Minutes of the Goole Town Deal Board Meeting
held on Friday 11 June 2021, 2.00pm to 4.00pm

Attending: Jos Richardson & Sons (JR Chair Joseph Richardson), ERYC Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth and Tourism (JE Jane Evison), ERYC Goole North Ward (AH Councillor Anne Handley), Constituency MP (AP Andrew Percy), North Yorkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (DK David Kerfoot), Environment Agency (PS Paul Stockhill), Goole Civic Society (MHC Margaret Hicks-Clarke), Goole Town Council (RT Ross Turner), Siemens Mobility Ltd (FB Finbarr Dowling), Hull and East Yorkshire LEP (TC Teresa Chalmers), Hull and East Riding SMILE Foundation (AB Andy Barber), Croda (MC Martin Chapman), Link Agency (Phil Jones).

Present: MHCLG (PC Peter Campey), Nichols Group (LQ Lisa Quinn), Head of Renaissance (NA Nigel Atkinson), Town Deal Programme Manager (HH Helen Hoult), Regeneration Projects Co-ordinator (CHM Charlotte Howe-McCartin), Forward Planning and Housing Strategy Manager (NS Nicola Swarowski),Inward Investment and Infrastructure Manager (SS Stephen Silvester).

1. Welcome and Apologies
The Chairman welcomed Nicola Swarowski, ERYC Forward Planning and Housing Strategy Manager, and Stephen Silvester ERYC Inward Investment and Infrastructure Manager, to the meeting.

Apologies were received from Beal Homes (RB Richard Beal), Associated British Ports (DM David Morris), ERYC Head of Economic Development (PB Paul Bell), ERYC (Leigh Johnson), Public Health (LF Laurie Ferguson)

2. Declaration of Interests
PS declared an interest on behalf of the Environment Agency in relation to the Local Plan.

3. Minutes of the Board meeting held on 14 May 2021
The Minutes were agreed as a true record of the meeting. Proposed DK and seconded by AH.

4. Any Matters Arising not included on the agenda
The Chair asked for recorded thanks to all involved with preparing the Town Investment Plan and especially Andrew Percy MP, in return, AP expressed thanks to the Chair for leading what was sometimes a challenging process.

4.1 Levelling Up Fund

Steve Silvester from ERYC Inward Investment outlined a funding bid being prepared for the levelling up fund. It is for Constituency areas and a combined submission with North Lincolnshire Council. The focus links to the Freeport land, Capitol Park and future phases on Goole 36. The ask is towards costs of building 7.5 meters of new road and a roundabout. The total bid will be in the region of £20 million and it will be submitted in one week's time. JR asked if match funding was required, SS advised it would mainly be levelling up fund. AP referenced Sandtoft and Lincolnshire Lakes within the proposals. RT asked if there was any information who would come to the site, SS advised that there are a variety of interests and enquiries for the area. A decision on the bid is expected in summer 2021.

5. Local Plan Consultation period and reference to the Strategic Flood Risk assessment
NS introduced herself to the Board, outlined her role and the purpose of the Local Plan Consultation. She shared a presentation which included reference to the five year review of the Local Development Plan, the time frame within which each stage will be completed and how the process will lead to adoption of the Plan in 2023. Documents currently forming the Development Plan include: Strategy Document, Allocations Document, Proposals Map, Bridlington Area Action Plan, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), Local Plan Viability Study, and Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The review will enable an update to the current Plan and cover from 2020 to 2039.

Alterations for the majority of policies and allocations are minor. The review will respond to the updated evidence base and changes made by government to the National planning Policy Framework, which sets out government planning policy for England. Key updates concern Policy S3, Housing Distribution, although this remains largely unchanged with the exception of Goole and Howden, and Policy S5 Numbers. An East Riding proposal for an uplift in affordable housing would anticipate 20,900 affordable homes across the plan period allowing for 1,100 per annum. Policy S6, Employment land is also impacted. NS explained that a 12% over allocation was suggested to ensure targets were met as there are always some sites that won't come forward or not in the timely manner expected, additionality of 12% is recommended to achieve the target. A slight reduction in employment land through the employment land review study has also been considered. The Local Plan has applied the SFRA evidence-based policy and sets out facts based on the modelling undertaken. The very detailed flood risk assessment for Goole has changed thought processes for Goole in terms of what would apply in a policy sense. Following publication of the SFRA Level 2 for Goole in 2020, deallocation of the following housing sites was proposed through the Local Plan Update consultation:

