East Norwich Regeneration: Delivery Board meeting - MINUTES

16th February 2023, 13.30 – 15.00

Members

Chair: Cllr Mike Stonard (MS) – Norwich City Council Graham Nelson (GN) – Executive Director, Development & City Services, Norwich City Council Louise Rawsthorne – Executive Director of Community Services, Norwich City Council Cllr. Graham Plant (GP) – Deputy Leader, Norfolk County Council Vince Muspratt (VM) –Director, Growth & Development, Norfolk County Council 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

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

Item	Торіс	Actions
1	Welcome / apologies	
	Apologies:	
	lan Charie, Sarah Ashurst	
2	Minutes of meeting 9 th January 2023 and matters	
	arising	
0	Minutes accepted as an accurate record of the meeting	
3	Workstreams and Resources paper	
	GN introduced the paper in IC's absence.	
	The purpose of the paper is to seek a steer on the activities	
	proposed in the paper. The financial ask will be reported	
	back to the next meeting.	
	GP:	
	 queried the timescale for CPO set out in para 4.5.2 	
	of report. Seemed ambitious and probably should be	
	extended to 2 years.	
	 Issue of devolution deal as potential source of 	
	finance for East Norwich. Working to get funding	
	agreed on an annual basis.	
	FL:	
	Helpful paper. Need for some form of prioritisation	
	and to set out dependencies/ This will help narrow	
	down focus and help HE identify particular	
	workstreams they can help fund.	
	• Don't lose sight of landowners and what they can do.	
	GN response:	

	 This work will extend over several years and it will evolve. No intention of completing it in one year. We will reconsider matters arising from this paper at the meeting in March. PC: Proposal seems fine but who will drive and coordinate workstreams? A body needs to take ownership of the project overall even though there are different bodies involved. Need to ensure sufficient resource – can we capitalise this and identify revenue at a later point? GN: role for city council in working out what can be capitalised at this point VM: Purpose of today is to get work list in order to form basis for longer term programme of activity Need to develop a delivery team with appropriate skills, sooner rather than later Confirmed strong commitment from County Council – fully behind project GN summary: No major problems with paper but request to work up a more detailed work programme of projects, with 	IC /
	 priorities, timescales, and costings / resources Possibility of exploring a joint team MT: happy that County takes some of the work forward. Questioned how far County can progress transport assessment on the basis of the current planning application GP: stressed full support from County members as well as officers 	others
4	Bridge proposals and navigation rights GN presented the report and outlined the main issue which is the assumption in the masterplan that the bridges will be fixed. The BA Navigation committee considers that there is a legal requirement for opening bridges. If this doesn't change it will impact on viability of scheme and on the likely success of a bid for infrastructure funding to unlock development. GN is seeking a revised view from the BA by autumn. Technical work is ongoing around interpreting the balance of 'protecting interests' of navigation. CS:	

	DA view on this issue has maximum suffered the	1
	 BA view on this issue has previous supported the principle of fixed bridges, but membership of Navigation committee has changed. Currently progressing legal advice to hopefully support opening bridges. Navigation cttee is not a decision making committee. The full BA would take the decision on applications for any bridges and may take a different view from the Navigation cttee. PC: queries the BA position given its previous support and its role as a partner in the GNLP. Hope we can give comfort through legal advice and conversations about 	
	compensation measures including marina.	
	Members agreed the proposed next steps set out in the report.	
5	Homes England update on Stage 3 Delivery Study	
	 FL reported that the Stage 3 study is going well. Updated reports on aspects of the study (inc market study / CPO / costings) will be shared with partners. Financial viability model: meetings coming up soon on this Delivery mechanisms study: HE has had sight of an early draft. Work should be completed in March. FL will discuss with GN and IC how this will be disseminated. Upcoming activities include HE site visit planned for early March, and consideration of future support for East Norwich. 	FL/GN/IC
	GN: how best to involve the Delivery Board in discussions on HE future involvement / support - at next Board meeting?	
	FL: aim for next Board meeting on 13 th March. HE to circulate documentation in draft (not final) form. Potential for workshop session with AY.	FL/CRJ
6	Project update	
	GN updated on lack of progress with Fuel application. There is a meeting with the applicant/owner coming up soon.	
	No further comments	
7	Risk register	

	No comments were provided at the meeting. GN asked for any comments to be sent through following meeting.	All
8	Comms/engagement GN – wider engagement will follow on from the final Stage 3 study (probably post the elections in late May / early June)	
10	AOB None	

Next meeting: Monday 13th March 2023, 11.00-12.30