

Minutes of the Goole Town Deal Board Meeting

Friday 18 September 2020

11.00am to 1.00pm

Dial in meeting on Microsoft Teams

Attending: ERYC Portfolio Holder for Economic Development & Inward Investment (VA Councillor Victoria Aitken), ERYC (AH Councillor Anne Handley, Goole North Ward), Goole Civic Society (MHC Margaret Hicks-Clarke), Hull & East Yorkshire Smile Foundation (AB Andy Barber), Jos Richardson & Sons (JR Joseph Richardson), Associated British Ports (DM David Morriss), Link Agency (PJ Phil Jones), Goole Town Council (BR Brian Robertson sub for Josie Head), Beal Homes (CM Chris Murphy for Richard Beal).

Present: ERYC Growth Programmes and Policy Manager (LP Liz Philpot), ERYC Head of Bridlington Renaissance (NA Nigel Atkinson), ERYC Local Growth Manager (HH Helen Hoults), ERYC Local Growth Co-ordinator (LJ Leigh Johnson)

Guests: Neil Longden, Paul Stockhill Environment Agency (EA) and Tom Bannister Planning Policy Manager and Ben Kirby Assistant Principle Engineer East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC)

Welcome. The Chair (JR) welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked after Josie Head who is unwell. All of the Board asked for their best wishes to be passed on. JR also advised that Brian Robertson (BR) was present in place of Josie Head and was welcomed to the meeting.

1. **Apologies** were noted for Lindsay Hudson, Josie Head, Kishor Tailor, David Kerfoot, Martin Chapman, Finbarr Dowling, Richard Beal, Andrew Percy MP, Peter Campey and Lisa Quinn
2. **Presentation:** Goole Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2 - Neil Longden & Paul Stockhill Environment Agency. Ben Kirby ERYC Assistant Principle Engineer ERYC and Tom Bannister Planning Policy Manager ERYC.

TB gave the Local Plan as the context for growth and the need to understand the flood risk. SFRA (Statutory Flood Risk Assessment) findings indicated that there was a risk of flooding from a breach of defences. SFRA2 is used in planning application determinations and to identify possible future impacts and to review how understanding has changed since 2011. The assessment looks at the risk to an area of flooding from all sources both now and in the future, the impact of climate change and land use. The modelling takes into consideration known risks from different types of flooding on two levels, first is for the whole of the East Riding and then a more detailed study for Goole and Hedon.

In Sept 2020 a Level 2 Study was approved by ERYC Cabinet which will become a material consideration in determining future planning applications as well as inform local plan allocations and map out how to deal with certain types of development in Goole. The detail of major flooding takes into account depth, speed, velocity, rate of onset and likely length of flooding. The starting point was a review of the existing SFRA 2011 which looked at the hydraulic modelling of the upper Humber. Consultants then reviewed the impact of the overtopping and breach of defences (worst case scenario). The set of maps shows the depth of water if there was a breach of the defences. In the town centre 2-3m is a significant depth (average ceiling height is 2.4m) speed of breach is fast, over 5m a second, slowing to 1m a second and is still significant. Overtopping (no breach but due to climate change and if there is high tidal or pluvial waters) is likely to be beyond the M62 corridor from the west, doesn't go much beyond that or affect the town centre, the depth is lower about a 1m and therefore the hazard is much less. Overtopping outputs demonstrate the value of existing defences and how important they are to moderating the risks shown. The Goole Development Map

is a ranking of risks with different zones and regions from the red line which is a 1 m defence buffer with a rapid inundation zone and is the one with the highest risk to the white area where flooding is unlikely.

This is important when looking at future developments as it would not be permitted in the red zone. The map has a recommendations table which supports it. Zones across the top and categories down the side – e.g. housing is classed as a more vulnerable development so you can see the impact related to the zones – each with actions to reduce the risk for occupants – e.g. raising floor levels etc. Employment land is less vulnerable so although different rules are applied new build is still not permitted in red zones, only change of use. Change of use is all about vulnerability which could increase by changing use from an office to a house or not increase at all by changing use from an office to a shop. Although there appears that there is a much larger area at risk from 2011 to 2020 the risk has not become significantly worse - it is the level of understanding, modelling and analysis that has improved which is driven by what is most likely to happen if there is breach. It should be noted that the risk is highly unlikely.