- North of Rawcliffe Road, a large part of site has planning permission and development is ongoing
- North and West of West Parkside
- West of Goole and District Hospital
- North of Sir Len Hutton Drive
- West of 41 Hilda Street / Dunhill Road – completed and deallocated
- Goole Depot – completed and deallocated
- Field House Farm, Swinefleet Road
- South of 14 - 50 Manor Road

NS referenced deallocation of the following non-housing sites: Glews Hollow Enterprise Park and Mariners Street. She explained the Retail Study did not identify any need for additional retail floor space. Reallocation and new allocation of the following non-housing sites was also proposed: Former rail sidings, Britannia Way, Land at Capitol Park, Land to the West of Capitol Park - 11.72 ha of land to provide for the expansion of Capitol Park. There is permission for new 855 dwellings in Goole and these are expected to come forward. 73.57 hectares of employment land at Capitol Park is also expected to come forward. Sites to take forward include the multimodal transport scheme and Capitol Park sites with others referenced for deallocation. NS explained the Humber Freeport announcement had not been referenced purely due to timing, the draft Plan went to Cabinet for approval and the Freeport announcement was made after that and will be picked up in the next round of consultation. Conversations had taken place with HH regarding the opportunities within the Town Deal Property Activation Fund and how that might be used to bring buildings back into use as a priority. NS reiterated that new buildings in Goole would be very difficult to create, especially in the rapid inundation flood zone (RIFZ), and new thinking is suggested to consider different options.

Local Plan consultation began on 28 May, a ten- week consultation will run until to 6 August 2021, an additional four weeks have been incorporated into the consultation period due to Covid restrictions. The deadline for adoption of the refreshed Local Plan is December 2023. NS explained that the date may seem a long way off but in planning terms it is brief and ERYC is currently on schedule to meet that deadline. She also informed the Board that all local authorities across England were working on the same process and principles in order to meet the date required and, there is limited room for any flexibility as elements of the process are externally controlled once the Plan is submitted to the Planning Expectorate and falls into their timetable.

Since the beginning of the pandemic MHCLG have stated that the planning system should continue 'as is'. People will be able to participate in the consultation via website, emails will be sent to people already on the database of interested people, press releases will occur, posters will be utilised used along with social media, display boards and circulation to Town and Parish Councils, libraries also have hard copies available to view. People can feedback via face to face events, subject to restrictions and covid safety measures, virtual attendance at Town and Parish Council meetings, stakeholder meetings and through an online form. Further information and consultation documents can be found at www.eastriding.gov.uk/localplanupdate. NS encouraged comments via the online form. The Chairman thanked NS for her interesting presentation and asked that the presentation slides be made available to the Board. The following questions were asked concerning deallocation, what process is used to decide what ought to be deallocated and who makes the decision.

NS explained Officers make recommendations and take those through the political process for decision making. Through consultation, if landowners think their land should not be deallocated as they are about to submit an application, they can inform ERYC of the imminent changes. NS was asked what the reason was for deallocating on Glews Hollow and did it have any relation to the focus on industrial units at Goole 36. She said the potential flood risk is the reason for the decision and it would be for the land- owner to comment and explain any ways around dealing with the risk, but it would be difficult to go against the flood risk evidence.

AP said the area came close to a cataclysmic event in 2013 and the Board understood the severe danger of such a scenario. He asked if an allocated site came forward that was considered for deallocation and successfully sought planning permission could the owner go ahead and build on the land. NS responded that it could happen if planning permission had been given but to be mindful that strategic consideration of flood risk would have occurred prior to planning approval. Some developers may get ahead of the Local Plan and test the strategy to see if they can build prior to the submission of the updated Plan.

AP explained the background to his request to have this topic on the Agenda. Environment Agency experts had taken him through flood risk implications and modelling. It would be difficult to argue against the evidence regarding the rapid flood innovation zone (RFIZ), clearly there is some risk and danger. However, trying to redevelop the town centre would be considerably problematic if a potential policy was agreed saying nothing at all could be developed in the town. He proposed the Board participate in consultation and give a clear steer on what they would want to see achieved in the town centre. Ground floor residential development in the RIFZ is unlikely to be acceptable. Current buildings could be impacted positively with a change in use through the Property Activation Fund. Retails premises could be reutilised for other business use. Upper floors could provide accommodation. Outside of the RIFZ lower floor uses should be accommodated for retail and business use with upper floors for living space rather than limiting the potential the buildings offer. AP asked how a position could be achieved where, outside of the RIFZ, lower floor residential conversion and upper floor conversions could be accepted as part of the Local Plan. Public consultation would also take place for residents to consider the overall evidence and mitigating factors.

