

East Norwich Partnership
Tuesday 12th May 2020 (2-4pm)

Attendees

- Graham Nelson (GN) Norwich City Council (NCC)
- Judith Davison (JD)(NCC)
- Tracy Armitage (TA) (NCC)
- Darryl Flay (DF) (Fuel Properties)
- Adam Gaymer (Fuel Properties).
- David Harvey (DH) (Harvey & Co)
- Akis Chrisovelides (AC)(SPC)
- Richard Cubitt (RC) (SPC)
- Ken Dytor (KD)(Urban Catalyst)
- Paul Shadarevian (PS) (Urban Catalyst)
- Andy Teague (AT) (Cushman and Wakefield)
- Matthew Trigg (MT)(RWE)
- Ben Quarrie (BQ)(National Grid)
- Charles Amies (CA) (Homes England)(HE)
- Simon Hughes (SH)(Norfolk CC)
- Matt Tracey (MT) (Norfolk CC)
- Helen Corina (HC) (Norfolk CC)
- Laura Waters (LW)(LEP)
- Cally Smith (CS) (Broads Authority)(BA)
- Cheryl Peel (CP) (BA)
- Paul Harris (PH) (South Norfolk Council / Broadland Council)
- Neven Sidor (NS) (Grisham Architects)

Apologies

- Paul Kitson (Homes England)
- Jayshree Patel (Homes England)
- Andre Serruys (SPC)
- Helen Mellors (South Norfolk Council / Broadland Council)
- Phil Courtier (South Norfolk Council / Broadland Council)
- Jonathon Green (NPS / Norfolk County Council)
- Charles Whitworth (Cushman and Wakefield)

Agenda item		Action
1	Welcome / apologies	
	GN opened the meeting and welcomed all participants to the first meeting of the East Norwich Partnership. There appears to be broad consensus among partners to work jointly to ensure comprehensive redevelopment. He stressed that it is important to keep momentum going with this project.	
2	Update since last meeting	

	JD presented an update of progress since the previous meeting on 31 January. This includes a series of 1-2-1 meetings between GN/JD and the key private sector partners: overall there has been positive feedback and a willingness to work in partnership. NCC has also met with Wolong, site owners of Laurence Scott to update them about the partnership and emerging masterplan. In terms of public sector partners, NCC has held a number of meetings with Homes England who are positively engaged in the process, and has also been in contact with the other public sector partners. NCC is also working on the procurement process for the masterplan.	
	GN provided an update on the GNLP likely timescales.	
3	Draft Terms of Reference	
	JD presented an overview of the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) document	
	RC – stated Network Rail should be involved from the outset. JD responded that it was agreed at the last meeting that a robust Partnership needed to be in place before making contact.	
	SH – Raised the question of publicity and matters of commercial sensitivity GN – from local authority point of view we are subject to FOI Act.	
	GN - Emphasised the need for transparency given the process is intended to inform the GNLP process/ planning policy for East Norwich. There would need to be ways at the appropriate times to handle matters that are commercially sensitive. Information subject to FOI	
	JD – responded to question regarding the £0.5m cost estimate, confirming this was derived with input from HE and having regard to comparable exercises conducted elsewhere (eg. York Central)	
	PH queried the role of local members involvement / sign off in the process. GN noted that each public authority will be expected to report through their own processes as they see fit, otherwise it would make the process very unwieldy.	
	PH - Queried role of the Reference Group. Trowse Parish Council highlighted as well as their intention to commence a Neighbourhood Plan. CS - also queried the role of the Reference Group and the need to include key interest groups with the Broads e.g Broads Society and the Norfolk Boat Owners Association RC - need to include Carrow Yacht Club in relation to access arrangements.	JD – to clarify the role of the Reference Group in TOR and to amend its members accordingly
	AC - Queried the £0.5m cost and whether this was all to be spent externally? GN – External costs of Masterplan process plus Project Management role (for cost effectiveness may be new temporary role created within the organisation)	
	AC - concern over reference within the document to strategic highway network being fixed as a constraint from the outset.	