Answers to questions raised by board members

- The new housing on Rawcliffe Road in the yellow zone and not the red zone.
- The Environment Agency maintain the defences and the study shows the value of the current defences. Regarding future developments, ensure that whatever is planned follows the rules and is conscious of the risks, even though it may be more expensive. The risk of a breach is a low chance but high in consequence in its impact and that needs to be considered. There is also a residual risk of tidal, pluvial and surface water risk which needs to be considered to improve resilience. Businesses need to be made more aware of the risk and prepare their properties and flood plans to come together to build a resilient community. All this will improve and support the towns economic growth and regeneration
- Flood risk in the existing housing stock, such as the basement flats in Hook Rd is a significant risk to residents but the likely hood of flooding is slim.

HH advised the board that Constituency MP, Andrew Percy was now unable to join the meeting.

PS works with Flood Risk Management authorities, Independent Drainage Boards and Yorkshire Water as well as others to make sure the asset stock is kept in order and is also a consultee on local plans. A plethora of organisations are involved with the asset stock to prevent flooding in Goole:- Defra (policy & funding); EA (overview of the management of all sources of flooding and includes coastal, main rivers and estuaries); Lead Local Flood Authorities (ERYC and Hull City Council) have strategies to manage surface and ground water flooding; Drainage Boards (land drainage); Highways Authorities (highways) and water & sewerage companies (surface water & sewage); DCLG Local Planning Authorities (planning, developing, risk & directing development – including Building Regs). The flood map warning area for Goole & Surrounding area indicates that 9,000 properties are at risk of flooding and which properties will receive an automated flood warning. The white area indicates that there are not a lot a properties or households that have not signed up to the alert. Historically the area was drained by Vermuden in 1600 when the River Don was straightened up, so the area has always suffered from flooding. The main defences that help to protect Goole and the area are earth embankment, walls, flood gates and locks. All defences are inspected & maintained. The standard of protection is good but assets do degrade and they are crucial to managing the risk e.g. emergency work undertaken at Chantry's Cottage between Rawcliffe & Goole was a £9m investment to rectify erosion to the river bank dropping. There needs to be a strategic assessment of assets in the upper estuary as some assets are in a better condition than others. Priorities in the national programme indicate a £45m investment over the next 20 yrs. When the EA bids for cash, partnership funding from the public sector and private business is

crucial and all bound by the Grant in Aid eligibility rules. The Humber Strategy (2008) is now The Humber 2100 Plus which is to ensure that the Humber Estuary flood management plan is managed as a whole. The EA can only bid for Grant in Aid (core cash from Defra) Local Levy, LEP (Business) EU Funding, LA Highways England and private business, the latter of which is quite difficult to achieve.

A key message to the Town Deal Board is about collaboration and that the regeneration work coming forward needs to take into consideration flood mitigation issues in design and change of use etc. Councillors AH and VA agreed that flood mitigation be a key factor for planning the future in Goole and considering Holland's approach as an example – such as not living on the ground floor.

JR thanked TB, BK, PS & NL for their contributions. PS and CM confirmed that they would stay for the rest of the meeting.

4. Declaration of Interests

None

5. Minutes of the Board meeting held on 17 July 2020

Proposed by AH and seconded by MHC

6. Minutes of the advance funding meeting held on 30 July 2020

Proposed by AH and seconded by MHC

Minutes of the consultative meeting on the 14 August 20

Proposed by AH and seconded by MHC

7. Matters arising not on the agenda.

7.1 ERYC Masterplan and Town Investment Plan consultancy support – verbal update

HH advised the board that ARUP had been procured by the council to refresh the 2010 masterplan for Goole to support the Town Deal process. Arup will also bring technical expertise such as re-modelling and spatial planning to the town deal process. The council has a compliant, transparent consultancy procurement framework from which a mini competition was undertaken. However, this process did not produce the level of returns expected. Consequently, a second process, Fee Initiation was applied which generated the next consultancy on the rotation, in terms of best value.

Whilst Arup hold the national contract to provide support to Town Deal Boards, the key difference between working on the Town Hub contract is that the company is there *to work with* town deals providing advice, tools and resources whereas, the direct appointment of Arup by ERYC is *to work for* Goole Town Deal. Richard Bickers of Arup is the lead Project Manager for this contract and it is separate to Arup's contract for the national support service.

JR commented that the expectation was that consultants be presented to the board so that the board were involved in the selection process. Although the process was accepted it was noted that the board should have been made aware of the actions taken before the decision was made. However, it was acknowledged that the oversight was due to tight turnaround timescales.

