

# Greater Norwich Growth Board

**Date:** 24 September 2015

**Time:** 2pm

**Venue:** Colman and Cavell Rooms, South Norfolk Council, South Norfolk House, Swan Lane, Long Stratton, NR15 2XE

**Board members:**

**Broadland District Council:**

Cllr Andrew Proctor

**Norwich City Council:**

Cllr Alan Waters

**South Norfolk Council:**

Cllr John Fuller (Chair)

**Norfolk County Council:**

Cllr Stephen Morphew

**New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership:**

Ms Davina Tanner

**Officers:**

Phil Kirby  
Phil Courtier

David Moorcroft  
Graham Nelson

Tim Horspole

Tom McCabe  
Fiona McDiarmid

Chris Starkie

Jobs, homes and prosperity for local people



NORWICH  
City Council



Norfolk County Council

**NEWANGLIA**  
Local Enterprise Partnership  
for Norfolk and Suffolk

<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
1. Apologies	
2. Minutes of meeting 24 March 2015	4
3. Nomination to the position of Vice Chair	
4. Greater Norwich Growth Ambitions <i>An update on the delivery of the growth ambitions of the Board</i>	9
5. Joint Core Strategy: Review and Roll Forward <i>To discuss the possible options for local plan review</i>	11
6. Annual Growth Programme 2016/17 <i>To agree the 16/17 Growth Programme and supporting borrowing drawdown</i>	21
7. Growth Programme – Case Studies and Highlights <i>To receive a presentation from Dr David White, Senior Green Infrastructure Officer, Norfolk County Council.</i>	
8. Greater Norwich Local Infrastructure Fund <i>To receive a summary of progress of applications to date</i>	44

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:**

Committee Officer: Owen Pugh

t: 01508 533685

e: [opugh@s-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:opugh@s-norfolk.gov.uk)

Democratic Services, South Norfolk Council, South Norfolk House, Swan Lane, Long Stratton, NR15 2XE

17 September 2015



If you would like this agenda in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language, please call Owen Pugh, Democratic Services Officer on 01508 533985 or email [opugh@s-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:opugh@s-norfolk.gov.uk)



Please call Owen Pugh, Democratic Services Officer on 01508 533985 or email [opugh@s-norfolk.ov.uk](mailto:opugh@s-norfolk.ov.uk) in advance of the meeting if you have any queries regarding access requirements.

# Greater Norwich Growth Board

Minutes

2pm to 3.10pm

24 March 2015

## Present:

### Board members:

#### South Norfolk Council:

Councillor John Fuller (Chair)

#### Broadland District Council:

Councillor Andrew Proctor

#### New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership:

Mark Jeffries  
(substitute for Mark Pendlington)

#### Norfolk County Council:

Councillor Steve Morphew

#### Norwich City Council:

Councillor Mike Stonard  
(substitute for Councillor Brenda Arthur)

### Officers:

Tim Horspole

Phil Courtier

Chris Starkie

Fiona McDiarmid  
Richard Doleman  
Phil Morris

David Moorcroft  
Graham Nelson

## 1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Brenda Arthur (Norwich City Council) and Mark Pendlington, New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP).

## 2. Minutes

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2014.

Arising from minute number 1, Fiona McDiarmid updated the Board on Norfolk County Council's recent appointment of Mr Hamilton (Tig) Armstrong following the retirement of Sandra Eastaugh. She confirmed that Mr Armstrong would be attending the next meeting of the Board.

### **3. Growth Deal – Update**

Mark Jeffries gave an update and tabled an infographic (a copy of this document is available on the LEP website) outlining investment in the region. He drew the Board's attention to the newly-signed Growth Deal, confirming that this Government investment in excess of £220million would lead to 16,000 new jobs and 3,000 new homes in Norfolk and Suffolk whilst improving and supporting local infrastructure, and gave examples of some of the projects and schemes being supported, such as the Construction Training Centre at Easton and Otley College, and the Aviation Academy at Norwich International Airport.

The Board was also advised that the transport improvements to the A11 corridor in the Norwich Policy Area would commence in 2016.

Reference was also made to the Growing Business Fund, which would be supporting 91 businesses across the region, securing 1000 jobs, whilst helping to secure additional private investment, and the Growing Places Fund which was supporting improvements at the UEA Enterprise Centre and a Digital Incubation Hub at Norwich University of the Arts, amongst many other projects.

The Chairman confirmed that the planned improvements to the Thickthorn Interchange had been included in the Government's Road Investment Strategy which released £30m that otherwise would have been provided by Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) monies.

Mark Jeffries confirmed that the New Anglia LEP had been meeting with representatives from Norfolk and Suffolk banking institutions to discuss the possibility of securing investment in local infrastructure projects through financial bonds. These discussions would be ongoing.

**RESOLVED** to note the update on the Growth Deal.

### **4. City Deal – Where Next?**

Fiona McDiarmid introduced the report which set out recent national policy developments and gave the Board an update on the current position and next steps required to ensure the delivery of strategic infrastructure to support the growth ambitions of the area.

The Board was encouraged to prepare for and consider the way in which funding may change as a result of the forthcoming General Election, with the Chairman suggesting that the Board should be prepared to approach the new government within 100 days of the election with its proposals. He added that the Board must learn lessons from the first round City Deals experience.

There followed some discussion around the issue of financial leverage and innovative financial opportunities that may be available in the near future, particularly investments involving infrastructure. Cllr Steve Mophew advised the Board not to underestimate the importance of private sector funding. Fiona McDiarmid confirmed

that officers would be focussing on financial aspects and working closely with the LEP in this regard.

**RESOLVED** to note the contents of the report and request that officers work up proposals for freedoms, flexibilities, financing and funding to drive forward delivery.

## 5. Growth Programme – 6 month update

Richard Doleman presented the report and updated the Board on the Growth Programme for 2014/15, highlighting individual projects, and confirming that overall the projects were on track. There was some slight slippage with a small number of projects but these were being carefully managed and monitored and it was anticipated that these would catch up and finish on target.

The Board was advised that the 2015/16 had now been signed off by each of the partner authorities, but that since the programme had been approved by the Board in October 2014, there had been a number of important funding announcements:

- The Road Investment Strategy had been published, confirming the Government's commitment to the funding of improvements to the A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange.
- £4million of Local Growth Fund monies had been secured and £8.4million of City Cycle Ambition Grant funding for delivery of Norwich Area Transportation Strategy schemes including improvements to walking and cycling around Norwich.

The Board discussed the importance of securing mainstream funding such as this which could be 'topped up' as appropriate by CIL monies.

The Chairman suggested that a 'master document' be produced showing total funding received as it would be useful to have an up to date view of all achievements, and could also be used to demonstrate the Board's track record on project delivery.

Richard Doleman went on to introduce the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Plan which would form the basis for the preparation of the 2016/17 Growth Programme. The Board discussed the document and its importance as an evidence base. The Chairman suggested that it could also include additional information such as the arrangement in place between a number of authorities in the County with regard to the pooling of business rates, and the significant amount of housebuilding taking place in the area. Members were in agreement that the introduction should be amended to set the context of the GNIP within the Joint Core Strategy.

There was some discussion about the delivery of NHS primary care (ie GP practices and other local health services) keeping up with housing growth. Fiona McDiarmid advised the Board that she and other colleagues had met with NHS England and local CCGs and would be involved in ongoing discussion about this issue. She confirmed she would keep the Board briefed on developments.

**RESOLVED to:**

- (1) note the progress on the current Growth Programme and publication of the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Plan subject to amendment of the introduction
- (2) note the timetable for preparation and approval of the 2016/17 Growth Programme

**6. Greater Norwich Communications Protocol**

Phil Courtier introduced the item, and confirmed that the principles remained the same as the GNDP Protocol. Following a brief discussion it was

**RESOLVED** to agree the Greater Norwich Growth Board Protocol

**7. Greater Norwich Local Infrastructure Fund**

Phil Courtier presented the report which gave a summary of progress on applications approved to date, put forward amendments to the Local Infrastructure Fund (LIF) criteria and also gave an update on the financial profile of all applications received by the GNGB.

The Chairman commented on the importance of ensuring that the Board was able to engage with applications to the LIF as quickly as possible. Members were in agreement that the best method to achieve this was to liaise with the Board by email to avoid unnecessary delays in the process.

Members considered the amendments (shown in red) to the LIF criteria and guidance and were in agreement with these.

**RESOLVED to:**

- (1) note progress on the proposals approved in principle at the Board Meetings on 31 July 2014 and 8 October 2014
- (2) agree amendments to the Criteria and Guidance Notes for the Local Infrastructure Fund as follows:

Schemes should provide a repayment profile, milestone or time-based, over 5 years. *In certain circumstances, and where the other LIF objectives and criteria are met, schemes with a longer repayment profile that are purely commercial may be considered.*

- (3) agree that subject to further detailed financial scrutiny under item 8 on the agenda the proposal be approved in principle and authorise negotiations to commence between the accountable body and the applicant to prepare a loan agreement.

## 8. Exclusion of the public

**RESOLVED** to exclude the press and public from the meeting during consideration of the following item on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as specified in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (paragraph 3).

## 9. Greater Norwich Local Infrastructure Fund

(Councillor Steve Morpew declared an Other Interest in this item because the County Council owned land at Beeston Park).

Phil Courtier presented the report and answered questions.

During discussion the Board members concurred with the recommendations set out in section 5 of the report. Members of the Board discussed the importance of a strict time-frame of six months (from the date of this meeting) for progress to be made and the need for robust legal arrangements. Members were advised that the position could be re-evaluated after the six month period.

Cllr Andrew Proctor suggested that a viability appraisal should be required as part of the programme addressed at paragraph 4.1 of the report. Members of the Board concurred with this view.

**RESOLVED** to agree in principle the availability of a loan but give the parties a timetable for progress and conditions to be met. Each party to be given six months to demonstrate meaningful progress on this programme as set out in the confidential report, after which the application be reviewed.

CHAIR

## Greater Norwich Growth Ambitions

*Tig Armstrong, Infrastructure and Economic Growth Manager, Norfolk County Council*

### Summary

This report provides an update on a number of activities being undertaken by the Greater Norwich Projects Team that are designed to support the Greater Norwich 'growth agenda'.

### Recommendations

- (i) To note the report

## 1. Introduction

The Greater Norwich Growth Board (GNGB) are committed to delivering strong and sustainable growth for the Greater Norwich area. Under direction from the GNGB the Greater Norwich Projects Team are undertaking a number of activities designed to contribute to this agenda, including identifying opportunities for increased investment into Greater Norwich and opportunities to increasing the delivery rates of new homes.

