

5. BETTER MID SUSSEX PROJECT

REPORT OF: Tim Barkley, Better Mid Sussex Planning Leader
Email: TimB@midsussex.gov.uk Tel: 01444 477336
Wards Affected: All
Key Decision No

Purpose of Report

1. The Better Mid Sussex Advisory Group was established by Council last year to oversee the Better Mid Sussex project. The purpose of this report is to briefly review the role of the Group and highlight the key work streams which have emerged over the last nine months within the project.

Summary

2. Last year, the Council decided not to appoint a preferred development partner to support the project. Instead, it decided to work with existing major landowners/leaseholders in our town centres and to encourage the private sector to come forward with schemes to improve our town centres. Progress is now being made on several schemes. In addition, the Council, working in partnership, is also taking forward other aspects of the master plans.

Recommendations

3. **The Advisory Group is recommended to: -**
 - 3.1 **To note the terms of reference for the Group;**
 - 3.2 **To note the current work streams and support continued engagement with the private sector;**
 - 3.3 **To note the project is one of the strategic risks for the Council in 2011/12.**

Background

4. When agreeing the formation of the Better Mid Sussex Advisory Group in 2010, Council set out the terms of reference of the Group and these are set out below for information:-

“To oversee the town centre revitalisation project, and advise Cabinet as appropriate.

The objective of the group is to progress the master plan for each town centre including seeking to achieve the following outcomes:-

The development of strong and successful town centres;

The development of new retail and commercial floor space, including residential development, where this is possible;

Where relevant, in the particular town centre, the provision of new / replacement / refurbished community buildings and improved public realm;

The enhancement of the accessibility of each centre, including car parking and public transport;

The improvement to the environment in each town centre”

5. The Council is a major landowner in each town centre and one key role for the Group is, therefore, to give advice to Cabinet on the use/redevelopment of Council land that will support the project. Another key role is to consider schemes from the private sector at an early stage, particularly those which might result in the Council disposing of land or granting a lease or those which might result in the replacement/relocation of existing community facilities. It is likely that where the Council receives a formal offer from the private sector concerning a specific scheme, it will include a development appraisal, containing commercially sensitive information.
6. Where necessary, the Council seeks independent advice. At present, we have a contract in place with BNP Paribas Real Estate, who are a wholly owned subsidiary of a major international bank and whose core businesses include asset management and real estate service. The contract expires at the end of 2012. We would normally instruct them to review a formal offer and make recommendations to the Council.
7. In 2010/11, the key strategy was working in partnership with the Town Councils, to develop stronger links with key private sector interests in the town centres and to support them in developing ideas to improve each town centre. This has included private sector and town council attendance at the BMSAG meetings and answering Member questions. This process has enabled open discussion of the opportunities and challenges we face in taking forward the project. It is likely that in 2011/12 detailed schemes will start to come forward and, potentially, the Council will receive formal proposals to consider.
8. At present, the following work streams appear to have the highest potential for taking forward the project: -
 - Solum Regeneration is a 50/50 joint venture between Network Rail and Keir and is Network Rail's preferred development partner for its surplus land and station regeneration in the South East. Solum Regeneration is currently investigating development opportunities at Haywards Heath Railway Station and they are planning to make a further presentation to this Group on their ideas for the site. A scheme here would not involve Council land but would represent a major opportunity for considerable inward investment into the town and help deliver a key aspect of the master plan.
 - The major landowner at Queens Walk, East Grinstead has identified a preferred development partner, Frontier Estates and they have recently entered into an agreement. The investigation of site conditions is currently being organised by Frontier Estates. We can expect to receive a proposal from them over the summer and arrangements will be made for them to attend a meeting of this Group to make a presentation.
 - Towards the end of 2010, the head lease of the Martlets Shopping Centre was acquired by NewRiver. They attended a meeting of this Group on 7th April 2011 and have committed to working with the Council on a major scheme in Burgess Hill Town Centre. Officer meetings are being held with them. Their current thinking involves a comprehensive approach to the town centre, including working with the head leaseholders of the adjoining Market Place shopping centre.
9. In addition to these work streams the Council, working with Haywards Heath Town Council, is leading on a project at Victoria Park, Haywards Heath and there is a report concerning this project elsewhere on the agenda. Working in partnership with

the Town Council and West Sussex County Council, public realm projects are being taken forward in both Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath. This Group will receive reports on this work later in the year. Also, the partnership scheme to provide new public toilets in East Grinstead Town Centre is moving forward and this Group will receive an update later this year.

