

A Review of the Shoreham Renaissance Masterplan

Barry Shaw Chief Executive Kent Architecture Centre
March 2006

Kent Architecture Centre Historic Dockyard Chatham Kent ME4 4TZ tel +44(0)1634 401166
fax +44(0) 1634 403302; e-info@kentarchitecture.co.uk; www.architecturecentre.org

A Review of the Shoreham Renaissance Masterplan

	Contents	page
1.0	Introduction	2
2.0	Background	3
3.0	The masterplanning process	3
4.0	Outputs	4
5.0	Feedback and interview responses	6
6.0	Outcomes	7
7.0	Conclusions	10
8.0	Recommendations	10
9.0	Good Practice Lessons	10
10	Appendices	12



1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report was commissioned by Worthing and Adur District Councils with the aim of reviewing the overall effectiveness of the Shoreham Renaissance Masterplan process and informing discussion on the evolving plan in Worthing. It addresses the following questions:
- To what extent does the final masterplan reflect the original objectives set out in the AIF proposal?
 - To what extent does the masterplan reflect the aims and objectives as set out in the consultants brief?
 - How useful will the final masterplan be in driving forward the regeneration of Shoreham town centre?
 - How successful has the engagement of stakeholders been?
 - Which elements of the project have worked well and what examples of best practice can be identified?
 - Which elements of the project have not worked well and what lessons should be learnt from this?
- 1.2 The review covers the work and outputs of the consultancy team led by Urban Practitioners in producing the Shoreham Renaissance Masterplan. It also takes into account the interaction with staff, members of ADC and other stakeholders including the community.
- 1.3 During February and March 2006 I discussed the work of the consultants with a range of stakeholders including Adur councillors and staff, members of West Sussex County Council, SEEDA and the lead consultants. I will review the draft document with the lead consultant.
- 1.4 I would like to thank all of those who made available their time to discuss the Shoreham Renaissance Masterplan. I hope I have recorded fairly what I heard and if I have not I am sure readers of this report will take the opportunity to correct any factual errors or misunderstandings.
- 1.5 A full list of those I have interviewed and spoken to in connection with this study is contained in the appendix to this report.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Adur District Council (ADC) successfully obtained funding from SEEDA through the Area Investment Framework (AIF) to develop a brief for the development of Shoreham town centre. Kent Architecture Centre (KAC) was appointed to develop a brief for the masterplan and manage the appointment of consultants. A series of seminars were held with staff, councillors and the Shoreham Civic Society which refined the aims of the study and identified all the key stakeholders. KAC were then retained to act as a 'critical friend' through the process.
- 2.2 This initial work resulted in the preparation of a detailed brief for the consultants which:
- Identified a series of opportunity sites within the masterplan area
 - Set out provisional aims and objectives
 - Defined the initial tasks and outputs
 - Identified the skills and experience required
 - Set out the selection procedure and timescale
- 2.3 Expressions of interest were sought and a shortlist of six consultants drawn up and interviewed by a panel representing Shoreham Renaissance chaired by ADC councillor Robert Dunn and comprising representatives of ADC; SEEDA; West Sussex County Council (WSCC); Worthing and Southlands Hospital Trust; Adur, Arun and Worthing Primary Care Trust and KAC.
- 2.4 A team headed by Urban Practitioners with Allies and Morrison, Faber Maunsell and C B Richard Ellis were appointed to produce the Shoreham Renaissance Masterplan by the Shoreham Renaissance working group in December 2004.

3.0 THE MASTERPLANNING PROCESS

- 3.1 The aim for the masterplan as set out in the brief was to regenerate Shoreham town centre as a sustainable community possessing economic, social and environmental vitality and diversity
- The following objectives accompanied this aim:
- To regenerate key sites, achieving high quality architecture which is innovative, sustainable and respectful of Shoreham's architectural heritage
 - To achieve exemplary standards of design in the public realm, including the creation / upgrading of public spaces
 - To secure the highest standards of community safety, through best practice design and street scene management
 - To introduce mixed uses including housing
 - To provide accessible, modern facilities for community services, arts and leisure uses and education