## 2. Greater Norwich Growth Prospectus

Creative Giant have been engaged to work closely with the Projects Team to develop a Greater Norwich Growth Prospectus. Creative Giant are a local graphic design agency who worked previously with the Greater Norwich Development Partnership.

The primary audience for the Prospectus are potential investors. Therefore the Prospectus will portray Greater Norwich as a dynamic and growing region with a number of unique selling points including growing creative technology, life sciences and advanced engineering and manufacturing sectors. The Prospectus will also reinforce the fact that growing the local economy is a collaborative effort involving a wide range of sectors and institutions.

Comments and input will be sought from the GNGB and others throughout the development and production of the Prospectus. Printing of the agreed and final version will occur in mid-October.

## 3. MIPIM UK, 21–23 October, 2015

Norfolk County Council's Economic Development Team, in conjunction with Hethel Engineering Centre, the Norwich Research Park and Scottow Enterprise Park have taken a stand at this year's MIPIM UK exhibition. Each will promote their respective investment opportunities under the 'Locate Norfolk' brand.

It has subsequently been agreed amongst the attendees and the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board that the Greater Norwich authorities should attend and co-locate with those already attending.

MIPIM is one of the key forums for local authorities and cities to showcase their

'investment offering' and attract the attention of potential investors. The Prospectus is being designed with this purpose in mind.

#### **4. Housing delivery research**

With the support of the LEP, the Projects Team will shortly be seeking quotes from suitably qualified individuals and organisations to undertake research and prepare a report for the GNGB that seeks to further the GNGB's understanding of factors that may be restricting the delivery of new housing across the Greater Norwich area.

The authors of the report will also be required to identify and/or recommend actions and strategies that could be implemented that have the potential to unlock delivery.

#### **6. Recommendations**

- (i) Note this report

#### **7. Issues and Risks**

##### **Other resource implications (staff, property)**

The Growth Prospectus is expected to cost ~ £5k, plus printing. This amount has been budgeted for in the GNGB budget.

The cost of attending MIPIM UK is the subject of ongoing discussion between the County Council and the GNGB.

Likely costs of the housing research projects have not been established as yet.

##### **Legal implications**

N/A

##### **Risks**

N/A

##### **Equality**

N/A

##### **Environmental implications**

N/A

#### **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Telephone Number</b>	<b>Email address</b>
Tig Armstrong	01603 223 264	tig.armstrong@norfolk.gov.uk

## Joint Core Strategy : review and roll forward

Report by Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board

### Summary

The Joint Core Strategy was originally adopted in March 2011 with some Broadland elements in January 2014. Other parts of each LPA's Local Plan have either been adopted recently or are nearing adoption. This paper sets out why it is necessary to begin a review and roll forward and assesses options for doing so. A review and roll forward of the JCS, incorporating site allocations, is recommended as the most appropriate option. This will provide a joint Local Plan excluding development management policies. If it is necessary to review development management policies, this can be undertaken independently by each district but, as far as possible, concurrently with the JCS roll forward. Governance arrangements will be the subject of a future report.

### Recommendation

The Board recommends that:

1. each of the local planning authorities, supported by the other partners, commits to work together to review and roll forward the JCS incorporating site allocations, with any requirements for development management policies produced separately and, as far as possible, concurrently.
2. Proposals for governance arrangements are developed and will be subject to a future report.

## 1. Background

- 1.1. There are a number of reasons that suggest that there is a need to consider a review of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) at this time.
- 1.2. Good practice  
The JCS has a base date of 2008 and was adopted in early 2011, with some Broadland elements adopted in early 2014. To keep a plan up-to-date, best practice is to review on a 5 yearly cycle (i.e. a revised plan adopted every 5 years). Government guidance (PPG) advises "*Most Local Plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years*".
- 1.3. Typically a statutory plan can take up to around 5 years to review, so commencing later this year, adoption of a replacement is unlikely before late 2020 i.e. 7 or 10 years from previous adoptions.
- 1.4. Government policy (NPPF) requires plans to look ahead at least 15 years The JCS has under 11 years left and may only have around 5 years life from adopting a replacement.
- 1.5. Experience elsewhere suggests that it may be possible, with sufficient resources, streamlined processes, no unforeseen delays, and a focussed review, to reduce the

timescale to perhaps around 3 years, but this would be very challenging.

1.6. Potential Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) review

The current CIL charging schedules were examined in October 2012 with the key evidence dating from 2011. It is timely to consider a review. Total funding could be increased by increasing rates of CIL and also altering the Reg. 123 list to make more infrastructure subject to S106 (although scope for the latter is undermined by “pooling” restrictions). Increasing the rate of CIL (or changing the Reg. 123 list) requires us to demonstrate that development is more viable than it was in 2011 – key determinants of viability are house prices, build costs and policy requirements:

- House prices have increased but this will be offset to a degree by some increased costs. Housing delivery is also still well below targets and this will make an examiner nervous about increasing developer burdens at this time.
- In the absence of a plan review, CIL would still be examined in the context of existing policy requirements, including those with a large impact on viability such as affordable housing

A review of CIL in advance of any local plan review would require the production of new viability evidence, based on currently adopted plans. It would be preferable to review CIL alongside the plan, giving time for delivery to have improved and sharing the same evidence. This option would mean that CIL rates will not be changed for some time. Maintaining a consistent approach to CIL across the area would be much more difficult if local plan reviews were not undertaken as a joint plan.

1.7. Land supply

Land supply is dynamic. A plan review provides the opportunity to keep planned supply at a sufficient level. It might also offer the potential to phase development to reduce current pressures and allow firmer linkage to the job growth ambitions in the City Deal.

1.8. Changing context

Issues include:

- The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) report is due to be published, reassessing housing need for the period 2012 to 2036 (over 5 districts)
- Agreement has been reached to produce a Norfolk Strategic Framework covering strategic planning issues. This will assist and inform any review.
- Infrastructure investment will improve connectivity:
  - the NDR has a Development Consent Order and construction is due to commence later in 2015.
  - A47 announcements – the dualling of North Tuddenham-Easton and Blofield-Burlingham sections, and a Thickthorn junction improvement are likely to be completed in the early 2020s
  - GEML improvements to journey times and reliability, and progress on East-West rail are expected in a similar timescale
- Economic development issues - the City Deal jobs target commits the authorities to accelerate job growth particularly in high value sectors that are not expected to grow under a “business as usual” forecast. In addition, since adoption of the JCS we now have clearer evidence of post-recession recovery.
- Other (less important individually):- the London Plan review and “Wider South

East” discussions; Breckland and North Norfolk LP reviews are underway, implications of a potential GY review within next 5 years; SEP review; and national initiatives e.g. devolution/growth deals/governance/garden cities.

## 2. **Issues affecting review options**

2.1. Legal advice has been sought from Counsel regarding our options for a joint review. Counsel considered four options:

1. A joint Local Plan (with or without DM policies) for the whole of the 3 LPAs;
2. A joint Local Plan (with or without DM policies) for a Norwich Policy Area (NPA) with separate Local Plans for the remainder of Broadland and South Norfolk;
3. A (whole/partial) review of the Joint Core Strategy;
4. A joint statement of principles on strategic matters, and separate Local Plans for each district.

2.2. Counsel identifies the main issues that affect the approach to a review:

- Commitments to review in existing policies
- The requirements of the Duty to Co-operate;
- The results of evidence regarding strategic issues; and
- The requirements of the Sustainability Appraisal process.

2.3. *Commitments in existing policies*

Counsel identified that the starting point for any review should be the trigger points already established in the JCS. Specifically, the JCS requires a review in one of two circumstances:

- There is no possibility of the timely delivery of the NDR; or,
- A monitoring report produced after January 2016 shows a significant shortfall in the housing land supply within the Broadland NPA (a significant shortfall is defined as less than 90% of the required supply).

2.4. In relation to the NDR, the DCO was granted on 2 June, and construction is programmed to start later this year.

2.5. The JCS trigger point relating to housing supply is set out in Policy 22 and was a requirement of the Inspector who conducted the examination into the amendments adopted in January 2014. While the Policy seeks a review focussed on finding new housing allocations this would be very difficult to achieve without a more comprehensive review taking full account of changing evidence and circumstances. Broadland District Council is currently engaged in examination for the Site Allocations DPD and Growth Triangle Area Action Plan. The adoption of these documents will significantly reduce the possibility of a shortfall in land supply within the Broadland NPA.

- 2.6. While trigger points in the JCS are less likely to come into effect, South Norfolk and Broadland have been required by Inspectors at examination to include an early review clause in their Local Plans. For South Norfolk a review will need to be completed by 2020, for Broadland by 2021. In practice any joint approach, if this is the option pursued, will need to conform to the earliest deadline. Review(s) would need to start this year to be confident that these deadlines are met.
- 2.7. *Duty to Co-operate*  
The Localism Act 2011, National Planning Policy Framework and Duty to Co-operate do not require a joint plan to be produced but the Duty does require each LPA to ask and answer the question as to whether a joint local plan should be prepared. It must also ask and answer the question “whether to consult on and prepare, and enter into and publish, agreements on joint approaches” to strategic matters.’ In answering these questions we might also ask what would be the justification for moving away from a pre-existing joint plan.
- 2.8. It is notable that Counsel considered that ‘*The collaborative processes and extensive engagement that produced the JCS was an exemplar of the work that this duty requires, and the continuing joint working remains an important way of showing that duty is being met.*’ In assessing compliance with the duty to collaborate, Local Plan Inspectors have also recognised the significance of the close collaboration between the Greater Norwich District Councils and the County Council on the JCS.
- 2.9. Norfolk’s local planning authorities have agreed to produce a Norfolk Strategic Framework which will demonstrate wider cooperation and provide agreement on key strategic planning issues. While the Framework will be invaluable it is not intended to be a strategic plan, and it will not be capable of providing a clear and defensible spatial strategy at sufficient detail, including the distribution of housing and economic growth across the Norwich area (NPA or a similar area). To be robust a strategy would need to be supported by a statutory process including consultation, sustainability appraisal, and public examination.
- 2.10. *Evidence base regarding Strategic Issues*  
The most significant issues for the purposes of considering review options are identified in the emerging SHMA. The SHMA:
- a) advises that the Housing Market Area (HMA) extends beyond the three council’s areas particularly into Breckland and North Norfolk. However, it should be noted that the extent of the HMA is largely determined by lack of self-containment in the outer areas rather than any strong relationship with Norwich;
  - b) identifies a ‘core area’ that is almost entirely within the Greater Norwich districts but is larger than the current Norwich Policy Area – on the basis of this evidence, the question has to be asked and addressed as to whether the boundaries of the NPA need changing

With an annualised “objectively assessed need” (OAN) for housing comparable to the overall rate of growth in the JCS, the option for a simple and quick “roll forward” of the JCS is limited. It should be noted that the OAN includes an uplift to align

housing growth with jobs forecasts and includes the jobs growth aims of the City Deal i.e. in broad terms it confirms that the annual rate of growth in the current JCS is appropriate to support efforts to deliver the scale of high value jobs sought through the City Deal.

