Brighton and Hove Food Strategy Refresh (2024) Research and Evidence Review

Thursday March 7ᵗʰ, 9.00-14.00
Attenborough Centre for Creative Arts, University of Sussex

Executive Summary

The Brighton & Hove Food Partnership are refreshing the city food strategy in 2024 and identified a need to build on existing evidence in order to adapt and improve the current approach. On March 7ᵗʰ, 2024, the University of Sussex Business School hosted a "research and evidence review" involving 36 researchers from different departments at Sussex, Brighton, Birkbeck, and Kingston Universities and the Institute for Development Studies, as well as representatives of Brighton & Hove Food Partnership, Brighton & Hove City Council, Food Matters and Fareshare Sussex & Surrey.

Participants heard from researchers whose work engaged with all eight aims of the 2018-2023 food strategy. The greatest levels of interest among participants was shown in food poverty, and access to healthy food, and embedding healthy, sustainable, fair food in policy and planning. Various broad themes were identified across tables, including the following:
- Reforming food banks to enhance equitable access and reduce stigma
- Create more community growing opportunities
- Scaling up impact through procurement and change in anchor institutions (e.g. hospitals, schools, universities)

These open space discussions yielded initial "brainstorm" suggestions – these should be fed into longer discussions, engaging with relevant practitioners to provide more detailed and evidence-based recommendations, as the process to refresh the food strategy continues. More consultations are already planned with schools, citizens' UK, and some of the city's projects related to food insecurity.

More generally, the review identified a need for improved information exchange (between research and policy). This would be aided by more regular research-policy discussions focussing on more targeted areas. Two people volunteered to help with future events.

Background

The Brighton and Hove Food Strategy has seen three versions, each based on multi-stakeholder consultations through to 2006, 2012 and 2018. With the end of the current plan ([2018-2023](#)), the Brighton & Hove Food Partnership are refreshing the strategy once again in a process lasting through 2024. The first meeting of the expert panel advising this process on 7th December 2023 called for a review of relevant research that has taken place in the city, to inform the ongoing refresh. As a member of the panel, Dr Adrian Ely of the University of Sussex Business School was asked to find ways to bring the huge amount of relevant research that has taken place at Sussex, IDS (as well as Brighton and other) Universities into the food strategy process. A half-day, in-person event was organised with support from the University of Sussex Business School and in collaboration with Ali Ghanimi of the Brighton and Hove Food Partnership on 17th March 2024.

Objectives of the Review

The event was meant to showcase relevant research from different departments at the University of Sussex, University of Brighton, Birkbeck, University of London, Kingston University and the Institute for Development Studies. The objective was to provide an opportunity for the researcher and stakeholder networks to share insights as they related to the food strategy, and to discuss future possibilities for engaged, transdisciplinary research.

The Expert Panel advising this process have agreed that the refreshed strategy should have fewer, higher-level level actions going forward, focusing effort and resources on priority areas. With this in mind, the event aimed to consider whether existing activities under [the 2018-2023 food strategy](#) should:
- **Stop** (identify which activities from the 2018-2023 strategy are no longer a priority)
- **Start** (which new activities and priorities need to be included in this refresh)
- **Continue** (which activities in the current food strategy should carry on, and how can they be adjusted so they are more effective?)

The day was divided into two parts – the first in which research and evidence was presented through "speed talks" (max 10 minutes each), with time for questions and answers, and the second in which participants were invited to draw on this evidence, and their experience, to brainstorm recommendations for the food strategy refresh.

Agenda

9.30 – 9.45: Introduction and welcome (Adrian Ely and Ali Ghanimi)
9.45-11.45: Part 1: Speed talks (max 10 minutes each)
11.45-12.00: Coffee/Tea Break
12.00-13.00: Part 2: Open space & plenary discussion
13.00-14.00: Lunch

Part 1 - Research "Speed Talks"

The following colleagues presented their work, building on transdisciplinary partnerships across different university departments and the wider community. Powerpoint presentations (where available) were made available to participants.

