

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board

Agenda

Members of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board

Representing Broadland District Council

Cllr Stuart Clancy
Cllr Roger Foulger
Cllr Andrew Proctor

Representing Norwich City Council

Cllr Brenda Arthur
Cllr Bert Bremner
Cllr Alan Waters

Representing South Norfolk Council

Cllr Yvonne Bendle
Cllr Derek Blake
Cllr John Fuller

Representing Norfolk County Council

Cllr Derrick Murphy
Cllr Graham Plant
Cllr Ann Steward

Representing Broads Authority

Mr Alan Mallett

Representing Homes & Communities Agency

Scott Bailey

Representing New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership

Andy Wood

Officers

Roger Burroughs	Broadland District Council
Phil Kirby	Broadland District Council
Andrea Long	Broads Authority
Sandra Eastaugh	GND Partnership Manager
Chris Starkie	New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership
Richard Doleman	Norfolk County Council
Mike Jackson	Norfolk County Council
Phil Morris	Norfolk County Council
Mike Burrell	Norwich City Council
Jerry Massey	Norwich City Council
Graham Nelson	Norwich City Council
Tim Horspole	South Norfolk Council
Andy Radford	South Norfolk Council

Date

Thursday 15 March 2012

Time

2pm

Place

Council Chamber
Thorpe Lodge
1 Yarmouth Road
Thorpe St Andrew
Norwich

Contact

Sara Utting tel (01603) 430428

Broadland District Council
Thorpe Lodge
1 Yarmouth Road
Thorpe St Andrew
Norwich NR7 0DU

Fax: (01603) 430411

E-mail: sara.utting@broadland.gov.uk

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS – FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF

MEETING: _____

DATE: _____

ITEM NO: _____ **AND TITLE:** _____

NATURE OF INTEREST: (Please write in this space a description of your interest)

	YES	NO
Is (or should) the Interest be registered in the Register of Members' Interests?		
If not, whose well being or financial position is affected to a greater extent than the majority of other people in the ward?		
Your own		
A family member (state name)		
A close associate (state name)		
Any person or body who has employed or appointed your family member/close associate (state name)		
Any firm in which your family member/close associate is a partner or company of which they are directors (state name)		
Any company in which your family member/close associate has shares with a face value more than £25,000 (state name)		
Any of the following in which you hold a position of general control or management: outside organisations, other public authorities, charities, pressure groups, political parties or trade unions (state name)		
Does the interest (a) affect your financial position or the financial position of a person or body described above? <i>(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)</i> (b) relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or any person or body described above? <i>(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)</i> (c) relate to scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny committee of a decision you were party to? <i>(If Yes the interest is prejudicial)</i> (d) relate to the functions of the council in respect of housing (except your tenancy), statutory sick pay, an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members, any ceremonial honour given to members, or setting the council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992. <i>(If Yes the interest is NOT PREJUDICIAL)</i>		
PREJUDICIAL INTEREST If you answered Yes to (a) or (b) is the interest one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest? If Yes the interest is PREJUDICIAL. If you answered Yes to (c) the interest is PREJUDICIAL		
If prejudicial do you intend to attend the meeting to make representations, answer questions or give evidence?		

Signed: _____

Date: _____

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to my interests?

- A** Does it affect my entries in the Register of Interests?
OR
B Does it affect the well being or financial position of me, my family or close associates; or my family's or close associates'
 • employment, employers or businesses;
 • companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more than £25,000 face value;
 • business partnerships; or
C Does it affect the well being or financial position of the following organisations in which I hold a position of general control or management:
 - other bodies to which I have been appointed or nominated by the council;
 - other public authorities;
 - charitable bodies;
 - bodies whose main purpose is to influence public opinion or policy
- More than the majority of other people in the ward?**
- D** Is Overview and Scrutiny considering a decision I made? If so you have a prejudicial interest.