7.2 Task and Finish theme groups

HH advised the board that originally there was an expectation that themes groups/task groups would be initiated to develop project solutions. However, the fast moving pace of Goole Town Deal and the introduction of the additional guidance and the support hub, alongside the reaching out to

organisations via Board Members and ERTC Officers, theme groups have not been initiated to date. This is not to say that they won't be, it is more a case of what they are being tasked with. The Board are currently working through indicative long list project proposals that respond to the new guidance and refining the strategic objectives and structure accordingly. Feedback from the first submission cohort is highlighting the need for the strategic context. A discussion confirmed that for example, whilst the physical Market Hall building was a renovation project in its own right, it is also one part of the wider town centre development.

AH expressed concern that individuals are waiting to give their views and the Town Deal should grow from the bottom up rather than the top down. HH replied that the Facebook Campaign and media coverage was generating public comments that are being factored in. The current Long List of Projects is a culmination of the work of the last nine months and previous work undertaken in Goole. The Board has an agreed communications plan covering all media platforms to ensure that the correct information is disseminated. As the draft Town Investment Plan is produced, it will be presented for wider public consultation on the basis of *'This is what we can apply for and these we think are the priorities based on what people have told us - that can also be endorsed by evidence and deliver the outcomes being sought by the funder'*.

Consultation is a full requirement prior to submitting the TIP and an explanation of how people were engaged and support the objectives. There needs to be clarity on the priority objectives and projects which can then be consulted upon. The launch of the website is the opportunity to "go large" on what the GTB has been doing, there will also be a Facebook campaign. To date the low communication profile has been deliberate whilst the details are being prepared.

8. Report from the Towns Fund Officers.

HH had provided a written report and talked through in summary.

8.1 Project prioritisation system

A Project Prioritisation scoring tool has been issued by the Town Hub. It is a spreadsheet that enables a fair and transparent process of project prioritisation.

8.2 Proposed Goole Town Deal project assessment criteria

The Project scoring tool requires Goole Town Deal Board to identify eleven specific criteria for projects to achieve. HH has presented a draft. JR suggested an additional criteria should be 'does the project demonstrate how the community had been engaged and effectively consulted' as a criteria.

8.3 Project Longlist framework and current active work-streams

HH summarised the circulated project long list and the next stage to use the project prioritisation tool to produce a shorter list.

8.4 Flexi grant system and project applications.

HH advised that the council's Flexigrant System provided a recognised transparent governance procedure and audit trail for awarding funding to projects and the system is preparing a document system for Town Deal in readiness. Some of this documentation will be helpful to the accelerated funding projects.

8.5 Milestones

JR advised that the board will soon need to agree which projects are incorporated into the Town Investment Plan (TIP). Whilst the consultants will work up the masterplan and enable alignment with the TIP the Project Longlist has to be appraised.

The impact of COVID-19 was recognised as impeding familiar forms of public consultation and it is important to use other platforms. HH and LJ will focus on implementing the Boards communication strategy. It was also suggested that a weighting should be agreed for the criteria with score cards so that agreement can be reached and decisions justified. The establishment of a framework is important to justify the whole investment plan, although over consultation is to be born in mind. The board approved this as the way forward.

9. Communications - Website Update report attached

LJ advised that a private link had been sent out to all members and that positive comments had been received – Members found it engaging, clear explanations and no jargon. It will also be important to encourage young people to get involved and for people to have their say via the link to the Google page of My Town website. GTDBoard can have FB, Instagram and Twitter accounts. There are some gaps which need information but it can be launched once all the feedback has been received. JR asked members to become familiar with the website, test it out and send their comment to LJ who also explained that the full use of social media including Twitter will be linked to the new website to re-direct people to the site.

HH advised that the launch may coincide with a Government Minister making an advance funding announcement, there should be no publicity on advance funded projects until the formal confirmation announcement is made.

10. Any Other Business

PS asked about the nature of the role of the EA and the board, he is interested in the strategic fit and role. PS to discuss further with HH and it was agreed that PS be invited to become a Board Member.

AH advised that she had attended a meeting with KCOM regarding putting full fibre into Old Goole and discussed the possibility of electric buses. There was also substantial amounts of funding through the wind farms community fund. Also, AH wanted to record a big thank you to LP on her contribution to GTB and congratulate her on her recent appointment to North Yorkshire LEP.

MHC advised that she had contacted HH after the Market Hall Facebook post regarding a Dream Heritage Group wanting to get involved and the need to engage with the group.

JR thanked LP for all her assistance and wished her well in her new role.

11. Date and time of next Board meeting:

Friday 16th October – This meeting will take place via Microsoft Teams from 2pm until 4pm.

JR reminded board members to respond to LJ regarding the website and to consider the project long list and to get in touch with HH or JR about any other business.