- Bonnie Holligan (School of Law, Politics and Sociology, University of Sussex) – How property relations shape experiences and transformative potential of urban growing spaces: connecting land, food and Earth justice perspectives.
- Chris Sandom (School of Life Sciences, University of Sussex) - South Coast Sustainability
- Beth Nicholls (School of Life Sciences, University of Sussex) & Leah Salm (Institute of Development Studies) - Biodiversity, Pollinators and Urban Farming
- Izabela Delabre (Birkbeck University) - Visualising and assessing multiple values of landscapes for the democratisation of land use and integrated sustainable development planning
- Ronald Ranta (Kingston University) - Dignity principles and Alternative Food Support
- Tilly Paz (Brighton & Sussex Medical School) - Poverty Proofing the School Day, the Food Perspective
- Lidia Cabral and Santiago Ripoll (Institute of Development Studies) - Building Back Better from Below
- Katerina Psarikidou (University of Sussex Business School) & Shelley Taylor (Brighton and Hove Food Partnership) – Policies for Transforming Brighton and Hove's Food System: Insights from the local community
- Nick Nisbett, Leah Salm (Institute of Development Studies) - Whole system approach to healthy eating

Part 2 – Open Space Discussions

Discussions took the form of an "open space" and were organised around the 8 aims of the 2018-2023 food strategy:

Aim 1: Champion healthy and sustainable food
Aim 2: Take a preventative 'upstream' approach to food poverty and ensure equal access to healthy food
Aim 3: Nourish a vibrant, diverse and skilled community food sector
Aim 4: Improve sustainability and security in urban, rural and marine food production
Aim 5: Encourage a vibrant and sustainable food economy
Aim 6: Transform catering and food procurement
Aim 7: Become a 'food use' not a 'food waste' city
Aim 8: Ensure healthy, sustainable, fair food is embedded in policy and planning, and has a high profile right across the city

Each of these was discussed at separate tables, with participants free to move between them and contribute their thoughts. Volunteers from the University of Sussex and the Brighton and Hove Food Partnership took responsibility for making notes on discussions at each table, and participants were asked to make recommendations on the basis of the "stop/ start/ continue" format:

- Stop (identify which activities from the 2018-2023 strategy are no longer a priority)
- Start (which new activities and priorities need to be included in this refresh)
- Continue (which activities in the current food strategy should carry on, and how can they be adjusted so they are more effective?)

The reports from each of the eight tables are presented below. More general points emerging from the plenary discussion are included afterwards.

Aim 1: Champion healthy and sustainable food
(11 of 43 participants who registered said their project related to this aim)

No "Stop" actions were noted.

Start
- It is important to embed the agenda (1.8 – Deliver a citywide SugarSmart campaign) across different areas, for example workplaces (canteens), schools. Do planning rules empower local areas to develop this? At the moment this requires national planning. It would be important to provide more ability to make decisions at city level.
- Expand city "healthy weight" programme.
- We need more diversity of food in the food banks - this means for example more land to grow different types of food and vegetables.
- We should learn from the "Peas Please" programme and its evaluation, for example what happens in "school meal dynamics" (i.e. how to make sure kids can eat school meal without stigma, what might trigger them to eat healthier foods.) How to improve availability of these programmes to schools that may not have much space? How can we better utilize untapped school space for food?
- Engage with supermarkets (e.g. Lidl). This can look at packaging, waste, poverty. Sometimes this works well with managers, but it also depends on the structure of supermarkets especially where there is a high incidence of obesity and diabetes. Would be good to target local supermarkets in these areas.

Continue
- 1.8 (SugarSmart): Problem of advertising junk food and use of billboards for fast food joints in bus stops near schools, engaging with planning and business and their advertising - needs a city-wide approach.
- Continue with Peas Please - get more people involved in growing.
- 1.7 (Co-ordinated weight management service) Weight management important.

- 1.10 (access to free tap water): Ramp up beyond Brighton and Hove – was part of national scheme, but the National Refill campaign were trying to charge for using their brand.
- The Health and well-being survey should be used and expanded
- Preventative approach malnutrition – expand urban farms
- More capacity – care homes – dedicated capacity

Aim 2: Take a preventative 'upstream' approach to food poverty and ensure equal access to healthy food
(14 of 43 participants who registered said their project related to this aim)

Stop
- It is hard to say what might need to be stopped, as we have no data about successes or current needs. Maybe some things require a research approach to check if the target has been achieved or is unnecessary due to lack of need or other priorities.
- Consider the ways we use referrals for food banks. Consider abolishing them, or at least making them equal and using the same standards.
- Emergency response shouldn't rely on the third sector. It creates inequalities in provision across the city and different groups.
- Practices that deter some communities from using food banks (requires identifying first!), such as not having culturally appropriate food, or things that create a sense of exclusion for BAME communities, for example.