NO

Disclose the existence & nature of your interest

You have a personal interest in the matter

YES

Is the interest financial or relating to a regulatory issue e.g. planning permission?

NO

The interest is not prejudicial you can participate in the meeting and vote

YES

You may have a prejudicial interest

- This matter relates to
- housing (except your tenancy)
 - statutory sick pay from the council
 - an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members
 - any ceremonial honour given to members
 - setting the council tax or a precept

YES

NO

The interest is prejudicial withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room (after making representations, answering questions or giving evidence). Do not try to improperly influence the decision

YES

Would a member of the public – if he or she knew all the facts – reasonably think that personal interest was so significant that my decision on the matter would be affected by it?

NO

Personal Interest

Prejudicial Interest

A G E N D A

Page No

- 1 To receive declarations of interest under Procedural Rule no 8**
- 2 Apologies for absence**
- 3 Minutes of meeting held on 15 December 2012** **1 - 8**
- 4 Matters arising therefrom (if any)**
- 5 Joint Core Strategy – Update** **to follow**

To receive an update following the outcome of the legal challenge into the JCS.
- 6 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – Consultation Update and Next Steps** **9 - 12**

To receive a report providing an update on the publication of the draft charging schedules for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk.
- 7 City Deals Proposal** **13 - 14**

To receive a report recommending a response to the Government on the “city deals” initiative.
- 8 Infrastructure Planning, Delivery and Funding**

To receive a verbal update from Price Waterhouse Coopers.
- 9 Date of Next Meeting**

To note the date of the next meeting: 24 May 2012 at 2pm

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board

Minutes of a meeting of the **Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board** at City Hall, Norwich on **Thursday 15 December 2011** at **10am** when there were present:

Cllr Andrew Proctor – Chairman

Cllr Stuart Clancy
Cllr Roger Foulger
Cllr Brenda Arthur
Cllr Bert Bremner
Cllr Alan Waters
Cllr Yvonne Bendle
Cllr Derek Blake
Cllr John Fuller
Cllr Derrick Murphy
Alan Mallett
Andy Wood

Representing
Broadland District Council
Broadland District Council
Norwich City Council
Norwich City Council
Norwich City Council
South Norfolk Council
South Norfolk Council
South Norfolk Council
Norfolk County Council
Broads Authority
New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership

Officers

Roger Burroughs
Phil Kirby
Sara Utting
Sandra Eastaugh
Richard Doleman
David Allfrey
Phil Morris
Gwyn Jones
Jerry Massey
Graham Nelson
Tim Horspole
Andy Radford

Broadland District Council
Broadland District Council
Broadland District Council
GND Partnership Manager
Norfolk County Council
Norfolk County Council
Norfolk County Council
Norwich City Council
Norwich City Council
Norwich City Council
South Norfolk Council
South Norfolk Council

The Chairman advised that agenda item 8 would be taken after agenda item 5 as these items were related.

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

Member	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
Mr Fuller, Mr Murphy and Mr Waters	9 (Growing Places Fund)	Members of LEP Board

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Graham Plant (Norfolk CC), Cllr Ann Steward (Norfolk CC), Scott Bailey (HCA), Chris Starkie (New Anglia LEP), Mike Jackson (Norfolk CC) and Andrea Long (Broads Authority).

3 CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

The Chairman endorsed the collective working between the partner authorities of the GNDP and emphasised how this had contributed to its success which it was hoped would continue for the future.

In addition, he referred to the recent allocation of £86.5m of funding by the Government for the NDR. This would be the first step of the infrastructure within the greater Norwich area to support the long term growth plans. Cllr Murphy added that this was an excellent first step, albeit there were caveats attached. However, it would be a spur to the aspiration of a continuation of the route from the A140 through to the western end of the A47. The Chairman concluded that the NDR was only one part of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy and there was still much work to be done, particularly on areas such as public transport etc.

