

**Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board**

MINUTES

2pm to 2.40pm

19 September 2013

- Present: Councillor Brenda Arthur (Norwich City Council) (chair)  
Councillor Mike Stonard (Norwich City Council)  
Councillor Andrew Proctor (Broadland District Council)  
Councillor Derek Blake (South Norfolk Council)  
Councillor John Fuller (South Norfolk Council)
- In attendance: Phil Kirby (Broadland District Council)  
Jerry Massey (Norwich City Council)  
Graham Nelson (Norwich City Council)  
Gwyn Jones (Norwich City Council)  
Tim Horspole (South Norfolk Council)  
Mike Jackson (Norfolk County Council)  
Richard Doleman (Norfolk County Council)  
David Cumming (Norfolk County Council)  
Chris Starkie (New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership)  
Sandra Eastaugh (Greater Norwich Development Partnership)  
Ruth Charles (Greater Norwich Development Partnership)  
Amy Broadhead (Greater Norwich Development Partnership)  
Natalie Beal (Broads Authority – substitute for Andrea Long)
- Apologies: Councillor Stuart Clancy (Broadland District Council)  
Councillor Shaun Vincent (Broadland District Council)  
Councillor Colin Foulger (South Norfolk Council)  
Councillor Judy Leggett (Norfolk County Council)  
Councillor George Nobbs (Norfolk County Council)  
Councillor Deborah Gihawi (Norfolk County Council)  
Councillor Brian Watkins (Norfolk County Council)  
Councillor Murray Gray (Broads Authority)  
Andrea Long (Broads Authority)  
Andy Wood (New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership)

## 1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

## 2. MINUTES

**RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2012.

## 3. JOINT CORE STRATEGY (JCS) – UPDATE

The head of planning services for Norwich City Council presented an update explaining that, following the previous meeting of the board, a lot had happened - including formal submission of the joint core strategy. He added that drafting of the main modifications to the JCS had taken place and that the commencement of consultation on the main modifications had begun. In summary, there were eight proposed modifications, six of which had been proposed or accepted by the city council. Two of those proposed, MM2 and MM8, had been drafted by the inspector. He considered that it would be good to submit a joint response to the proposed modifications representing a single voice from the GNDP.

Councillor Andrew Proctor said that the JCS was now in a stage of consultation. He explained that there was time to provide a measured, considered joint response, reflecting the position of the partners.

Councillor Derek Blake voiced concern that there would be additional growth in South Norfolk.

The inspector's report was expected to be published during November. As such, it was likely that the councils will be in a position to decide whether or not to adopt the plan in December or January.

**RESOLVED** to note the update and delegate responsibility to the Lead officers in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder, to agree a joint response from the GNDP to the Inspector's proposed modifications MM2 and MM8.

## 4. CITY DEALS – VERBAL UPDATE

The deputy chief executive officer (operations) for Norwich City Council explained that the skills element of the city deal had been negotiated and developed with Ipswich and New Anglia LEP. This had been accepted by central government and as such would be moving forward. The business support innovation and enterprise

element had the potential to provide substantial support via grant aid funding. Innovation vouchers were also mentioned as a means of providing further support.

The next step in the process would be the meeting with Ministers, which was expected to be after the party conferences season.

**RESOLVED** to note the report.

## **5. NORWICH AREA TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN UPDATE**

The director of environment, transport and development for Norfolk County Council presented the report. He explained that good progress had been made in implementing the strategy and that the board had been successful in securing a number of funding opportunities (including the better bus bid, cycle city ambition fund). He also explained that the legal challenge regarding the work to be carried out on Chapelfield North had been rejected by the courts, and added that the Secretary of State had confirmed the NDR as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). He explained that there had been a positive visit from the Minister for roads and that the A47 now had priority status in terms of feasibility studies and was likely to be a priority for the government in terms of funding going forward. He added that this represented a key part of delivering the JCS.

The chair recognised the hard work to deliver outputs so far as very impressive.

**RESOLVED** to note the report.

## **6. PROPOSAL FOR DISSOLVING THE GREATER NORWICH DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP BOARD**

The director of growth and localism for South Norfolk Council explained that the GNDP Board had developed from setting policy framework to building and delivering. As such it had achieved much and gave a good basis from which to build the new board. He said that the report looked at how the new board would need to set a governance arrangement which will help deliver the aims of the city deal, along with other initiatives. Para 3.3 reflected what the intention of the new growth board should be - in particular setting strategic direction and co-ordinating the city deal along with the growth programme generally across the Greater Norwich area. Appendices set out how to achieve that with the growth board at the centre. He said that the board would need to bear in mind that what was being set up may need to evolve further to meet the challenges that come forward.

He explained that the main proposal retained many positive aspects of the GNDP Board – including membership from each of the constituent bodies. Draft terms of

reference maintained the collaborative approach; each constituent authority would agree their own priorities and feed those into the board for the Board to manage on their behalf.

The chair said that the opportunities for funding were changing and that the new structure would fit well when aligning the board with the new funding opportunities whilst still providing plenty of flexibility. She added that the new board could prove to be a major delivery vehicle for the Local Enterprise Partnership.

The director of growth and localism for South Norfolk Council explained that the recommendation was that the constituent partners take a paper to the individual Councils to dissolve the GNDP Board and establish the Greater Norwich Growth Board. He then stated that he would like to table an additional recommendation, worded as follows:

“To delegate to the directors group to make minor corrections to the governance structure and terms of reference including taking account of the developing governance arrangements for the enterprise and innovation theme, the employment and skills theme, and the infrastructure theme.”

Board members agreed that this was acceptable.

**RESOLVED** to:-

- (1) recommend to the constituent partners that the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board is dissolved;
- (2) recommend to the constituent partners that work progresses to establish a Greater Norwich Growth Board; and
- (3) delegate to the directors group to make minor corrections to the governance structure and terms of reference for the new Growth Board including taking account of the developing governance arrangements for the enterprise and innovation theme, the employment and skills theme, and the infrastructure theme.

## **7. GREATER NORWICH EU FUNDING BID – VERBAL UPDATE**

The report examined ways in which the board could secure additional funding to deliver priorities. The New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) had run a number of consultations and workshops in which people put forward proposals with a view to including priorities that they raise within the strategic and economic plan. The possibility of the board putting forward an integrated territorial investment proposal (ITI) was discussed. This could draw down funding linked to the priorities of the Greater Norwich deal. It would provide earmarked funds to be spent solely on areas that the board had identified as priorities for Greater Norwich.

The managing director of the LEP explained that the role of the LEP and the future European funding programme is relatively straightforward. It would be a national EU programme where each member had been given a national allocation. He said that by the first week of October the LEP had to present their strategy on how funding is intended to be allocated. One option would be via an ITI. An ITI is an option open to LEPs and could offer a better way of integrating different funding streams from Europe. He explained that draft strategy would be submitted to central government on the 7 October and a finalised strategy at the end of January. He said that whilst central government was not keen on it, it should not necessarily stop areas from making the case for ITIs. He said that the LEP are happy to work with partners on looking at whether moving forward they pursue an ITI or a programme of work that looks and feels the same as an ITI, as well as providing support to look at how to work more effectively with the European funding programme to combine themes and ensure a joined-up approach.

The managing director of the LEP explained that a combined officers group is putting the EU plan together, coordinated by the LEP. He finished by saying that the door would remain open regarding ITI and this can be included in the final proposal submitted in January if that is what people decide is for the best.

**RESOLVED** to note the report.

CHAIR