10. There are areas of the project which have not progressed as quickly as anticipated. This is primarily in Haywards Heath Town Centre at, and around, the Orchards Shopping Centre. The managing agents are actively considering opportunities but have not made sufficient progress that allows them to attend a meeting of this Group. It is recognised the Centre is constrained but it is acknowledged that the town centre would benefit from some larger and more modern retail units, together with improved car parking for visitors. At Burgess Hill and East Grinstead railway stations, the issue for Solum Regeneration appears to be the lack of viable schemes. However, East Grinstead Station will benefit from significant investment later this year when work should start on a new ticket hall, together with changes to the station forecourt. At Burgess Hill Railway Station, the Council does own some adjoining land and this Group may have to consider options for the land later this year if Solum Regeneration is not able to bring forward a scheme.

Policy Context

11. The policy context for the project is set out in the corporate plan 2011/12, the economic development strategy, the Council's planning and asset management policies, together with the principles set out in the adopted master plans for each town centre and the published community requirements. Compliance with these policies should ensure that the individual schemes within the project do deliver the revitalisation of the town centres and sustain/improve key revenue streams for the Council.

Other Options Considered

12. Without the support of the Council as landowner and the promotion of inward economic investment, it is likely that only modest schemes might come forward from the private sector. The Council could revisit its decision not to procure a development partner to lead on the project but such an approach is not only time consuming to put in place, with a potentially expensive procurement process, but it is likely to result in reduced contact with key existing investors in our town centres.

Financial Implications

13. This report contains no financial implications.

Risk Management Implications

14. Cabinet has identified this project as one of the five Strategic Risks for the Council in 2011/12. The Better Mid Sussex Project risk is described in the following terms:-

Risk1 Town Centre Revitalisation Project does not deliver anticipated improvements.

The aim of the Better Mid Sussex Project is to secure significant improvements in our town centres. The risk in 2011/12 is that the private sector is unable to progress the revitalisation of our town centres in accordance with our requirements, adopted

policies and strategies. The result could be the loss of trade to competing centres that could have an adverse impact on the local economy and well-being of our towns.

15. The work of this Group, the input and support from the Town Councils and the response from the private sector is encouraging and indicates that the project should make good progress this year which will ultimately lead to significant improvements in our town centres. The engagement with the private sector has largely been good so far and it is judged that this will continue in 2011/12.
16. The willingness on the part of the Council to allow Council-owned land to be included in potential schemes is a key aspect to securing inward investment and helps to provide confidence to the private sector to commit resources to bring forward schemes. However, it is recognised that at this stage there are a number of hurdles to be overcome, including reaching an agreement with the private sector on specific schemes from a landowner point of view, securing planning permission, land assembly may be an issue in some cases and securing funding.

Other Material Implications

17. The private sector can only come forward with schemes that are viable and where they can gain funding. Schemes in the town centres will need to be carefully designed and phased to ensure each town centre continues to function and supports existing businesses. There may be occasions when public car parking is disrupted or temporary arrangements have to be put in place. Maintaining the momentum built up in the last few months is important and the confidence of the private sector to invest in our towns needs to be retained. This can be achieved by close working with key parties and by continued partnership working with the Town Councils and the involvement of this Group. Other private sector interest is being expressed to invest in our town centres and it is likely that some of this interest will result in the Council being formally approached. These matters would be reported to this Group and, where relevant, the promoters will be requested to attend to make presentations and answer Members' questions.