- To make Shoreham attractive to investment and visitors
 - To improve transport interchange facilities at Shoreham Station
 - To improve pedestrian and cycle routes into and through the town centre
 - To improve integration between the town centre, the riverfront and Shoreham Beach including improvements to or replacement of the pedestrian bridge.
 - To build upon the Community Strategy by involving stakeholders and the local community effectively throughout and ensure that proposals cater for all age groups
 - These initial aims and objectives should be tested by the consultants through additional research and consultation with all stakeholders.
- 3.2 It was the intention, stated in the brief, that the masterplan would form part of planning policy and not be simply an advisory document. The Adur Local Plan, adopted in 1996 was being reviewed and was to be replaced by a Local Development Framework (LDF). There was a requirement for the consultants to work closely with planners at ADC to ensure that the masterplan was embedded in the local plan process. This required co-ordination in terms of policy direction, consultation arrangements and timescale.
- 3.3 The programme was reviewed at appointment stage and the initial 11 month programme reduced by agreement to 9 months to fit better with the committee process.
- 3.4 As the masterplan would become a Statutory Document within the Local Development Framework any proposals had to comply with the Statement of Community Involvement. Similarly, the Local Strategic Partnership's Stakeholder Planning Forum will become one of the vehicles for stakeholder involvement in Shoreham Renaissance.
- 3.5 A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) were also required for any proposals detailed in the Shoreham Renaissance Masterplan. An examination of current baseline data relevant to the site/areas, along with projected sustainability/environmental impacts was required. Sustainability objectives and indicators had to be tested against any proposals derived from the Masterplan. Clear indication of how any amendments may have been made following an SEA/SA would need to be detailed.
- 3.6 The masterplanning process comprised a series of studies and consultations with the consultants reporting to a dedicated manager and to the Shoreham Renaissance steering committee.

4 OUTPUTS

- 4.1 The main output from the study takes the form of a series of reports which are listed below.

- 4.2 *Shoreham Issues and Opportunities Report April 2005.*
This document set out the policy context including regional planning guidance, strategic and local policy context; a review of corporate policy at ADC with a special emphasis on maritime and coastal issues; a socio-economic review; and a property market review. It also included the results of consultation from the Shoreham Action Planning Day, the Adur Junior Citizenship Workshop and Shoreham Stakeholder meetings. Analysis was produced of the historical development, urban design, ecology, and patterns of transport and movement. The concluding chapter confirmed the identification of six main sites and identified a further five areas suitable for development.
- 4.3 *Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report August 2005.*
The consultants published a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report in. ODPM define sustainability appraisal as 'to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainable considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans'. The Scoping Report set out baseline information and identified social, environmental and economic issues relevant to the plan with information on synergies. It identified a proposed Sustainability Appraisal Framework included appraisal objectives and indicators with targets and an explanation of how they were chosen. A series of key issues were identified including: relative deprivation; education and skills; housing; air quality; energy efficiency and renewables; buses and public transport; waste and recycling; and the economy.
- 4.4 The report set out a framework for appraising the Renaissance Masterplan against sustainable objectives. The objectives were tailored to reflect local concerns as well as national and regional issues. A series of questions were posed to cross check appropriate objectives and ensure all relevant material was included.
- 4.5 *Appendix Report on Viability and Deliverability Issues September 2005.*
An Appendix Report on viability and deliverability issues outlined in the Masterplan, set out a 'high level' assessment of financial viability of the individual sites. It also outlined issues associated with deliverability and implementation, outlining the principal delivery structures that the council and its partners might consider together with key issues for further consideration. It dealt with the six main sites and concluded that there was a funding gap. This was an additional piece of work requested by ADC.
- 4.6 *Shoreham Renaissance Masterplan Draft Final Report November 2005.*
The draft final report was published in. The structure is similar to the Issues and Opportunities Report, which effectively it updates. It begins with the context and analysis, setting out the regional planning context followed by transport and movement analysis and review of the property market. There follows a report on the public consultation programme. A section outlining the vision and objectives details linkage to the community strategy and movement strategy. Under the heading Development Principles outline development proposals are set out for Pond Road; the Civic Centre and The Ham; Ham Road and Tarmount Lane Car park; East Street, Tarmount Lane and New Road; Shoreham Station; Ship street and Middle Street Car Parks; West End of High street/DSS site; Ropetackle North; and Shoreham Beach. A concluding section on Implementation deals with

key issues; individual site sales; appointment of a strategic development partner and a short review of PFI/PPP and direct procurement options.