2.11. Although Breckland and North Norfolk are partly within the same housing market area as the GNGB districts and the whole of the five districts are covered by the same SHMA, a 5-district joint plan is not an option as they are both more advanced on individual Local Plans and do not wish to pursue a joint plan.

2.12. *Sustainability Appraisal*

The requirements of the Sustainability Appraisal process is a crucial consideration, in particular the need to consider, select and evaluate all, not merely a selection of reasonable alternatives capable of meeting the plan objectives. These alternatives would include those which address the distribution of growth, including any definition of a core area, similar to the current NPA.

### 3. **Consideration of possible options for plan review.**

3.1. *Separate but Co-ordinated Local Plans in GNGB area?*

In addition to the issues outlined above, this option was considered when the JCS was commenced and the problems that led to rejection are very similar or the same:

- Full coordination has no clear advantages for either timescales or local control over a joint plan developed through consensus.
- There would be greater potential for delay, confusion, inefficiency and cost.
- It would be more difficult to resolve differences of view.
- Moving away from a joint plan is likely to significantly undermine the perception of co-operation – an issue for the local plan process but also a, potentially very significant, negative impact on wider influence and inward investment.
- Working on a joint plan offers significant efficiency savings. In addition, it may have the potential to attract external funding to support evidence studies (to be investigated).

3.2. Counsel does not rule out individual local plans, but does suggest that the ability to demonstrate strategic matters on a wider than local authority basis is much more difficult in the absence of a joint plan: *“I can see that the legal and policy requirements to demonstrate that the strategic matters have been addressed on a wider basis than the City area, the collection of a robust evidence base, and the testing of the strategic option may inexorably lead to some sort of joint plan”*.

3.3. This view highlights a weakness in an approach with a strategic agreement and separate Local Plans. Specifically that this option has the disadvantage, in comparison with a Joint Local Plan (or a JCS and related DPDs), that the strategic matters would not be adopted policy and would need to be reconsidered at each Local Plan examination.

3.4. *Joint Core Strategy or Joint Local Plan?*

Although the Government’s current preference is firmly on producing a comprehensive Local Plan other locations are continuing to progress JCSs and this

is confirmed as an option by Counsel.

- 3.5. As a refinement of any joint approach, it is possible that a joint local plan could be separated into a core area plan and separate non-core area plans (for Broadland and South Norfolk). However, this would necessitate the definition of the boundaries of the three plans in advance, and this would be vulnerable to challenge for having pre-judged important issues. This is a significant risk. Counsel's opinion is that it would be better to determine a core area as part of a wider local plan review for the area as a whole. A core/non-core approach would also necessitate Broadland and South Norfolk each being covered by two separate Local Plans with consequent resource and production issues, and potential for divergent policies and public confusion.
- 3.6. If a joint approach is taken, Counsel considers there is a lot of merit in excluding DM policies, this would simplify the document and allow for locally distinctive approaches. He considers that a single joint local plan, with joint DM policies and all site allocations may be trying to do too much in one local plan.
- 3.7. Counsel considers that a partial or full review of the JCS could be the quickest route to review, as the framework is a familiar one. This approach would provide continuity and familiarity for the public. The JCS is, however, currently only a strategic plan, that does not include site allocations. It would be possible to treat the JCS update as a hybrid, including site allocations, although care would need to be taken in this option to ensure that this process does not become unwieldy.
- 3.8. Allocations would be necessary as part of the JCS if a 5 year supply could not be demonstrated. As long as the revised annualised housing provision is similar to current and the review is adopted before the end of 2020 (or thereabouts), existing allocations and the stock of permissions should be adequate to demonstrate sufficient supply. On the other hand including allocations in a JCS would better demonstrate deliverability of the overall strategy and negate the risk of being found unsound on land supply issues.
- 3.9. A further refinement could be for each district to review and roll forward where necessary other DPDs (i.e. site allocations, AAPs and DM policies) independently, but as far as possible, concurrently with the JCS. This would provide the opportunity for a complete local plan as early as possible but without slowing production of the JCS.

#### 4. **Governance**

- 4.1. There are a range of Governance options that could be investigated. However, arrangements do not need to be established immediately and can be firmed up over the next few months taking account of any proposals that emerge as a result of devolution discussions.

#### 5. **Conclusions**

- 5.1. Legal advice confirms that there is still a choice to be made about whether to have a joint plan, but it would be more difficult and risky for each LPA to seek to address the wider strategic matters in a piecemeal, district-by-district basis. In addition,

moving away from a joint plan would convey a negative message on our commitment to work together to deliver economic growth.

- 5.2. A joint plan confined to a core area (NPA or other) runs significant risks as it pre-determines the principle of continuing with such a policy and the boundary to which it applies. It would also require Broadland and South Norfolk to each produce two separate plans with resultant costs and opportunities for confusion.
- 5.3. In practical terms a comprehensive joint Local Plan covering all issues would be a complex and lengthy process. However, Counsel saw the merit of excluding DM policies from a joint Local Plan approach, as this would simplify the document and allow each district to adopt their own locally-distinctive approaches.
- 5.4. A JCS review would provide continuity, familiarity to the public and probably the earliest completion date as the framework is familiar – a high level project plan based on this option can be found at Appendix A. The disadvantage of a JCS is that it is currently only a strategic plan that does not allocate sites for development. On balance, while it is unlikely to be the quickest option, it is considered that allocations should be included in the JCS to ensure we can demonstrate delivery of the strategy. This approach could also be characterised as a Local Plan without development management policies and is therefore much closer to the Government's emphasis on single Local Plans. Development management policies may only require a light touch review and could be brought forward separately but concurrently in order to reduce the timescale for adoption for a complete local plan but without risking delay to the core elements.
- 5.5. A CIL review linked to the local plan review would share evidence, take account of policy changes that might impact viability, and allow more time to demonstrate improved viability/deliverability, which is likely to be a concern for any examiner in the short term.
- 5.6. Taking account of all these issues it is recommended that a review and roll forward of the Joint Core Strategy (with site allocations) is the best option as it:
  - Offers the opportunity for significant cost savings
  - Best fulfils the requirements of the planning system (particularly the duty to cooperate)
  - Is the most beneficial for economic development by maintaining a high profile, demonstrating we mean business and attracting public and private investment
  - Builds consensus while retaining responsibility for decision making with the LPAs

## Recommendation

The Board recommends that:

- each of the local planning authorities, supported by the other partners, commits to work together to review and roll forward the JCS incorporating site allocations, with any requirements for development management policies produced separately and, as far as possible, concurrently.
- Proposals for governance arrangements are developed and will be subject to a future report.

## Background Papers

## Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Telephone Number</b>	<b>Email address</b>
Phil Morris	01603 222730	phil.morris@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 and ask for **Phil Morris** or textphone 0344 800 8011 and we will do our best to help.

## Options

Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>1. Joint Core Strategy review</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviews what we have – can be focussed</li> <li>• Clearly demonstrates ongoing DtC and long term commitment to work together to deliver economic growth</li> <li>• Cost savings</li> <li>• Retains local flexibility in content and timetable for Site allocations and Development Management Policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to justify why it is not a comprehensive Local Plan</li> <li>• In the absence of new allocations, or any significant delay in delivering current allocations, there may be a 5 year land supply issue particularly if we take too long.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Joint Core Strategy plus site allocations (i.e. Local Plan without DM policies)</b>  Pros and Cons sit between 1 and 3. Inclusion of allocations makes it easier to demonstrate deliverability but risks being delayed by objections to specific sites.	
<b>3. Joint Local Plan</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly demonstrates ongoing DtC</li> <li>• Clearly demonstrates ongoing long term commitment to work together to deliver economic growth</li> <li>• Complies with requirement for single comprehensive Plan</li> <li>• Potentially the biggest cost savings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major piece of work, more complex than JCS</li> <li>• Likely to be slower process than JCS (but would be quicker overall unless JCS and other DPDs are developed in parallel)</li> <li>• Risks being delayed by arguments about specific allocations or development management policies.</li> <li>• Makes it difficult to have district specific DM policies</li> </ul>
<b>4. Joint Local Plan or JCS for “NPA” with separate plans for rest of Broadland and South Norfolk</b>	
No obvious advantages over 1 or 3. May fail legislative requirements. By fixing the NPA boundary this is likely to be seen as a “policy on” approach and is likely to fail	
<b>5. Separate Local Plans (assume strategy element and timescales would need to be coordinated)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each appear more in control of their own destiny (but subject to Duty to Cooperate constraints. In addition, no great advantage over a consensual partnership which also retains local control over joint plan)</li> <li>• Complies with encouragement for single comprehensive Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undermines effective DtC and the demonstration of a joint commitment to delivering necessary growth</li> <li>• Difficult to co-ordinate and align timetables</li> <li>• Risk of unresolved disagreements and consequent objections</li> <li>• Risk that separate examinations result in different strategies</li> <li>• Land supply risk for all and particularly the slowest.</li> <li>• Likely to cost more</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX A

### High level project plan<sup>1</sup>

Dec 2015	Agree and Publish Local Development Scheme
Jan 2016	Review Statements of Community Involvement
Jan 2016 to March 2016	Evidence Audit, commissioning of new studies and call for sites.
Jan 2016 to March 2016	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report
April 2016 to Dec 2016	Issues and Options preparation (approx. 9 months)
March 2017 to June 2017	Regulation 18 'Issues and Options' consultation (12 weeks)
July 2017 to March 2018	Analysis of response/draft Regulation 19 (approx. 9 months)
May 2018 to June 2018	Publish Regulation 19 (6 weeks)
July 2018 to Dec 2018	Analysis/redraft (approx. 6 months)
Feb 2019	Agree submission version
April 2019	Submission to Secretary of State
Sept 2019 to Dec 2019	Examination
June 2020	Inspector's Report received (approx. 6 months including Mods Consult)
Sept 2020	Adoption

<sup>1</sup> Based on a JCS review model which is likely to provide the earliest adoption date.