4 JCS – LEGAL CHALLENGE

Phil Kirby updated the Board on the legal challenge to the adoption of the Joint Core Strategy. The case had been heard at the High Court on 6 and 7 December. In addition, he referred to an update previously circulated to the GNDP Board members and advised this would be made available on the GNDP website.

The claimant's Barrister had detailed the three grounds of the claim and advised that Ground 3 (conformity of the JCS with the Regional Strategy) would not be pursued. The hearing therefore focused on the remaining grounds of the claim:

- Ground 1 – the adequacy of the Sustainability Appraisal in meeting European and national legal requirements, particularly in relation to the choice of the spatial locations for the growth and to potential alternatives to policies in the JCS.
- Group 2 – the major link road to Norwich needed to service the growth in the Broadland area at the heart of the Broadland part of the JCS was not assessed at all as part of the process.

The Judge had challenged both parties fairly vigorously on both of the claims. Judgement was reserved and it was unlikely that the Judge's decision would be received until early next year.

5 PREPARATION OF FIVE YEAR INVESTMENT PLAN

Richard Doleman and Sandra Eastaugh presented the report outlining the brief to procure financial advisor support to the GNDP, accompanied by a

Powerpoint presentation (a copy of which was available on the GNDP website). He advised that implementation of the JCS depended on developing a financial strategy which co-ordinated a structured approach to the funding challenges and risks. Financial advice would be required in two stages.

Stage 1

- Review of the 5 year Investment Plan prepared by the GNDP to test the financial robustness of the proposed programme (in the context of the longer term plan).
- An independent view of the challenges for each council in meeting the obligation to underwrite in part or whole the debt repayments of specific major infrastructure projects.
- Assistance in determining the level of income required from CIL (not only during the life of the plan but also covering a 15 year period).
- Identification of issues and requirements needed in order to pursue the principle funding options available, in addition to CIL, which would enable the works to proceed in a timely manner (detailed look at the first 2 years' requirements but to include future and long-term positions).

Stage 2

An option to continue beyond stage 1, providing the main options for the organisational and governance structures required to deliver the infrastructure required for the implementation of the JCS.

The GNDP Partnership Manager advised that support was needed for a better understanding of any shortfalls for potential borrowing, investment in pensions schemes / Bonds etc for the future and this was an area where expertise was essential. There was sufficient money in the budget to cover the costs of engaging a financial advisor and, if approval was granted, the Board would receive an update at its next meeting in March.

The Board endorsed the proposals, recognising that there was currently a shortfall in funding and front-end loading would probably be necessary to kick-start projects. However, it was considered that stage 2 was not optional and should follow as a second phase, once the outputs of stage 1 had been identified.

Accordingly, it was

AGREED:

- (1) to note the summary and

- (2) agree that the GNDP tender for financial support, as outlined in the report, on a phased basis

6 SUMMARY OF GROWTH PROJECTS

The GNDP Partnership Manager presented the report summarising the status of capital projects within the remaining Growth Area Fund.

AGREED:

to note the report.

7 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY – RESULTS ON CONSULTATION ON PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULES AND NEXT STEPS

Phil Morris presented the report outlining the results of the consultation undertaken on a preliminary draft charging schedule for the CIL in October / November 2011, accompanied by a Powerpoint presentation (a copy of which was available on the GNDP website). Attention was drawn to the recommendation and corrections which needed to be made to the appendix numbers in recommendations (i), (ii) and (iv).

Approximately 4,000 addresses, including development interests, interest groups, business interests, neighbourhood groups and parish / town councils had been written to, resulting in a total of 79 responses. A summary of the responses, together with the officer response was attached to the report and a copy of the detailed paper setting out the individual responses etc was available on the GNDP website. Following the responses to the consultation and further evidence on viability, a number of changes to the charging schedules and the document Community Infrastructure Levy: Background and Context were being recommended. In summary, these were:

- (1) A change in the residential zone in Zone A to a rate of £115 per sq m.
- (2) The inclusion of domestic garages in the residential charging rates for Zone A and Zone B.
- (3) The inclusion of fire and rescue stations, ambulance and police stations which are sui generis within the same rate as uses falling under C2, C2A and D1 (£0 per sq m).