Background Papers

None

6. VICTORIA PARK, HAYWARDS HEATH

REPORT OF: Head of Leisure and Sustainability
Contact Officer: Jan Lear, Strategic Projects Manager,
Tel: 01444 477299 or email: janl@midsussex.gov.uk
Wards Affected: Ashenground/Heath
Key Decision: No

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider stage 1 evaluation documentation for the provision of new restaurant/café facilities with replacement public toilets ("the new facilities") at Victoria Park, Haywards Heath ("the Park").
- 1.2 Members are asked to agree the addition of item 15 within the design brief in Appendix A and to agree evaluation documentation for the 1st stage of the procurement process, Expressions of Interest (EOI).
- 1.3 Further reports will be presented to members for consideration in due course in accordance with the timetable.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 **The Advisory Group are recommended to:-**
 - a) **Consider and agree to the addition of item 15 to the design brief; and**
 - b) **Consider and agree Part B of the Pre Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) for the 1st stage of the procurement process, EOI; and**
 - c) **To note the next steps of the project.**
-

3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 This site was considered at the Better Mid Sussex Advisory Group (BMSAG) meetings held on 4th November 2010 and 3rd February 2011. At the meeting on 3rd February 2011, members considered proposals for a schedule of requirements for the redevelopment of the public toilets in Victoria Park. The brief had been drafted in consultation with Haywards Heath Town Council (HHTC) and proposed siting the redevelopment in the area of the existing public toilet building.

A key area for debate was the extent of the area and the location to be leased. After some discussion members agreed the following recommendation to Cabinet: -

That the area to be included in the proposed lease should be considered by Cabinet.

- 3.2 Accordingly, at the meeting on 11th April Cabinet resolved that:-
 1. Officers be authorised to advertise and seek EOIs for the design, construction and operation of the proposed facility;
 2. The approximate size and location of the site for the development was approved, (sited within the area of the existing public conveniences and curved path);
 3. The design brief was approved with the revision of items 6 and 10 as follows. Item 6 – reference to the design being of sufficient merit to be considered for a design award should be removed, and item 10 - the removal of the dimensions 28m x10m;
 4. Agreed in principle to the disposal of the land for a ground lease of up to 150 years.

A copy of the design brief is attached as Appendix A. The plan in Appendix B indicates the proposed site location and size.

- 3.3 HHTC has considered the procurement documentation for the provision of a cafe/restaurant in the Park and is comfortable with the documentation provided for the first stage of the process. HHTC wishes that the BMSAG note two issues relating the provision of the cafe/restaurant, which it asks to be considered during the procurement process. These include suitable wording to regulate the kind of food operator invited to bid and that the size/footprint of the cafe/restaurant is carefully considered so as not to be detrimental to the green amenity of the Park. HHTC looks forward to continue its role of being a consultee on this matter throughout the evaluation of the applications.
- 3.4 The design brief in Appendix A has been revised to reflect those items raised in 3.2(3) and 3.3. The amendments apply to items 6 and 10, along with the inclusion of item 15 to address the 'catering offer' to be provided by the café/restaurant operator.

4.0 PROCUREMENT PROCESS

- 4.1 Government Guidance states that where a local authority enters into a contract, that is not a public contract, the procurement rules ought to be applied in some circumstances as if it were and therefore it is advisable that the Council follows the Restricted Procurement Process outlined in the EU Consolidated Procurement Directives in the interests of openness and transparency.
- 4.2 An outline of the procurement process and associated timeline is attached in Appendix C.

It is intended that the procurement process will be a two stage process. The 1st stage will be the Expressions of Interest (EOI) phase, a pre-qualification process of assessing applicants, in order to draw up a select list of Interested Parties, who will be invited to submit Detailed Submissions. Applicants will be required to complete and submit the Pre Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ). Part A of the PQQ covers the interested parties professional and business standing and finance, and is mandatory "pass/fail" questions. They must be eligible to bid in accordance with regulation 23 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006, see paragraph 4.1. They must also be able to demonstrate suitable financial strength and stability. Part B contains optional questions which are scheme specific, and is attached as Appendix D. Interested parties that successfully meet the minimum requirements in Part A will have their responses evaluated against the criteria detailed in Appendix D.