Start
- Using the Hub approach, taken by some food banks, and extending it to other parts of the city. Providing not just food but also advice, a community centre and other services. Hubs will also link well with other aims of the strategy.
- Better links between the excess food and those who need it, placing standard and more equality.
- Embedding dignity in all food projects.
- Finding ways to reach out to those who do not qualify for support, but are in need.

Continue/Upscale
- Using examples from University of Sussex, discussing with caterers elsewhere the provision of low cost meals (one on the menu). Low cost could be simply the cost, with no profit.
- Expand the regulation around nurseries so private providers are regulated in the same way as the council's ones. Consider the amount of sugary food provided to very young children in nurseries, in a way that creates vicious cycles that lasts throughout adulthood.

More general points
- We suggest that if most targets stay and others are added, prioritising will take place based on assessed needs, with each aim focusing on the first three, taking account of resources and aligning with bigger picture elements (policies, government's' plans etc).
- As for Food Poverty – is it the right way of framing it? It's minimalistic and might be focused on a minimalistic provision that sees calories and not necessarily nutrients. Wesuggest considering a shift to the Right to Food, and thinking of the right as being for sustainable, good, diverse, high quality diet/food.
- We sense that the city is divided to those who are aware and active and can afford sustainable methods/food, and those can't prioritise that.

Aim 3: Nourish a vibrant, diverse, and skilled community food sector
(9 of 43 participants who registered said their project related to this aim)

Stop:
- Interventions for food distribution/ access should not be designed in ways that 'target' particular groups in isolating and stigmatising ways. Instead, the emphasis should be on spaces for integration that enables people from diverse backgrounds and needs to come together in community hubs.
- There is perhaps a need for a clearer articulation of distinctiveness between some of the aims and the assumptions that shape them, as well as the linkages between them. For instance, the group discussed whether the focus on 'community food sector' in Aim 3 implies voluntary work and strengthening social interactions, versus Aim 5 which focuses on 'food economy' is meant to emphasises businesses. And, how interventions around skills and skilling might differ/ can be aligned across them.

Start:
- While creating a skilled sector is mentioned as part of the aim, the 'skilling' aspect could be strengthened explicitly in some of the sub-aims. For instance, support for food growing skills; managing, cultivating allotments for those who are new to food growing; trainings and facilitating exchanges around growing diverse types of food in sustainable ways including managing pests, composting in individual and community gardens as well as allotments.
- One specific issue that was highlighted in relation to facilitating diverse community food sector was the importance of connecting with University students, including international students who are a significant part of Brighton and Hove neighbourhoods, enhancing their role in facilitating diverse community food hubs (cooking/ volunteering), and also access to affordable/ nutritious food. This led to a broader discussion on forums and places for connecting varied existing community groups/ NGOs/ university, schools and other community institutions which can be challenging to sustain.
- The community hubs approach – integrated cooking and eating spaces that are open to all to enable destigmatised access can promote such community building, particularly creating welcoming spaces for new and transient residents such as asylum seekers/

students. Periodic community events can be used to draw attention to specific cuisines and/or promote diverse as well as local foods, and communal eating.

Continue:
- Efforts around advancing cooking skills through schools and for adults through community venues (3.1 "be the city that cooks") is a key intervention. It could include trainings for batch cooking meals; cooking nourishing/ healthy meals with limited/ affordable ingredients; for people with different dietary needs. Time and knowledge sharing around cooking could be encouraged in community hubs.
- The group discussed the reliance on volunteering and unpaid work in the community food sector and perhaps the need for greater paid opportunities and whether council and local grants (3.5 – "champion community food projects") could contribute to that. Paid work roles would be particularly important for building sustainable networks with consistency over a longer time frame, necessary for co-ordinating activities and exchanges across institutions, organisations to implement a 'whole-systems' approach.

