

Greater Norwich Growth Board Meeting Minutes

Date: Thursday 24 September 2020

Time: 2.00pm

Venue: [Online](#); virtual Microsoft Teams meeting

Present:

Board Members:

Broadland District Council:

Officers:

Trevor Holden

Helen Mellors

Norwich City Council:

Cllr Alan Waters

Graham Nelson

Stephen Evans

South Norfolk Council:

Cllr John Fuller

Trevor Holden

Helen Mellors

Norfolk County Council:

Cllr Andrew Proctor (Chair)

Vince Muspratt

In attendance:

Hollie Adams

Committee Officer, Norfolk County Council
(clerking)

Grace Burke

Greater Norwich Project Team Leader, Norfolk
County Council

Matt Tracey

Growth and Infrastructure Group Manager,
Norfolk County Council

Duncan Merren

Principal Communications Officer, Norfolk
County Council

Simon Hamilton

Strategic Director, Norfolk County Council

Mike Burrell

Greater Norwich Planning Policy Team
Manager, Norfolk County Council

Ruth Oyeniyi

Greater Norwich Senior Project Officer, Norfolk
County Council

1. APOLOGIES

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Shaun Vincent, Chris Starkie and Doug Field, whose tenure with LEP (Local Enterprise Partnership) had now finished.
- 1.2 The Chairman advised that the new LEP representative would be CJ Green; Hollie Adams **agreed** to contact the new Member in preparation for the next meeting of the Board.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.2 No interests were declared

3. MINUTES

- 3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 15 May 2020 were agreed as an accurate record

4. PLANNING AWARDS PARTNERSHIP WORKING CATEGORY WINNER- THE GREATER NORWICH INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PLAN & INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT FUND (VERBAL UPDATE)

- 4.1 The Chairman congratulated all partners on the receipt of this award, noting they had worked well together for years on developing and delivering infrastructure, housing and other requirements of the plan, and would continue to work to successfully meet any challenges which arose.

5. GREATER NORWICH SPORTS AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY STRATEGY

- 5.1.1 The Board received the report setting out the update of the 2014 indoor Sports Facility and Playing Pitch Strategy; an initial scoping exercise had been undertaken which concluded that the scope of the work should be developed beyond an assessment of built sports facilities, taking a more holistic approach considering the wider outcomes of improving physical health, mental wellbeing, reducing inequalities and improving community cohesion whilst supporting the need for Active Travel solutions following the Covid-19 outbreak.
- 5.1.2 Graham Nelson and Simon Hamilton, introduced the report:
 - This piece of work would allow processes to be aligned with opportunities for funding, noting the change to a focus on promoting active lifestyles rather than on sport
 - This work aligned with the review of the Greater Norwich Sports Strategy which was initiated in December 2019
 - The shift in emphasis from promoting sport to targeting inactivity aimed to reduce inequality; 25% of adults and 29% of children in the UK were classed as inactive, and this statistic was similar in Greater Norwich.
 - The development of the new Sports and Physical Activity Strategy would allow long-term planning for promoting active lifestyles for communities;

stakeholder engagement was key to understanding and targeting barriers to people being active.

- Indoor sports facilities would be reviewed to support and enable the Greater Norwich sports plans. The new strategy would look at the capacity for people to be active in informal spaces such as streets, open spaces and parks, and the quality of these spaces. This was important to physical and mental wellbeing and was not addressed in the existing 2014 strategy.
- It was noted that, with the current restrictions on sport and activity clubs caused by the Covid-19 pandemic, the strategy would be able to focus on things which allowed people to be more active as part of their daily routine and help to narrow the inequality gap.
- This work would also align with economic growth plans and health and wellbeing plans

5.2 The following points were discussed and noted:

- Leisure centres and other activity clubs were vulnerable to the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic and lockdown and could be supported by expanding the range of activities people were encouraged to take up
- A consultancy would be appointed to support delivery of the strategy; through working in collaboration across Councils the consultancy would be able to speak with people in communities to identify barriers to activity and identify sustainable solutions on how these could be addressed
- It was queried whether CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) or Section 106 funding could be used for this project.
- Simon Hamilton clarified that Sports England advocated an approach guided by sustainable outcomes. The strategy would therefore define a vision for sport and activity for Greater Norwich with deliverable objectives. The next 9-12 months would be key to identify what would be delivered and how.
- The change to CIL funding and implications for its use as part of this strategy was discussed; it was agreed that there was a need to look forward at delivery with the changing funding landscape in mind

5.3 As there was no Member from LEP or Broadland District Council at the meeting, Members **agreed** that recommendations would be agreed in the meeting by the three members present and endorsement for the recommendations made sought after the meeting from the LEP and Cllr Shaun Vincent.