- 4.3 Following the completion of the PQQ process during September 2011, letters and documentation will be sent to those Interested Parties short-listed to submit their detailed proposals. It is proposed that a maximum of 6 applicants progress to the 2nd stage and are invited to submit Detailed Submissions.
- 4.4 To explain the procurement timeline in a little more detail; we would place an advertisement in the national property press, the Estates Gazette, local press and the Council's website. This approach will ensure the Council gets the best response possible from the market. Those organisations registering their interest will be sent a PQQ and an Information Document, which includes the design brief and site plan for the development; the Council's outline strategic objectives and requiring responses to a range of questions.

- 4.5 The submissions and responses to the PQQ are then evaluated and a short list of potential partners that have met the requisite thresholds for financial standing, experience and technical competence (PQQ) are issued with an Invitation to submit a Detailed Submission.

The purpose of this stage of the evaluation process is to test each interested parties' capacity and operating experience together with their economic and financial standing to deliver the scheme, i.e. their ability to design, build and then operate the facility.

4.6 PQQ - Preliminary checks:

The purpose of the PQQ is to provide a series of preliminary checks to establish the credibility and ability of bidders. The format of the PQQ and the information it requires is standard documentation used by the Council for this type of procurement; the templates having been produced jointly by the Council's legal and procurement officers. Questions take the form of pass/fail items, in Part A of the PQQ. Issues covered by Part A preliminary checks include providing evidence to prove their suitability in a number of areas:

- Professional and business standing / organisation identity;
- Financial elements – condition, risk etc;

Applicants will then be assessed against the business and technical criteria, Part B.

- Evidence of contracts and previous experience within the last three years;
- Ability to adhere to and incorporate the design brief in their proposal within the allocated site

This part of the PQQ, Part B the questions are weighted to add up to 100%. The higher weightings of 40% being given to both the experience of the applicant along with their incorporation of the design brief into their proposal, accounting for 80% of the marks. The remaining 20% being split equally between the technical abilities of their staff and the added value of any membership to a trade organisation might bring to the development.

5.0 NEXT STEPS

- 5.1 At the BMSAG meetings Members will be receiving information and update reports, along with details of the evaluation criteria for the EOI and detailed submission stages of the process, and make recommendations about the short list of applicants for the detailed submission stage, and the preferred applicant.

A further paper will be presented to the BMSAG on 30th June 2011 concerning the evaluation and criteria documentation for the 2nd stage, Detailed Submissions.

6.0 POLICY CONTEXT

- 6.1 The adopted Town Centre Master Plan indicates the opportunity for development of the existing public toilets and provides some guidance on the potential of a scheme at this location. The retention of toilets in the park is considered a vital element of any scheme and would be in accordance with the strategy to ensure adequate provision is made in each town centre.

7.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 7.1 The Council could decide not to explore the opportunities to redevelop this site but that would leave it with the issue of how to improve the existing public toilets.

8.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 Other than the costs of advertising for expressions of interest, which can be covered by existing revenue budgets this report contains no financial implications.

9.0 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The risk in 2011/12 is that Town Centre Revitalisation Project does not deliver anticipated improvements.

The aim of the Better Mid Sussex Project is to secure significant improvements in our town centres. The risk in 2011/12 is that the private sector is unable to progress the revitalisation of our town centres in accordance with our requirements, adopted policies and strategies. The result could be the loss of trade to competing centres that could have an adverse impact on the local economy and well-being of our towns.”