Aim 4: Improve sustainability and security in urban, rural and marine food production
(11 of 43 participants who registered said their project related to this aim)

Stop:
Initially, our group found hard to identify areas of the strategy that may need to stop. They highlighted the significance of the work done and the need to carry on doing or further enrich it. However, as discussions revolved, there were particular elements or aspects in Brighton and Hove's food production that the revised strategy could help stop.
- First, in relation to the current strategy's 4.3 ("encourage urban food production"), the group underlined the need to stop allowing the use of herbicide/pesticide use in allotments (see also proposals in the 'start' section).
- Second, in relation to the strategy's 4.4 ("deliver enjoyable, inclusive, sustainable and affordable allotments"), the group also proposed to stop the existing individual-based model of allotment allocations, and move towards a more community-based and inclusive food growing model, rather than a model of individual allotments.
- Third, the group underlined the need to stop gating food growing areas (i.e. Stanmer Park), a point also linked to proposals connected to the overall aim of adding equity in aim 4, as something that is currently missing (see also below in 'start' section).

Start
Overall, the group found that equity needs to be more clearly embedded in this specific aim of the strategy. The group identified a number of parameters which could directly or indirectly help towards that as well as enrich the existing strategy.
- First, revising the criteria for allotment holding was one key aspect that participants suggested would be key for enabling more equitable access to allotments. For example, participants suggested those lacking of private land (e.g. in the form of house garden) would be one of the priority criteria.

- Second, in relation to 4.5 ("establish Stanmer Park as a beacon of good practice, inspiration and education on sustainable food production"), participants proposed start embedding high-traffic areas in Brighton and Hove in the allotments planning. They gave Old Steine as an example.
- Third, accountability of new developers for growing space has also been mentioned as a key parameter that could be added to the strategy, also in line with the national Right to Grow movement. Thus, in relation to 4.3 ("encourage urban food production"), participants suggested to enquire the ways commitment to food growing is associated with new developments – for example housing developments. As part of this, they also proposed to consider and build on synergies with the Right to Grow movement.
- In relation to the strategy's 4.8 clause ("encourage good connections between urban residents and businesses and Sussex-wide farmers and producers"), participants underlined the need for more support for the promotion of benefits of local food – e.g. for restaurants.
- Linking this to the strategy's 4.6 "include food security in the citywide resilience planning, in planning for climate change and in crisis planning e.g. for a flu epidemic, flooding, drought and other extreme weather"), the participants proposed including food processing in the strategy's climate changing planning.
- Funding training to support the uptake of agro-ecological practices (e.g. by schools, farmers as well as citizens) and connecting those to existing initiatives has also been identified as key.
- Finally, in relation to 4.6 ("include food security in the citywide resilience planning, in planning for climate change and in crisis planning e.g. for a flu epidemic, flooding, drought and other extreme weather"), climate proofing for food production was another recommended area for further development. Participants recommended the need of a tool that would help balance nutrient/production productivity per square meter – in other words, a tool that would help identify the best drought resistant crops with the highest nutritional value.

Continue

Participants have found that a lot of existing work needs to carry on being done! Specific areas that were highlighted included:
- 4.2 ("develop a whole estate plan"): Improve communication of the outcomes of the consultation process
- Carry on working on sub-aims 4.3 ("encourage urban food production") & 4.4 ("deliver enjoyable, inclusive, sustainable and affordable allotments", also by considering existing communities' access and inequality in access (please also points above on 'equity').
- 4.8 ("encourage good connections between urban residents and businesses and Sussex-wide farmers and producers"): Continue connecting urban residents and businesses with farmers and producers – and build in the examples and ways covid has enhanced that in areas across Brighton and Hove.

Aim 5: Encourage a vibrant and sustainable food economy
(9 of 43 participants who registered said their project related to this aim)

Discussion summary
Generally, all participants agreed that B&H has a vibrant independent food sector (5.3 "foster a vibrant independent food sector"), i.e. a wide choices of restaurants, farmers'/community markets, speciality and ethnic groceries, and events/festivals.

No "Stop" actions were noted.

Start:
- There are many more exciting initiatives in the area, and having a 'food trail' platform/directory could help showcase them better.
- The lack of local food processing capacity was raised, such as small-scale abattoirs, but LC reminded that during the pandemic, opportunities and resources were aligned to prop up local 'food factories' (albeit temporarily).