## **Annual Growth Programme 2016/17**

*Tig Armstrong, Infrastructure and Economic Growth Manager,  
Norfolk County Council*

### **Summary**

This report provides an update on the 2014/15 and 2015/16 Annual Growth Programmes and proposes projects for inclusion in the 2016/17 Growth Programme.

### **Recommendations**

- (i) The Board note progress on the 2014/15 and 2015/16 Annual Growth Programmes.
- (ii) The Board:
  - endorse the six projects recommended for inclusion in the 2016/17 Annual Growth Programme and commit £2.4m from the pooled Infrastructure Investment Fund towards these projects (see Table Three); and
  - approve in-principle four projects (brought forward in the 16/17 Business Plans) for inclusion in the 2017/18 Growth Programme and commit in-principle £1.025m from the pooled Infrastructure Investment Fund towards these projects (see Table Four).
- (iii) The Board delegates responsibility to the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board to manage the delivery of the 2016/17 Annual Growth Programme, report progress to the next GNGB Board and to consider inclusion of further schemes emerging from the identified development work.
- (iv) The Board reaffirm endorsement of the 5 year NATS programme as set out in Appendix C and the use of £2,150,000 of pooled CIL funds to support delivery from 2017/18 to 2019/20 within future annual growth programmes
- (v) The Board reaffirm their commitment to borrow funds as and when required to support the delivery of the significant infrastructure projects including the Northern Distributor Road (NDR), Long Stratton Bypass and other transportation improvement measures.

### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The Greater Norwich City Deal was signed in December 2013. The infrastructure strand of the City Deal agreed a Strategic Infrastructure Programme supported through Government-approved access to preferential borrowing (i.e. the 'project rate') from the Public Works Loan Board.
- 1.2 In addition Broadland District, South Norfolk and Norwich City Councils committed to pooling a significant proportion of their Community Infrastructure

Levy (CIL) income to support the Strategic Infrastructure Programme.

- 1.3 Decisions on delivery and pooled funding support for the Strategic Infrastructure Programme are made by the Greater Norwich Growth Board (the GNGB) via the Annual Growth Programme cycle for subsequent endorsement by the Partners.
- 1.4 The Annual Growth Programmes set out the projects prioritised for development and delivery on an annual cycle. In addition, they also commit pooled CIL funds, either partly or wholly to these projects. The first Annual Growth Programme (2014/15) was approved by the GNGB on 31 July 2014 and covered a six month period to March 2015. The 2015/16 Annual Growth Programme was approved on 8 October 2014.
- 1.5 During June and July 2015 Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Councils each approved their 2016/17 Annual Business Plans. Annual Business Plans identify strategic infrastructure projects that are considered to be local priorities for delivery in the forthcoming year, and that support the planned growth detailed in the Greater Norwich City Deal, the Joint Core Strategy and each Authority's Local Plans (adopted and emerging).
- 1.6 The 2016/17 Annual Business Plans informed the development of the proposed 2016/17 Annual Growth Programme. The timing of the preparation cycle is such that confirmation of the Annual Growth Programme, for this and future years, can inform each Authority's budget setting cycle.
- 1.7 This report summarises the progress on the delivery of the projects in the previously agreed Annual Growth Programmes. It sets out the projects that have been identified for delivery in 2016/17 in the Annual Business Plans and proposes a 2016/17 Annual Growth Programme.
- 1.8 The report reconfirms the requirement to borrow to support delivery of the Strategic Infrastructure Programme.

## 2. Progress on the Approved Growth Programme

- 2.1 Table One sets out the projects approved for delivery in the 2014/15 and 2015/16 Growth Programmes and summarises progress. Further details can be found in the Project summary highlight reports attached as Appendix A

**Table One: 2014/15 and 2015/16 Growth Programme update**

Project	Total Cost	Pooled Funding Approved	Pooled Funding Drawdown	Status
Harrisons' Plantation	£35,000	£35,000	£5,000	Project behind schedule. Spend Profile has been revised accordingly
Danby Wood	£35,000	£35,000	£25,861.85	Completed under budget
Project	Total Cost	Pooled Funding Approved	Pooled Funding Drawdown	Status

Marston Marsh	£35,000	£35,000	£23,861.85	Completed under budget
Riverside Walk	£70,000	£51,000	£17,361	Project behind schedule
Norwich Health Walks	£40,000	£40,000	£37,852	Complete
Earlham Millennium Green Phase 1	£15,000	£15,000	£3,159.83	2 phases combined. Project delayed by adverse weather
Earlham Millennium Green Phase 2	£47,000 Revised from £66 agreed for 15/16			See above
Marriott's Way Phase 1	£60,000	£60,000	£60,000	Phase 1 Complete
Marriott's Way Phase 2	£250,000	£250,000	£65,000 committed spend	Project on schedule
<b>NATS</b>				
Salhouse Road BRT	£15,000	£15,000	£9,182.64	Project behind schedule
Blue Pedalway Toucan Crossing	£120,000	£120,000	£0	Scheme location revised but same cost
Roundhouse Way bus interchange	£500,000	£500,000	£0	Project on schedule
Eaton bus interchange	£100,000	£100,000	£0	Project on schedule
Guardian Road Traffic Signals	£1.6m	£1.6m	£0	Project on schedule
Longwater Scheme Development	£2m	£0	£0	Project on schedule
Golden Ball St	£2.5m	£500,000	£0	Project on schedule
Yellow Pedalway	£119,000	£0	£0	Project on schedule

2.2 The 2015/16 Growth Programme set out a 5-year NATS Programme (Appendix C) mostly funded by Local Growth Fund (LGF) with a top-up from the pooled CIL. That programme is ongoing and the Board is recommended to

reaffirm its commitment to the use of £2,150,000 pooled CIL to support delivery to 2019/20.

- 2.3 The management of the Growth Programme is overseen by the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board (IDB), which reports to and takes direction from the Greater Norwich Growth Board.

### 3. Pooled Funding

- 3.1 The Partners have agreed to pool CIL to assist in delivery of the Strategic Infrastructure Programme. As the delivery of the Programme progresses the sources of funding to add to the pool may expand, however in 2016/17 the only contribution to the pooled fund is CIL. Table Two shows the projected pooled CIL income to the end of 2016/17. The projected CIL income has been adjusted to reflect exemptions such as self-build.

**Table Two: CIL income**

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/ 19	2019/20
	(£)						
Existing Growth Programme commitments*		155,000	1,086,000	<b>730,000</b>	105,000	1,605,000	415,000
Annual pooled fund income**	55,699	850,818	1,962,367	<b>5,657,184</b>			
Surplus/Deficit	55,699	695,629	876,587	<b>4,927,184</b>			
<b>Cumulative pooled funding position</b>	<b>55,699</b>	<b>751,328</b>	<b>1,627,915</b>	<b>6,555,099</b>			

\* revised to reflect actual spend and re-profiling

\*\* actual (13/14 and 14/15) and projection (15/16 onwards)

### 4. Proposed 2016/17 Annual Growth Programme

- 4.1 The Annual Growth Programme for 2016/17 is developed from projects promoted in the three Authorities' Annual Business Plans. The proposed Annual Growth Programme takes into account the core principle of the Programme to ensure delivery of strategic infrastructure required to support the growth in the Greater Norwich area. Although this is an annual programme it is prudent to recognise that, currently, insufficient funding has been identified to deliver the long term infrastructure programme as a whole.
- 4.2 The proposed Annual Growth Programme is formed from project information provided in the three Annual Business Plans and has been reviewed by the Delivery Officers Group (representing all Authorities). The proposed 2016/17 Growth Programme has also been endorsed by the Infrastructure Delivery Board.
- 4.3 The draft Growth Programme has been developed so that projects put forward for inclusion:

- benefit the growing community and/or the wider economy of the Greater Norwich area;

- have investigated and secured appropriate match funding (where available);
- are deliverable (either in whole or in part) during 2016/17; and
- have been identified as strategic priorities by the relevant working groups and governance structures.

4.4 Tables Three and Four list the projects promoted in the Annual Business Plans and detail those recommended to be endorsed for inclusion in the proposed 2016/17 Growth Programme and those recommended to be endorsed in-principle for subsequent years. Table Five shows projects recommended to be endorsed for inclusion in the 2016/17 Growth Programme, however these projects do not require funding from the Infrastructure Investment Fund in 2016/17. A summary of all projects can be found in Appendix B.

<b>Table Three: Projects proposed for inclusion/funding in 2016/17</b>	
<b><i>Scheme</i></b>	<b><i>Recommendation</i></b>
Diamond Centre – £1m loan funding	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme – subject to exploration and finalisation of borrowing terms etc.
St Faiths to Airport Industrial Estate link road - £500k (16/17) and £500k (17/18)	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 and 17/18 Growth Programme – subject to outcome of current feasibility work.
Golden Ball St – (up to) £500k	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme – subject to detailed costings work and exploration of private sector funding opportunities.
Heathgate Pink Pedalway- £150k	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme.
Carrow Bridge to Deal Ground cycle path - £100k	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme.
Colney River Crossing - £150k	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme.

<b>Table Four: Endorsed in-principle, subject to further work</b>	
<b><i>Scheme</i></b>	<b><i>Recommendation</i></b>
Long Stratton Sports Hub - £500k	Endorse in-principle for inclusion in 17/18 Growth Programme – subject to additional funding becoming available and further site planning
Castle Gardens - £150k	Endorse in-principle for inclusion in 17/18 Growth Programme – subject to securing additional funding
Wensum Strategy Phase 1 - £200k	Endorse in-principle for inclusion in 17/18 and 18/19 – subject to further scheme

	development via the Wensum Strategy.
Marriott's Way Phase 3 - £365k	Endorse in-principle for inclusion in 17/18 and 18/19 – subject to further scheme development via the Marriott's Way Strategy

<b>Table Five: Strategic projects supported by borrowing</b>	
<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Northern Distributor Road - £40m	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme. First call on pooled CIL Infrastructure Investment Fund anticipated 2017/18.
Long Stratton Bypass - £10m	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme. Reaffirm commitment to use borrowing powers to ensure timely delivery. Further work on phasing and timing to be undertaken
The GNGB has access to a further £10m of borrowing via the City Deal. These funds may be used for a range of infrastructure projects, including transportation infrastructure in the city centre.	