The adoption of a CIL by a local authority entailed formal processes including an Examination in Public (the whole process possibly taking approximately 20 weeks) but, following a meeting with a PINS examiner, it was hoped this could be reduced which would enable CIL to be adopted earlier than originally

anticipated.

An additional paper was circulated at the meeting on the further viability evidence relating to flatted development of over 6 storeys in the city area, in response to feedback on the consultation. The recommendation proposed changes to the charging schedule specifically for Norwich City Council to include a rate for flats (of 6 storeys and above) of £100 per sq m.

Finally, the Board noted minor wording changes to Appendix 1 (indicative regulation 123 policy) section on maintenance, paragraph 7.1 (setting of CIL rates) and Appendix 1 (indicative regulation 123 list) section on maintenance, the detail of which was circulated at the meeting.

Mr Morris concluded that house prices were key to the viability of the CIL. He stated that the CIL rate was index-linked to the all in tender price index and there could also be adjustments between the balance of S106 and CIL monies. For example, if the economy picked up more quickly, then S106 contributions could be increased.

Concern was expressed at the proposed three year period before carrying out a review as it was considered this should be reduced to say, two years. The Chairman responded that continuous monitoring would be undertaken and consequently the review period would be longer or shorter as necessary, according to the market conditions. It was considered each authority in the GNDP would need to agree to include an appropriate form of words in its charging schedule.

In response to a comment why some parishes fell within both Zones A and B, as this caused potential difficulties, Mr Morris stated that the Regulations required boundaries to be based on viability (they must not be policy based) and could not be defined by parish boundaries. In time, if this was proven not to be the case (ie if evidence showed there was no difference in viability within a parish) then it could be remedied through the first review. The expectation was that CIL income would increase as house prices were anticipated to rise.

The Chairman summarised the key points as follows:

- Consultation responses, particularly those on Zones A and B residential rates
- Setting an appropriate CIL for flatted development above 6 storeys to be incorporated into the charging schedule (relevant to Norwich City Council only)
- Ongoing review – to be written into the charging schedules
- An appreciation of the difficult economic situations currently being experienced and how to encourage developments to be both sustainable

and viable

- Certainty of the CIL
- Staging issue
- A recognition that CIL income was important to all local authorities in the partnership

Accordingly, it was

AGREED:

that the constituent partner authorities be recommended:

- (1) to proceed towards the publication of draft charging schedules for the three charging authorities, incorporating the changes recommended to the documents set out in Appendices 3 and 4 of the report and as discussed above;
- (2) to agree the Background and Context Document incorporating the changes as set out in Appendix 5 of the report (including the amendments referred to above);
- (3) to work towards the timetable as identified in the report;
- (4) to note the charges as sought by other authorities as set out in Appendix 6 of the report and
- (5) to agree that any minor changes to ensure consistency and clarity be delegated to the Director representative on the GNDP Board following discussion with the relevant Portfolio Holder.

8 GNDP RESPONSE TO CENTRAL GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON CIL DETAILED PROPOSAL AND DRAFT REGULATIONS FOR REFORM

Roger Burroughs presented a draft response on the consultation for CIL detailed proposals and draft regulations for reform, which it was proposed be a joint response from the partner local authorities. It was noted that the deadline for submitting responses was 30 December 2011.

The Board reviewed the questions and proposed answers and commented as follows:

Q1 – In addition to the proposed response, it was noted that consultation responses received by the GNDP would be passed to the Government as part of this consultation.

Q2 - In addition to the proposed response, it was noted that consultation responses received by the GNDP would be passed to the Government as part of this consultation.

Q1 (para 1.1) – Delete “yes” at the start of the response.

The Board endorsed the proposed responses, subject to the amendments above and accordingly, it was

AGREED:

to agree the submission of the joint GNDP response as contained in the report and as amended above.

