

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT (1)

GREATER THETFORD DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP - FRIDAY 21 APRIL 2017

Enclosed are the following items for your information:

Item No	Report Title
----------------	---------------------

- | | |
|----|---|
| 2. | GTDP - Draft Minutes 17 February 2017 |
| 3. | Greater Thetford Development Partnership - Planning and Projects Sub Group Update 21 April 2017 |

**Greater Thetford Development Partnership Board
Minutes**

17th February 2017 10.00am – 11.30am
The Bell Hotel, King’s Street, Thetford, Norfolk

Chair: Graham Jermyn GJ

Attendees:

Board Members

Mike Brown MB (Thetford Business Forum), Chris Hey CH (Norfolk County Council), Tony Poulter TP (Brettenham & Kilverstone Parish Council), Robert King RK (Croxtan Parish Council), John Newton JN (Sub) (Thetford Town Council), Robert Campbell RC (Breckland Council – sub-group chair), Denis Crawford DC (Norfolk County Council), Will Van Cutsem WVC (Pigeon), Diana Goucher DG (Sub)(Communities sub-group), Jenny Hollis JH (Sub) (Breckland Council), Tig Armstrong TA (Norfolk County Council)

Minutes

Helen McAleer HM (Breckland Council)

Apologies:

Adam Broadway AB (Flagship), Richard Doleman RD (Norfolk County Council), Rob Walker RW (Breckland Council), Robert Whitaker RWh (Communities sub-group chair), Rob Cooper RCo (Norfolk County Council/ South Norfolk CCG), Terry Jermy TJ (Thetford Town Council), Sam Chapman-Allen SCA(Breckland Council).

	Item	Action
1.	<p>Apologies and introductions round the table.</p> <p>The following Apologies and Substitutions were noted:</p> <p>Apologies from Adam Broadway, Richard Doleman, Rob Walker, Rob Cooper, Robert Whittaker, (Substituted by Diana Goucher), Terry Jermy, (Substituted by John Newton) and Sam Chapman-Allen, (Substituted by Jenny Hollis)</p> <p>Introductions were made round the table. The Chairman advised that the meeting would be held in private session from 10.00 to 11.30 for discussion on Item 3. There would then be an opportunity to take questions from the public on general matters.</p>	
2.	<p>Approval of Minutes (21 October 2016)</p> <p>The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2016 were agreed.</p>	
3.	<p>Further Consideration and Agreement of Strategy and Objectives for Greater Thetford</p> <p>A paper written by Rob Walker was presented for discussion. It set out the outcomes and objectives generated from the two facilitated Workshops that had been held.</p> <p>Partners view were sought and some minor amendments were suggested.</p>	

<p>JN asked for the Board's support in lobbying BDC for a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO). The town currently had an Order which restricted drinking in public in certain areas until October 2017. When that ran out he hoped the PSPO would take over. He was concerned that if nothing replaced it there would be an increase in anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>JN explained that a paper was going to be discussed at BDC's Cabinet meeting on 21 March and that was when the Board's support for the PSPO needed to be brought to their attention.</p> <p>RC thought that such things should be discussed as separate agenda items to give everyone enough information to make a decision. Due to the tight timescale in this instance someone should find out what the recommendation in the paper would be and if it was to support a PSPO there was no issue. However, if the proposal was not supported, information should be distributed to the Board by e-mail to give everyone the opportunity to comment and to submit their support.</p> <p>MB asked what Paul Wheatley thought. He should be asked to submit his comments to BDC. If he supported a PSPO, the Board should write in with their support as well.</p> <p>GJ said there were always two sides to every argument. There might be consequences so significant that the Council did not support the PSPO. Without all the information it was difficult to comment.</p> <p>TA agreed and said that he could not vote and would have to abstain because it was outside his area of expertise. The Board's role was to look at the broader strategic issues; these difficult social issues were not in their remit.</p> <p>TP suggested that the Town Council should write to the Police and Crime Commissioner and ask for his support.</p> <p>RC would speak to RW and ask him to provide a clarification statement and if possible include a statement from Paul Wheatley.</p> <p>GJ referred to the comment about the remit of the Board. The Board had focussed a lot on the TEP and SUE because of the impediments around them and their lack of progress. When those impediments were removed it was going to impact on the whole of the Greater Thetford area in terms of jobs, impact on existing industrial estates, social housing, the town centre etc. It would be the Board's responsibility to explore all those issues to ensure that the people that already lived in Thetford were involved and not forgotten. GJ felt that the Board could not do much itself, but the organisations of the people round the table could. The Board would gradually achieve more using persuasive powers.</p> <p>JH as a resident of Thetford asked whether there was adequate education to compete with outsiders.</p>	<p>RC/RW</p> <p>All</p>
---	-------------------------