4.7 *Consultation Report: Exhibition Responses. November 2005.*
Sets out consultation responses against site proposals.

4.8 *A Strategy for Shoreham. March 2005.*
The final report is a short, more accessible, form of the previous draft, in effect an executive summary. The masterplan document becomes a supporting document and chronological record of the process.

5 FEEDBACK AND INTERVIEW RESPONSES

- 5.1 The process, especially the public consultation, has been thorough. If the document were to prove effective in the long term it had to be comprehensively supported and signed of by members, and in this respect the care and time taken over the exercise was helpful.
- 5.2 Not everyone agreed that the Masterplan delivered what they had expected. 'We did not get what I thought we would get, but what we got was fine'. 'I expected a lot more detail, but what we got has started people talking and thinking differently'.
- 5.3 The overall impression is that the masterplan is useful overall but that some principles have not been bottomed out. There was general recognition that the process of engagement gave the Plan added weight. Both the document and the process will inform the emerging Local Development Framework.
- 5.4 The community consultation was considered to be highly successful. 'The involvement of the general public was really good'. 'The event at the Farmers' Market was a stroke of genius'. There was some feeling that more businesses could have been involved. It would have been helpful to have had more focused engagement with the County Council. The web site needed more monitoring and updating.
- 5.5 Expectations and opportunities were clearly set out. Some respondees felt the study went too far in detailing the physical environment. For some too many expectations were raised without sufficient attention to how things might be paid for.
- 5.6 Engagement with members and officers was considered good. 'The process was absolutely vital'. 'The process has effectively engaged the members'. 'The study worked well and land values have risen'. (This last point was a local perception and not an evaluated statistic).
- 5.7 The role of the KAC acting as a 'critical friend' gave reassurance and confidence to members and staff.

- 5.8 The emphasis on design was welcome but more attention needed to be paid earlier to financial issues. 'There was too much focus on our own land interests and not enough thought given to other land'.
- 5.9 A general concern was that the plan has failed to demonstrate commercial viability. There was a general expectation of a clearer picture of economic viability emerging whereas the reality is that a lot more work needs to be done. 'We needed something that could be implemented straightaway such as Pond Road. We have not got a comprehensive redevelopment plan for Pond Road that stacks up financially'. 'It doesn't set the subject alight'.
- 5.10 Some would have liked a greater emphasis on jobs and employment.
- 5.11 The transport study was seen to be less satisfactory than other aspects of the work leading some to question the effectiveness of a large team of associated consultants.
- 5.12 There was a feeling that the study was not fully integrated but the product of a series of separate consultants. There was some disappointment that the consultants did not take up the offer of a desk in the council's offices. Day to day interaction was too remote.
- 5.13 The initial timetable was considered to be unrealistic and the process really needed three months at the end to deal with committees.
- 5.14 If the project was to be commissioned again the masterplan would be progressed in at least two stages. The first stage would establish the broad principles and would be followed by public consultation and a longer period of internal reflection. The second stage would be more detailed.
- 5.15 The next steps were not shown clearly enough. More time needed to be spent on delivery and the move into implementation.

6.0 OUTCOMES

6.1 To what extent does the final masterplan reflect the original objectives set out in the AIF proposal?

- 6.1.1 There was recognition that the masterplan document and process generally achieved what was expected of it. The process was thorough. A key aspect of the AIF was that the plan should form part of the Local Development Framework process and this has been achieved.

6.2 To what extent does the final masterplan reflect the original objectives set out in the consultants brief?

- 6.2.1 A review of the documentation shows that the masterplan addressed all the aims set out in the consultants brief. It might be said that some issues were more thoroughly developed and more successful than others, but this will almost always be the case. The detailed delivery was affected by the amount of time necessary to carry out the sustainable development requirements.

- 6.2.2 Some responses indicate that it did not deliver the detail that was expected. It can be difficult to get the balance right when dealing with such a wide range of issues. It is also a case of matching output to expectation.

6.3 How useful will the final masterplan be in driving forward the regeneration of Shoreham town centre?

- 6.3.1 There was general recognition that the process of engagement gave the Plan added weight. Both the document and the process will inform the emerging Local Development Framework.
- 6.3.2 The plan will provide an effective strategy to enable clear communication of its principles. The plan is only the most visible part of the strategy and delivery will depend on the way the internal SBC team is organised and resourced to carry forward the delivery without loss of momentum.

