

Minutes of the Goole Town Deal Board Meeting held on Friday 26 March 2021, 2.00pm to 4.00pm

Attending: Joe Richardson & Sons (JR Chair Joseph Richardson), ERYC Portfolio Holder for Economic Development & Inward Investment (VA Councillor Victoria Aitken), 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), Croda (MC Martin Chapman), Link Agency (PJ Phil Jones), Public Health (LF Laurie Fergusson), Goole Civic Society (MHC Margaret Hicks-Clarke), Goole Town Council (BR Brian Robertson), Associated British Ports (DM David Morris).

Present: ERYC Head of Bridlington Renaissance (NA Nigel Atkinson), ERYC Town Deal Programme Manager (HH Helen Houlton), ERYC Regeneration Projects Co-ordinator (CHM Charlotte Howe-McCartin), ERYC Development Co-ordinator (JRus Joe Russell), Nichols Group (Lisa Quinn).

1. Welcome

The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting.

2. Apologies

Received from MHCLG (Peter Campey), Humber Local Enterprise Partnership (Kishor Tailor and Teresa Chalmers), Siemens Mobility Ltd (Finbarr Dowling), Beal Homes (Richard Beal), ERYC Head of Economic Development (Paul Bell) and ERYC Local Growth Co-ordinator (Leigh Johnson).

3. Declaration of Interests

No Declarations of Interest were asserted.

4. Minutes of the Board Meeting held on Friday 19 February 2021

The Minutes were agreed as a true record of the meeting. Proposed by DK and seconded by PJ.

5. Update on Town Investment Plan

JR's understanding is no news on the outcome has been received to date. HH confirmed this understanding adding that an email from Peter Campey had been received, confirming an announcement shall be after elections in May. AP concurred suggesting it might be late May.

6. Associated British Ports on Humber Freeport Status

David Morris outlined the recent news: The Humber region gained Freeport Status in the latest Government budget announcement (03/03/2021). It includes Hull, Immingham, Grimsby and Goole. DM circulated slides showing annotated maps for the Humber region that included a collaborative bid across four local authorities, 2 local enterprise partnerships and businesses across the region. Humber is one of the UK's busiest ports, handling 17% of UK's trade. A Freeport is a port where normal tax and customs laws do not apply, essentially allowing businesses located within Freeport zone to import goods, add value to those goods and export relatively duty free. If goods are then brought into the UK i.e. outside Freeport zone, duty/customs will have to be added as standard. Within the Freeport there are additional tax assisted areas (Freeport Enterprise Zones), similar to existing Enterprise Zones like Goole 36, with business rate relief, capital allowance relief and NI contributions, aimed at stimulating economic activity. It is anticipated that economic impact will be

felt across the wider Yorkshire region. Finer details and advanced discussions are ongoing and the governance model is likely to operate similar to a Local Enterprise Partnership.

Focusing on the Goole map, JR asked if the blue zone had been formally allocated in the East Riding Local Plan as an employment zone. AP confirms ERYC are going through a local plan revision and this has been allocated as such in the draft submission. JR asked DM to clarify the size/location restrictions considering the site is restricted to 200ha continuously but how does Goole work being so far away from the main site in Hull. DM suggested the 200ha figure was in relation to tax assisted areas, but the combined Humber Freeport is restricted to 45km and within that Goole has its own Freeport status. VA clarified the customs zone doesn't include Goole, but the tax site does include Goole and reconfirms it is proposed in ERYC Local Plan going forward.

BR questioned if the tax relief was only available for importing businesses, or is the land available to others? DM suggested tax assistance would be available for all businesses within that geographic location, but then there are further duty benefits for those who import. The fine detail of the levels of relief available are currently being worked through and it is important to be careful that businesses located just outside are not disadvantaged.

MC commented that it is a positive development that there is a customs zone within Goole. Croda operates as a customs warehouse so operates similar to Freeport. As the current Brexit deal stands, if you are importing into the UK to export for sale in Europe there are advantages. AP asked about costs when leaving custom zones, MC advised that currently only pay duty for the items for sale in the UK.

The Chair concluded that this is very positive news for Goole and DM advised that establishing the Board and operational detail is expected before the calendar year end.

7. Project Engagement Groups

HH referred to the circulated paper to clarify the purpose of these groups is to secure wider community and stakeholder engagement. The groups will have similar roles to the engagement processes reviewed during the check and challenge stage of the TIP. The Towns Hub website highlights the need to keep the community engaged, involved and updated on thinking and developments, especially in this 'waiting' period. The groups will form part of the development stage that will feed into the thinking in preparing for businesses cases. The businesses cases will be lead and driven by the accountable body in association with the Board. They will require specific necessary expertise, especially where technical and specialist detail is required. But, comparing for example, the rail project with the market hall, a whole different set of community stakeholders will need to be involved with each.

