

## Norwich Town Deals Board

Monday 11<sup>th</sup> January 2021

10am, Via MS Teams

Chair:

Andrew Dernie - Aviva

Attendees:

Kris Jones – TechVelocity

Linn Clabburn – Cambridge Norwich Tech Corridor

Chris Starkie -

Graham Nelson – Norwich City Centre

Ellen Tilney – Norwich City Council

Jerry White – Norwich City College

Chris Sargisson – Norfolk Chamber of Commerce

Phil Courtier – South Norfolk DC/Broadland DC

Stefan Gurney – Norwich BID

Juliana Meyer - Supapass

Stephanie Beggs - MHCLG

Apologies:

Sarah Steed

In attendance:

Ellen Tilney – Norwich City Council

Amy Dunham – Norwich City Council

### Notes

Ref	Item	Action
1	<b>Welcome, apologies, minutes</b>  Previous Minutes 21 December 21.  Welcome to Juliana Meyer –  Supapass	
2	<b>Project and Programme level financial profiles etc</b>  Project confirmation document Highlighting the two fast track projects and a summary of all projects and a profile which shows how we make the savings required.  Where under summaries there is expected funding – what is the risk of the expected funding not coming in. In the event funding is not forthcoming – especially in terms of Arts Council funding, then savings will need to be made and this is likely to be around equipment purchase.	

	<p>It is acknowledged that some funding is still at risk. It will be up to project managers how they fill that gap.</p> <p>Where funding does not come in – there is a risk of outcomes not being achieved.</p> <p>GN we have asked for flexibility to view funds from one project to another. We are in a position to start drawing down now, there is a need to manage the process as we go along. We do need to add in the programme management line as the level of management required from City Council becomes clear. The end programme may look different. As time goes on there may be a risk of obtaining the money from government.</p> <p>CS it is critical to see the projects as a package. Agree that the programme management should now be factored in as a separate line. Outputs should be closely monitored and recorded.</p> <p>Agreed that table no P4 is fit and a good approach.</p> <p>ET many projects will involve procurement and costs will be more firmly nailed down once we can start these processes.</p> <p>As an example the digital hub may draw in further match funding, and this will likely be the case with other projects, as the financial profiles become more developed.</p> <p><b><i>Digital Hub – Accepted.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The Halls Project - Accepted</i></b> Some funding there is still expected but not confirmed. However we have no reason to doubt it and the project is scalable if funding is not received. CS is meeting with ACE and offers to lobby or discuss.</p> <p><b><i>Digitech Factory – Accepted</i></b> This project is fairly advanced and had LEP funding already in place. This is an active build so most aspects are clear and the business case is in place. To re-iterate, the financial information around this project must remain confidential. Contractors are onsite and construction is underway. There are some issues with lead times and materials arriving on time.</p> <p><b><i>ACE – Accepted</i></b> There is some work to do around the business case and the levels of risk around this one.</p> <p>AD – is there some further work to be done around how these projects connect? ET believes this will come out in the further development of the business cases.</p> <p><b><i>East Norwich Masterplan &amp; Carrow House – Accepted</i></b> Carrow House purchase is moving forward, looking at refurbishment and developing the business case at pace. The Ramidus study point towards this being a good venue for call centre etc. The business case will come to the Board at the end of January.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p><b><i>Revolving Fund – Accepted</i></b>  A fund to purchase through CPO if necessary to acquire stalled sites and sell them on to developers who are will to develop and move them on. There are uncertainties with the CPO process, this is being modelled in line with the risk of CPO processes failing. There is a 'hitlist' of sites within this project. This fund could also be considered an opportunities fund as such in the event of sites becoming available in key areas within the city – such as maintaining key areas within the city centre retail.  JW – careful governance will be required and thought should be given to the decision making process – Noted.  GN – City Council has a list of sites. This project was influenced by the Council's previous and continuing experience of owners using sites to list as an asset value.  SG – is there a secondary plan for the funding, if the fund is not required to unlock sites? GN anticipates in due course there will be decisions to make about how the fund continues.  AW – there are opportunities to support wider initiatives for the city  <b>ACTION: Develop and report back to the board on governance</b></p> <p><b><i>Branding – Accepted</i></b>  ET consultation will follow as is necessary</p> <p><b><i>Public Realm – Accepted</i></b></p> <p><b>The Board APPROVED the submission of this document for submission to MHCLG.</b></p> <p>Agreed to keep meetings diarised.</p> <p>Please return any comments on the Consultation and Engagement documents to ET.</p> <p>ET will disseminate final drafts for review prior to submission.</p>	<p>ET</p> <p>ALL</p>
3	<p><b>Programme Highlight Report</b></p> <p>Very few changes to the Highlight report, owing to the festive period.</p> <p>The purchase of Carrow House is proceeding.  Outline design briefs are being put together for Townsend House  Engagement with digital partners is also underway.</p> <p>Metro Dynamics are engaged and are working with individual project managers to provide the project summary documents for submission. They are also engaging to form the 5 stage business cases.</p> <p>JW – are there new or changing risks which need to be updated? For instance the ACE centre is facing potential risks over further tightening of C19 rules.</p>	

	<p>JS notes that Brexit is causing problems in terms of sourcing materials.</p> <p>ET confirmed that both the above are listed as issues on the project risk logs. In terms of the draw-down profiles, there is some slack in the timescales. There is the opportunity to build more time into the programme if required.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>Please forward any AOB items to the Chair and Amy Dunham to add to the future agenda.</p>	

**Forward meeting dates:**

18 January 2021, 10am -11.30am

25 January 2021, 10am -11.30am

22 February 2021, 10am -11.30am

29 March 2021, 10am -11.30am