

East Norwich Regeneration Delivery Board – MINUTES

21 June 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 & Economic Development, Norfolk County Council

Fionnuala Lennon (FL) – Head - Markets, Places & People - South, Homes England

Cally Smith/Rob Rogers (CSm/RR) – Head of Planning/Director of Operations, Broads Authority

Phil Courtier (PC) – Director of Place, Broadland District & South Norfolk Councils (N/A)

Chris Starkie (CSt) – Chief Executive, 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 Programme Lead, Norwich City Council

Carlton Roberts-James (CR-J) – Senior Manager, Homes England

Matt Tracey – Growth & Infrastructure Group Manager, Norfolk County Council

Andrew Turnbull - Development strategy manager, Norwich City Council

Item	Topic	Actions
1.	Welcome / Apologies Apologies: Lou Rawsthorne, Cllr Plant, Phil Courtier, Chris Starkie. Cally Smith attended from Broads Authority	
2.	Minutes of meeting 24 April 2023 and matters arising Minutes accepted as an accurate record of the meeting.	
3.	Update on Sites & Planning + Q&A session Planning update: GN advised that an allocation and policy for East Norwich were anticipated in the GNLP, with Modifications to the Plan expected this autumn. The Draft SPD for East Norwich would be updated this coming autumn, including with reference to the Stage 3 reporting on Viability and on triggers for infrastructure, infrastructure, energy, education as well as a general 'refresh'. Nutrient Neutrality: Proposals from Natural England and a JV with Anglia Water are still awaited (potentially	

	<p>Autumn 2023); significant credits for East Norwich would be needed.</p> <p>Sites update:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Carrow House – have completed refurbishment but haven't been able to let. 2) Carrow Works – significant issue arising from Fuel still not having achieved a valid Planning application, despite initial documents being submitted on 8 July 2022. Both Britvic/Unilever and NCC have become frustrated by the lack of progress. Fuel Properties expect to submit remaining outstanding material to enable validation in the next 2-3 weeks. 3) May Gurney / Deal Ground – the Reserved Matters application in compliance with keeping the 2013 Outline consent alive are expected to be submitted before the expiry date of 12 July. If RM Consent is granted, there would then be a 2 yr period in which commencement would have to start. 4) Utilities site – no recent engagement with National Grid / RWE. NDA re early due diligence was drawn up. HE have not discussed price with owners, it is known that NG/RWE are keen to sell. Homes England position is that the potential acquisition of the Utilities Site does not, currently, meet the criteria for acquisition. IC commented that the acquisition would be a significant step forward, and there needs to be an element of long term consideration, and it would be helpful if the criteria for acquisition were reviewed. VM advised that the cost to purchase was not a huge amount of money, noting that at the present time it is the bottom of the market, there is no competition to buy and land ownership is key. Other approaches, such as considering acquiring Options for future purchase should be explored. FL advocated that a local view on land strategy/acquisition by the local Partners should be explored. 	<p>City to approach US landowners and establish parameters/ opportunities for local position on US to be explored, also involving the County</p> <p>IC</p>
--	--	--

<p>4.</p>	<p><i>Avison Young Stage 3 Delivery Report (Commercial in Confidence)</i></p> <p>East Norwich delivery report had been circulated to Board Members. Key points were drawn out to inform debate in five sections and help understand how to proceed.</p> <p>The Conclusions and Recommendations (section 17 of the report) were run through. Overall, noted that no one size fits all for delivery – a number of recommendations are made for NCC, HE and Partners to note. Need to assess risk appetite. Ability of Partners to commit budget, and skills required, is key.</p> <p>Suggestion from NCC – immediate priority is to drive momentum of Carrow Works. NCC owns Carrow House, including the access, so have, only a small, degree of influence.</p> <p>Messaging is key: willingness to intervene if necessary – justified by masterplan. Ensure site is delivered: either lower level of intervention, ie as current, through the planning process, or – if opportunities arise, a higher level of public sector intervention (through funding contributions, or potentially land acquisition across East Norwich.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <p>1) Is Board content that priority should be getting delivery on the Carrow Works site? FL stated that this is a good idea from HE perspective, particularly to keep momentum going. It would set the standard and result in medium-long term goals that open other doors. These views were echoed by others, and SA stated that positive messaging will be key. MT stated the case for regeneration that wasn't dominated by car dependency.</p> <p>2) Is Board content that both high and low intervention models should be considered at this point? This is the preferred option, with flexibility in approach needed dependant on how matters progress over the coming months.</p> <p>3) Are there any other models for delivery which should be pursued?</p>	
-----------	---	--