NS said that the flood risk is evidenced and has to be taken account of. In the RIFZ there's potential for up to 4 metres high flooding so no development would be allowed in that area regardless of height. She suggested the Board formally respond to the consultation to continue the conversation. There may be certain buildings or areas the Board would want to particularly consider. Although significant changes could not be made to the RIFZ, there may be tweaks that could support what the Board would want to achieve and these would be considered in conversations with the Environment Agency.

AP emphasised there cannot be a situation in which the only available option is to spend the Property Activation Fund on commercial properties for commercial uses that possibly don't exist. There is a need to make units marketable again and enable living accommodation on upper floors. There is also a need to avoid conflict with planning to ensure Goole has a future of viable development, and with upper floor accommodation there is an added mitigation factor. He proposed the Board produce a response to the draft Plan potentially considering either Boothferry Road precinct or the town centre, to include a special policy in the Plan to allow development of potential upper floor accommodation with built in flood mitigation. AP also added that the cost to transform these properties would require substantial support from the Property Activation Fund as no private developer would be commercially able to support the cost in entirety. AP concluded that the Board must be strong in response or the funding for commercial property development will only be used for commercial development and will cut off the regeneration options that are an important part of the Property Activation Fund and the reinvention of the town centre.

The Chairman agreed and said the Board view must be taken into account and the appropriate response put forward. He asked where the specific location of the RIFZ was in relation to the town centre and queried if the area is already built up, why further development would pose additional danger. He also asked PS if there was any particular aspect of what the Board aimed to achieve with the Town Deal that would allow a reassessment or further debate concerning the level of risk. PS reminded everyone that he has a conflict of interest adding that the RIFZ is a huge area comprising of Goole on the river side along with Hook and Airmyn. He reiterated his declaration of interest on behalf of the EA as the organisation has a regulatory role and statutory consultation role on the Local Plan. Work in Goole will reduce the risk of catastrophic failure happening. In terms of the SFRA he said showing residual risk will have same impact.

He added that decision making between the SFRA and Local Plan can account for defences less likely to fail but would need to be justified very tightly.

NS added that the flood defence work the EA is doing will reduce the risk, but in terms of the SFRA, deciding where to sequentially allocate or deallocate housing, the decision has to be right and transparent to put in front of the Planning Inspectorate. NS informed all that a decision will have to be made; a policy decision had been taken and that is rightly out to consultation. Now would be the appropriate time to make a decision, based on evidence and comments. A very difficult decision has to be made and Planning do understand all the important issues AP raised but everything has to be evidence based and justified if there is to be any change within the evidence base. She asked those present to consider the map highlighted within the presentation she gave. PS asked that any consultation with ERYC on this issue from the Board be discussed in conversations without his inclusion. The Chairman suggested a meeting take place within a week with NA and HH to discuss how the Board can respond, including the points raised by AP and those from other Board members so a response can be submitted within the ten week consultation period.

RT Informed NS and the Board that the main concern from a resident perspective is the anticipated massive increase in property value and the knock on effect for younger generations of residents unable to afford to buy a home. He said Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs), continue to be allowed and they are having an impact on the sewer system as well as bringing other negative impacts. He asked if the issue would be considered in terms of not allowing any further HMO development. If not, he suggested it would seem that one area of development was to be allowed and not another which is a big problem in the town. NS explained any development would be considered if it required planning permission. Some development does not require planning permission so applications don't come through to the Council. If any came through as a change of use and that included increasing units in the RIFZ it would increase vulnerability and be unlikely to receive approval. Unfortunately, not all change of use comes through the planning system as it currently stands. NS explained that at Goole and Humber Head level sub area, there is a proposal for significant extension to the housing offer in Howden of 2000 homes to mitigate the lack of housing availability likely in Goole, although there is potential for over 800 new dwellings in Goole. There was acceptance that some people will not necessarily want to relocate from Goole to Howden, but the plan will deliver a high percentage of affordable homes along with market value homes a short distance away from Goole. The flip side of no new housing is considering what can be made available for people in Goole and the opportunities for affordable homes.