It had been suggested that it may be helpful for each Project Engagement Group to be chaired by member of the board, this would assist with giving a local focus and lead sponsor for the project and steer away from a project being perceived as being council driven.

HH advised that some Board Members have indicated that whilst they are fully committed to participating in the project/s development, they do not feel they are locally known to be a projects figurehead.

AH said she was not at the previous meeting, but would like to be part of/chair the opportunities hub initiative having personally worked closely with schools and the Job Centre etc. Equally, she would like to sign up for the VPG project. JR also confirmed volunteering for the VPG project.

AP clarifies this is specifically for public engagement and consultation and does not cross into business case decision making which shall remain the board's role. HH confirmed adding that it is about establishing forums for preliminary and exploratory dialogue with the beneficiaries which brings ideas back into the wider project scope. AP advised that he would want to be involved in the rail project. BR happy to be involved in VPG, as primary lease holder and managing the accelerated project. VA commented that all of the projects cross cut her Portfolio and is keen to support where most effective.

BR asked if a non-Board Member should chair a PEG, especially for those projects which have a wider community investment. HH commented it may be that projects such as the market hall/VPG for example, naturally evolve into ongoing community working groups. However, the Board still need to launch them and set the foundations, particularly during the Town Deal so that it does not diverge from the objectives. However, with time and capacity building of that forum, it could be a natural progression step for the community to foster and champion projects. This will also ensure the projects can complement and add value to each other as anchor points of the town centre, pulling people in and creating cohesion across investments.

Stakeholder Forums involved with the TIP all asked 'What happens next and how can we stay involved?' This approach is one the response to that and complies with the Boards operational protocol and communication engagement plan.

PS supported the value of having two or three sponsors for each group, particularly a business sponsor working alongside a community focused sponsor and would like to see a delivery model/business case that has the engagement group embedded in the projects development journey. MC suggested 'sponsor' is better terminology and agreed with BR for another stakeholder could chair these groups but the board needs representing. Croda would be happy to be a business sponsor, considering PS's comment on the environmental project. JR voiced concern with a none-Board Member Chair, indicating that changes to the project could occur without the direction or agreement of the board. General consensus groups can run away with an idea and the title 'chair' could be misleading to the wider public eye. If a board member leads, they can ensure the project is kept on track, but call them a facilitator or convenor etc. It is also clarified there is an open invitation approach to these groups for board members.

LQ made comment that the final tip submission gained wider community engagement strength after the check and challenge, bringing it to where it needed to be. The approach being taken now is very positive going forward. A point to keep in mind is recognise that with no announcement yet, to be conscious that taking these groups forward might have a project risk but, it could work well for discussing contingency plans etc. Towns Fund is a long programme (2026) and continuous engagement is key throughout business case and delivery but also people on the board may come and go, so it is important to have community adoption.

AP suggested that the two projects with revenue implications will no doubt involve more work – skills hub and rail project and so it would perhaps be a wise move to prioritise those business cases. HH agrees those two are complex and early thinking and preparatory work could be beneficial. The Accountable Body (ERYC) have started an internal dialogue regarding positioning and lead personnel.

8. Business Cases Templates

A template outlining the business case requirements had been circulated to the Board for information. Each project will have its own complexity and technical needs and whilst the process will remain the same for each, the content will differ and therefore require different technical expertise for each. ERYC

as the Accountable Body have started to assess the internal capability and expertise to determine what additional support may need to be procured following the TIP outcome announcement.

It was agreed the business case template is very comprehensive. PS asked if it is possible to share the business case template with the EA's project team as it will take time to prepare a business case, so early insight is helpful. HH confirmed that the level of data/documentation that will be required to support the environmental project will be complex and as such the EA can benefit from thinking about the business case now whilst also recognising that any associated support and conditions for TD funding remain unknown at this stage.