	GN - Confirmed that the reference to the strategic road network in this part of the city having limited capacity is a factual statement. Need to link the development into the city and not rely on creating additional capacity within the highway. Although nothing in the brief to preclude this.	
	MT - Vision for the site is to deliver a highly sustainable development in a highly sustainable location. Focus on walking, cycling and public transport links	
	RC - Rail head should be included within scope of ToR GN – Rail head designated as critical infrastructure. Re-location complex and would introduce risk. Existence does not preclude development and operators (LaFarge) would need to be involved in the process.	
	AC – Queried whether the ToR was an internal document only. GN – Intention that the ToR and the Masterplan Brief would be appended to the report to Cabinet (10 June) and would become public at that point	
	SH - Raised the need to manage publicity and public/press interest which might arise through the process GN – Indicated that the ToR could be amended to include the need for a Communications Plan	JD to action
	GN - confirmed further draft of the ToR would be circulated to parties for comment by the end of the week, and comments will be required back by the end of the following week (22 May).	JD
4	Draft masterplan brief	
	JD – presented an overview of the Draft masterplan framework brief	
	AC – praised the overall content of the document. Raised query regarding other sources of funding referred to in document and whether these should be addressed earlier in the process than Stage 2f and whether HE were prepared to indicate early on what level of financial support they might offer. GN – It is understood that the delivery of East Norwich sites will require some level of public subsidy. Indicated sources did not just include HE, highlighting Town Funding (NCC making a bid for £25m).	
	CA - Confirmed that HE intend to be involved throughout the process and be an active partner. Needs to be a sequential approach to the masterplan process but this not mean that funding matters could not considered as they arise.	
	GN – highlighted that the partnership arrangement and collaborative process create the best conditions for success in securing public funding.	
	DF – remarked that draft brief is comprehensive. Queried whether ‘social value’ should be identified as a key driver/regeneration objective. Delivery of homes/community spaces etc all capable of being measured. GN – Agreed that if this was not yet included, then it should be.	JD – seek to include in next draft
	PH – Expressed concern about the extent of viability work in Stage 1 given the intent that the process supports the next stages of the GNLP process.	

	JD – Confirmed that this matter had been discussed at some length with HE	
	CA - Highlighted the need to ensure the quality of viability information. If Stage 1 is too broad in scope there is the risk that the information on viability may not be fit for purpose.	
	GN – Referred to the GNLP timetable and that the aim was to ensure that the viability information would be available to support the examination stage.	
	PH – Suggested a high level cost analysis would be helpful at Stage 1	
	BQ – Queried the scope of the viability assessment ie both infrastructure and site specific costs? He confirmed that he had relevant information in relation to the latter	
	JD – Indicated would seek further input from HE in term of defining more precisely the scope of the work and whether high level assessment could be front loaded in Stage 1	JD – for consideration in next draft
	SH - Highlighted the need early in the process to understand costs and how these are going to be divided out.	
	GN – Confirmed the importance of the masterplan process resulting in a development approach for the sites which is deliverable. Stage 1 of the brief should include some high level indication of the viability of the sites.	JD - for consideration in the next draft
	RC - stated more information should be included about planning history of Deal Ground and actions already taken to facilitate delivery – eg removal of overhead power cables [GN said yes to history inclusion].	JD - for consideration in the next draft
	CS - Raised the relationship of the sites with the water and the opportunity this presents. Suggested inclusion within Masterplan Framework a requirement for a Waterspace Framework	JD – for consideration in next draft
5	High level timescales and budget	
	GN indicated need to think through sources of funding for phase 2 and beyond. Towns Fund and Norfolk Business Rates pot possibilities. Signs from govt. that investment in infrastructure will form part of the post Covid response. Indicated that NCC will be emailing individual parties regarding financial contributions.	
	JD – presented overview of the High Level timescales and budget paper	
	AC – Queried input of partners into the appointment process, specifically would partners see tender documents from applicants and have a say in who is appointed? GN - Confirmed a panel would need to be established. Significant funding partners would need a key say.	
	BQ - Indicated that the ToR document should include decision making process GN – Confirmed that as the NCC would be the legal entity in relation to commissioning the masterplan work, decision making would need to accord with the requirements of the Constitution.	JD – for consideration in next draft

	<p>KD – queried the effect of the process on landowners selling sites/new owners and landowners ‘going it alone’ and progressing scheme for individual sites</p> <p>GN - Process is a carrot rather than a stick. The benefit of the process is to secure a strong partnership arrangement and a comprehensive development approach which will unlock funding. The resulting masterplan, and GNLP policy including SPD will act as a constraint on landowners</p>	
	GN - Confirmed redrafts of both documents would be circulated by the end of the week as well as emails regarding funding contributions.	
6	Any other business	
	GN - asked for updates from landowners	
	AC - Indicated still looking at ways of proceeding with the existing consent.	
	DF - Indicated close to concluding the deal on Carrow Works. This has included agreement for remediation of the site and these works have commenced. Masterplan for the site hasn't really changed and going forward, looking to work up a scheme which can support the process.	
	SH - Carrow House taken off market. Not clear yet on timescale for getting the site back on the market.	
7	Date of next meeting	
	To be confirmed	Action JD
End	16.00	