RT said an EA study a decade ago advised should the River Ouse flood the impact would be greater on Howden than Goole. The public view could speculate why Goole is potentially losing housing allocation and Howden being prepped for a further 2000 homes. NS said there are no weak points of defence and the SFRA is not working on the basis of flooding being more likely in one location than another. It is based on modelling in the 12 locations specified and evidence based. PS responded that he would only be able to speculate as he was not party to the work RT referenced. The EA perform regular inspection regimes around all assets, some are worse than others and some perform better than others. If deallocation is recommended in Goole and allocation recommended in Howden, a current flood risk assessment would be required to support that allocation and it could not go ahead without one. The EA would not support moving allocation to a smaller risk location. Evaluation of the risk would have to be completed on any allocation of housing.

AP added that there had perhaps been a misunderstanding in that not only is Goole at risk of the Ouse flooding but also the River Don and River Aire, hence Goole is one of the most at risk of areas for flooding in the UK. If no measures are taken Goole could be under water in 50 years. He added two further points; Town Deal funding would bring forward and strengthen the case that defences are being improved four years prior to the EAs estimation and that ought to help strengthen the argument for development. He suggested it would be incorrect to create a policy that relocates HMOs to another town. The argument would need to focus on Goole town centre, key areas and the buildings that need to be developed and that this could be achieved safely as the Town Deal offers funding to deliver the regeneration and investment required. He asked NS if the regeneration aspect in terms of creating zones as special regeneration areas could be persuasive in informing the Local Plan. NS responded by reiterating the issue concerns the evidence base, in order to justify any change, there would need to be some evidence to support that, whether it is identifying individual buildings or regeneration. It could also be worked through a policy change at ERYC but NS said it would be unlikely that the EA would support that due to the current evidence. AP asked if upper floor accommodation could be exempt or designated in key parts of the town on a regeneration basis with appropriate flood alleviation in place as these spaces would not be as impacted as ground floor residential space.

NS described the impact in terms of people not necessarily experiencing an invasion of water in their properties but difficulty in rescue terms due to the nature of the water and the length of time it could take emergency services to respond. She will consider the points made and discuss with the EA. PJ added the point that Goole already has below pavement level apartments situated on Hook Road. There are also hundreds of properties in town that fall into the RIFZ and all are insurable. Repurposing commercial properties comes at a financial risk but insurance would cover any risks from potential flooding. Blocking all development regardless of the fact insurance is available would not seem sensible. Having a strategy that recognises the need to move forward with plans that would regenerate the town would make sense given the Board has an agreed investment plan and the required funds to begin the process.

JR suggested development differences could be explained through 'grandfather rights' and new development with insurance companies taking different perspectives at different times. PS suggested PJ was correct. The key concern was risk to life and the Local Plan would have to consider that. He explained the difficulty is sequential in terms of ERYC being required to prove why they are making each decision and the basis for it across the entire geography of the East Riding areas. There is a requirement for robust evidence to highlight why Goole would be chosen over other localities and PS said this is a challenging process. Repurposing buildings brings a different set of opportunities. Making decisions for each must include being mindful and cognisant of the risk. Other areas have successfully worked on this and that has led to development. PJ said he understood the risk but the zone is vast and there is a question of how real the perceived risk is and how much difference would taking forwards a regeneration programme including commercial development in a very small area of the zone really make in terms of planning for a catastrophic flood event. JR suggested that an additional 200 people (circa 1% of the town's population) living in the town centre would seem to make very little difference in terms of the percentage of people and properties impacted, compared to the huge area incorporated in the RIFZ. The impact of blocking town centre redevelopment would be extremely detrimental.

MC added risk assessment is a mix of consequence and probability. The original risk assessment was based on the non-accelerated programme of flood defences, demonstrating the claims that can be made on the basis of an accelerated flood defence programme for Goole would need to be well founded. He suggested there was something wrong if a programme of mitigation did not give any leeway and adjust the potential risk through the works the EA will be providing as outlined in the Town Investment Plan. The accelerated programme offers a potential lever to consider rethinking and amending the policy within the Local Plan. NS said there is a risk to life and a danger to all if there were to be a breach. Retrospectively from a Planning point of view there is nothing that can be done about property that already exists in the RIFZ. There is more knowledge of the impact a breech or overtopping would cause so decisions have been made with the information that is currently available. This may change if work is progressed on the defences. However low the risk of a breach, it will always remain a risk for Goole. The Chairman thanked NS for her presentation and attending the meeting.