#### 4.5 **Commentary**

4.6 Of the 13 projects proposed in the Annual Business Plans two projects, **Long Stratton Sports Hub** and **Castle Gardens**, are recommended to be endorsed in-principle for inclusion, in the 17/18 Growth Programme subject to further work and clarification. A further two projects, **Wensum Strategy phase 1** and **Marriott's Way** are also recommended to be endorsed in-principle for inclusion in the 17/18 Growth Programme, however, this is subject to additional scheme development work being carried out. One project, **Yare & Wensum Links**, is not recommended for inclusion in the Growth Programme at this time.

4.7 **The Diamond Centre** is recommended to be endorsed for inclusion in the 16/17 Growth Programme to receive a £1m loan from the pooled fund. However until the work to clearly identify the funding and financing package is complete a profile cannot be confirmed in the Growth Programme.

4.8 The proposed 2016/17 Growth Programme includes a number of transport projects which if endorsed will be incorporated into the overall NATS delivery programme which also includes City Cycle Ambition Grant and LGF funded projects.

4.9 It is recommended that the 2016/17 Annual Growth Programme as shown in Table Three and pooled funding support of £2,400,000 is endorsed.

4.10 It is also recommended that the four projects deferred to commence in 17/18 (as shown in Table Four) are endorsed in-principle with pooled funding support of up to £1,025,000, Final endorsement will be subject to the completion of

additional scheme development work and reconsideration in line with the rest of the infrastructure programme.

- 4.11 It is recommended that the projects shown in Table Five are endorsed for inclusion in the 2016/17 Growth Programme, however these projects will have no call on the pooled Infrastructure Investment Fund in 2016/17.
- 4.12 Table Six sets out the cost profile of the projects recommended for inclusion in the Growth Programme to receive direct funding from the pooled funds. An indication of the cumulative position to 2020 including existing and proposed commitments shows that there is a projected pooled Infrastructure Investment Fund balance of £24.2m that is available to directly fund other future projects and to support the financing of projects where borrowing may be required.

## **5. NATS including the NDR and Long Stratton Bypass**

- 5.1 The Greater Norwich Infrastructure Plan (GNIP) sets out the key infrastructure projects that are required to support growth. The GNIP includes green infrastructure, education, community facilities and NATS schemes. For NATS, the GNIP identifies the future investment in the six BRT corridors to link major growth locations, measures in the city centre and measures to aid public transport, walking and cycling, as well as the NDR.
- 5.2 At the 17 March 2011 Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group Meeting it was agreed to use a significant proportion of future CIL revenues to establish a shared investment fund to support delivery of priority 1 key infrastructure projects and this includes up to £40m of local investment for the delivery of the NDR and related measures.
- 5.3 The NDR has a significant funding contribution from Central Government and the Long Stratton bypass will have significant developer contributions but both schemes will need additional funding. It is likely that the other NATS projects will be primarily funded from other sources (for instance £11m LGF funding has already been secured for NATS through the Growth Deal and in excess of £12m secured for cycle improvements to 2020) although funding sources for longer term projects are yet to be secured.
- 5.4 Following the approval granted by the Secretary of State earlier this year construction of the NDR will commence in 2015. The NDR has no call on the pooled fund in 2016/17; however there is anticipated to be a requirement for CIL expenditure in future years starting in 2017/18. It is important to recognise that provision for this will need to be made in future Growth Programmes. Delivery of the NDR is Critical to support the planned scale and distribution of growth set out in the Joint Core Strategy.
- 5.5 Through the three Annual Business Plans the agreement in-principle to use pooled CIL funding in future years to ensure the delivery of NATS measures, including particularly the NDR and Long Stratton bypass, has been re-confirmed.
- 5.6 The projected CIL income profile will not cover the cost profiles identified for delivery of the **NDR and Long Stratton Bypass** and any borrowing for the other NATS measures. The pooled fund surplus will be used to support borrowing to deliver these projects. The detail of that will be subject to project specific funding agreements and will need to be reflected in future years'

## Growth Programmes.

- 5.7 It is recommended that the Board authorise borrowing to support the delivery of both the NDR and the Long Stratton Bypass. A legal agreement between the County Council as the Accountable Body and the District Councils as the CIL Collecting Authorities will underpin this borrowing.

**Table Six**

<b>Proposed Annual Growth Programme for 2016/17</b>									
Directly funded Projects			13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20
	Total Cost (£,000)	Pooled funding							
Diamond Centre	2,400	1,000				1,000			
St Faiths to Airport Ind. Estate link	1,000	1,000				500	500		
Long Stratton Sports Hub	2,545	500					500		
Golden Ball St	3,000	500				500			
Heathgate	250	150				150			
Carrow to Deal Ground	350	100				100			
Colney River Crossing	401	150				150			
Castle Gardens	1338	150				0	150		
Marriott's Way Phase 3	365	365					275	90	
Wensum Strategy Phase 1	410	200					100	100	
<b>16/17 AGP Commitments</b>	<b>12,059</b>	<b>4,115</b>				<b>2,400</b>	<b>1,525</b>	<b>190</b>	
Existing AGP commitments (14/15 & 15/16)			0	155	1,086	730	105	1,605	415
CIL income (actual and projected)			56	851	1,962	5,657	7,708	7,993	8,208
<b>Cumulative Surplus</b>			<b>56</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>1,628</b>	<b>4,155</b>	<b>10,233</b>	<b>16,431</b>	<b>24,224</b>
<b>Project funded by supported borrowing</b>									
Northern Distributor Road	178,450	138,450				22,320	16,680	1,000	
Long Stratton Bypass	20,000	10,000				5,000	5,000		

## **6. Scheme Responsibility**

- 6.1 The Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board will oversee the day to day management of the Annual Growth Programme. Responsibility for the planning, delivery and reporting of each scheme rests with the scheme promoter. It will be for the promoter to secure all consents and approvals required and manage the delivery and costs of the project. Scheme promoters will be required to give scheme progress reports to the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board as a condition of drawing down pooled funding.
- 6.2 Whilst funding for scheme development work may be recoverable as part of the capital cost of delivering the scheme this will depend on the preparatory work undertaken and will vary from scheme to scheme. The risk of cost recovery for preparatory work lies with the scheme promoter if the project is not formally committed for delivery.

## **7. Recommendations**

- 7.1
- (i) The Board note progress on the 2014/15 and 2015/16 Annual Growth Programmes.
  - (ii) The Board:
    - endorse the six projects recommended for inclusion in the 2016/17 Annual Growth Programme and commit £2.4m from the pooled Infrastructure Investment Fund towards these projects (see Table Three); and
    - approve in-principle four projects (brought forward in the 16/17 Business Plans) for inclusion in the 2017/18 Growth Programme and commit in-principle £1.025m from the pooled Infrastructure Investment Fund towards these projects (see Table Four).
  - (iii) The Board delegates responsibility to the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board to manage the delivery of the 2016/17 Annual Growth Programme, report progress to the next GNGB Board and to consider inclusion of further schemes emerging from the identified development work.
  - (iv) The Board reaffirm endorsement of the 5 year NATS programme as set out in Appendix C and the use of £2,150,000 of pooled CIL funds to support delivery from 2017/18 to 2019/20 within future annual growth programmes
  - (v) The Board reaffirm their commitment to borrow funds as and when required to support the delivery of the significant infrastructure projects including the Northern Distributor Road (NDR), Long Stratton Bypass and other transportation improvement measures.

## **8. Issues and Risks**

### **8.1 Other resource implications (staff, property)**

The programme will be managed within existing resources and will require continued support for the Greater Norwich Growth team. Resources for project

delivery will be the responsibility for the project promoter.

## 8.2 Legal implications

The pooling arrangements and the designation of an Accountable body are set out in the Joint Working Agreement.

## 8.3 Risks

The most significant risks are project cost and delivery risks. These remain with the project promoter.

## 8.4 Equality

No specific issues arising from the funding of the Annual Growth Programme

## 8.5 Human rights implications

No specific issues arising from the funding of the Annual Growth Programme

## 8.6 Environmental implications

Project promoters will be required to meet their own environmental obligations.

## Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Telephone Number</b>	<b>Email address</b>
Tig Armstrong	01603 223264	tig.armstrong@norfolk.gov.uk

### Attachments:

Appendix A – Annual Growth Programme Project Highlight Reports

Appendix B – Annual Business Plan Project Summaries

Appendix C – NATS LGF Programme

### Background Documents:

- Broadland Annual Business Plan 2016/17 – [See Appendix A of the Council Papers here](#)
- Norwich Annual Business Plan 2016/17 – [Available to download under Item 8 here](#)
- South Norfolk Annual Business Plan 2016/17 – [See Item 6 of the Cabinet Reports here](#)
- [Greater Norwich Infrastructure Plan](#)

## Appendix A

Greater Norwich Growth Programme Project Highlight Reports			
The Greater Norwich Growth Programme for 2014/15 was approved by the Growth Board in July 2014. 7 projects were approved for funding from the strategic infrastructure fund. A further 10 projects were approved for funding in October 2014. This report provides an update on each of the projects being delivered.			
Approved Projects for Delivery in 2014/15			
Report	Project sponsor	Lead Officer	Project Status
GP1 Harrison's Plantation	Phil Courtier	Richard Squires	Green
GP2 Danby Wood	Graham Nelson	Paul Holley	COMPLETE
GP3 Marston Marsh	Graham Nelson	Paul Holley	COMPLETE
GP4 Earlham Millennium Green	Graham Nelson	Paul Holley	Rolled over into GP8
GP5 Wensum Riverside Walk	Graham Nelson	Lara Hall	Amber
GP6 Marriott's Way	Graham Nelson	Tim Mellors	COMPLETE
GP7 Norwich Health Walks	Tim Horspole	Stephen Andrews	Green/Complete
Approved Projects for Delivery in 2015/16			
Report	Project sponsor	Lead Officer	Project Status
GP8 Earlham Mill Green	Graham Nelson	Paul Holley	Green/Amber
GP9 Marriott's Way	Graham Nelson	Tim Mellors	Green
GP10 Salhouse Road	Tom McCabe	Jon Barnard	Green
GP11 School Lane/ Chartwell Road/ Denton Road Toucan Crossing (Blue Pedalway)	Tom McCabe	Jon Barnard	Amber
GP12 Roundhouse Way Bus	Tom McCabe	Ian Parkes	Green
GP13 Eaton Interchange	Tom McCabe	Ian Parkes	Green
GP14 Guardian Road/Sweetbriar road Traffic Signals	Tom McCabe	Jon Barnard	Amber
GP15 Longwater	Tom McCabe	Ian Parkes	Amber
GP16 Golden Ball Street	Tom McCabe	Jon Barnard	Green/Amber
GP17 Lakenham Way Yellow Pedalway	Tom McCabe	Jon Barnard	Green

