

# East Norwich Delivery Board – Minutes

17 July 2024 – 14:00 – 16:20

Boardroom (201), City Hall

## Members

**Chair:** Bob Lane – Independent Member

Cllr Stonard, Norwich City Council, Leader

Cllr. Paul Kendrick – Norwich City Council, Cabinet Member for Resources

John East – Norwich City Council, Executive Director, Interim, Major Projects

Graham Nelson – Norwich City Council, Executive Director, Development & City Services

Louise Rawsthorne – Norwich City Council, Chief Executive

Cllr. Andrew Jamieson – Norfolk County Council, Cabinet Member for Finance

Cllr. Graham Plant – Norfolk CC, Cabinet Member Highways, Infrastructure & Transport

Chris Starkie – Norfolk County Council, Director Growth & Investment

Julia Krause – Homes England, Assistant Director, Market, Partners & Places (South)

Rob Rogers – Broads Authority, Director of Operations

Phil Courtier – South Norfolk Council & Broadland DC, Director of Place

Saul Humphrey – Independent Member

## Officers

Shelley Hall – Homes England, Senior Partnership & Business Manager

John Whetstone – Homes England

Matt Tracey – Norfolk County Council, Growth & Infrastructure Manager

Maria Hammond – Norwich City Council, East Norwich Programme Manager

Rob Anderson – Norwich City Council, East Norwich Project Manager

Andrew Turnbull – Norwich City Council, Development Strategy Manager

Sarah Ashurst – Head of Planning & Regulatory Services

Judith Davison – Norwich City Council, Planning Policy Team Leader

Sharon Page – Norwich City Council, Communications Manager, Community Services

Martin Woodhouse – PRD Consultants

Bek Seeley – Place Partners

Item	Topic	Actions
1.	<b>Welcome / Apologies / Introductions – BL</b> <b>Apologies:</b> Cllr Stonard Louise Rawsthorne Cllr Jamieson Cllr Plant Matt Tracey > Chris Starkie sub Ruth Sainsbury Natalie Beal Sharon Page > Andrew Keeling sub	

Item	Topic	Actions
	<p><b>Additional attendees:</b> Nya Dzwowa</p>	
2.	<p><b>Minutes from 10 May 2024 Meeting – BL</b> The minutes will need an update for publishing on website to ensure any commercial items regarding landowners are suitably managed.</p> <p>Planning update requires a summary.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Review of the minutes – comms and action log FOR PUBLISHING. ALL AGREED.</b></p>	PM
3.	<p><b>Commercial Review – Highlights – MW</b></p> <p>PRD ran through a presentation on outcomes of the work that they have been carrying out to date.</p> <p>Top six headlines –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. opportunities to <b>improve viability</b>.</li> <li>2. Need for public sector investment will remain.</li> <li>3. Funding gap through infrastructure is wide, but <b>phased and rational approach</b> to infrastructure is key.</li> <li>4. <b>High quality placemaking and activation, accessing a regeneration premium</b> – place offer through non-residential uses.</li> <li>5. <b>“market-make” to support the quantity and quality of new development.</b></li> <li>6. <b>Potential to be simplified to provide long term flexibility to support delivery.</b></li> </ol> <p>Element of market failure and therefore the need for Public Sector (PS) leadership, business case and funding. Local Plan will feed into this.</p> <p>PRD undertook a review of the market to produce a multidisciplinary review of the EN masterplan in order to unlock it and look at next steps of work and moving forward.</p> <p>Migration to Norwich – not many people migrate to Norwich which creates a challenge when looking at market absorption. Establishing East Norwich as a neighbourhood will involve positioning EN in the wider UK environment.</p> <p>Urban Design – there is the ability to deliver and integrate more dense family housing. Need to consider the user</p>	

Item	Topic	Actions
	<p>experience e.g. for families who want to live and work here? Commute to London, etc. East-West activation.</p> <p>Planning Strategy – Routes through planning and role of the Public Sector on delivery. Workshops are coming up to think about this.</p> <p>Meanwhile and asset re-use – heritage sites need to be considered, and how we can activate them to establish Place. In order to deliver comprehensive plans, have to have overall control and curation. “Buy Give Work” concept.</p> <p>Alternative Uses – 4000 jobs across the site but need to be flexible in the future plan for where commercial jobs exist. Need to have an open plan but the Masterplan will respond over time.</p> <p>SHu raised that PRD haven’t mentioned saleability as a result of the new Government regulations and whether this should be more focused on. MW responded absolutely, in light of the Labour manifesto – this has potential to be picked up in the design code. More specificity will be included in the site-wide plan. Ongoing management is an important point.</p> <p>Viability review – took AY financial model and input into the Argus developer. Looking at mixed approach to drive and deliver sales.</p> <p><b>Next stage work interface –</b>  Masterplan &gt; Planning Strategy &gt; Visioning Work &gt; Delivery &gt; Statutory Outline Business Case to government to apply for public funds to develop the project.</p> <p><b>Key considerations:</b>  Optimising the masterplan  Further understanding and balancing infrastructure delivery  Looking at where next for planning  Looking at what is most important and where the new Government is taking things</p>	
4.	<p><b>Commercial Review – Alignment with new Government themes – MW / BS</b></p> <p>BS delivered PP presentation on new Government themes.</p> <p>Growth-focused approach to planning system. Housing needs to be redefined as a critical infrastructure. Fast moving field – need to update.</p>	

