

East Norwich Partnership
Monday 5th October 2020 (3-5pm)

Attendees

- Cllr Mike Stonard (MS) Norwich City Council (NCC)
- Graham Nelson (GN) (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) Serruys Property Company (SPC)
- Richard Cubitt (RC) (SPC)
- Ken Dytor (KD) (Urban Catalyst)
- Charles Whitworth (Cushman and Wakefield)
- Matthew Trigg (MT) (RWE)
- Ben Quarrie (BQ)(National Grid)
- Adrian Cross (AC) (National Grid)
- Charles Amies (CA) (Homes England)(HE)
- Carlton Roberts-James (CRJ) (HE)
- Matt Tracey (MT) (Norfolk CC)
- Helen Corina (HC) (Norfolk CC)
- Richard Doleman (Norfolk CC)
- Laura Waters (LW)(LEP)
- Cally Smith (CS) (Broads Authority)(BA)
- Cheryl Peel (CP) (BA)
- Paul Harris (PH) (South Norfolk Council / Broadland Council)
- Paige Chappell (PC) (Network Rail)

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)
- Andy Teague (AT) (Cushman and Wakefield)
- Simon Hughes (SH)(Norfolk CC)

Agenda item		Action
1	Welcome / apologies	
	GN opened the meeting and welcomed all participants to the second East Norwich Partnership meeting.	
2	Minutes of the last meeting	
	JD took those present through the minutes of the last meeting on 12 May. All actions had been completed.	

Agenda item		Action
3	Progress update	
	JD presented an update of progress since the previous meeting on 12 May, based on the paper circulated. Procurement commenced in June and the Expression of Interest and Sifting Brief stages are now complete. The procurement process was temporarily halted in August as there was uncertainty about landowner contributions. JD noted an update to the funding position set out in the document; the city council has successfully bid for £90k from the Norfolk Strategic Fund towards the project management of the masterplan process.	
	DF provided an update on the exchange of contracts for Carrow Works. This should take place in the next day or two. Post-meeting note: exchange of contracts has now taken place.	
	RC asked whether the cost of the masterplan contribution from Carrow Works could be underwritten by the existing owners? DH: no however the decision is imminent.	
	CW provided the current position of the Utilities landowners. The key challenge is infrastructure. They have various masterplans in place. He is not going to be able to persuade the Board to fund the masterplan. GN: we need a masterplan for the 3 sites to inform what infrastructure is required to be delivered and to attract public sector funding.	
	BQ: concern at the outputs of the brief. GN responded that we would like the landowners to be as specific as possible in terms of outputs. It was agreed that a discussion on this should be taken off-line. CW: likely to take a month before we would know the Board's response.	JD to arrange meeting
	AC: suggested that the Utilities landowners could opt out of the Partnership. He asked whether the masterplan would still include the Utilities site even if the owners were not in the Partnership? GN: yes, we have to look at the East Norwich sites as a whole.	
	RC: asked Ken Dytor if he would contribute instead of the Utilities landowners. KD: this would be inappropriate, and he endorses what CW says.	
4	Discussion of options / next steps	
	GN asked for comments on the options set out in the paper. Option 2 (involving contributing landowners) would seem to be the best way forward. In response to a question from AC, he confirmed that this would enable contributing landowners to have a say in the appointment of consultants.	
	AC : costs of a masterplan may not be as much as we currently think.	
	GN: we are confident that we will have sufficient funds to proceed. It is important we maximise funding to enable us to address infrastructure concerns fully.	
	AC: issue of reducing private sector contributions if the public sector is contributing more? GN: wants funding to be agreed on an equal footing as much as possible so not likely to support reduction in private sector funding. It would also be important to also take the views of the other public sector bodies into consideration.	
	AC: non-contributing landowners should not be in Partnership. GN: we will need to engage with the landowners in any case as they are	

Agenda item		Action
	key stakeholders, so would be involved in consultation etc. They could rejoin the process going forward if appropriate.	
	DF: indicated support for option 2.	
	MT: happy to support option 2. Would like to see the private sector partners making contributions.	
	MT updated on the County's highways study currently underway looking at transport infrastructure, which will complete by end of year and help inform masterplan.	
	CA: happy to support option 2.	
	Overall consensus to go with option 2, which would involve contributing partners in the selection process.	
5	Partner updates	
	GN update on Carrow House: marketed over the summer by Norfolk CC(NCC). NCC had received a number of offers and are in the process of identifying a preferred bidder which it will introduce to the city prior to making any decision.	
	GN introduced Paige Chappell from Network Rail. PC: land strategy for NR to be produced internally by mid 2021, looking at feasibility of various options available and rail needs. Eg looking at Trowse rail bridge feasibility and potential relocation of freight tenant near station which could unlock opportunities and assist with regeneration and the masterplan. May look at Lafarge site in longer term.	
	Laura Water (LEP): monthly meetings taking place on Trowse swing bridge. Importance of understanding constraints including navigation rights.	
	Cllr Mike Stonard (NCC): East Norwich is probably the most important regeneration site in the city and the council is committed to taking it forward. MS welcomed the open and honest discussions and that partners had agreed to proceed with option 2.	
	Akis (SPC) mentioned that SPC had commissioned Scott Brownrigg to produce a masterplan for the Deal Ground and May Gurney site to understand its capacity. AC shared images from the study which took 2 weeks to complete and he considered to be good value for money.	
	CW (C& W): asked what the need is for a masterplan if SPC and Fuel are working on their own? Akis stressed that an overall masterplan is needed but which takes into account what landowners' aspirations are for their own sites. GN responded: need for a robust evidence base for these extremely complex sites to justify HE involvement, to attract external funding for infrastructure, and to robustly inform the local plan process. The masterplan studies being carried out for landowners will provide useful insight for the consultants but are quite limited. The proposed East Norwich masterplan will identify key infrastructure across the sites, eg school, affordable housing, the mix of dwellings etc. He also noted the importance of an anchor institution for East Norwich to underpin its successful delivery over the long term.	
	GN provided an update on the GNLP. The plan is now moving ahead to a faster timescale with public consultation on a Reg 19 plan in Feb – March. Therefore we need to keep up momentum on the masterplan to inform the submission and the public examination.	
6	Any Other Business	

Agenda item		Action
	None	
7	Date of next meeting	
	Likely to be in 6 to 8 weeks time. Need to report updates on procurement, GNLP progress, Network Rail involvement, and funding.	JD