<b>Harrisons Plantation</b>					
<b>Project Description:</b>					
Securing areas of woodland located off Blue Boar Lane, Sprowston (and associated with the White House Farm development proposal) for public access and future use as a 'Woodland Activity Park', as set out within Sprowston Neighbourhood Development Plan.					
<b>Ref:</b>	GP 1	<b>Cost</b>	£35,000	<b>Project Status:</b>	Green
<b>Summary of Progress:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site scoping meeting with Norwich Fringe Project</li> <li>• Initial development of Phase 1 routes through woodland</li> <li>• Discussion with landowner relating to pedalway terminus and wider woodland works</li> <li>• Discussion and confirmation with Sprowston Town Council regarding options for heathland management on part of site.</li> <li>• Initial discussion with BDC Highways Development Management Officer re. safe temporary access to the site.</li> <li>• Initial proposals for interpretation material drafted by Broadland Graphics team.</li> <li>• Legal transfer progressing with solicitors.</li> </ul>					
<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b>					
<b>Wensum Riverside Walk</b>					
<b>Project Description:</b>					
The development of a revised layout and design for the Oasis site adjacent to Fye Bridge on the River Wensum. In partnership with key stakeholders to enhance the site to maximize its use, linkages and potential for access to the river. The Broads Authority working in collaboration with the City Council aim to provide funding for a new canoe portage accessed from the Oasis site.					
<b>Ref:</b>	GP 5	<b>Cost</b>	£70,000 (£51,000 from GP)	<b>Project Status:</b>	Amber
<b>Summary of Progress:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contact has been made with the Broads Authority and work can now progress on the detailed design for the site.</li> </ul>					
<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to clarify whether canoe portage will be included in the project.</li> <li>• Determined opposition to clearance works and potentially future works from a local resident.</li> </ul>					
<b>Norwich Health Walks</b>					
<b>Project Description:</b>					

A footpath through the tree belt surrounding the N&N University Hospital					
<b>Ref:</b>	GP 7	<b>Cost</b>	£40,000	<b>Project Status:</b>	Green/Complete
<b>Summary of Progress:</b>					
<p>Urban Forestry the appointed contractors have completed the contract as described in the documentation. Tree Surgery completed and arisings cleared from site. Construction of footpath completed and contactors site compound is being cleared. Final handover date to be confirmed and invoices presented to SNC</p>					
<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b>					
None.					
<b>Earlham Millennium Green Path improvements</b>					
<b>Project Description:</b>					
Complete refurbishment of pedestrian routes through Millennium Green					
<b>Ref:</b>	GP 8	<b>Cost</b>	£66,000	<b>Project Status:</b>	Green (Phase 1) Amber (Phase 2)
<b>Summary of Progress:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary site clearance, willow coppicing and pollarding work and initial groundworks were previously completed</li> </ul>					
<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unplanned staff absences</li> <li>• Unfavourable weather conditions may affect when works are undertaken</li> <li>• Choice of footpath surfacing may affect completion date</li> </ul>					
<b>Summary of Progress:</b>					
Initial project planning undertaken.					
<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b>					
Potential cost over-runs caused by unexpected factors, e.g. unfavourable weather conditions					
<b>Marriott's Way</b>					
<b>Project Description:</b>					
<p>Improvements to Marriott's Way within the urban area to encourage commuting by bicycle and on-foot.</p> <p>The project originated from the Greater Norwich Investment Plan (ref: GNIP P7.1.1) City Deals Strategic Infrastructure Programme/LIPP project ref: NF13(JCS G1 11)</p>					

<b>Ref:</b>	GP 9	<b>Cost</b>	£250,000	<b>Project Status:</b>	Green
<b>Summary of Progress:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volunteer conservation work ordered</li> <li>• Bat surveys ongoing</li> <li>• Access &amp; barrier works sent to Highways for ordering</li> <li>• contractor discussions re surfacing improvements</li> <li>• Wayfinding &amp; signage – strategy produced</li> </ul>					
<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protected habitats and species</li> </ul>					
<b>Salhouse Rd Sustainable Transport Corridor Scheme Identification (BRT/Pink Pedalway)</b>					
<b>Project Description:</b>					
<p>The aim of this study is to build on the previous study and identify BRT and cycling enhancements and improvements along the Salhouse Road corridor focusing on the essentially urban parts of the route between the Racecourse public house and the city centre.</p>					
<b>Ref:</b>	GP 10	<b>Cost</b>	£15,000	<b>Project Status:</b>	Green
<b>Summary of Progress:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting held with IP/PH/JW/BB to discuss through the options developed for the Gurney Road, Blue Boar lane and the proposed Racecourse Pub junctions. MA highlighted a number of constraints at the junction which limit the measures that can be delivered. It was agreed that going forward MA would produce a set of drawings and a note to summarise the work completed and highlighting the constraints. It was noted that a key outcome will be drawings showing the carriageway width required along Salhouse Road to deliver the aspirations of the BRT corridor.</li> </ul>					
<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b>					
<b>Denton Road / Chartwell Road / School Road Toucan Crossing and associated works</b>					
<b>Project Description:</b>					
<p>The project will deliver a toucan crossing, and associated works, which improve cycle connectivity across the outer ring road between School Road and Denton Road along the route of the Blue Pedalway as identified in the adopted Norwich Cycle Network.</p>					
<b>Ref:</b>	GP 11	<b>Cost</b>	£120,000	<b>Project Status:</b>	Amber
<b>Summary of Progress:</b>					

- Funding for Denton Road / Chartwell Road / School Road crossing confirmed through the Norwich Area Transport Strategy, Pre-committed LGF Programme and Greater Norwich Growth Programme 2015/16.
- Crossing relocated to St Clements Hill and taken as a larger projects forward co-funded with City Cycle Ambition. £120k

**Significant issues to be addressed:**

Awaiting a decision from the board that the funding can be found reinstate the Denton Crossing in the Growth Programme.

Secure funding to replace the identified funding that is planned to be reallocated to support City Cycle Ambition II.

**Roundhouse Way Bus Interchange**

**Project Description:**

The provision of a new transport interchange at Roundhouse Way will enable passengers to alight and then catch a frequent bus serving the N&N, UEA and NRP, avoiding the need to travel into the city and back out again

<b>Ref:</b>	GP 12	<b>Cost</b>	£500,000	<b>Project Status:</b>	Green
-------------	-------	-------------	----------	------------------------	-------

**Summary of Progress:**

- Formal feedback received from First, which indicates a high level of support and that bus routes will be revised to serve the new interchange. Feedback still awaited from konectbus, the other main bus operator serving this corridor. This is a positive step and enables detailed design to progress.

**Significant issues to be addressed:**

- Need to clarify land requirements for the interchange, particularly how much non-highway land may be required to meet the project's objectives
- Commitment from bus operators to serve the interchange is being sought

**Eaton Interchange**

**Project Description:**

A number of projects have been combined including the Eaton Interchange project. This enables a seamless delivery of a number of improvements including public realm, review of cycle provision in the area. Review of traffic light priority and improved passenger interchange area

<b>Ref:</b>	GP 13	<b>Cost</b>	£500,000	<b>Project Status:</b>	Green
-------------	-------	-------------	----------	------------------------	-------

**Summary of Progress:**

- Key Norfolk and City Team preparing brief

<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b>					
None identified					
<b>Guardian Road Traffic Signals Feasibility</b>					
<b>Project Description:</b>					
<p>The Dereham Road/Outer Ring Road junction currently experiences persistent and extensive congestion in the AM and PM peak periods on a daily basis that results in long queues and delay to general traffic and buses.</p> <p>The objectives of the Dereham Road/Outer Ring Road junction improvements is to build on feasibility work previously carried out for a congestion alleviation scheme at this junction by Network Management in 2013. The aim is to determine a deliverable new junction form that operates more efficiently for all modes and allows priority for both inbound and outbound bus services.</p> <p>The outputs will be preliminary design drawings and budget cost estimates for a small number of possible options together with a recommended option to be taken forward. Sufficient work shall have been carried out to determine that there are no overriding impediments to delivery.</p>					
<b>Ref:</b>	GP 14	<b>Cost</b>	£50,000	<b>Project Status:</b>	Amber
<b>Summary of Progress:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting held with Traffic Signals &amp; Network Analysis to discuss options and resourcing etc.</li> <li>• Options considered further with preliminary list of Pros and Cons developed.</li> <li>• Discussions held with surveyors with allotment owners contacted to inform of topo survey dates.</li> </ul>					
<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine land ownership and potential issues with land acquisition</li> <li>• Potential issue with access to business in south west corner of roundabout, may compromise viability of business.</li> <li>• Significant impact on trees</li> </ul>					
<b>Longwater Scheme Development</b>					
<b>Project Description:</b>					
<p>The development of a transport strategy for the Longwater and Easton area of Norwich to resolve existing transportation issues and accommodate the planned JCS growth.</p>					
<b>Ref:</b>	GP 15	<b>Cost</b>	£2,000,000	<b>Project Status:</b>	Amber
<b>Summary of Progress:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Getting legal work in train on the S106 issue</li> <li>• Awaiting final report from Mott MacDonald</li> </ul>					

<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working with South Norfolk to ensure S106 monies can be used on the current strategy and spent before they would need to be repaid.</li> </ul>					
<b>Golden Ball Street / All Saints Green Scheme Development</b>					
<b>Project Description:</b>					
<p>This feasibility element of the project is to determine the operational details involved in making Golden Ball Street and Farmers Avenue two way for general traffic which will enable the pedestrianisation of Westlegate and create bus only on Red Lion Street.</p> <p>This work will also investigate the merits of including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the bus only on All Saints Green as part of this phase of the overall scheme</li> <li>alteration to the access to the John Lewis car park</li> </ul> <p>It will also be necessary to determine whether changes in traffic patterns will require any alterations to the Ber Street/Queens Road/Finkelgate junctions.</p> <p>The costs and merits of possible associated public realm improvements need to be evaluated as the majority of the funding is coming from Local Growth Fund.</p>					
<b>Ref:</b>	GP 16	<b>Cost</b>	2015/16 - £875k	<b>Project Status:</b>	Green/Amber
<b>Summary of Progress:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation period has ended and results are being analysed.</li> <li>NHAC report seeking permission to proceed is being drafted.</li> <li>Preliminary streetscape design received from City landscape team and incorporated in the design.</li> <li>Traffic survey results analysed and traffic forecasts progressed.</li> <li>Meeting held with City engineers to discuss design issues to consider and future maintenance liabilities</li> <li>Initial Traffic Management meeting held with contractor.</li> <li>Progression of detailed design and target price package for contractor.</li> <li>Contingency for public realm enhancements proposed for inclusion in 16/17 growth programme.</li> </ul>					
<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pressures on design resource.</li> <li>Ensure traffic modelling is sufficiently robust so that committee are able to make informed decision on whether to progress with scheme.</li> <li>Develop John Lewis car park design that is agreeable to both John Lewis and NCC network team.</li> <li>Construction period – preliminary estimate by contractor is for a 40 week construction period so scheme will need to start in January in order to be completed before Christmas. However, this includes estimated 26 weeks on Westlegate but extent of works here is less than initially indicated.</li> </ul>					