- 9.2 The work of this Group, the input and support from the Town Councils and the response from the private sector is encouraging and indicates that the project should make good progress this year which will ultimately lead to significant improvements in our town centres. The revitalisation of the town centres has been affected by the current economic climate. However, the private sector has indicated an interest in this site, and the site does have the capability to achieve inward investment and contribute towards the well-being of the town centre.

- 9.3 The procurement process will address all aspects of the scheme

10.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The Council's Legal Officer confirms that this is not a public contract within the meaning of The Public Contracts Regulations 2006. However, the Council's Legal Officer advises that in the interests of transparency the Council should follow the government guidance mentioned in paragraph 4.1. Subject to identification of a successful bidder it will be necessary for the Council to comply with its legal obligations in relation to the disposal of public open space as set out in the Local Government Act 1972, but such matters are not a material consideration for this report. Save for these there are no other legal implications to this report.

11.0 OTHER MATERIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 There are no other material implications, other than to note that the site is strategically located in the town centre and as such would make a valuable contribution to the enhancement of the town centre.

Background Papers

Better Mid Sussex Advisory Group 4th November 2010 and 3rd February 2011
Cabinet 11th April 2011

APPENDIX A

CAFÉ / RESTAURANT BRIEF - VICTORIA PARK HAYWARD'S HEATH.

The Councils key objectives with regard to the development arrangements are as follows:

1. The provision of a Café/restaurant with days/hours of operation – subject to planning consent & having regard to the Council's licensing policy. Access for delivery of provisions & services being via the gate at the north west corner of the park adjacent to South road,
2. The provision of new freely accessible public toilets with minimum opening hours of between 07:00 to 20:00 April to September and 07:00 to 18:00 at all other times, excluding Christmas day and Boxing day,
3. The public toilets to be fully DDA compliant, managed and operated by the operator of the café/restaurant at their own cost, and should not be duplicated with those used by the café customers so as to minimise the building footprint,
4. The maximum height of building, not to be greater than 2 storey, with the upper floor level entrance at street level from South Rd,
5. Scheme must generate a rental income for the Council. The Council intend for a ground lease not exceeding 150 years with suitably geared rent reviews at regular intervals,
6. The scheme should be an innovative design and it should also complement the street scene,
7. A sustainable building that is fully accessible to all in our community. Energy efficiency and waste management should be an integral part of the design,
8. The inclusion of a public space affording views across the park and towards the South Downs at road level which complements the street scene,
9. The provision of cycle parking,
10. Proposed area of lease land, including the soft landscape encompasses the existing toilets and the curved path as indicated on the site plan,
11. The provision of a community consultation plan,
12. The provision of a lighting and a signage scheme for the building and its approaches,
13. A hard and soft landscaping scheme for the leased area and surrounding areas, including the re-provision of any existing pathways and pedestrian access routes,
14. The provision of temporary publicly accessible toilets throughout the construction period.
15. With regards to the catering business that will be operated from the café/restaurant the Council are seeking a flexible catering service which meets a number of target markets and which makes a positive contribution to the ambience of the park setting. Please indicate the type of service options available within your provision which could include waiter / self-service / take away options; menu range, which could include hot and cold meals, snacks, coffee/tea shop, licensed service. Please also supply your policy regarding use of locally sourced produce, fair trade products and healthy eating options.

APPENDIX B

SITE PLAN OF VICTORIA PARK

See Page 21

APPENDIX C

PROCUREMENT PROCESS AND TIMELINE

VICTORIA PARK DEVELOPMENT – provision and operation of café/restaurant facilities with replacement public conveniences	Estimated Start/ Completion Date	
	BMSAG - report re stage 1 evaluation criteria	2 June 2011
Place Advert & invite Expressions of Interest (EOI)	3 June	
Advert published in the Estates Gazette	11 June	7 July
Report to BMSAG re stage 2 evaluation criteria	30 June	
Close re EOI	7 July	
Evaluation of EOI & report produced for BMSAG re shortlist of applicants to be invited to submit detailed submissions	8 July	22 September
Report to BMSAG re stage 2 shortlist	22 September	
Applicants Invitation to submit detailed submissions	23 September	4 November
Close date for receipt of detailed submissions	4 November	
Submission evaluation commences	4 November	2 December
Presentations by interested parties	Mid November	
Detailed Submission evaluation completed	2 December	
Produce report re detailed submission evaluation	2 December	12 January 2012
Report to BMSAG re submission evaluation	12 January 2012	
Report to Cabinet	6 February 2012	
End of 15 day standstill and call in period	22 nd February	
Contract exchange	From 23 rd February 2012	