Continue:
- Farmers markets cater largely for upper-middle class consumers and do not necessarily offer an ethnically diverse range of products. These markets (one example given was Florence Road Market) are effectively being subsidised by those who can afford to pay a 'premium' price and the volunteers who help run at reduced operational costs. We questioned and discussed the viability of these business models. We concluded that sustainability concerns might be important for these businesses, but their priority is still financial viability and survival, which means these businesses may not be able to hold their sustainability standards consistently (for example, 5.5 "put good food at the heart of the city's tourism offer"). Committing to a living wage and fair working conditions). Can the City initiate farmers' or food markets that are suitable and affordable to deprived communities and areas?
- A community-supported agriculture (CSA) food box example was discussed. Participants emphasised the importance of including recipes (how to cook the featured ingredients), and cooking training through community kitchen demonstrations and eating together to build social networks and solidarity.
- Engage with supermarkets (and restaurants) – although difficulties were recognised, participations suggested that these groups should take local procurement seriously, but this means embracing seasonality, too. This implies a change in consumers' perceptions and attitudes of fresh out-of-season products, which may be hard to change and compete against during winter (unless we consider local green/glasshouse production and the energy that is used to grow them). The group highlighted examples in Canada and the USA, where some big supermarkets would feature a section of their aisles with fresh local produce (e.g., within X miles).

Aim 6: Transform catering and food procurement
(8 of 43 participants who registered said their project related to this aim)

We firstly acknowledged that more effort needs to be put in to pushing the large caterers / anchor institutions (e.g. hospitals, schools, universities) as they have significant buying power and can help to transform food systems for the better. We know, for example, that a lot of what ends up on the school plate ends up in the bin and the nutritional content of secondary school meals, hospital food is poor.

We acknowledged that barriers to change include privatisation/outsourcing of catering to large profit-driven companies where supply chains are long and lack transparency. Breaking into the public sector supply chain to improve the quality and sustainability of ingredients, therefore, can be very difficult.

The policy levers include the price of a meal, the school meal standards and the power and influence of consumers and school meal commissioners. We know from the success of Sugar Smart, for example, that it's possible to change practise with a clear, well targeted campaign the whole city can get behind.

Stop
- Trying to do it all. Focus on one or two things and put energy into them citywide to make a bigger, measurable impact. For example, getting all caterers to reduce meat by 30% or halving their food & packaging waste. This needs to be evidence-led. Where can we make most difference and get the city behind us?
- Stigmatising people through tech solutions – e.g. school meal money system as highlighted in the research into poverty proofing the school day.

Start
- Learning from research and evidence on better food procurement.
- Taking a more regional approach to procurement (better scale for buying more local and sustainable food)
- Community-centred knowledge building (better intelligence)
- Organising focus groups to understand what people aspire to (care homes, hospitals, nurseries, schools, universities, work place catering etc.)
- Creating/ co-design a healthy, affordable and sustainable meal at cost in work places, schools, universities etc. (Could be something simple like a chick pea curry, but would mean people on very low incomes can get a decent meal while also focussing on health and sustainability).
- Training city caterers (for example in the BHFP Community Kitchen) to make small but powerful changes.
- Exploring synergies and trade-offs around food system policies (City University are looking into this)

Continue
- Learning from what works elsewhere (national and international). Elaine Swan (University of Sussex Business School), for example, has looked at school food in lots of countries. What can that research tell us?
- Healthy Choice Awards (Council runs this)
- Showcasing good/best practice to show what's possible and inspire / influence others
- Promoting activism among consumers to change catering practices, e.g. BiteBack, Sugar Smart (national), School Food Waste Audits (local)

Aim 7: Become a 'food use' not a 'food waste' city
(8 of 43 participants who registered said their project related to this aim)

Summary
The discussion moved between systematic/preventive measures, and business/individual targeted intervention approaches to becoming a food use city. There was a focus on supporting businesses and individuals to grow fresh veg, and ideas of how to reduce waste at household and restaurant level.

Stop
- Supermarkets pushing overconsumption - was suggested as one reason why food waste occurs in the city. While direct solutions weren't voiced – encouraging smaller retailers was linked to this (see below)

Start
- Collecting food waste – build on the upcoming government initiative likely to start in 2025 – weekly food collection will be needed.
- Supporting small pop-up businesses e.g. affordable veggie vans. The lack of local shops selling fresh veg means that people tend to buy in bulk in a weekly shop, leading to things going off. Supporting pop up vans and other business was suggested as an idea to mitigate this.
- Support businesses like Ashurst Organics financially - local food growing business are at risk of closing due to rising costs and completion– these types of business offer more than high quality local food and the need to re-orientate farming subsidies to support these small veg growers was suggested.
- Fridge efficiency awareness - poorly working fridge's at incorrect temperatures can increase food waste. A campaign could raise awareness for those that can afford to switch/repair their fridges, and affordable food schemes could (funding allowing) help those that can't afford to switch with repairs/replacements.
- Consider joining the Plantbased Treaty (to reduce waste of high emission food like meat). The difficulties with attitudes and practicalities around this topic was discussed. A solution could be to take and implement elements from the treaty (e.g one entirely plant- based meal a week in schools).