ACTION: *JR will meet with NA and HH to formulate a Board response to the consultation documents. Members can email their input to HH. The response will be shared with the Board prior to the next meeting. RT and AH agreed to take the issue to Goole Town Council to agree a robust response in line with the Board's thinking. Individual Board Members were also encouraged (in their own right) to submit comments via the formal consultation process concluding on the 6 August.*

6. Towns Fund Heads of Terms Offer

JR outlined the formal offer received from MHCLG and the favourable outcome. Three projects have specifications attached that includes the business case for the rail project needing to be submitted to MHCLG for a decision. JR has spoken with AP about potential links to additional and alternate funding. The department of Culture, Media and Sport may have a broadband programme that could be utilised for the intervention in Old Goole, and conditions have been defined for the skills shop with evidence required of long term sustainability. £28.7m was requested, £25m offered, Goole has 8-12 weeks to ascertain how that difference could be met and if any projects take priority and/or are scaled back.

AP summarised the offer letter from government and the financial freedom given to allocate spend across a mix of projects including those with attached conditions. Scunthorpe's offer limited the amount that could be spent on projects with conditions. His starter for ten considered interventions which have the highest priority for delivery.

Public realm and significant improvements to the town centre were thought vital; flood mitigation measures were equally fundamental given their importance to the future of the town and the acceleration of EA funding to advance the works and draw that down four years ahead of schedule. The Goole to Leeds rail cost of £3.7m was based on Northern Rails' cost expectations for a five year trial. If this is progressed there is now significant benefits for North and West Yorkshire. The West Yorkshire combined authority Mayor has significant transport funds and could potentially draw down some for this project. Yvette Cooper MP in West Yorkshire is also supportive.

AP explained that broadband infrastructure across the canal and river is not commercially deliverable because of the profile of the location, a return on anticipated investment required would not be returnable. If this project can be achieved through another government funding stream it would be ideal and work on this is imminently required. He added that early work is essential now with YWCA and North Yorkshire to ascertain if funding is available and ensure Northern Rail is driving forwards the Leeds to Goole / Goole to Leeds project. The Skills intervention was included in the Investment Plan on the basis that a significant economic collapse was likely following the pandemic. AP said this did not occur and therefore has thinking now changed? Unemployment in the constituency is below the national average so potential savings could be made in amending this intervention. AP suggested moving forward on the full amount allocated for urban realm town centre enhancements and flood defences. The skills element of the Investment Plan would require further consideration given what government has allocated to other programmes such as Kickstart. JR asserted that each intervention or project would have to stand on its own merit and pass the business case stage to be accepted by MHCLG. AP agreed and said the deal offered, enabled the maximum allocation requested for each project to be drawn down should it pass the business case criteria. Public Realm was thought an easy case to be made to drawn down the allocated sum in entirety. Funding will be required for the rail project and will be the most difficult to develop and deliver.

FD agreed the skills aspect had altered but there was nonetheless a dramatic need to fill the significant number of employment roles now required, there is a near crisis in the HGV sector. FD gave an example of a recent recruitment drive for apprentices on the Siemens construction site, two applicants applied, one succeeded and left after two weeks, there is a shortage of skills rather than jobs. The project could refocus on connecting people to retrain in roles and sectors where there are substantial growing vacancies. FD thought it worth considering pivoting in a different direction to address the issue. TC said APs point on actual unemployment was correct but did not take into account the impact the furlough scheme and self-employed income support scheme had across East Yorkshire. 14,100 people have been furloughed and over 11,000 were in receipt of self-employed income support. She asked the Board to be cognisant of the impact that will take place when these systems are turned off and suggested looking at reskilling areas in a different way.

JE asked about the timeframe required to produce a business case for projects that don't currently have enough funding and use the Goole to Leeds rail link as an example asking how the process would work given the necessary involvement of external organisations and the impetus to deliver the outcome. FD said someone needs to take ownership of the Goole to Leeds rail project and suggested ERYC or North Yorkshire Council should project manage the business case for the rail link. Northern Rail have done some work and have no objection to this being taken forwards. JE asked if additional financial support could be secured given the indicative £3.7m required. AP said the Board had been given a funding envelope which enabled prioritisation to occur for fit and deliverability. He recognised the rail project was not an easy project to take forwards and referenced comments made at previous Board meetings regarding his expectations this project would come with conditions. He said he would be happy to chair a small working group to get the process started ASAP.

