

East Norwich Regeneration - Delivery Board Meeting - MINUTES

9 January 2023, 14.00 – 15.30

Members:

Chair: Cllr Mike Stonard (MS) – Norwich City Council

Graham Nelson (GN) – Executive Director, Development & City Services, Norwich City Council
Stephen Evans (SE) – Chief Executive, Norwich City Council
Cllr. Martin Wilby (MW) – Cabinet Member Highways, Transport and Infrastructure, Norfolk County Council
Carolyn Reid (CR) – Assistant Director, Growth & Economic Development
Fionnuala Lennon (FL) – Area Manager, Homes England
Cally Smith (CS) – Head of Planning, Broads Authority
Phil Courtier (PC) – Director of Place, Broadland & South Norfolk Council
Ellen Goodwin (EG) – Infrastructure Manager, New Anglia LEP

Officers:

Sarah Ashurst (SA) – Head of Planning & Regulatory Services, Norwich City Council
Judith Davison (JD) – Planning Policy Lead, Norwich City Council
Ian Charie (IC) – East Norwich Regeneration, Interim Project Manager, Norwich City Council
Carlton Roberts-James (CR-J) – Senior Manager, Homes England
Matt Tracey (MT) – Growth & Infrastructure Manager, Norfolk County Council

Attendee:

James Lineham – Avison Young, Project Manager

Minutes

Item	Topic	Actions
1	Welcome/Apologies Apologies: Cllr Wilby, Ellen Goodwin	
2	Minutes of 9 November 2022 East Norwich Delivery Board and matters arising Minutes accepted as an accurate record of the meeting. Matters arising: GN confirmed that a Briefing Presentation and invite for further briefing had been sent to the 3 Norwich MPs before Christmas.	
3	Review of ToR The amended ToR wording, without change to substantive content, which was circulated with the Agenda, was approved as a clearer expression of the remit for the Board. The TOR will now be published on the East Norwich web pages. In response to the Organisational Chart, there was no dissention re the relationships within the Chart, and FL raised whether there should be a key for the different elements within the Chart. IC responded that such a Chart was perhaps failing if a key was needed, so undertook to rationalise the Chart. A revised Organisational Chart was presented to Board.	IC
4	Project Update – including Workstream Programme IC gave a project update with accompanying slides based on 2 headings: Key Updates since last meeting, and the Workstream Programme.	

	<p>Key Updates:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stage 3 Delivery Study Homes England will give a fuller update later in the meeting; noted that the Study is at the midway point, there has been a focus so far on the Financial Model, and that other Workstreams/Outputs need to be accelerated FL advised that Consultant Presentation would be given at 13 March Board not 16 February 2. GNLP Further hearings on 22 March reviewing Housing Trajectories and Nutrient Neutrality, though this does not involve evidence being submitted re East Norwich 3. Carrow Works Planning Application Progress towards validation awaited, Programme requested from Fuel, but not received. Concern about length of time has been expressed <p>PC raised several points related to Risk, noting that there are some big risks still recorded, and that it may be prudent to consider the range of possible project outcome scenarios.</p> <p>GN advised that work was taking place to mitigate where possible, including wide-ranging dialogue with all parties, eg Network Rail, GNIDB and landowners.</p> <p>IC thanked PC for raising these wider, strategic aspects.</p> <p>The Chair echoed the concerns re delays in further information being submitted with respect to the Carrow Works application and that this should be further followed up, including with the landowner.</p> <p>MT also stated concerns re Transport information not coming forward re Carrow Works. He confirmed that liaison with Network Rail was taking place across a number of sites.</p> <p>IC gave a brief run-through the Workstream Programme, sharing on screen. The objective was to capture the wide range of workstreams, categorised into 'topics' at high level, with implications for timescale and resourcing, with separate Tabs for each 'Topic', and to be updated as work/the Project progresses.</p> <p>FL said that the Programme was really helpful to ongoing work, that this strategic overview needed additional detail behind it, indicating, for example, dependencies. The Programme also needed to be monitored alongside the Risk Register.</p> <p>Board Members would review the Programme (to be circulated with the next meeting Agenda). No other comments were made.</p>	IC
5	<p>Stage 3 Delivery Update</p> <p>FL advised that good progress was being made, and that the study was on schedule to finish by the end of February/early March. There would be a collaborative Workshop set up shortly. Discussions with a number of parties were being progressed.</p> <p>James Lineham from the Consultants Avison Young gave a Presentation: a number of reports had been prepared/were being finalised. Good progress had been made on the Financial Model. More detailed work was being undertaken on Delivery Strategy. It was recognised that there are high risks associated with Infrastructure costs. Viability was identified as a Medium Risk.</p> <p>GN raised that clarity was needed on a Delivery Vehicle and Delivery Mechanisms, along with the approach to equitable apportionment of</p>	Avison Young

	<p>Infrastructure – and whether this could be set down as an Agreement, or captured in a proposed MoU, for example, with an understanding of to whom any future Grant monies might be paid.</p> <p>JL advised that a Workshop on Funding would be set up shortly.</p> <p>MS asked if the figure for Viability gap would be adjusted given changes in construction costs.</p> <p>FL advised that the Model would be, and in the future, could be adjusted to take account of such changes. Reports received from AY would be circulated.</p> <p>GN advised that key context was market failure on land to the east and south of the railway, sought reassurance regarding approaches to the different landholdings and that the Financial Model needed to be credible at individual site, as well as aggregate East Norwich, level.</p> <p>SE advised that while the Norfolk Devolution Deal was agreed, it would be some time (after May 2024) until funding could be allocated from the proposed identified £20m per year ‘pot’.</p>	
6.	<p>Risk Register update The Risk Register had been circulated with the Agenda, and it was agreed that this item would be dealt with on a ‘by exception’ basis – ie any points raised if felt necessary.</p> <p>SE added that uncertainty associated with future funding arrangements with respect to the Devolution Deal should be added into the Risk Register</p>	IC
7.	<p>Comms / Engagement IC advised that the Stakeholder Management Plan would be updated. An article in the Evening News re Carrow Priory was drawn to the Board’s attention.</p>	
9.	<p>AOB No other Business was raised</p>	

Next meeting: 16 February 2023