

## East Norwich Regeneration - Partnership Board Meeting

03 March 2022, 2.00 - 4.00pm

### Members:

Chair: Cllr Mike Stonard (MSt) – Norwich City Council

Graham Nelson (GN) – Norwich City Council  
Matt Tracey (MTra) – Norfolk CC  
Charles Amies (CA) – Homes England  
Cally Smith (CS) – Broads Authority  
kis Chrisovelides (ACh) – Serruys Property Company  
Adrian Cross (ACr) – National Grid  
Matt Trigg (MTri) - RWE

### Attendees:

Sarah Ashurst (SA) – Norwich City Council  
Ian Charie (IC) – Norwich City Council  
Judith Davison (JD) – Norwich City Council  
Carlton Roberts James (CRJ) – Homes England  
James Waterhouse (JWa) – Icen, rep Fuel Properties  
Charles Whitworth (CW) – Cushman Wakefield, rep NG/RWE  
Martyn Saunders (MSa) – Avison Young  
Kim Grieveson (KG) – Avison Young  
James Lineham (JL) – Avison Young  
Anthony Benson (AB) – Allies & Morrison  
Lianne Peterkin (LP) – Allies & Morrison

### Minutes

Item	Topic	Actions
1	<p><b>Welcome/Apologies &amp; Minutes of the previous meeting.</b></p> <p><b>Apologies:</b> Ellen Goodwin (EG) New Anglia LEP Phil Courtier –South Norfolk &amp; Broadland District Council Paige Chappell – Network Rail John West – Fuel Properties</p> <p>No matters were raised from the 24 January 2022 Minutes</p>	<p>Minutes from 240122 were agreed</p>
2	<p><b>Project Manager's Report – IC</b></p> <p>IC gave an update covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Programme</li><li>- Engagement</li><li>- Technical Matters</li><li>- Infrastructure/Viability/Phasing/Funding</li><li>- Draft Supplementary Planning Document</li><li>- Governance</li><li>- Delivery Plan (Stage 3)</li><li>- Risk Register</li></ul> <p>No questions or comments arose.</p>	<p>A copy of the Presentation is attached to the Draft Minutes</p> <p>A copy of the Risk Register is attached to the Draft Minutes</p>

Item	Topic	Actions
3	<p data-bbox="304 226 552 259"><b>GMLP Update – GN</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 286 1177 439">GN advised that the Inspectors had asked for further information on viability and deliverability. A timetable is being agreed with the Inspectors Team for submission times. GN remains optimistic that a demonstrable case for the allocation can be made, noting the challenges to the proposed allocation from Green Field site promoters.</p> <p data-bbox="304 472 1107 506">There was also to be some minor rewording of the proposed Policy.</p> <p data-bbox="304 539 1150 595">It was important for Statements of support to be submitted by Partners, including the landowners, and Homes England.</p> <p data-bbox="304 629 616 663">No questions were raised.</p> <p data-bbox="304 696 1182 954">CS was invited to give a brief update re the Presentation to the Broads Authority (BA) Navigation Committee held on 25 January 2022. It was noted that there was excitement from Members about the benefits the scheme could bring, including increased access to Whitlingham CP and a Marina (s) being delivered as part of the initiative. However, the Committee did not feel there was sufficient mitigating reasons to take away navigation rights to the Port, and therefore opening bridges should still be sought. The Officers had advised of the implications for cost, and viability.</p> <p data-bbox="304 987 1118 1043">A 1/2 day Workshop is being held with all BA Members invited on 11 March.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1077 1182 1133">GN thanked Officers at the BA for their continuing interest and for time for progressing this issue.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1167 1158 1290">MSt – raised that there is a requirement, by Statute, for the Trowse rail bridge to be opening, unless the statute is changed, but asked if this would impact on the willingness for the twin tracking and ‘Norwich in 90’ objective.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1323 1177 1447">GN added that in engineering terms, it would be challenging and costly to provide an opening twin track bridge. IC added that collective lobbying from the City Council, with other parties (County, LEP, BID, Ch of Commerce, other stakeholders) for ‘Norwich in 90’ should continue.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1480 1185 1715">GN advised that there was a timing issue as other (non rail) bridge proposals were likely to come forward before any proposal for Trowse, and therefore there is a timing and decision making procedural issue here. DtT and NR have not been sending positive messages re a decision being made in the short-medium term, especially with uncertainty about rail travel coming back to higher pre-Covid levels. The wider issue of how, and when, approvals are given could have an impact on unlocking delivery of the regeneration sites.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1749 1177 1850">AB – advised that while the Masterplan was based on fixed bridges being provided, from a costings for viability point of view, the MP allowed for opening bridges to be provided from a land take point of view.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1883 1177 2007">GN – the bridge emphasised the need for continuing working with the BA, and other key stakeholders/partners, particularly the County Council, suggesting the need for a pragmatic approach be taken re. bridges and a marina, with information provided to assist with decision making.</p>	