NA informed all that a meeting had taken place with East Riding Transport representatives and Northern Rail. Northern Rail were look at a scoping exercise for development of a business case. NA has spoken with transport policy officers and they are pursuing that with Northern Rail this week. An ERYC Officer has a joint post with North Yorkshire so things are moving ahead in that area too. AP said a political meeting would be required with Yvette Cooper, the YWCA Mayor and himself to drive the project forward politically and to establish if North Yorkshire and WYCA want to see delivery of the rail link and partner an investment. NA said the funding for transport in and out of Leeds and the relationship with the five towns in WYCA looking west to east, but notably did not refer to extending beyond Knottingly. In terms of policy the rail link is simply a short extension.

The Chairman asked HH to outline the processes now required following receipt of the offer letter from MHCLG. She asked LQ and PC to comment if any factors had altered since the previous Board meeting and explained that within three weeks of receiving the offer letter, MHCLG must be informed if the Board and ERYC as the funding Accountable Body are happy to accept the offer. In accepting the offer the conditions and actions required to progress are also accepted along with the financial 'deal' that has been offered. Solutions and answers are required eight weeks from accepting the offer. Documentation for each individual project receiving TD funding will need to be prepared. This process begins in tandem with the process to agree Heads of Terms and will include what funding allocation each intervention will receive, addressing the shortfall in funding, a review of match funding for each intervention, an indication of delivery time and what the spend might look like across the lifetime of each intervention, outputs and outcomes will be considered with key milestones, and a refresh of the Investment Plan project outline. The collective project portfolio is regarded as the TD programme.

The Rail Project business case will be called in so government will make the decision. HH asked members to consider the scenario planning discussed at the previous Board meeting and to consider the maximum impact projects can deliver, how they support each other, how one project could enable another project, the best return, the best value, best impact, and the number of beneficiaries. The Chairman confirmed what HH had outlined: the Board has three weeks to accept and agree the deal offered and eight weeks to flesh out some of the detail on each of the ten projects. The only business case to be called in for a decision on funding by government will be the Goole to Leeds rail link, but it must be noted that all locally approved business cases can be called in for scrutiny at any time.

JR asked if ERYC had an outline on the circumstances around the £25m deal offered and the shortfall of £3.7m in terms of taking forward and shaping projects. HH explained ERYC has four roles within Town Deal – as accountable body; employing the programme level delivery team; Board representation; delivering several of the projects.

AP thanked PC for his excellent support throughout developing the Investment Plan and the support from his department. He added that more work will be required on three projects to be brought back to the Board at the July meeting. These were: ERYC broadband team to discuss with DCMS if other programmes can be used to fulfil the Old Goole broadband aspirations. A formal conversation is required with WYCA and North Yorkshire and all Officers to see if they are to be potential partners in the Goole to Leeds rail link and if they are willing to financially support the project. If not, AP suggested the project could be undeliverable via the Town Deal. The Skills project also requires attention. Following this information, the funding shortfall could be addressed. AP suggested AH and RT take the Market Hall and Public Realm projects to Goole Town Council for their perspective. He also added that RT could look at the possibilities of splash pads as an additionality via the public realm objectives. HH added that an engagement and consultation strategy agreed by government in submission of the Investment Plan would have to be followed and this would include engaging with organisations, sector representatives and the wider public whilst formulating the business case for each project.

PC suggested considering as a starting point if all objectives could be delivered by potentially looking at additional funding schemes for broadband and the rail link as this could put the Board in a position to deliver all ten of the interventions. The Rail link project can still move forward with action on the business case and be signed of as part of a process between MHCLG and the Department of Transport (DFT). If Town Deal funding is not being used to support the project then the requirements outlined would not be expected. The DFT may have their own views to discuss separately. The Skills project was also thought positive, the issue was understanding the additionality it would bring in terms of outputs and outcomes over those anticipated by the additional funding programmes government is putting into skills. The One Stop shop element seemed speculative and requires detail on sustainability, it was not thought insurmountable if the Board want to proceed with the intervention. PC said he was happy to have a conversation about any of the projects.

