

East Norwich Regeneration - Partnership Board Meeting

24 January 2022, 2.00 - 3.30pm

Members:

Chair: Cllr Mike Stonard – Norwich City Council

Graham Nelson (GN) – Norwich City Council
Matt Tracey (MT) – Norfolk CC
Carlton Roberts James (CRJ) – Homes England
Cally Smith (CS) – Broads Authority
Elle Goodwin (EG) New Anglia LEP
Jeremy Fooks (JF) – Fuel Properties
kis Chrisovelides (ACh) – Serruys Property Company
Adrian Cross (ACr) – National Grid

Attendees:

Sarah Ashurst (SA) – Norwich City Council
Ian Charie (IC) – Norwich City Council
Judith Davison (JD) – Norwich City Council
David Parkin (DP) – Norwich City Council
Cheryl Peel (CP) - Broads Authority
James Waterhouse (JW) – Icenl, rep Fuel Properties
Charles Whitworth (CW) – Cushman Wakefield, rep NG/RWE
Martyn Saunders (MS) – Avison Young
Anthony Benson (AB) – Allies & Morrison
Lianne Peterkin (LP) – Allies & Morrison

Minutes

Item	Topic	Actions
1	<p>Welcome/Apologies & Minutes of the previous meeting.</p> <p>Apologies: Phil Courtier –South Norfolk & Broadland District Council Paige Chappell – Network Rail Matthew Trigg – RWE John West – Fuel Properties</p> <p>No matters were raised from the 4 November 2021 Minutes</p>	<p>Minutes from 041121 were agreed</p>
2	<p>Project Manager's Report – IC</p> <p>IC gave an update covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Programme- Engagement- Technical Matters- Infrastructure/Viability/Phasing/Funding- Draft Supplementary Planning Document- Governance- Delivery Plan (Stage 3)- Risk Register <p>A key point to note was the programme for issue of Draft Deliverables, and turnaround times needed for comments, and</p>	<p>A copy of the Presentation is attached to the Draft Minutes</p>

Item	Topic	Actions
	<p>subsequent Draft issues. IC requested Members/Attendees noted the Programme for being able to give feedback at the appropriate time</p> <p>JF advised that Fuel Properties would be responding to Historic England re the outcome from the completed Listings Review</p> <p>GN reinforced the update of a Broads Authority (BA) Workshop set for 11 March for BA Members to discuss the issue of Fixed/Opening Bridges. GN advised that a decision re Trowse Rail Bridge was not a single decision within Network Rail, and that there was no clarity re any programme for dualling the track.</p> <p>ACh asked how 'deliverability' of ENR was being defined. IC advised that this was composed of many aspects, not least 3 different sites/5 different landowners, but that ultimately successful delivery was the creation of homes/jobs, not just infrastructure, and high quality, sustainable new communities and a new District for the city.</p> <p>No other questions or comments arose.</p>	<p>A copy of the Risk Register is attached to the Draft Minutes</p>
3	<p>Consultants Presentation – Update re Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)</p> <p>The consultant team gave a presentation covering the above, noting that Endorsement from the Board re work in progress for the IDP and SPD was being sought.</p> <p>Key points raised by MS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Working assumption re proposed bridges being fixed. There would be significant cost increases if bridges are required to be opening, hence the BA Workshop output is eagerly awaited. - Criticality of the E-W ped/cycle route – including potential rerouting of NCP 1, noting different character stretches of the route as it moves from City to the Broads - Bus access would be key, preference for route through to King St, and to look at Deal Ground/Utilities Site additionally. Input of Bus Operator needed. - Land Uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment: a series of hubs created School: Masterplan shows 3 potential locations within Carrow Works site, 1 within Carrow House Car Park ; form/funding being explored with LEA Marina: constraints, requirements and opportunities led to the main Marina being within the Utilities Site, and a smaller Boating Marina within the Deal Ground (where flood risk precludes development) <p>JF sought clarification on what was to be Endorsed. There was discussion on this, and a revised text for Endorsement was added for the meeting to Members to read (see below),</p> <p>JF raised that they awaited seeing the evidence of need for a primary school, and had appointed a Consultant to review this matter. Until this assessment had been carried out, JF was</p>	<p>Copy of the Presentation attached to Draft Minutes</p>

Item	Topic	Actions
	<p>unable to endorse this aspect of input to the SPD, but that position could change.</p> <p>JF said he understood the need for a bus route, advised that there could be alternatives and there was currently no agreement for access onto Paper Mill Yard/King Street.</p> <p>Cllr MS said at this point that he was keen to achieve consensus.</p> <p>ACh said it was important to have a holistic view, including funding, before endorsing inputs to the Deliverables.</p> <p>AB offered that the landowners were not in a position to sign off the SPD, this is for the lpa's to do, but that a form of words could be set out in the Intro. to the document along the lines of the SPD having input from the ENR Partnership, but that does not necessarily reflect agreement of every Landowner Member to all details in the SPD.</p> <p>At this stage, a level of acceptance re. the Principles was being sought.</p> <p>CS advised that the view about Fixed Bridges as part of the ENR sites was NOT a view of the Broads Authority Members, but had been expressed by the Navigation Committee. CS takes comfort that from a land point of view schemes could be progressed with opening bridges if required, IC pointed out it is the cost differential that would impact on scheme deliverability in a very adverse way.</p> <p>CW reiterated points made by JF and ACh that the financial position needed to be better understood before full endorsement could be given, eg National Grid are still concerned about a Marina being identified for their land. There would need to be some flexibility within the SPD.</p> <p>ACh advised that he could not endorse all aspects yet, but that he could agree to all elements being included in assessment for the SPD, with further information needed.</p>	
4	<p>Endorsement of IDP and SPD work</p> <p>Arising from the above comments/discussion, IC proposed a revised resolution regarding Endorsement of IDP/SPD work:</p> <p><i>'The Board to endorse the inclusion of elements identified in the IDP and SPD to be further assessed, including financial issues (related to funding, viability and deliverability), as part of ongoing work, to be brought back to the Board for a final decision'.</i></p> <p>This wording was twice read out and put into the Chat function for all to read.</p> <p>Cllr MS asked if Board agreed to the above. There were no dissensions.</p>	<p>The Board agreed the resolution as set out.</p>
5	<p>AOB and date of next meeting</p> <p>No matters of AOB were raised.</p> <p>Next Meeting is 3 March 2022, 14.00 – 16.00</p>	