<b>Yellow Pedalway - Lakenham Way Improvements</b>					
<b>Project Description:</b> Improvements to access and lighting.					
<b>Ref:</b>	GP 17	<b>Cost</b>	£119,000	<b>Project Status:</b>	Green
<b>Summary of Progress:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None to date</li> </ul>					
<b>Significant issues to be addressed:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>					

**Appendix B  
Annual Growth Programme 2016/17  
Business Plan Project Summaries**

<b>Area Wide:</b>
<p>The Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATS) sets out a programme of improvements to the transport networks. In the 15/16 business plan a 5 year programme of NATS measures to facilitate planned growth supported by Local Growth Fund and Pooled CIL was approved in principle. This programme has been expanded as a result of a further successful bid for Local Growth Fund and the Announcement of the second round of cycle city ambition grant funding.</p>
<p><b>NDR</b></p> <p>All 3 business plans recognise the importance of the NDR in supporting the planned growth of the Area. The NDR is identified in the JCS as a requirement of the growth strategy and a key element NATS. The NDR has secured its development consent order and DTF funding has been confirmed. The Growth Board Partners have agreed to use up to £40m of pooled CIL to support delivery of the NDR. The NDR is planned to commence late 2015.</p>
<b>Broadland:</b>
<p><b>Sprowston Diamond Centre</b></p> <p>Redevelopment of a former school building for community uses. Sprowston Neighbourhood Plan has identified a lack of community facilities. The continued development will create more new facilities and a sports hall in Sprowston, offering several function rooms. The project is estimated to cost £2.4m and £1.4m of these is being sought from various funding sources. £1m is proposed for forward funding from the pooled fund in 2016/17, subject to the development of an appropriate loan agreement with Sprowston Town Council setting out terms and repayments.</p>
<p><b>St Faiths Rd to Airport Transport Link</b></p> <p>Link Road and Cycle Links between St Faiths Rd and Airport Industrial Estate (AIE) will join the existing employment area with the growth triangle providing connectivity between residential and employment areas. The part of the link between St Faiths Road and the edge of the Airport Industrial Estate will be delivered through the development of proposed AAP allocation GT15: Land North of Repton Avenue. The final section of the link to Hurricane Way will need to be delivered through the combined intervention of Norwich City Council, Broadland District Council, Norfolk County Council and the Estate Manager NPS. Feasibility work is underway</p>
<p><b>Chartwell Road/Denton Road to School Lane Toucan Crossing</b></p> <p>This project was given approval in principle as part of the 5 year programme of Norwich Area Transportation Strategy projects approved in the 2015/16 Growth Programme. However, additional funding awarded through the City Cycle Ambition Grant allowed an improved Blue Pedalway scheme with an amended route and requirement for a Toucan Crossing between St Clement's Hill and Spixworth Road. The funding for this project has been re-allocated to the new crossing but the Denton Road to School Lane crossing remains of local importance and is therefore put forward for replacement funding in the 16/17 Growth Programme.</p>

**Norwich City:****Golden Ball St / Westlegate, Norwich**

This scheme build on the traffic improvements realised as part of the Chapelfield North scheme and is an important element of the City Centre NATS measures that will provide a more attractive environment for pedestrians and cyclists. Additional funding of £500k is being sought to enhance the quality of public realm in Westlegate and All Saints Green.

**River Wensum Parkway (City and SNDC)**

Enhancements to the strategic green link network between the River Wensum and Ber Street/Thorn Lane. This will include improvements to the wooded ridge path between Thorn Lane and Carrow Hill, measures to improve access to the link for pedestrians on King Street close to the southern Boom Tower, and enhancement of the setting of the Boom Towers and City Walls between the river and Ber Street including some repairs and tree work.

**Cycle routes - Carrow Bridge to Deal Ground riverside path**

Delivery of a short section of cycle / footway on north bank of the River Wensum. This will provide a key 'missing link' in the route between Norwich city centre / rail station and Whitlingham Country Park, which is also needed to serve several planned new developments in the area.

**Colney river crossing (NRP to Threescore)**

Improvements to the existing right of way, including a new footbridge across the River Yare and improvements to the existing footpaths will improve linkages between housing at Three Score and the Norwich Research Park. This is part of a wider project of improvements to green space in Bowthorpe associated with the development of Three Score. The river crossing and footpath improvements would provide a direct link between housing in Bowthorpe, the Bowthorpe Southern Park and the major employment locations at the NRP and the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital.

**Marriotts Way Phase 3**

Work to make the section of Marriott's Way within the Norwich urban area more usable and attractive for commuter and leisure cycling and walking through:

1. Barn Road entrance public realm improvements
2. Mile Cross Road access improvements
3. Sloughbottom Park – Andersons Meadow path improvements
4. Hellesdon Road – Sloughbottom Park surfacing enhancements
5. Access improvements to Burnet Road (Sweetbriar industrial estate)

**Heathgate - Pink Pedalway**

The construction of a 3m wide lit cycling and walking path between Heathgate and Gurney Road at the junction with Britannia Road.

**Castle Gardens**

Comprehensive restoration of Castle Gardens and improvements to Castle Green to complement the planned refurbishment of the interior exhibition spaces within the Castle.

## **South Norfolk:**

### **Long Stratton Bypass**

The project consists of a bypass to Long Stratton, at least two roundabouts, an improvement to Hempnall crossroads and village centre enhancement measures. A planning application is currently being worked up for the development including the bypass, its junctions and Hempnall crossroads improvements. Current estimates put the cost of these schemes at about £20m. This will be refined through the application process.

### **NATS**

In addition South Norfolk Council's business plan identifies **B1172 bus/cycle improvements, Pink Pedalway extension (B1172) and bus priority at the Harford A47 junction**. These projects have been given approval in principle as part of the 5 year programme of Norwich Area Transportation Strategy projects approved in the 2015/16 Growth Programme.

### **Long Stratton Sports Hub & pitch improvements**

The project aims to bring together a number of facility-providing partners (South Norfolk Council, Long Stratton High School and Long Stratton Parish Council) to improve the sport and leisure facility stock in the village in anticipation of significant housing growth. It will create a new sport and leisure 'Hub' across three adjacent sites and provide new and enhanced facilities that are fit for purpose and better suited to the current and future facility needs of local residents

### **Wymondham High Extension**

Expansion of the existing high school to provide capacity for planned growth. The first phase of expansion is expected to cost approximately £1m and will commence in 15/16 and a planning application for the classroom block extension has been submitted. The project is funded from S106 contributions.

### **Hethersett Primary**

Provision of a new primary school to serve the consented housing growth. Discussions are being held with existing local schools about school organisation within the context of growth. The project is identified for delivery in 16/17 with a cost of £5.1m. The project is funded from a combination of S106 and Children's Services mainstream public funding sources.

### **Brooke Primary Relocation**

Relocation and expansion of the existing primary school. Land acquisition is in progress. The project has an estimated cost of £4.5m with delivery programmed to commence 16/17. The project is fully funded from Children's Services mainstream public funding sources to address condition.

**Appendix C - Norwich Area Transportation Strategy, Pre-committed LGF Programme**

	NATS Ref	Total	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
<b>Salhouse Rd Sustainable Transport Corridor</b>								
Salhouse Rd Sustainable Transport Corridor Scheme Identification (BRT/Pink Pedalway)	NEGT1	(30)	(30)					
Salhouse Rd Corridor Scheme delivery		(400)			(400)			
Repton Ave Link (Purple Pedalway)	NEGT2	(1,000)			(1,000)			
Repton Ave Link - developer funding		1,000			1,000			
Repton Ave Link Scheme Identification		(20)	(20)					
Salhouse Road Walk/Cycle Route (Pink Pedalway)	NEGT3	(200)		(200)				
Salhouse Road Walk/Cycle Route CCAG funding		200		200				
North Walsham Road Core Bus Route Enhancements Scheme Identification	NEGT4	(10)		(10)				
North Walsham Road Core Bus Route Enhancements		-						
School Lane/ Chartwell Road/ Denton Road Toucan Crossing and associated works (Blue Pedalway)	NEGT5	(120)		(120)				
Broadland Way Scheme Development (pink pedalway extension)	NEGT6	(15)	(15)					
NE Norwich link road		(14,250)		-	(6,000)	(5,000)		(3,250)
NE Norwich link road - developer funding	NEGT7	14,250		-	6,000	5,000		3,250
		-						
<b>Yarmouth Road Sustainable Transport Corridor</b>								
Yarmouth Rd Sustainable Transport Corridor Scheme Identification (BRT/Green Pedalway)	YAR1	(20)		(20)				
Lower Clarence Road	YAR2	-						
Rail Station Cycle Hub	YAR3	-						
Broadland Gate S106 Est		-						
		-						
<b>A11 Sustainable Transport Corridor</b>								
A11 sustainable transport corridor scheme identification (BRT/Pink pedalway)	SW1	(60)	(60)					
Roundhouse Way Bus Interchange	SW2	(500)		(50)	(450)			
Pink Pedalway Route Extension	SW3	(250)			(250)			
B1172 Bus/Cycle enhancements	SW4	(250)			(250)			
		-						
Thickthorn Scheme Development	SW5	-						
Thickthorn Scheme Development		-						
Eaton interchange	SW6	(100)		(25)	(75)			
		-						
<b>Dereham Road Sustainable Transport Corridor</b>								
Extension to Longwater/Easton Scheme Identification (BRT/Green Pedalway)	DER1	(40)	(20)	(20)				
Guardian Road Traffic Signals Feasibility	DER2	(1,650)	(50)	(50)	(50)	(750)	(750)	
Longwater walk/cycle	DER3	-						
Longwater Scheme Development	DER4	-						
Longwater Scheme Development		(2,000)		(750)	(750)	(500)		
		-						
<b>BRT Fakenham Road/Drayton High Road</b>								
Fakenham Rd BRT Feasibility (Scheme Identification) - revenue	FAK1	(30)			(30)			
		-						
<b>City Centre Measures</b>								
Golden Ball Street / All Saints Green Scheme Development	CC1	(125)	(125)					
CC1 delivery		(2,500)	-	(1,500)	(1,000)	-	-	-
Golden Ball Street (two-way for general traffic)	CC1a	-						
Westlegate (remove right turn and pedestrianise)	CC1b	-						
Bus only on All Saints Green	CC1c	-						
Finkelgate/Queens Rd Junction	CC1d	-						
Ber Street	CC1e	-						
Farmers Ave Two Way	CC1f	-						
POW Rd, Rose Lane, Ag Hall Plain	CC2	(5,100)	-	-	-	(1,100)	(2,000)	(2,000)
Prince of Wales Road (two-way bus only)	CC2a	-						
Rose Lane (two-way for general traffic)	CC2b	-						
Agricultural Hall Plain (bus only)	CC2c	-						
		-						
<b>A140 Corridor</b>								
A140 Corridor scheme identification (BRT/Yellow Pedalway)	CRO1	(60)		(60)				
Yellow Pedalway - Lakenham Way Improvements	IPS1	(119)	(19)	(100)				
Yellow Pedalway - Lakenham Way (S106)		119	19	100				
Bus priority Harford A47 Junction	IPS3	(1,750)			(100)	(100)	(1,100)	(450)
		-						
<b>Other NATS</b>								
Committed NATS schemes		(735)		(205)	(155)	(150)	(225)	
Committed NATS funding		735		205	155	150	225	