- Restaurants/takeaways – as there are some many in Brighton and Hove. 'How much are they wasting'? plate waste could be tackled by offering different portion sizes. Could there be a zero waste restaurant treaty?

Continue:
- Voice ongoing concerns to council (e.g. lack of food waste collection). Bring residents' voices to the table.
- Very localised excess food sharing between residents - working towards changing attitudes around small food sharing to 'make it less weird'. It also needs to be simple, as people are busy. How about a 'veg bench' where can drop off unwanted bits?
- Champion home composting and other solutions (e.g. wormeries where space is limited)
- Encourage food growing (increases value and more thought about use). Using front and back gardens so that people can harvest as needed.
- Supporting/promoting organisations like the gleaning network and Real Junk Food Project Brighton

Aim 8: Ensure healthy, sustainable, fair food is embedded in policy and planning, and has a high profile right across the city
(16 of 43 participants who registered said their project related to this aim)

Much of the discussion related to the interaction between research/ intelligence and policy. Most of those present worked in the public health domain, although some points were made about food growing.

The group found it difficult to identify actions that should be de-prioritised in the 2024-28 Food Strategy Refresh.

Start:
- Overall, the food strategy should prioritise opportunities for greater information exchange and policy learning, both between research and policy organisations but also across local authorities in the Greater Brighton region.
- Connecting different areas of activity was seen as a priority (an example was given of Public Health England "open" meetings during the pandemic, which enabled broad discussion around shared goals).
- Integrating (public) health was seen as important, with a recommendation to involve NHS Sussex as a partner in the Food Strategy.
- The Council needs to improve information collection, collation and exchange (e.g. Sussex ICS Insight Bank). There are opportunities to move towards crowdsourcing knowledge, involving citizen engagement and citizen science inputs.
- Where possible, it would be useful to influence funders such as NIHR, so that they provide more flexible types of support.

Continue
- Improved information exchange (between research and policy), for example in JSNA (Joint Strategic Needs Assessment) and in-depth needs assessments. These could include "whole systems" principles.
- Research and intelligence needs to feature more clearly, and capabilities be strengthened in the Council.
- Policy needs to build on the innovative work of the Downland Estate Plan, initiated during the past (2018-23) food strategy.
- Public health thinking could link better to broader (currently neglected) areas, for example food growing.

General Findings across all aims and ways forward (discussed in plenary)

The open space discussions were constrained in time, and only yielded initial suggestions/ brainstormed ideas. These need to feed into longer discussions, engaging with relevant practitioners to provide more detailed and evidence-based recommendations. Whilst it was beneficial to bring together a broad, transdisciplinary group in this instance, it will be necessary to target a core set of aims and to focus discussions more narrowly, as the process to refresh the food strategy continues. Themes such as abolishing/reforming food banks (to enhance equitable access and reduce stigma), creating more community growing possibilities, and scaling up impact through procurement and change in anchor institutions (e.g. hospitals, schools, universities) need to involve the most relevant policy, private and third sector stakeholders. More consultations are already planned with schools, citizens' UK, and some of the city's projects related to food insecurity.

At a number of tables and in discussion, participants suggested that improved information exchange (between research and policy) and real-time monitoring and evaluation could bring improvements across the strategy. Rather than one-off events, one suggestion was to hold more regular research-policy discussions on more specific targets (e.g. food waste, healthy food in schools) on an ongoing basis. Such events could be held under the auspices of the Brighton and Sussex Universities Food Network, or independently. Two people volunteered to help with future events. Other ongoing research activities could also support the continuation of these exchanges, and thus the formulation and implementation of the strategy. These include the [Sussex Sustainability Research Programme](#)/ [South Coast Sustainability](#), [FoodSEqual](#), [Building Back Better from Below](#) and others.