6.4 How successful has the engagement of stakeholders been?

- 6.4.1 It was generally agreed that the public consultation process was thorough and successful. The outputs as presented in the various reports show this clearly. The exercise thoroughly tested community priorities and more than 350 letters were received by ADC during the process.
- 6.4.2 Engagement with members and officers was considered good. The balance between consultants reporting to a large steering group and to the officer management team needs to be kept under review. Overall the balance was seen to be about right but there were times when there was a perception of managing by committee.
- 6.4.3 The steering committee process was not in itself sufficient to ensure partnership working with key stakeholders such as West Sussex County Council or the PCT. They were represented but lines of communication were not always clear. More corporate engagement would have been helpful.
- 6.4.4 More might have been done to specifically engage the business community, but this raises the question of by whom and when. The business community is generally reluctant to sit in meetings without clear outputs and it could be considered an advantage to talk to them now when there are clear issues to discuss.
- 6.4.5 Shoreham Civic Society ran a series of sessions which were positive and detailed. It was less clear to some members of the steering committee as to how their responses were taken into account.
- 6.4.6 The consultants recommend a number of delivery options and a review of key partner requirements should be carried out prior to finalising the next steps.

6.5 Which elements of the project have worked well and what examples of best practice can be identified?

- 6.5.1 The process overall worked well. The process has effectively engaged the members. 'We have a vision and a lot of ideas'.
- 6.5.2 The consultation process worked well. A large group of members, officers and community engaged with and understood the process.
- 6.5.3 The Five Towns aspect of the AIF worked really well. This was initially seen as a 'bolt-on' but emerged as a useful joint working and marketing opportunity.
- 6.5.4 The role of dedicated manager was critical to the process and worked particularly well here. The consistency of availability throughout the study was a key feature of the role. This is a clear example of best practice.
- 6.5.5 The client body maintained their energy and commitment. They were recognised as a demanding and engaged client.
- 6.5.6 The role of 'critical friend' appears to have been helpful in creating confidence and helping explain the process.
- 6.5.7 The plan has related the recommendations to delivery. Aspects of delivery have been discussed and the nature of the future delivery vehicle outlined.
- 6.5.8 The design side worked well giving everyone something that they could identify with.
- 6.6 **Which elements of the project have not worked well and what lessons should be learnt from this?**
- 6.6.1 The changes to the planning process resulted in a degree of uncertainty about how best to prioritise the work. The sustainability appraisal is a requirement of any formal planning document but not necessarily required if the document is not formerly part of the planning suite. The time devoted to working up the detail of the sustainability appraisal might have benefited other areas of the study.
- 6.6.2 There was a general expectation of a clearer picture of economic viability would emerge from the study. To some extent this is a reflection of the initial disappointment felt when it emerged that the work and development required to enhance Shoreham was not cost neutral. It is also the case that a full economic viability study can only be done against a clear brief. This in turn raises the question, and expectation, of output by way of designs with briefs.
- 6.6.3 The transport study was seen to be less satisfactory than other aspects of the work leading some to question the effectiveness of a large team of associated consultants. Transport is frequently the most difficult area to resolve in any plan. This is particularly so when the transport authority is a separate body. Transport planning can appear to operate in a silo and more integration was needed from the highways team. This consistently difficult area might be reviewed in terms of delivering the next phases.
- 6.6.4 There were times when the consultants appeared to be too remote. A review of the time put into the study on site by the consultants does not really justify this.

Expectations about availability need to be clarified by client and consultant in an open way and regularly reviewed through the management process.