APPENDIX D

PRE QUALIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE – PART B

PART B

The following questions will be assessed using a weighting score for each question. Your response to each question must be no more than 4 sides of A4 using font: Ariel 11. Information that is included over and above 4 sides of A4 will not be considered as part of your answer. Please ensure you insert the question number at the top of each page of your response. With regards to the response to Q5.4 there should be a response to all of the 15 items of the brief within the 4 sides of A4 and in addition a brief outline diagram of the proposal can be attached.

5	BUSINESS & TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES_[rnd1]	
5.1	Are you or your business a member of any trade body or professional association relevant to the requirements outlined in the brief? If Yes please attach further details	Weighting 10%
5.2	Please attach details of you or your business's experience in providing similar works and services to those required in the brief. In particular please provide a list of similar works and services carried out over the past 3 years. For the most important of those projects please also provide evidence of:- <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the value of the works/services;• when and where the work/services were carried out;• that the works were carried out according to the rules of a trade or profession and properly completed.	40%
5.3	Please provide details of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• your business's technical staff and facilities;• the measures in place for ensuring quality;	10%
5.4	Please provide details of how your proposal will address and incorporate the brief. Please refer to section 3 parts 1-15 in the Information Document. (Note – the brief is Appendix A to this report)	40%

WCs

7. BETTER MID SUSSEX PROJECT – CONSIDERATION OF WORK PROGRAMME

REPORT OF: Tim Barkley, Better Mid Sussex Planning Leader
Email: Timb@midsussex.gov.uk Tel: 01444 477336
Wards Affected: All
Key Decision No

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is for the Advisory Group to agree its work programme for the Council year.

Summary

2. A draft work programme has been prepared for the Group to consider and it can be found at Appendix 1 to this report. It has been prepared based on the work of the Group in 2010/11, the work streams that have emerged in that period, the objectives of the project and the need to manage the strategic risk. In part, the programme is dependent on the continued support parties being prepared to attend meetings of this Group. The programme is flexible and may change if other issues/opportunities arise.

Recommendations

3. **The Advisory Group is recommended to agree its work programme for the Council year.**
-

Background

4. The background to the proposed work programme is set out in the first report on this agenda.
5. Members are reminded that the Corporate Plan for 2011/12 refers to a number of work streams which will be progressed during the year. These are listed below: -
 - Environmental Enhancements in Haywards Heath and Burgess Hill town centre;
 - Victoria Park, Haywards Heath;
 - Queens Walk, East Grinstead;
 - Haywards Heath Town Centre;
 - Burgess Hill Town Centre; and
 - Joint Working with Solum Regeneration
6. The BMS project has been identified as a strategic risk for 2011/12 with the risk described as “Risk 1 - town centre revitalisation project does not deliver anticipated improvements”. Part of the management of this risk is the role and work of this group including its engagement with interest parties and providing advice to Cabinet as necessary.

7. The Better Mid Sussex Advisory Group, in its role of overseeing the project and providing advice to Cabinet on the matters in their remit and can set its own work programme. To assist with this process, attached at Appendix 1 is a suggested programme of activity for the year. The Group may review the work programme during the year and add additional matters or, if it wishes, remove items as it considers appropriate. In the case of this project, it is highly likely the programme will need to be flexible as well as working closely with the Member Property Working Group on occasions.
8. The work of the Group is covered in the Constitution under the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules. Members and the Group as a whole, have rights as set out in those rules concerning access to information and requesting the attendance of Members and officers at meetings. The Group may also invite persons from outside the Council to attend and to give information / advice to assist their deliberations.
9. It is suggested that the working style developed by the Group should continue - that is the use of a workshop style, rather than the traditional committee format. This allows greater Member interaction and consideration of ideas and alternatives and this is considered very suitable for the work of this Group. Each agenda item will be supported by a paper and, where relevant, a presentation.