PS suggested consideration of potential project cost rises and making sure those are built in to the programme in terms of grant aid and moving forward to protect confidence in projects. PC asked the Board to consider the overall programme costs and the importance of discussing this with ERYC as the Accountable Body, as they will be responsible for picking up any overspend. He added the discussion on planning flagged up the importance of aligning business cases around existing and emerging policy especially around planning, if restrictions will impact on what the Board want to achieve, they must be considered in the business case. JE acknowledged some projects will be more difficult to deliver and require conversations to consider how they can be appropriately funded and delivered. She said the focus needs to be on what can be achieved and delivered and which projects can proceed first such as the sport, public realm, flood prevention and broadband aspirations. There is excitement in the community, Goole Town Deal has a high profile and people want to see results. PC agreed and said it was important to flag the issue around fast track projects adding HH was correct that in 12 months from now government will expect a business case summary document, providing that is acceptable it will start the release of funding from 2022 – 2023. Fast track projects that can have business cases signed off in this financial year, can start spending in 21/22 and should be identified in the project confirmation process.

The Chairman proposed establishing a small working group consisting of six board members to work with the delivery team and identify solutions and options required before the end of August. AP suggested this may not be necessary for all projects as some already have a known deliverer such as the EA on the flood defence intervention. He thought the public realm and market hall projects would bring a number of ideas from GTC so it would be a positive step in asking the town council to provide their own thoughts and ideas at an early stage.

HH said each stage had to be managed and coordinated between engaging stakeholders, technical specialists and bringing forward conversations with residents and local businesses. Some projects will require an intense level of community engagement and consultation and different conversations around public realm, VPG, leisure centre and the market hall. Consultation is asking 'do you agree', engagement fleshes out new ideas and there is a need to ensure both occur. Each project will need to be facilitated, owned and managed, each requires a robust business case and designated project manager.

The Chairman asked HH to provide post meeting a document fleshing out in a few sentences for each project, who is envisaged to develop each business and provide a summary of how each could be taken forwards. It was recognised each business case will have a different level of technical need and complexity with content on the strategic, economic, commercial, financial and management cases.

Action: *HH to prepare a short summary of each project including how stakeholders can assist and the level of confidence ERYC has in each intervention and forward to the Board prior to the next meeting.*

PJ requested Board members consider the timeline of the Town Deal, a process that will take 5 years and more and not a short- term quick win or quick fix programme, its role is to bring about long- term strategic change and investment. He focused on the essential need to manage expectation of the populous in terms of timescales and communicate it is a long- term programme, not a quick fix programme and communicate this again and again. This message must be driven home to prevent the idea from spreading that the Town Deal will see projects springing up straight away. The Chairman echoed the same thoughts and agreed with PJ that the message must be continuously shared.

Action: *Delivery Team to develop a series of press releases focused on the stage 2 project business case of Town Deal and reiterate in each release that the Town Deal is a long- term programme to 2026/27.*

MHC agreed with AP on prioritising urban realm enhancement and market hall transformation but recognised it would take much effort and had to include sustainability to move forwards. She referenced potential interest from Together for Goole, a group of voluntary organisations that HH had spoken with regarding Town Deal ambitions and added that AB participated in the group to represent HEY Smile Foundation. She was mindful that additional sources of funding would be required to make any voluntary sector interest sustainable. FD briefed the Board on a meeting held with Dominic Gibbons of Wykeland who developed the Humber Street site in Hull. He suggested the space is a good example of what could be achieved in Goole given the right mix of housing, retail and regeneration and that Dominic Gibbons would welcome a conversation to share his experiences for the benefit of Goole.

Action: *The Chairman will contact Dominic Gibbons for an initial chat and invite him to Goole.*

PS agreed with FD regarding Humber Street development. The EA had involvement on the development and consultation on the ground floor sleeping led to some units being lost to ensure a place of safety as the focus from an EA perspective. Challenges were met and the area is now a fantastic multi use mix.

RT informed all that Howard Duckworth had been contacted by the BBC to ask if he would be submitting a bid for Goole to become a City as he previously attempted a number of years ago. He will be pursuing a second attempt and meeting with Goole Town Council to gain support. RT said he thought it would generate interest and excitement in the town and could tie in with Town Deal. The Chairman responded positively and asked RT to keep the Board up to date with any developments. AP commented that the latest round of potential city status is linked to the Queen's platinum jubilee anniversary. He also agreed Humber Street was an excellent regeneration example that was many years in the making and made the general point that care must be taken when discussing what Goole Town Deal funding can be spent on. It must be spent using Treasury rules and all projects must be able to prove economic benefits.

7. Accelerated Projects Update

CHM provided an update to the Board concerning Oakhill Country Park. Siemens will complete car parks works within the next five days, smaller items such as waste bins and seating will be in place next week and the final set of sculptures were installed this week.