9 GROWING PLACES FUND

Andy Wood, Chairman of the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership, presented the report on the “Growing Places Fund”, a Government fund of £500m to support the delivery of infrastructure needed to unblock jobs and growth. The fund was being allocated by formula to Local Enterprise Partnerships, with New Anglia LEP’s indicative share just over £12m. The report sought the Board’s approval for the development of the New Anglia Growing Places Fund and outlined a potential way forward for the development of such a fund. A copy of the Government’s Growing Places prospectus was attached to the report for further information.

The three overriding objectives of the Fund were:

- (1) To generate economic activity in the short term by addressing immediate infrastructure and site constraints and promote the delivery of jobs and housing.
- (2) To allow Local Enterprise Partnerships to prioritise the infrastructure they needed, empowering them to deliver their economic strategies.
- (3) To establish sustainable revolving funds so that funding could be reinvested to unlock further development and leverage private investment.

It was noted that a lead local authority had to be identified as the accountable body to receive and account for the funding on behalf of the Partnership and Suffolk County Council had been appointed for the New Anglia LEP. A team, comprising Sandra Eastaugh GNDP Manager, David Ralph, Chief Executive of the Haven Gateway Partnership, Mike Dowdall, Economic Development Manager of Suffolk County Council and Chris Starkie of the New Anglia LEP, had been established to move the initiative forward, looking at three key areas in establishing the Fund. The key priority would be job creation. The LEP

Board will arbitrate on bids for funding but Mr Wood emphasised that this would not result in additional bureaucracy. Consideration would be given to cross-LEP boundary bids but would require a 50% contribution from the neighbouring LEP.

Two percent of the Fund could be utilised to help the Partnership manage the Fund, providing enough resources for New Anglia to develop and administer the Fund and one proposal would be to second a member of staff from a local authority with experience in this field to the LEP team.

The working group would complete the pre-qualification questionnaire and circulate it to New Anglia LEP Board members for approval prior to the December submission date.

The Chairman welcomed the emphasis on job creation and also Mr Wood's assurance that the LEP Board would not create bureaucracy.

Accordingly, the Board

AGREED:

to note the action taken to date.

10 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

AGREED:

The following dates for 2012:

15 March
24 May
20 September
13 December

All meetings to be held at Broadland District Council offices and commence at 2pm

The meeting closed at 11.32am

Community Infrastructure Levy for Broadland, Norwich and
South Norfolk – Comments Regulation 16 Publication of
Draft Charging Schedules and Next Steps

Report by: GNDP Directors

Summary

This report provides an update on the Regulation 16 Publication of the Draft Charging Schedules for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk from 6 February – 5 March 2012

1. Background

1.1. The constituent authorities of the GNDP agreed to publish preliminary draft charging schedules in late 2011 as a first step towards the adoption of a Community Infrastructure Levy covering the Councils of Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, as charging authorities under the CIL legislation. The outcome of the consultation exercise was reported to the partner authorities inviting them to proceed to the next stage. The meeting dates were:

- Broadland District Council: 5 January, 2012
- Norwich City Council: 31 January 2012
- South Norfolk Council: 23 January 2012

The report was also considered by the cabinet of Norfolk County Council Cabinet at its meeting on 3 January 2012

1.2. The report was supported by a number of documents:

- A report on the consultation undertaken on the preliminary draft charging schedules
- A background paper and showing further work undertaken on viability issues
- A summary of the changes recommended to the draft charging schedules and background document
- draft charging schedules for each of the charging authorities showing the recommended changes from the preliminary draft following an earlier consultation
- A background and context document showing the recommended changes from the preliminary draft following an earlier consultation
- A summary of the CIL charges being proposed elsewhere

Having considered the report, the partner authorities agreed to proceed by publishing draft charging schedules under Regulation 16 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, as amended, and invited representations under Regulation 17.