- 6.6.5 The timetable was initially shortened and then lengthened. The study was initially estimated to take 11 months. This was shortened to 9 at the outset. In the event it has taken 15 months.
- 6.6.6 More engagement with the County Council was needed and similarly stronger representation from West Sussex Economic Partnership would have been desirable.
- 6.6.7 Not enough attention was paid to the town as a retail centre.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 Shoreham is at the beginning of a period of considerable change and everyone I spoke to considered the masterplan process to have been a success and the final output to be good. The reservations expressed to me and set out in this report do not detract from that. The comments recorded here were all given in the spirit of wanting to achieve excellence, and that itself is a sign of a successful process. The work has secured a clear start to the process and it is now very important that momentum is maintained.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 Strategic leadership supported by a clear management structure needs to be maintained to deal with the long term nature of the delivery of the plan.
- 8.2 Internal capacity issues and management continuity need to be addressed. Replacement cover needs to be found for Wojtek Boden who is retiring and for Lynda Spain who is moving on to other projects.
- 8.3 The timescale for delivery needs to be reviewed and project and delivery planning put in place for an anticipated 7 – 10 year programme.
- 8.4 Consideration should be given to nominating a councillor as the corporate champion of the project.
- 8.5 The partnership needs to be reviewed. Business interests should be engaged through a body like 'Worthing First'.
- 8.6 The role and expectation of stakeholders should be clearly set out especially with regard to perceived conflicts of interest arising from the expectation of partnership and the obligation to negotiate to demonstrate value for money.
- 8.7 Stronger and more comprehensive links need to be made to the County Council to achieve more corporate engagement.
- 8.8 Stronger and more comprehensive links need to be made to the PCT.
- 8.9 A continuing public consultation/information strategy should be drawn up with the aim of retaining the good will and involvement of the community.
- 8.10 Regeneration and planning needs to be better integrated.
- 8.11 A detailed brief should be drawn up for Pond Road following a review of the community facilities considered necessary and sustainable. This should become the focus of the next stage.
- 8.12 Decisions should be taken on the form of delivery body that will be set up and its funding requirement.

9.0 GOOD PRACTICE LESSONS

- 9.1 It is important that objectives are set and prioritised. A clear vision is needed at the outset and time and funding needs to be made available to achieve it.
- 9.2 A dedicated project officer based within the Local Authority is critical.
- 9.3 Community involvement is critical but reference should also be made to limitations of funding and other issues.
- 9.4 With large scale community involvement it is important to articulate back to the community how their views have been taken into account, particularly when the community engagement has been positive and thoughtful with the engagement of bodies such as the Civic Society.
- 9.5 Realistic timetabling. The timetable needs to be reviewed at set stages. Delivery is going to take many years.
- 9.6 There needs to be a realistic understanding of what consultants can achieve. A series of projects need to be defined as it is not possible to achieve everything in a single exercise.
- 9.7 Monitoring and review is an important part of the process.
- 9.8 A degree of flexibility is helpful and important.

10.0 Appendices

10.1 Appendix 1: List of people and organisations interviewed during the course of this study.

Cllr. Robert Dunn	Adur District Council
Cllr. Elizabeth McKinnie	Adur District Council
Wojtek Boden	Adur District Council
Peter Davies	Adur District Council
Peter Latham	Adur District Council
Lynda Spain	Adur District Council
Paul Street	Adur District Council
Geoff Howitt	Representing Community Groups
John Snell	West Sussex County Council
Angharad James	SEEDA
Anthony Benson	Urban Practitioners

10.2 Appendix 2:

Barry Shaw is the founding Chief Executive of the Kent Architecture Centre, which was set up in 1995. The centre is a not-for-profit organisation funded by a group of national, regional and local bodies to help bring about a high quality environment by working closely with the community and its decision makers. It has a full-time staff of 11 delivering projects across the South East including community planning, briefing and project initiation, architectural competitions, and education and training for local authorities. It manages for SEEDA the South East Regional Design Panel and contributes to the management of the South East Design Champions Club. It worked with SEEDA and CABE to set up two further architecture centres in Solent and Milton Keynes.

Barry is an architect and town planner with extensive experience of working with local authority, community and business groups in the UK, mainland Europe and the USA. In addition to his work with the centre, he is a member of the English Heritage Advisory and London Advisory Committees and CABE Regional Committee. In addition to his work in the UK he worked with Harvard University Centre for Urban Development Studies as a visiting professor and advisor. In 1999 he was a member of the committee advising the Department of Culture, Media and Sport on the establishment of CABE. He was awarded an MBE in 2000 for services to architecture.

Prior to helping set up the Kent Architecture Centre he was a director of Fleetwood Shaw, an international regeneration consultancy. Earlier in his career he was a member of the management team that set up the London Docklands Development Corporation where he had particular responsibility for the design and planning of South Docklands including Greenland Dock and Butlers Wharf. As Head of Urban Design he established the first regional design panel in the UK.