

## East Norwich Delivery Board – Minutes

**11 October 2024 – 13:30 – 15:15**

**Mancroft Room, City Hall**

### Members

**Chair:** Bob Lane – Independent Member

Cllr Stonard, Norwich City Council, Leader

Cllr. Paul Kendrick – Norwich City Council, Cabinet Member for Resources

John East – Norwich City Council, Executive Director, Interim, Major Projects

Louise Rawsthorne – Norwich City Council, Chief Executive (apologies)

Cllr. Andrew Jamieson – Norfolk County Council, Cabinet Member for Finance (apologies)

Cllr. Graham Plant – Norfolk CC, Cabinet Member Highways, Infrastructure & Transport (absent)

Chris Starkie – Norfolk County Council, Director Growth & Investment

Julia Krause – Homes England, Assistant Director, Market, Partners & Places (South)

Rob Rogers – Broads Authority, Director of Operations (absent)

Phil Courtier – South Norfolk Council & Broadland DC, Director of Place(substitute – George Denton)

Saul Humphrey – Independent Member

### Officers

John Whetstone – Homes England

Matt Tracey – Norfolk County Council, Growth & Infrastructure Manager

Maria Hammond – Norwich City Council, East Norwich Programme Manager

Rob Anderson – Norwich City Council, East Norwich Project Manager

Andrew Turnbull – Norwich City Council, Development Strategy Manager

Sarah Ashurst – Head of Planning & Regulatory Services

Judith Davison – Norwich City Council, Planning Policy Team Leader

Andrew Keeling – Norwich City Council, Regeneration Communications Lead

Ruth Sainsbury – Broads Authority, Head of Planning

Martin Woodhouse – PRD Consultants

Jen Gutteridge – PRD Consultants

Will Temple – PRD Consultants

Bek Seeley – Place Partners

Item	Topic	Actions
1.	<b>Welcome / Apologies / Introductions – BL</b> <b>Apologies:</b> Louise Rawsthorne Cllr Jamieson Rob Anderson Carlton Roberts-James will attend via Teams	
2.	<b>Minutes from 17 July 2024 – BL</b>  Minutes agreed	

Item	Topic	Actions
3.	<p><b>Progress update following Commercial Review – MW</b></p> <p>PRD provided a presentation on updated viability for scheme, including look through typologies to introduce more family homes.</p> <p>Scoped out an energy strategy -.looking at delivery and funding.</p> <p>Economic Growth vision, on East Norwich in particular, is an extensive exercise looking at positioning Norwich within the wider economic market. Norwich has capacity to be a very distinctive place with the potential for creativity and innovation, even in existing buildings.</p> <p>When we talk about employment opportunities in East Norwich, we like this idea of fitting in with the wider narrative of the city centre as a whole.</p> <p><b>Next steps –</b> Norwich economic growth vision with East Norwich economic purpose. Where we are looking to take EN is to socialise the headline ambition statement but also link overall deliverability of the scheme.</p> <p>SH – journey of many businesses is from the city centre out, for example to Broadland business park, also largely due to car park space.</p> <p>SH recently attended an event and the whole focus was on Norwich and flooding – need to look at a really resilient location as it would be really irresponsible not to share that.</p> <p>SH - Building Safety Act post-Grenfell – need to ensure those factors are all built into these models.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Legal and planning advice – MH</b></p> <p>A legal review of the planning and strategic position had been undertaken, the Board was updated of the contents which are of a confidential nature.</p> <p>When we last met, we were progressing with the draft SPD to see what it could do. Now we should pause SPD production to review the options in the overall planning strategy.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Emerging Strategy – BS</b></p> <p><b>Landowners –</b></p>	

Item	Topic	Actions
	<p>Issue with all landowners will be a journey.</p> <p><b>Masterplan status and scheme viability –</b> There is a viability gap within the scheme as it is currently positioned. There are fundamental challenges including residential and commercial uses.</p> <p><b>Planning status –</b> No appeal received on Carrow Works which could remove potential complexity. However, there is complexity on the May Gurney and Deal Ground sites. Significant issues with the Environment Agency and questions on flooding.</p> <p><b>Stakeholders –</b> Everyone is supportive of East Norwich going ahead and are behind the public sector to make this happen. Investment and delivery appetite, Carrow Works application refusal, and general talk is that there are challenges.</p> <p><b>What are the priorities?</b> A key thing that is drawn out is to secure land ownership.</p> <p><b>How do we make this happen –</b> We want to secure a deliverable planning position. Need to give people confidence that planning is in a good place and can be delivered.</p> <p>Emerging next steps – Improved viability and investability of the scheme.</p> <p>Discussion on how to get viable scheme including: potential grant funding, benefit-cost ratio, GNLP, economic vision, meanwhile uses, design code and tenures.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Project Update – MH</b></p> <p>PoaP – have been working through what everything will look like for workstreams and programming. There are conversations we need to follow up with after today.  <b>MH to share round PoAP to have follow up conversations.</b></p> <p>BL – need to be aware that we are being rather ambitious to have a SOBC by January for February Cabinet.</p>	MH
7.	<p><b>Planning Update SA/JD</b></p> <p>Landowner has engaged barrister on flooding and Tarmac sites within middle of regeneration area. Haven't seen advice received.</p>	

Item	Topic	Actions
	New NPPF additional housing requirement would give us some opportunity to increase density and to look at other sites. Could have some positive implications.	
8.	<b>Landowner Update – BS</b>  BS delivered a verbal update of a sensitive and confidential nature.	
9.	<b>AOB – BL</b>  What we are doing is on all the things we can influence. What we cannot influence is government decision making, markets etc. If we can get all this in place for Cabinet in February, that would be great.	
	<b>Next meeting TBC (December)</b>  Suggest end Nov/Dec (1 <sup>st</sup> week December) BL wanted to maximise Member involvement so suggested the meeting be via Teams.  BL thanked members for their impressive work showing meaning and purpose, and closed the meeting.	