9. Reopening High Streets Safely Fund

JR provided a presentation on Reopening High Streets Safely Fund, conceived in spring 2020 as result of Covid-19 pandemic, ERYC has a total of £300,000 ERDF funding for the purpose of safe reopening of local economies. The fund has several priorities, the first strand is the commission of several town centre focused Covid-recovery action plans (Pocklington, Market Weighton, Beverley, Hornsea, Withernsea, Hedon, Hessel, Howden and Goole). The work is being undertaken by 'Retail Group', external experts who base findings on sit visits and surveys from businesses and stakeholders. The work will produce short, medium and long term options based on consumer confidences, mainly focused on Covid-issues, or issues that have been exacerbated by lockdown. The second strand is footfall monitoring (Bridlington, Beverley, Driffield, Goole, Howden and Haltemprice), this is town centre monitoring done through mobile devices and Bluetooth to give an indication of personnel numbers, time spent in town centres and eventually could feed through traffic and weather data too. Footfall data will provide quantitative data to support town centre initiatives, particularly the Towns Fund business cases. The third strand is a public information campaign: 'Do it for East Yorkshire', will be on ITV Hub, social media, radio, newspapers, and also a high-street based tool kit for town councils. The printed versions can be localised 'Do it for Bridlington' or 'Do it for Goole' and will be launched 12th April for 8 weeks (in line with Government Covid-19 guidance). The fourth strand is business-facing awareness raising/support, focusing on high-street SMEs. The work has already delivered a series of location specific workshops focused on business adaptation for trading during Covid-19 and then preparing for reopening successfully.

AP commented so much of what drives a high street is office based workers and many are not going back into offices yet, if at all. This could be a privilege that many others do not get the option for. East Riding could lead on getting people back into offices and asked that if all in agreement, the Town Board write to ERYC Chief Executive highlighting the benefits to towns and town-centres for having the presence of office based workers. JR said he would be happy to write letter as Chair of GTD board and certainly in his own company, staff are currently working on a rota system that supports good mental health.

DM asked if ERYC has footfall data pre-Covid? JRus explained no not currently on a large scale (although anecdotal data can be drawn upon).

DK questioned to what extent and how, have ERYC undertaken business engagement for this action plan and what was the reaction? JRus informed a business survey via email has happened and engagement with local business groups and town centre stakeholder groups including via press releases which generated a significant response from landlords. Regarding the reaction, most have not been completed yet so cannot say based on outcomes, but in terms of process and sharing ideas it was welcomed with cautious optimism. As a shopper's survey could not be conducted, a resident's survey was used as an alternative which secured over 3,000 responses and Goole response numbers were high in volume.

10. Any Other Business

10.1 JR raised the on-going work regarding the town centre Masterplan. HH clarified the Masterplan and the Town Investment Plan work in tandem, the TIP became the priority due to it being deadline driven, but work is on-going with ARUP and LDA Design for a refreshed Masterplan focussing on the town centre. When GTD started there was no current masterplan other than the 2010 renaissance plan that put much focus on rolling out at Goole 36. The refreshed Masterplan will focus on the Town Centre and a first draft is currently circulating within ERYC to ensure the future development issues associated with the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment are defined sensibly. HH would like to bring the draft to the Board meeting on the 16 April. The scope of the document is very much articulating the vision and providing a prospectus of opportunities for development and investment.

ERYC are giving consideration to the weight and link the masterplan will have with the current Local Plan refresh. NA commented that the masterplan refresh is also proving to be a positive review exercise in evaluating the success of the Renaissance Plan 2010, things are constantly changing so the aim of this document, whilst setting a vision, needs to allow for flexibility and opportunities to come forward resulting from those wider investment/development discussions.

AP expressed hope it will align with current TIP projects, also highlighting the need to reduce the footprint of retail space which is not sustainable in a contemporary society. AP asked if the masterplan will established where retail space can be reduced and how much retail floor space Goole can reasonably sustain in the future. This would be relevant to the Property Activation Fund business case offering a granular level of detail regarding specific sites, buildings and land. HH stated that this is an area being given consideration but that some finer details will also be part of the specific project business cases. A further challenge is also where alternative uses can be identified and established (as permitted within the SFRA2) from some soft market testing to inform where clearance is then the only/most viable option.

10.2 MHC informed that Goole Civic Society is a member of Civic Voice who currently have a campaign to do high streets differently which agrees with reducing retail footprints. Urban Splash Developers are working with Civic Voice and have some interesting ideas, although clarified these are more residential orientated, but could still look out to other towns/developers for fresh ideas to bring into Goole. DK offered to circulate reports done on 21st Century Towns that he has been involved with.

10.3 AP asked for future meetings, to have as a standing agenda item an update on the accelerated projects. HH confirmed and will bring a full update to the next meeting.

11. Date and time of next meeting

Friday 16 April at 2pm to 4pm via Teams.

Additional dates to be established for May/June/July

- Friday 14 May at 2pm
- Friday 11 June at 2pm
- Friday 16 July at 2pm