5.4 The Board (*including retrospective sign off from Cllr Vincent and LEP)

- i. **Noted** the increased scope that is required to develop a Sport and Physical Activity Strategy.
- ii. **Agreed** for the Greater Norwich Sport and Physical Activity Strategy to be delivered, giving delegated authority to the Infrastructure Delivery Board to oversee its progress.
- iii. **Agreed** a contribution of £50,000 as match funding for the strategy. (as detailed in 4.2 of the report)

6. EAST NORWICH MASTERPLAN UPDATE

6.1.1 The Board received the report providing an update on progress with the East Norwich masterplan, including the creation of the East Norwich Partnership and commencement of the procurement process. The report also identifies potential risks that might arise from landowner funding issues.

6.1.2 Graham Nelson introduced the report to the Board:

- Emerging policy in the Greater Norwich Local Plan drew attention to the scale and potential development of this area
- A master plan would be drawn up in relation to the sites in question to scope out the potential that the sites could deliver collectively, look at how to deal with viability and deliverability of options, what intervention would be needed to deliver the vision and look at mechanisms needed to bring forward the scheme.
- There would be infrastructure challenges such as unlocking access; for example, the river was a barrier to east-west access
- It was thought that the scheme could deliver 4000 homes and employment space and would provide an interface between the City and the Broads
- Officers were working closely with Homes England and were in discussion with them regarding their recently announced package of infrastructure funding. The outcome of the application for Town Deal Funding was being awaited
- Constraints on private sector partners had caused a slight delay to the original timetable
- The partnership around Trowse rail bridge was in place and discussions with Network Rail were underway

6.2 The following points were discussed and noted:

- The sale of Carrow House, which could be regarded as being in the development area, was queried; the sale of the site was underway, but it was not possible to discuss details of this in the public domain
- Confirmation was still needed from a private sector partner on funding, but officers were optimistic of the outcome; once this was confirmed it would be possible to proceed
- The timeframe for development was queried; officers confirmed it was hoped that procurement would be complete by December 2020 and the master plan would be drawn up by summer 2021. It was then hoped that by the end of 2021 deliverability and viability of the scheme would be clear and mechanisms to ensure deliverability identified by 2022

6.3 The Board (*including retrospective sign off from Cllr Vincent and LEP) **NOTED** the contents of the update report and in particular the current funding position and its possible implications for procurement.

7. GREATER NORWICH MEDIA PROTOCOL

7.1.1 The Board received the report introducing the Greater Norwich Media Protocol, seeking initial agreement on the basic principles of dealing with media

communications and activities, creating a foundation upon which further communications drafts can then be developed.

7.1.2 Helen Mellors introduced the report:

- All five communications leads had agreed to implement the protocol
- The spokesperson for each element and how to deal with proactive elements still needed to be decided.

7.2 Members discussed and **agreed** that if the GNGB Chair was not available then sign off should be by the Vice-Chair; the Board **requested** this change was made to paragraph 3a of the protocol.

7.3 The Board (*including retrospective sign off from Cllr Vincent and LEP)

- i. **AGREED** to adopt the Greater Norwich Media Protocol with the change proposed to paragraph 3a: that sign off should be by the Vice-Chair in absence of the Chair. (see paragraph 7.2 above)
- ii. **INSTRUCTED** the Infrastructure Delivery Board to develop further Greater Norwich communications protocols to support the partnership working of the Greater Norwich Growth Board (GNGB).

8. Exclusion of the public

8.1 The Board **AGREED** to consider item 9, Greater Norwich Priority Development Sites, in private session as it was considered exempt by virtue of Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972: the appendix supporting the paper contained details of development sites which included commercially sensitive information, information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

9. Greater Norwich Priority Development Sites

9.1 The Board received the report providing details of the priority development sites within the Greater Norwich area.

9.2 After discussion the Board agreed the recommendations as set out within the report.

The public session concluded at 2.50