	<p>Joint ventures could, potentially be looked at in the future across East Norwich.</p> <p>4) Are there any comments about the need for and structure of the proposed joint delivery team?</p> <p>Discussions to continue re broader Joint Team including Infrastructure, finance and economic development. Utility issues, Energy and water – need to be looked into further. County are aware and undertaking work in this area on a strategic basis. A Growth Bid for additional resourcing from the County is being prepared, alongside the City finalising the Business Case for additional core team members. Capacity Funding support from HE was also raised – FL agreed on the basic approach being taken, emphasised the need for the importance of good design, and agreed that future conversations re capacity funding support from HE should be held.</p> <p>5) Are the Board happy with the suggestions above re Board membership?</p> <p>Additional Members from both City and County recognised as adding resilience (in case of absences) but also additional Portfolio areas, of great relevance to East Norwich.</p> <p>A new quarter will be created for Norwich – we will be judged upon whether we succeed in creating new communities – so this aspect is important.</p> <p>Board representation was from Homes England was discussed; whilst there have been some organisational changes within HE, and at present the relevant Director is on sick leave, FL remains the appropriate rep. FL agreed that Director level representation would be appropriate in the future if, for example, there is a change of circumstance, eg if HE involvement in the EN initiative becomes different, eg if a JV is formed, or land is acquired, and different Governance arrangements become appropriate.</p> <p>An additional independent Member, or even Chair, who has significant Regeneration experience would be a valuable addition. FL to consider this from ‘figures’ in the industry.</p> <p>6) Is there an appetite to prioritise exploring whether a potential new private sector JV partner could be identified?</p>	<p>IC/GN to take discussions forward</p> <p>County (VM/CS and MT) to pursue Growth Bid, with City input</p> <p>IC with GN / CS</p> <p>IC/GN</p> <p>FL</p>
--	---	---

	<p>JV is currently not likely to be pursued, but could be in the future. IC raised the importance of seeking private sector investment eg from an institution like L&G or Aviva – this should be picked up further in the future. Also, understanding whether the English Cities Fund type model is appropriate. This is not ‘off the table’.</p> <p>It was agreed there should be a ramping up of discussion with landowners for how development will be delivered alongside the planning context becoming clearer.</p> <p>7) Does Board agree that, as appropriate, early due diligence and preparatory work to build future business cases for possible partner led/funded purchase of sites in East Norwich be considered at appropriate times?</p> <p>At Strategic level, the City Council and County Council Leaders are due to meet.</p> <p>Risk assessment, and sharing is key here.</p> <p>GN/IC will be further meeting with Fuel Properties and Britvic/Unilever reps in early July.</p> <p>VM – supportive of doing piece of work on Innovation, linked to Clusters and Employment.</p> <p>8) Is the Board happy for engagement with SPC over delivery models and whether interested in BIL funding support?</p> <p>Depending on the planning discussions moving ahead, there may be a need for discussions with Homes England re public funding being sought, as previously, for the main access road.</p> <p>9) Is the Board content that pursuing matters on Utilities site is not a priority at this stage?</p> <p>Utilities Site – Homes England are due to respond to Utilities Site owners. An Option for future acquisition should be considered.</p>	
5.	<p>Consideration of Possible Joint Delivery Team</p> <p><i>Discussion took place in previous agenda item</i></p>	
6.	<p>Governance, inc Board</p>	

	<i>Discussion took place in previous agenda item</i>	
7.	<p>Workstream Programme and Risk Register Update</p> <p>Need to ensure that more detailed Tasks are set out in the Workstream Programme, and to assist with future resourcing.</p> <p>In particular, draft Brief to take Legal review of Navigation issue forward is work in progress. There will be a national interest in this. Initial review to be undertaken by nplaw which helps keep costs down, with referral of specific Questions to a firm who have specialists in Navigation matters. Agreement to Brief from County and Broads Authority needed.</p> <p>One option would be for the BA to commission this work, but recognising that there are many sensitivities here, this is unlikely to be supported.</p> <p>Need to further assess / review Risk sharing.</p> <p>Both documents will be reviewed at next Board as Agenda items.</p>	
8.	<p>AOB</p> <p>This was the last Board meeting for VM, who is retiring from his Director role. CRJ is focussing on a different geographic area, to be succeeded by Shelley Hall. The Chair thanked both for their contributions to the Board.</p>	

Next meeting: Wednesday 26 July 2023, 13:30 – 15:00.