lot of work had taken place to get to the current position and thanked everyone for this. He highlighted the importance of an executive summary that included a link to wider issues and linkage with other government strands such as green energy and the Freeport opportunity to draw out consistencies. He also asked for clarity on the Board's role in the governance section, where decisions would be made, the role of the Lead Body and how this could be made clearer in the graphic.

AP suggested the project presentations could place projects in natural alignment to follow each other such as the Leisure Centre following on from VPG as both are leisure focused and naturally fit together. In the project summary he suggested that something could be included to show how other projects link to each other and indicate the positives within that. An example being floods defences, the importance of the river, how it's an asset to the town and an enjoyment in terms of leisure pursuits. This focuses on the coherent stream of connectivity between each project and highlights assets.

JR asked HH if the main comments regarding executive summary, linking strategic ideas (Freeport, Devolution etc.) and running order of projects could be resolved. HH thanked all for the feedback and said all would be taken on board for the next version and would also be very useful for the Check and Challenge session. An executive summary would be included along with an introduction on the front page from the Board Chairman and the Leader of the East Riding of Yorkshire Council. HH also said a team of people had worked hard to produce the Town Investment Plan and thanked members for their acknowledgement of the work that had occurred. HH explained project profile form requirements and ran through each section.

7. Board Member attendance and structure for the Check and Challenge session on 11 January 2021

JR asked for a show of hands to indicate who would be attending the Check and Challenge session on Monday 11 January 2021 via TEAMS. The following Board members will be attending along with East Riding Officers and ARUP representatives. KT, PJ, AP, FD, MC, DK, MHC, PS, JR. VA offered apologies for herself and AH as the session clashed with a full Council budget setting meeting.

8. Any Other Business

KT asked in preparation for the Check and Challenge session who will respond to any questions from the Panel and if a plan was in place to ensure a coherent response from within the team. JR said his thoughts were that initially NA, HH and ARUP would respond and bring in Board Members as and when thought appropriate. HH added that there are people in attendance from the Board with specialist knowledge and she will look to Board members to come in to the response if they are comfortable to do so. HH said the date set for the next Board meeting, 22 January 2021, would give time to respond to Board feedback and that from the session on Monday. A second draft would be circulated ready for the Board to approve submission.

AP said he would be happy to come in on anything related to public engagement and the bigger vision for the town. PS asked if there were any gaps that required filling for the meeting in terms of particular topics. None were noted as a broad range of expertise would be in attendance.

PC agreed that much progress had taken place to get the document to its current version. He gave an indication of what may come up during the Check and Challenge session and suggested areas that require strengthening within the next three weeks. In terms of engagement more work would be required in terms of the proposals. He suggested talking to business groups to seek views, for the Civic Society to take the proposals back to groups and ask what they think about them. PC thought there was time to do more work to strengthen engagement. Vision also requires strengthening as it comes across as too generic. More work on wording is required. In order to secure Town Deal demonstrable need is required to show how issues link into proposed projects.

PC added there is little about education and skills in the first part of the document yet there is a significant proposal focused on skills. More information is needed about education and private sector investment issues in the town, the barriers need to be identified and explanation as to their existence. Providing a more compelling story about the strengths of the area and the opportunities is essential. Freeport should be included in relation to the opportunities it would bring to Goole. Revenue ask for projects other than the rail project is significant and unclear as to what the Government is buying The One Stop Skills Shop and Flexible Fund looks generic, a stronger case as to why this can't be delivered through existing provision is required.

In response, JR said it was useful to go through the process for someone to be as rigorous as possible so the document shapes up to be the best that it can be. PC said the aim is to get the best possible proposal put forward for the town. JR asked if Town Investment Plans already submitted had been 100% successful or if some had projects knocked back. PC said only part of cohort one have currently been announced. Some received more than £25m, such as Blackpool receiving £39m, others have received less than £25m. Two elements are required, the Investment Plan has to stand up to scrutiny with a strategic narrative. Plans are judged on strategic fit, deliverability and outcomes. PC said he would be happy to assist where necessary following Monday's session. DK asked if there was any correlation between towns with successfully submitted Future High Street Fund bids and those that weren't successful. PC said In short, no, they were completely separate. Future High Streets was vastly oversubscribed. All had to evidence value for money tests and some were unable to do so therefore were unsuccessful with their bids to the fund.

Revenue issues were discussed in relation to the difference between councils absorbing costs and additional costs that would not be part of the anticipated running costs for a given project such as the leisure centre. Revenue costs would occur whether the Towns Fund bid was successful or not. If the revenue element was needed in order to take projects forwards such as a study works that can be classed as capital. If it's required for running costs then understanding is required as to why. PB explained revenue would be required for the works PC suggested as an example not running costs. PC informed that this could be classed as capital and to check with the Councils S151 Offcier. JR thanked all for attending and for those attending Check and Challenge on Monday.

9. Date and time of future meetings

Check and Challenge: Monday 11 January 11am.

Board Meetings: Friday 22 January 2pm, Friday 19 February 2pm, Friday 12 March 2pm, Friday 26 March 2pm, Friday 16 April 2pm