	<p>RC advised that the statistics showed that Thetford was significantly below the national average in educational achievement and many post 16 young people had to travel a considerable distance for further education.</p> <p>Currently, local businesses employed a lot of unskilled people, but a lot of those jobs would disappear over the next ten years. Manufacturing was transforming and was unlikely to retain a high level of unskilled workforce.</p> <p>The recommendations in the report were considered. After some discussion recommendations one and two were unanimously supported, subject to amendments. Recommendation three was deferred until after a further workshop session had been held.</p>	RC/RW
4.	<p>Next Steps and Unveiling at Public Session</p> <p>The Chairman explained the process; people could ask questions and he would nominate who was to answer.</p>	
5.	<p>Communities Sub Group (Update)</p> <p>DG was present as substitute for RoW. She gave some background about the Communities sub-group and said that the main things that people were concerned about were education and health provision. They had received a very good education presentation at their last meeting from CH. People had been reassured that things were in place for the new people coming in. Existing schools already had difficulties and they must not be forgotten.</p> <p>Other areas of concern were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where would enough doctors come from? • King Street Square; could the Board get together with NCC, BDC and the Town Council to do something about it? • Croxton Road and Mundford Road. The community were very worried and it was a problem that would become worse. • Parking and disabled access at the railway station • The walking and cycling network needed joining up. • The former cottage hospital. • Provision of land within the new area for scouts. • Better and more affordable leisure facilities. • Improvements to the sub-group's website. <p>WVC asked for more information on the Scout's requirement as land was available.</p> <p>GJ said they would make sure to capture those issues in the programme of work.</p> <p>TP asked for the Director of Public Health in Norfolk to be invited to speak to the Board. There was no provision for primary care and a needs analysis was required.</p>	<p>GJ/RW</p> <p>DG</p> <p>GJ</p>

	<p>RC noted the relationship of leisure with public health and that it contributed to better education outcomes as well. It was agreed that that would be followed up and information would be fed back to the sub-group.</p> <p>DC commented that he had attended the community sub-group and he had found it rather negative and very anti-council. JN confirmed that he had received similar reports from members of the community.</p> <p>DG said she would report back on that. It was also suggested that the venue for the sub-group should move to provide access for more members of the community.</p> <p>WVC said that an easy way to get positivity was to find a way to address some of their issues and give them positive feedback.</p>	<p>GJ/HM</p> <p>DG</p>
6.	Planning and Projects Sub Group (Update) NTR	
7.	Inward Investment Sub Group (Update) NTR	
8.	Any Other Business <p>TP asked if someone from the LEP could be invited to speak to the Board. It was felt that it would be better to wait until the delivery programme had been developed so that there would be specific topics to discuss.</p> <p>TP asked for the Director of Public Health to be invited to the workshop and for a representative of the LEP to come to the next Board meeting.</p> <p>JH asked when housing development on the SUE would start.</p> <p>WVC explained that they were trying to get a deal with a developer to buy the first phase of land. If that was successful they would submit a Reserved Matters planning application and there was the potential for work to commence onsite in the first quarter of 2018.</p>	<p>RC/RW</p> <p>RW</p>
9.	Date of Next Meeting <p>The next scheduled meeting was on 21 April 2017. Venue to be confirmed.</p> <p>The workshop would be held on Friday 17 March 2017 from 10-12. Venue and facilitator to be confirmed.</p>	<p>HM</p> <p>RW/HM</p>

Meeting closed at 11.40

Open Session (no attendees)

Greater Thetford Development Partnership Planning and Projects Sub Group Update 21 April 2017

Project identification

The Greater Thetford Development Partnership Planning & Projects sub-group met on the 24th March. This was the first meeting for nearly 6 months to consider the outcome of the recent round of GTDP Board away days on the future work of the sub-group.

To date, the P&P sub-group has concentrated on the drafting of a delivery plan that identifies projects that are being actively pursued.

The away day sessions identified a number of project priorities, and it was requested that the P&P sub-group to look at strategic infrastructure projects serving the Greater Thetford Area.

Rather than simply restate infrastructure projects which are already either planned or underway, the P&P sub-group discussed how best to inform the Board's knowledge base on key themes which would help facilitate discussion on project formation and prioritisation.

As a first step, a piece of work has been undertaken by the P&P sub-group, using Green Infrastructure (GI) as a case study, as it has relevance to a number of the Board's key strategic objectives.

Findings

The consideration of GI identifies that a large body of evidence exists, but there is limited knowledge of both the existence and content of this evidence base. It is also clear that no single 'definitive' report exists which represents the position of the GTDP on this important theme.

There is real benefit to collate a comprehensive list of evidence studies and review these to formulate a clear position statement on Green Infrastructure by the GTDP Board and to identify potential projects for delivery, leading towards decisions on which projects to back.

As a technical group, the P&P sub-group are well placed to identify evidence sources and potential projects within them.

Recommendations

- The P&P sub-group expand the review of the existing evidence base to cover further key themes. The P&P sub-group to suggest further themes for the Board that warrant further evidence review.
- Board to agree how potential projects should be considered by the GTDP, to develop and deliver priorities.
- A review of the P&P sub-groups terms of reference be undertaken.