

## East Norwich Delivery Board – MINUTES

22 November 2023 – 13:30 – 15:00

### Teams

#### Members

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

Cllr Paul Kendrick (CP) – Norwich City Council, Portfolio Holder, Resources

Graham Nelson (GN) – Executive Director, Development & City Services, Norwich City Council

Louise Rawsthorne (LR) – Executive Director of Community Services, Norwich City Council

Cllr Andrew Jamieson (AJ) – Norfolk CC, Deputy Leader, Portfolio Holder, Finance

Cllr. Graham Plant (GP) – Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport, Norfolk County Council

Chris Starkie (CSt) – Director of Growth and Investment, Norfolk County Council

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

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

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

#### Officers

Shelley Hall (SHa) –Senior Partnership & Business Manager, Homes England

Ian Charie (IC) – East Norwich Regeneration, Interim Programme Lead, Norwich City Council

Judith Davison (JD) – Planning Policy Lead, Norwich City Council

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

Andrew Turnbull (AT) – Development Strategy Manager, Norwich City Council

Sharon Page (SP) - Communications manager, Norwich City Council

Item	Topic	Actions
1.	<b>Welcome / Apologies</b>  <b>Apologies:</b> Cllr Kendrick Louise Rawsthorne Cllr Andrew Jamieson Chris Starkie Cally Smith Sharon Page	MS
2.	<b>Minutes of meeting 20 September 2023 and matters arising</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agreed</li><li>• No matters arising.</li></ul>	MS
3.	<b>Planning Update</b> a) GNLP implications for EN	IC/GN

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JD delivered a summary of implications of the GNLP main modifications for East Norwich (ENSRA) and the SPD.</li> <li>• Main noted modification is a reduction in delivery anticipated within the plan period for ENSRA, with the overall housing number reducing to around 3,000 homes by the end of 2038 (in the plan area). This figure does not include c.362 units in the Broads Authority area which is outside the GNLP area.</li> <li>• PC questioned if there was anything in the proposed modifications that had a positive or detrimental impact on viability and therefore delivery? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ultimately, we have regard to phasing plans and the testing of proposals. Detailed developer work on viability, then independent assessment, is needed, but the draft GNLP now has more weight in the planning process which will be further enhanced through the emerging SPD. Would create a better place and therefore placemaking premium, but in-depth work needed to assess viability. We need to strive towards a deliverable Masterplan/SPD.</li> <li>• IC states that the GNLP Mods. plans don't raise further additional requirements, constraints or burdens, but it, along with the forthcoming SPD give greater clarity and where possible greater certainty on requirements and how they can be met – but doesn't help address the core issue of where the funding comes from.</li> <li>• FL endorsed the discussion, noting that it is key to ensure the vision is deliverable and that the SPD adds further clarity to requirements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Relating to site wide modification “requiring that development allows scope for greater use of the rivers for water based recreation, leisure and tourism” – does the council feel there is a positive impact from those main modifications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JD – this is in the master planning process – important to improve use of the rivers.</li> <li>- MS – this will add benefit to development.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>b) Supplementary Planning Document Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Big piece of work that is progressing well.</li> <li>• A recent engagement exercise with key stakeholders yielded six responses. This is helpful to input into the update and ahead of formal statutory consultation.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some interest from parties for a variety of film, studio and creative arts uses. Want to reflect flexibility in SPD that there are benefits to the existing sheds on the East part of CW site potentially being repurposed, with the need to demonstrate how such a use would integrate with the remainder of the site.</li> <li>• Also clarifying future school location being less prescriptive to meet identified criteria.</li> <li>• <b>Programme update</b> – Redrafting will be February/March 2024 Review of final draft – June Consultation June/July. Cabinet – September, with adoption of SPD that month.</li> <li>• Land Use – future school location: MS says that there is flexibility with the school in terms of location within the Carrow Works site, rather than whether one is required or not. The developer is still saying their consultant feels a school isn't necessary. LEA says contrary and that the school is required for E Norwich as a whole.</li> </ul> <p>There were concerns relating to general locations in terms of impact, noise, and odour because of the Aggregates Plant– any developer would have to satisfy best practice and environmental standards in terms of where the school is located.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FL – ref incorporation of flexibility to enable potential greater opportunities for employment uses; IC responded impact on viability will have to be assessed. Rest of site would be residential driven to ensure optimum value achieved to become viable as a whole. Very little has been done to examine that to be proven. Don't want to say there is a strong position for retention for the sheds – may not be viable, but would be a good path if can be achieved, and all site planning is acceptable. In terms of GNLP, the housing number is a target – It was emphasised that no such formal proposal has been received, or view has been reached by council on this matter. re Infrastructure triggers – it is difficult to tie down and be descriptive as there is still so much in play in terms of phasing. Where infrastructure provision can be tied down, eg the number of completions for a school, this will be stated where possible in the SPD. FL – agreed that this has to be as robust as possible.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As discussed under the Planning item on the Agenda, there will be an impact for reference to a Marina(s) and Bridges in the SPD.</li> <li>• The City and County Councils are seeking a position which helps support the Broads Authority in being able to support future fixed bridge proposals.</li> </ul> <p><b>b) Trowse Underpass</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More detailed feasibility for pedestrian/cycle route to be taken forward by Consultants from County Framework, in conjunction with Network Rail Officers when Agreement with NR is signed and Public Liability Insurance matter resolved.</li> <li>• GN provided a further update – CSt and GN met new Network Rail Anglia regional director, Katy Frost in mid November and updated her re EN and relationship to Trowse rail bridge and criticality of underpass. No decisions made, ensuring new director sighted on EN and relationship to Network Rail. She confirmed the continuing support of NR.</li> <li>• AT looking at capacity funding across Norwich in 24/25. FL requested programme updates are given at next Board meetings. Need to look at how these strands are coming together. Starting to set budgets for next year.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION: Navigation &amp; Trowse Underpass:</b> Interim Updates to be given to Board</p>	IC
5.	<p><b>Risk Register</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated each month. NCC role holders have been updated.</li> </ul> <p>Highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Red against financial/economic context and viability, and landowner. These matters are monitored for their impact on East Norwich.</li> <li>• Role that County Deal can play for future funding for EN. The uncertainty brings a risk, but also an opportunity.</li> <li>• The risk register is taken as read, but if Members/attendees have any comments, then please advise.</li> </ul>	IC
6.	<p><b>Update re Board</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous Board discussions identified a need to augment skills at the Board by getting one or two independent people on the Board to provide greater credibility and focus. Members of the Board were invited to submit names.</li> </ul>	IC/GN

	<p>Four people were reached out to, narrowed down to two, with one of those names being identified as a next Chair.</p> <p>Process for appointing will be checked, but do not want process/time to lead to disinterest from 2 good candidates.</p> <p>Cllr Stonard – when the matter of appointing is clarified, the 2 new Members should be confirmed, with a view to starting in April.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> GN to check if HR procedures allow us to recruit directly.</p>	GN
8.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p><b>Papers for Dec Board:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Update on County Deal</li> <li>2. Priority Workstreams</li> <li>3. 2024-25 Budget: NCC, Nflk CC, HE</li> </ol> <p><b>Next meeting 20 December 2023, 13:30 – all agreed to have via Teams.</b></p> <p><b>Pmn: this meeting was subsequently cancelled</b></p>	CSt IC IC