Provisional Work Programme

10. The suggested programme has been developed with a view to taking forward the work already started by the Group and reflects the work of Portfolio Holder and the private sector engagement that your officers have undertaken over the last year. Members are requested to consider the items on the programme and agree whether they would wish these items to be considered by the Group and whether there are any other matters that should be addressed. Where additional items are contemplated, Members should consider whether the Group is able to make a positive contribution to the BMS project and how the matter would be taken forward after the Group's deliberations. Members will also wish to ensure that meetings are well balanced, and its agendas not overcrowded or too light.

Policy Context

11. The policy context for the project is set out in the corporate plan 2011/12, the economic development strategy, the Council's planning and asset management policies, together with the principles set out in the adopted master plans for each town centre and the published community requirements. Compliance with these policies should ensure that the individual schemes within the project do deliver the revitalisation of the town centres and sustain/improve key revenue streams for the Council.

Financial Implications

12. This report contains no financial implications.

Risk Management Implications

13. Cabinet has identified this project as one of the five Strategic Risks for the Council in 2011/12. The Better Mid Sussex Project risk is described in the following terms:-

“Risk1 Town Centre Revitalisation Project does not deliver anticipated improvements”

The work of this Group, the input and support from the Town Councils and the response from the private sector is encouraging and indicates that the project should

make good progress this year which will ultimately lead to significant improvements in our town centres. The engagement with the private sector has largely been good so far and it is judged that this will continue in 2011/12.

Other Material Implications

14. No other material implications have been identified as arising from this report.

Background Papers.

None.

Draft Work Programme - Better Mid Sussex Advisory Group June 2011-May 2012

Date of Meeting	Item	Purpose
2 nd June 2011	<p>Role of the Group and Review of projects and the current strategy</p> <p>To consider work programme</p> <p>Victoria Park, Haywards Heath</p>	<p>To provide an update for members on the work streams within the project and explain the strategy</p> <p>To agree the proposed work programme</p> <p>To consider the Stage 1 evaluation documentation and an addition to the design brief.</p>
30 th June 2011	Victoria Park, Haywards Heath	The evaluation and criteria documentation for the 2 nd stage detailed submissions
28 th July 2011	<p>Haywards Heath Town Centre</p> <p>Solum Regeneration – Haywards Heath Railway Station</p> <p>Queens Walk, East Grinstead</p> <p>Burgess Hill Town Centre</p>	<p>To consider development opportunities and revisions to the Landowner Brief</p> <p>To provide Members with an update following the presentation given to Members by Solum Regeneration on 3rd February 2011</p> <p>To review the project and make recommendations to Cabinet</p> <p>To review the project and make recommendations to Cabinet.</p>

Meeting Date	Item	Purpose
22 nd September 2011	Environmental Enhancements, Haywards Heath Town Centre	To update members on the progress of the project
	Victoria Park, Haywards Heath	To receive the tender shortlist for consideration
	Queen Elizabeth Avenue, Burgess Hill	To report back to members on the progress of the project
	East Grinstead Toilets	To receive an update on the progress of this project.
20 th October 2011	Sadlers Yard, East Grinstead	To receive an update concerning the site.
17 th November 2011		
15 th December 2011		
12 th January 2012	Better Mid Sussex Annual Report	To present to Members the Annual report for consideration.
	Victoria Park, Haywards Heath	To consider tender evaluation and make recommendations to Cabinet
9 th February 2012		
8 th March 2012		
5 th April 2012		
3 rd May 2012		