8. Publicity, Communications and Branding

CMH informed all present that since the announcement of the Goole Town Deal, the Town Deal Facebook page and Twitter account had received 5.5k hits on Facebook and one thousand clicks through to the website from the Facebook page. HH added that as discussed earlier, publicity, communication management and expectations management were all covered in the Boards communications strategy plan. Guidance from the MHCLG had arrived regarding communications, and branding with clear guidance on logos, referencing quotes and other aspects. She added that it was essential all Board members were clear on protocol when they were speaking as a Board member as opposed to speaking when representing themselves or their own organisation and protocols were in place for Board members to respect.

HH highlighted the resources available through towns fund central resource hub including training and webinars. Most are aimed at Board Chairs, Vice Chairs and programme officers and caters to all 101 town deals. She highlighted a two-day nationally recognised business case training course she and Charlotte have signed up to and that she had completed an excellent leadership programme along with the Vice Chairman. PJ said the course was well worth attending with four two- hour sessions held over five weeks focused on interactive sessions, case studies of regeneration programmes and participation from around the country. He added that talking with other Chairs and leads facing similar issues and challenges was very useful and he came away with masses of information and a toolkit he can reference. The last session, acting in a complex environment, provided insight from Chris Naylor Chief Executive of Barking and Dagenham Council, with many parallels with Goole. He recommend the opportunity to get involved. HH will send a link to Board members; sessions are recorded and the resource library is available for all Board members to help with every step with Town Deal. The Chairman thanked everyone for their input and to contact HH or him if they would like to add anything else.

9. Any Other Business

AH said she had read numerous comments on social media from local trades people desperate to be considered for some of the work that will be delivered under Town Deal rather than the work be given to larger businesses. She thought the ERYC Portal for submitting tenders would not fall into the radar of smaller businesses and asked the Board to think about what action could be taken to enable small local businesses to access work as well as larger firms. JR added that bigger organisations often subcontract to smaller teams. PJ had looked at this issue during the accelerated project delivery phase when disquiet was voiced from tradesmen in Goole concerning a Hull based scaffolding firm gaining the contract for the market hall and found the Goole firm had not registered for the job. He thought the tender portal was too complex and perhaps too difficult to work with.

HH referenced a point made by FD & DK in a previous meeting, applying a higher score for reference to using local people and local firms in the supply chain. She informed the Board about the work of an ERYC team focussing on and supply chain network support for SMEs to be able to participate and bid for works. The project plugs SMEs into the system to enable them to participate, it addresses their concerns and benefits by keeping money in the local economy. Referrals have been made to this service. JE suggested the service could be offered to businesses through workshops in Goole through the Town Deal. HH added that details could be added to the GTD website and information tweeted to boost economic prospects in the locality. CHM said GTD twitter account already followed The Supply Chain Network on Twitter and retweets their updates so information could also be added to the GTD website if a workshop goes live.

https://www.thesupplychainnetwork.co.uk/

RT said he had responded on social media to certain posts to clarify and ensure people were aware of the circumstances as one complainant had not registered for the work in question yet complained the contract had been given to a firm outside of Goole. He suggested hosting a public meeting to provide information to local contractor on how to register with Yorbuild and perhaps consider a simpler system to register for work. Online publicity could be generated. HH added a supply chain event could be delivered locally as this was the remit of their work across East Yorkshire. AP suggested the issue could also be considered through social contract terms requiring successful bidders to utilise local supply chains and people. He also suggested consideration of projects that are delivered elsewhere but the firms are based in Goole or those that are based in Goole or Brigg also want to secure work outside of their local areas in Scunthorpe or Beverley and stressed the importance of wider benefits to the region not just the town. He suggested some projects could be delivered outside of ERYC by partners such as GTC. HH said GTC would have their own procurement rules to abide by and consideration should also be given to the economic function area.

Action: CHM *to add a page of information on the Goole Town Deal website regarding supply chain network and add details of a workshop when organised for Goole SMEs.*

9.1 Goole COVID recovery work and action plan

The first draft is expected prior to the next Board meeting for circulation and comment.

9.2 Training options for Board members

This item was discussed during item 8 – publicity, communication and branding.

10. Date and time of next meeting

The Board will next meet on Friday 16 July from 2pm to 4pm via TEAMS.

HH said arrangements will be made to seek approval to sign off and accept the TD offer and a new sequence of dates will considered for Board meetings following the July meeting.