2. Publication

2.1. The Partnership was keen to receive as many comments as possible and promoted Publication by:

- Sending the publication materials to all neighbouring authorities and Parish and Town Councils in the three district area. Further copies were also sent to the Department for Communities and Local Government.
- A new webpage on the GNDP website, www.gndp.org.uk, which included download copies of the consultation material and the evidence base as well as further background documents.
- Public notices in the EDP and Evening News on 6 February and reminder adverts on 20 February.
- Public notices in the Beccles & Bungay Journal, Diss Mercury, Great Yarmouth Mercury, Lowestoft Journal, North Norfolk News, Norwich Advertiser, Wymondham and Attleborough Mercury on 3 February and reminder adverts on 17 February.
- Over 4000 letters and e-mails to organisations, businesses; housing providers and individuals on the three districts Local Development Framework consultation database. Correspondence included a link to the website and a contact telephone number.

2.2. A total of 34 responses were received to the consultation. Representations are being logged and will be posted on the GNDP website, www.gndp.org.uk.

2.3 A list of the respondents can be seen below

Name	Ref
Service Providers/ statutory agencies	
Anglian Water	DCS012
Environment Agency	DCS010
Highways Agency	DCS005
Natural England	DCS034
Water Management Alliance	DCS003
Neighbouring Authorities	
Broads Authority	DCS019
Breckland Council (Capita Symonds, on behalf of)	DCS007
Parish and Town Councils	
Blofield Parish Council	DCS016
Brundall Parish Council	DCS006
Chedgrave Parish Council	DCS013
Hainford Parish Council	DCS002
Loddon Parish Council	DCS001
Stratton Strawless Parish Council	DCS008
Thurton Parish Council	DCS015

Community organisations	
Stop Norwich Urbanisation	DCS017
Templemere Residents Association	DCS023
Agents/ Developers/ Landowners	
Hethersett Land Ltd (Bidwells, on behalf of)	DCS014
University of East Anglia (Bidwells, on behalf of)	DCS018
Timewell Properties (Bidwells, on behalf of)	DCS020
Building Partnerships	DCS021
WM Morrisons Supermarkets plc (Peacock and Smith, on behalf of)	DCS024
McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd (The Planning Bureau Ltd)	DCS025
Barrett Eastern Counties (Bidwells, on behalf of)	DCS026
Welbeck Strategic Land (Barton Willmore, on behalf of)	DCS027
United Business & Leisure	DCS030
Norfolk Chamber of Commerce (Bidwells, on behalf of)	DCS028
(Sainsburys Supermarkets (Indigo Planning, on behalf of)	DCS031
Easton Landowners, Norfolk Homes, Endurance Estates (Savills, on behalf of)	DCS032
Asda Stores (Thomas Eggar LLP, on behalf of)	DCS033
Interest groups	
CPRE	DCS022
NNTAG	DCS029
Sport England	DCS011
The Theatres Trust	DCS009
Residents	
J Wheatley	DCS004

2.4 A range of comments have been received, some emerging themes are:

- The viability of residential development
- The viability of commercial development
- The boundary of the charging zones
- The provision of infrastructure

3. Next steps

3.1 Following the judgment on the legal challenge to the Joint Core Strategy officers are working to assess the impact on the CIL process and have advised delaying submission for the time being (previously anticipated to be 26 March).

3.2 A revised timetable will be published once the assessment is complete.

Recommendation

- (i) The GNPD Board notes progress on the CIL.

Officer Contact

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

Name	Telephone Number	Email address
Roger Burroughs	01603 430558	Roger.burroughs@broadland.gov.uk
Gwyn Jones	01603 212364	gwynjones@norwich.gov.uk
Tim Horspole	01603 533806	thorspole@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Phil Morris	01603 222730	Phil.morris@norfolk.gov.uk

City Deals

Report by: GNDP Directors

Summary

This report sets out the government's recent city deals initiative and explores how it might relate to Greater Norwich. It is recommended that a response is sent to government highlighting the issues that might arise in applying the current city deal model in a non unitary area.