Item	Topic	Actions
	<p>Mandatory housing targets – know where we are that this will be the order of the day. Brownfield prioritised – not being used has a detrimental effect on Place.</p> <p>New Towns in Cities – opportunity to pitch in as EN fits that definition. Hopefully this will strengthen the approach to jobs and community.</p> <p>Social justice – affordability and affordable homes.</p> <p>Solutions to challenges – different financial models.</p> <p>Devolution potential deal – upper tier authorities to pitch in who don't have an opportunity already.</p> <p>High quality resilient places – more efficient living in carbon aspect.</p> <p>In summary – this list will change over weeks and months once get more clarity, but we are well positioned. Need to firm up the story of the Place.</p> <p>MW – more support for first time buyers and bigger focus for social housing. Brownfield First policy. CPO reform could be massive in terms of planning aspect and expanded role of Homes England.</p> <p>BL – not just building housing but creating jobs (economic vision) and communities.</p> <p>How do we accelerate quality placemaking and housing typology to ensure targets are hit?</p> <p>BL – other side of the Government policy is that with growth, there will be more money, lower interest rates, etc.</p> <p>Conversations were held regarding car parking. The location is great so residents wouldn't need a car, but the Local Plan isn't prescriptive of a maximum threshold and the local surveyor would say that you need access to car parking spaces due to the shift to family units. With apartments, you can get away with less car parking but first need to understand the character of the Place to look at car parking which will have a knock-on effect on infrastructure and densities.</p> <p>Members wanted opportunities to grow a skilled workforce, build the fabric of the Masterplan and be as flexible as possible without jeopardising quality. The Masterplan will be developed with a project management focus to build up visions and outcomes, dealing with two aspects – strategic then infrastructure.</p>	

Item	Topic	Actions
	<p>Public money will be used to deliver enabling infrastructure. Need flexibility of marketing of economic rationale. Buildings can be repurposed for other ideas such as film studios. Can create self-containment and infrastructure required. It is difficult to answer questions on housing typologies etc until more work has looked into core economic purpose and attracting investment. This could get institutional investors to back it.</p> <p><b>Next steps</b> – finding out economic rationale to make it less nebulous.</p> <p>Advocating different types of density housing. Different models around terraced housing can still work at a dense rate. Getting the marketing right can drive people to move to Norwich and work there. The plan is for a primary school to go in an existing building to start to activate it and drive footfall. Repurposing the school into an existing building could reduce costs.</p> <p>With some optimism in the appraisal, some public funding would be required.</p> <p>GN - Phasing element that needs to be input. Road access is already there and can get cashflow moving as the bridge would be advantageous and needed to unlock the Deal Ground.</p> <p>Planning strategy – next meeting, this work will be complete.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Commercial Review – Action Plan - JE</b></p> <p>Work to be done on strategic refinement. Consolidate supplementary planning document – lock in core things by simplifying it. Concurrent activity – tie it all in – what is the brand, what is the purpose.</p> <p>EN economic vision – PRD have started this additional work.</p> <p>JE – look again at masterplan. 2-3 months to undertake this work. A need to look at all the moving parts at the same time to manage and integrate them. Can't agree the SPD until the findings are sought.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Discuss Commercial Review updates at future stage – 3 months.</b></p>	JE

Item	Topic	Actions
	SH – understanding flood risk and rising sea levels. This site may be more vulnerable. MH – there is some work ongoing on this to better understand the situation.	
6.	<p><b>Project Update – MH</b></p> <p>A paper was written for presentation to the Board giving updates on the River Wensum Navigation legal opinion, Trowse Underpass feasibility, energy, economic vision, Carrow House and Communications.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Project Plan – RA / MH</b></p> <p>Visual report on where we are under four different categories.</p> <p>This has been based on working to taking the strategic outline business case and delivery strategy to the Council's Cabinet. Recognition that we need to do some more work in re-baselining the plan.</p> <p>Sequencing then regrouping – <b>update at next meeting.</b> There has been work on this. BL agreed that need to be realistic targets and can only go as fast as we can go. Early next year will be Cabinet. BL agreed that this is fine given government plans, complexity of project, etc.</p>	RA/MH
8.	<p><b>Planning Update – GN / JD</b></p> <p>Carrow Works planning – six months from refusal is significant for planning purposes.. If they do submit an appeal, we are looking at 18-24 months. There are various statements that are required over this time, and would need to give 10 days' notice before 22 September if seeking a public inquiry.</p> <p>Questions arising from the Deal Ground plan – updated position of flood zone three.</p> <p>Is there a committee date to review this? Planners are awaiting timeline – 6-12 months. Consultation is needed.</p> <p>SH – we could refuse it, but we are not at that point. Until RM application is determined, the application doesn't expire. They have to respond to Planning.</p>	
9.	<p><b>Landowner Update – BS</b></p> <p>BS delivered a verbal update of a sensitive and confidential nature.</p>	

Item	Topic	Actions
	<p>Awaiting changes expected over the Summer. Re-engage post September.</p> <p>BL – part of audit process, will realise that values have dropped but they haven't given this to BS.</p>	
10.	<p><b>AOB – BL</b></p> <p>None</p>	
	<p><b>Next meeting TBC (October)</b></p> <p>W/c 7 October – PM to liaise with Naomi Alden and Glenn Dodds re dates for Cllrs at County.</p> <p>No Cabinet, Labour party group in w/c 22 Sept. Not the Monday.</p> <p>BL thanked members and closed the meeting.</p>	PM