	Total	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
<b>Costs</b>							
Total Cost	(30,995)		(3,110)	(10,510)	(7,600)	(4,075)	(5,700)
Scheme development		(313)	(110)	(30)	-	-	-
<b>Capital Cost</b>	<b>(30,855)</b>		<b>(3,000)</b>	<b>(10,480)</b>	<b>(7,600)</b>	<b>(4,075)</b>	<b>(5,700)</b>
<b>Income</b>							
LTB City Centre	7,000	-	1,050	1,850	1,850	2,250	-
LTB Longwater	2,000	-	750	750	500	-	-
LTB2	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	2,000
Cycle City Grant	200	-	200	-	-	-	-
S106	15,350	19	100	7,000	5,000	-	3,250
NATS LTP Committed	735	-	205	155	150	225	-
NATS LTP Uncommitted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total income	27,285	-	2,305	9,755	7,500	2,475	5,250
<b>CIL requirement</b>	<b>(3,570)</b>		<b>(695)</b>	<b>(725)</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>(1,600)</b>	<b>(450)</b>

## **Greater Norwich Local Infrastructure Fund**

*Phil Courtier, Head of Planning, Broadland District Council*

### **Summary**

This report provides an update on the Greater Norwich Local Infrastructure Fund. It summarises the applications received to date, including an updated financial profile for information.

### **Recommendations**

- (i) Members of the Board to note progress on the proposals approved in principle to date.
- (ii) Reaffirm the in-principle loan agreement for the Buxton Road to North Walsham East – West Link noting that some progress has been made since the original in-principle agreement in March 2015.
- (iii) Agree that work continues to progress loan agreements for each of the schemes given in-principle agreement by the Board, and to review each of the agreements against progress every 6 months to ensure meaningful progress is being made.

## **1. Background**

- 1.1 The Local Infrastructure Fund (LIF) was established through the Greater Norwich City Deal. The City Deal provides access to £20m of Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) borrowing to provide loans to developers for infrastructure required to unlock onsite delivery.

## **2. Introduction**

- 2.1 There have been two Calls for Schemes, in April 2014 and October 2014, and a total of 8 Expressions of Interest were received in response. The Board has considered full business cases for 5 of these schemes and agreed to approve all of these in-principle, subject to due diligence processes and loan contract negotiations.
- 2.2 A further Expression of Interest was received in March 2015 following the agreement of the Board to accept applications to the Local Infrastructure Fund (LIF) outside the six monthly cycle of Board meetings. An application from Halsbury Homes East Anglia Ltd. was received, subjected to financial appraisal and agreed in principle by the Board via email on 11 August 2015.

2.3 This report updates the Board on the progress being made toward finalising of the loan agreements for the 6 schemes which have been approved in principle by the Board.

2.4 This report also provides an update on the Buxton Road to North Walsham East – West Link road scheme and asks the Board to re-affirm its approval for the progressing the loan, noting that some progress has been made since the original in principle agreement in March 2015.

### 3. Update on approved schemes

3.1 As stated above, six applications have been approved in-principle to date, subject to due diligence processes and contract negotiations. The schemes, applicants and requested loan amount are listed below:

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Loan Amount</b>
Bowthorpe Threescore	Norwich City Council	£1.865m
Deal Ground	Serruys Property Company Ltd	£3.48m
South Wymondham	Endurance Estates Strategic Land Ltd	£3.5m
Beeston Park	Beyond Green	£5m
Buxton Road to North Walsham East – West Link	Cirrus Strategic Land/Badger Building/Beyond Green	£3.7m
St. George's Park, Loddon	Halsbury Homes East Anglia Ltd	£4.5m
<b>Total</b>		<b>£22.045m</b>

3.2 The firm that carried out the independent financial appraisals has been retained to prepare the loan agreements. The views of the Board on the applications will be taken into account in drafting the agreements. In all cases the agreements will incorporate provisions to review the loan should the scheme not progress. The agreements will be between the applicant, the Growth Board and Norfolk County Council as the Accountable Body.

#### 3.3 **Bowthorpe Threescore**

£1.865m was applied for to provide onsite road and utilities infrastructure. The infrastructure will accelerate delivery of 1100 dwellings. Financial negotiations are progressing but confirmation of the final loan amount required is outstanding.

### 3.4 **Deal Ground**

£3.48m was applied for to provide a spine road, bridge and other associated works to open up the site for development. The site has consent for 670 dwellings, a local centre and leisure uses.

Discussions are ongoing between Norwich City Council and Serruys Property Company Ltd on the programme for delivery for Deal Ground. Details of the Generation Park proposal are being considered alongside that of the Deal Ground.

### 3.5 **South Wymondham**

This £3.5m scheme submitted was to widen the existing rail bridge on Silfield road, construct 1.5km of cycleway and improve the drainage associated with proposal for 1230 new dwellings. The infrastructure to be delivered at South Wymondham has since changed slightly from the original application, details of which will be shared with the Board when known, but it is anticipated the outcomes remains in line with those originally intended. Negotiations are ongoing to ensure the timely delivery of this scheme.

### 3.6 **Beeston Park**

£5m was applied for to provide transport infrastructure on the new North Walsham Road Corridor which will help accelerate the delivery of at least 600 homes in the North East Growth Triangle.

Since the loan was approved in principle the promoters for this site have changed and while the financial backers remain the same the implications for the progression of the LIF loan are currently being investigated.

### 3.7 **Buxton Road to North Walsham East – West Link**

This £3.7m scheme delivers a phase of the corridor linking the East and West sectors of the Beeston Park scheme, specifically the section between the North Walsham Road and the Buxton Road. This infrastructure will release the development of circa 1,100 homes, a school and small scale mixed use development.

### 3.8 **At the meeting on 24 March 2015 the Board agreed in principle to the availability of a loan for this scheme but gave the parties a timetable for progress and conditions to be met before this meeting.**

Some progress has been made on this application although not all conditions have been met to date. Delays with the Beeston Park scheme due to reasons above have had implications but the other parties involved are progressing.

### 3.9 **St. George's Park, Loddon**

£4.5m has been applied for to support the construction of a new roundabout on the A146 to service a development of 200 homes including 66 social housing for rent.

Due diligence and contract negotiations have begun for this scheme and are

progressing well.

## **4. Reviewing the in-principle approvals**

4.1 The initial criteria for applications to the Local Infrastructure Fund included a requirement for planning consent and a willingness to start development in short order. It is now apparent that most applications currently going through the negotiation stages are part of a complex process of finding an end developer, raising finance, complying with planning conditions and negotiating infrastructure provision.

4.2 In this process, the offer of a LIF loan has been very helpful in giving developers the confidence to proceed with their developments. An offer of a loan serves a useful purpose even if developers are not ready to draw it down immediately.

4.3 It is recommended that the Board agree to the continuing development of the loan agreements for all previously approved applications subject to a programme of regular review to ensure progress is being made. If insufficient progress is being made introduction of a sunset clause into the loan agreements will be considered.

## **5. Financial profile of proposals**

5.1 Although the total value of the loans being progressed exceeds the £20m fund, the anticipated draw-down and repayment profile indicates the schemes can be accommodated within the current scope of the Local Infrastructure Fund.

## **6. Recommendations**

- (i) Members of the Board to note progress on the proposals approved in principle to date.
- (ii) Reaffirm the in-principle loan agreement for the Buxton Road to North Walsham East – West Link noting that some progress has been made since the original in principle agreement in March 2015.
- (iii) Agree that work continues to progress loan agreements for each of the schemes given in-principle agreement by the Board, and to review each of the agreements against progress every 6 months to ensure meaningful progress is being made.

## **7. Issues and Risks**

### **7.1 Other resource implications (staff, property)**

The fund will be managed within existing resources and will require continued support from the Greater Norwich Projects Team.

### **7.2 Legal implications**

All schemes will be assessed by the Greater Norwich Growth Board and the organisation named in the Business Case will be required to enter into a legal

contract with Norfolk County Council, the Accountable Body for the funding.

**7.3 Risks**

Each loan will be subject to financial appraisal and appropriate risk mitigation will be written in to the individual conditions of offer as set out in the Local Infrastructure Fund Criteria and Guidance Notes document.

**7.4 Equality**

No specific issues arising from the award of LIF funding towards a scheme. Each scheme will be required to meet its obligations under relevant legislation.

**7.5 Human rights implications**

No specific issues arising from the award of LIF funding towards a scheme. Each scheme will be required to meet its obligations under relevant legislation.

**7.6 Environmental implications**

No specific issues arising from the award of LIF funding towards a scheme. Each scheme will be required to meet its obligations under relevant legislation.

## **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Telephone Number</b>	<b>Email address</b>
Phil Courtier	01603 430549	phil.courtier@broadland.gov.uk