1. Background

- 1.1 In December 2011, Government announced "city deals", which were intended to recognise cities as "engines of growth" and offer an opportunity for cities to enter into a partnership with government involving devolution of power in return for meeting certain conditions. The city deals guidance sets out a menu of initiatives that government would be willing to negotiate e.g. greater freedoms to invest in growth; the power to drive critical infrastructure development and new tools to help people get the skills and jobs they need. The conditions include demonstrating strong visible and accountable leadership and effective decision making structures. Cities must also be able to demonstrate that they are willing to take on proportionate risks. The first city deals were open to core cities only and the first deal was announced on 7 February 2012 for Liverpool. The Liverpool agreement includes:
 - A new Enterprise Zone, This means that for the next 25 years increases in Business Rate income, would be invested in regeneration.
 - Creation of a joint Mayoral Investment Board to oversee the city's economic and housing strategy, pooling local assets including those of the Homes and Communities Agency to drive economic growth.
 - Welfare Pilots to reduce welfare dependency. The city will work closely with the Government on local schemes including a 'youth contract' to increase the number of claimants moving to work.
 - A Secondary School Investment Plan to build 12 new secondary schools including at least six new academies to help support the local skills agenda and the local economy. The Council will work with the schools, private companies and local universities to develop specialisms to meet local skills shortages.
- 1.2 On 23 January 2012, Government announced that it was extending the offer of a bespoke city deal to more of England's cities, beyond the main ones, and invited them to start considering their proposals. The Government's Cities Unit is leading the negotiation process.
- 1.3 The initial menu of possible transformative powers, including greater freedoms to invest in growth, and new ways for cities to boost jobs and apprenticeships, were set out in a document "Unlocking Growth in Cities", published in December 2011. The initial menu suggests that there may be an opportunity to secure additional funding through a share of Regional Growth Fund, pooling of business rates

across a LEP area and potential European Social Fund (ESF) money. It is not clear how much of this is additional funding or whether it is pooling existing allocations into a new pot.

1.4 City deals therefore appear to be intended to be based on rounded packages of proposals to support economic growth in functional urban areas. There is also an expectation that they would reflect LEP boundaries.

2. Issues for Greater Norwich

2.1 If Greater Norwich is to consider a city deal type of arrangement, there are a number of questions and issues that arise from the current proposals:

- It is unclear how city deals would work outside unitary authorities to tackle issues such as skills, transportation, education etc
- Similarly there may be issues for non- metropolitan areas where there is more than one town or city in the LEP area.
- The geographical and political boundaries may make it difficult to demonstrate a clear contribution to the government agenda in return, such as the range of powers available through the Localism Act
- In areas such as Greater Norwich it is unclear how the expectation of "strong, visible and accountable leadership" could be met. Whilst no model is given it appears to assume that there will be single political leadership rather than inter-authority does state that elected mayors will automatically meet this requirement.
- The ability to commit resources and take risks associated with a city deal

3. Conclusions

3.1 The principle of a package based deal which provides incentives and transformative powers for the local area in return for meeting conditions agreed with government seems attractive. The current city deal arrangement appears to favour large unitary and metropolitan areas. Whilst Greater Norwich is the driver for growth across an extensive hinterland, is committed to delivery and has a strong track record of working across administrative boundaries, it is unclear how the present city deal arrangement could be delivered in practice, given the size of the area and the two tier structure. Other cities in two tier areas are considering submitting proposals and the suggested approach for Greater Norwich at this stage is to lobby Government about the key role that shire cities can play in delivering growth.

Recommendation

The GNDP Board is recommended to respond to government to the City deals offer to ensure that government recognises the positive appetite towards city deal type arrangements and to draw attention to the practical issues of implementing the current model in a two tier non metropolitan area.

Officer Contact

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

Name	Telephone Number	Email address
Gwyn Jones	01603 212364	gwynjones@norwich.gov.uk