Item	Topic	Actions
4.	<p><b>Consultants Presentation – Update re Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Viability</b></p> <p>The consultant team gave a presentation covering the above.</p> <p><b>SPD</b>  AB advised that feedback from the Stage 1 MP had led to no radical changes to feed into the SPD. A list of changes, or reinforcements, was shown, reflecting the need for emergency/secondary/public transport access ; heritage enhancement ; land uses ; ecology based on the County Wildlife Site (CWS) (and a change in boundary)</p> <p>There has also been a modest increase in housing numbers (from 3,469 to 3,632), noting that housing numbers on the Deal Ground have been maintained – despite the apparent change to CWS boundary, and also a modest decrease in employment space.</p> <p>A key to the SPD preparation was establishing clear language and tone as the basis for each of the key topic areas.</p> <p>Noted that graphic presentation often provided an indicative way of providing development within the Framework of the SPD; this would be made clear in the document. The document is NOT a blueprint ; there could be other ways of meeting Framework requirements or objectives to those indicated.</p> <p>GN – advised that the key issue in relation to the CWS was the Ecological value of the land. This should entail an updated Ecological study being undertaken. MTrA advised that the boundary change issue was being reviewed.</p> <p>JWa – advised that Fuel comments on the Draft SPD had been submitted, had sought to be constructive did indicate some divergence from the current Fuel proposals, and that the Fuel scheme would be submitted for the next preApp discussions.</p> <p><b>Viability</b>  JL advised some changes from the initial St 1 viability exercise. This included reduced s106/unit contribution (from £6k to £3k). The GDV inputs are based on the same assumptions.</p> <p>Phasing was outlined, noting that Phase 1 included both part of the Carrow Works site (Riverside) and the May Gurney site.</p> <p>Profit outturns can now be achieved within the range of usual commercial returns, based assumptions for public grant, stated assumptions re infrastructure costs (see Viability v1 – v6, and the accompanying IDP and schedule of costs), and based on a land value of £1.</p> <p>Ach – raised some queries re infrastructure costs, land value, finance charges. Meetings are being arranged with each landowner.</p> <p>JWa – sought clarification of when information was required for the Inspectors, advised about changes in the Fuel scheme which would impact on viability eg more houses, fewer flats and questioning assumption re Land Value</p> <p>KG – advised that the land value point is one of presentation: the profit line expresses ‘surplus’. JWa acknowledged this response.</p>	<p>Copy of the Presentation attached to Draft Minutes</p>

Item	Topic	Actions
	<p>Ach – concerned that some infra costs were high, that there is a time/value issue to be better reflected.</p> <p>IC – advised that costs were reflective of seeking a high quality scheme, and that landowners are being encouraged to share their own Financial Matrices to assist with a collective understanding of viability.</p> <p>CA – advised that the viability work, and discussion, was very helpful, that there was a lot of further work for Homes England to do – and that the opportunities arising from these sites’ regeneration matched Government ambition.</p> <p>GN – advised this is WIP, necessarily high level, but demonstrating a baseline , noting this is at a ‘point in time’, and that a timescale for submission to the Inspectors would be advised (PMN: htis advised as end of March).</p> <p>JWa – noted some clarification was needed re policy wording; eg if 20% affordable is showing that a development profit can be obtained, does that mean a reduced level of affordable housing is accepted, also stating conversations were needed between the Council and Homes England?</p> <p>MSt – advised that there was no intention t reduce the level of affordable housing being sought.</p> <p>IC - summarised by reference to a baseline development appraisal being established for which inputs could still be adjusted, and gave a frame t the challenges within the project.</p>	
5	<p><b>AOB and date of next meeting</b></p> <p>No matters of AOB were raised.</p> <p>Next Meeting is 29 March 2022, 14.00 – 15.30</p>	