
BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

GREATER THETFORD DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP

**Held on Friday, 15 December 2017 at 10.00 am in
Church on the Way, Grenville Way, Thetford IP24 2JH**

PRESENT

Roy Brame RB (Norfolk County Council),
Duncan Butler DB (NHS England)
Robert Campbell RC (Breckland Council – sub-group chair),
Sam Chapman-Allen SCA(Breckland Council),
Richard Doleman RD (Norfolk County Council)
Terry Jermy TJ (Chairman [Item 1 only] Thetford Town Council)
Robert King RK (Croxtton Parish Council),
Tony Poulter TP (Brettenham & Kilverstone Parish Council),
Robert Whittaker RWh (Communities sub-group chair),
Rob Walker RW (Breckland Council),

In Attendance

Teresa Smith – Breckland Council, Democratic Services

Action By

10/18 REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Terms of Reference had been updated to reflect the recent changes within the Board and discussed at a previous meeting. Membership of the Board would be reviewed annually and should include a representative from each authority, and the Chairman of each of the sub-groups.

Following the resignation from the Independent Chairman, a decision had been made to no longer continue with this role and the Chairman should rotate on an annual basis between the respective authorities.

There were no substantial changes to the meetings and ways of working.

TP asked why the Chairman would rotate. It was **AGREED** to remove this line from the terms of reference.

TP went onto suggest that the board should monitor and advise, rather than oversee; however it was felt that as the delivery of the Board would be by the authorities of the partnership, the board could recommend or advise.

RB, a new member of the Board sought clarification on the role of the Board. He felt that the Town Council were not fully aware of what the Greater Thetford Development Partnership would be delivering and felt very disappointed.

Action By

RWh felt there should be a fourth bullet point added that included communication and engagement with the public.

SCA said the aim of the partnership was to achieve what was best for Thetford. The Board needed to be mindful that it had not been given a mandate to make decisions, however as the three-tiers of each Authority were represented on the Board it could work as a collective and make a difference to prioritise and deliver the needs of Thetford. It was important to understand that the Board was self-funding and was an opportunity for everyone to deliver, not just the District Council. He added there was no reason why the Board could not invite the LEP or utilities to provide updates of the delivery of the Greater Thetford development.

RW added that the GTDP Board consisted of different tiers of Local Government and should have an awareness to deliver a shared agenda in a co-ordinated fashion for Thetford.

The following actions were agreed:

- To remove the 2nd line under 'Chairman'.
- A 4th bullet point to be added to the Role of the Board, to read: "to ensure plans and developments are effectively communicated to the public and that appropriate engagement and consultation with the public and public stakeholders is undertaken".

11/07 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

It was agreed Sam Chapman-Allen be appointed as Chairman for the ensuing year.

It was agreed Mr Tony Poulter be appointed as Vice-Chairman for the ensuing year.

12/18 APOLOGIES

None.

13/18 MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM 13 OCTOBER 2017

RWh asked for an amendment under Item 6 – Thetford SUE and TEP update to include – "Decision on whether planning permission to be made has been requested".

Subject to this amendment, the minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2017 were agreed.

14/18 HEALTH IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Duncan Butler, (NHS England) worked as a consultant providing strategic planning and develop health facilities. He was considering in detail on the issues of the current health practices and the impact the new development would have and how this would be met.

The three practices were working collaboratively with the Watton

Action By

practice, and discussing how future development affected neighbouring services, including the acute service contracts.

In order to open a new practice at least two GPs would be required as well as a large number of patients (ratio was 1800-2000 patients to 1 GP); therefore existing practices would be considered and expanded where possible. The piece of work would provide recommendations that the Commissioners would need to sign up to.

TJ had noticed some clinics being provided in community centres and welcomed the use of such buildings. DB said the new health centres could be very expensive to build, and some community organisations were requiring long term leases which was not always suitable. Many health services were now benefitting from co-location, and that formed the basis of the Healthy Living Centre in Thetford.

It was hoped the report would be submitted by the end of March 2018. Feedback had been received that the Healthy Living Centre was under-utilised for a variety of reasons; although it had been suggested that additional parking was required.

RWh said Section106 funding had been allocated for the provision of healthcare, however the funding would not be released until the new developments had been built.

It was also asked how Dental provision would be considered. Dentistry was commissioned in a different way and current services were provided in the healthy living centre.

TJ mentioned the Charles Burrell centre offered midwifery services and diabetic clinics, and further space could be found if required.

ACTIONS –

- Board Members to provide specific written questions for NCC to work with the Public Health Director to unlock communications.
- NCC to invite Public Health Director and Clinical Commissioning Groups to attend a specific Health focussed meeting (proposed April meeting).
- DB to also attend the health themed meeting in April.
- RW to email DB contact details of himself and RD.

15/18 GREATER THETFORD DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP BOARD OBJECTIVES

RW said that as the organisations were no longer part of the Board work would be undertaken by Officers to create a co-ordinated report that would be presented at future meetings. It

Action By

would also allow the board to see the objectives prioritised and allow more focus for the Board.

RC informed the Board that a new Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership Strategy had been published; as well as the Norfolk delivery infrastructure. The Government Industrial Strategy white paper had also been published in November. He would bring a further paper at the next meeting for the Board to consider the priorities.

RB asked for Officers to take the scope for the TEP and consider access to the bottom of the site.

RD said phase 1 and 1a of the signage work had been completed and work on Phase 2 had commenced. The Thetford Network Improvement Strategy would identify the most effective transport improvements to support future planned growth and help address transport issues such as congestion, enhancements to safety and access to public transport. Whilst there had been some stakeholder engagement the timescales were still unknown. The Board would be updated on progress.

RW was working with Flagship on the regeneration of housing, with a particular focus on the Abbey estate and Barnham-cross estate. The Board would be updated in due course. Work within the Market Towns began to gain pace with the highly successful community fridges being launched (re-allocating excess food to those that needed it to reduce waste).

An engagement event on 'green infrastructure' had been arranged in the Carnegie Rooms, Thetford, and the confirmed date would be communicated to the Board as soon as possible.

TP asked for the A14 / A11 junction to be added as a priority for Officers to consider.

TJ asked for a previous piece of work to be re-visited on creating a brand for Thetford. This would also prove useful for all board members to have clear points in selling Thetford, for all to use to share the clear vision.

All Officers would work together to create the co-ordinated report.

RWh asked for the disabled access issues to the rail station and lack of parking to be assigned to one of the objectives. It was agreed that this would be added to the infrastructure list and reflected in the Officers report.

16/18 COMMUNICATIONS

Materials relating to the GTDP partnership and website would be updated following the agreed recent changes to the terms of reference. A formal report would come to the next board meeting and RW welcomed input from all parties involved.

Action By

RWh had submitted a paper on transparency of the Board and sub-groups. The Board responded as follows:

1. *The board should resume production of a meeting highlights summary, to be published rapidly after each board meeting.* This is already being carried through.
2. *Except for emergencies, all reports, papers and proposals should be published with the Agenda in advance of each board meeting.*
The Chairman would ensure this happens.
3. *Board Members must be consulted on the proposed agenda for each meeting, and have the opportunity to request additional items be added.*
The Chairman sets the agenda for the next meeting, but expects the Board to set the agenda in future.
4. *Papers and minutes should be published in accordance with the agreed timescales.*
This would be attempted to the best of ability.
5. *At each Board meeting, written reports should be provided, but each sub-group; TEP and SUE progress; and, activity on the boards strategic objectives.*
The Chairman asked for reports only if there was anything to report.
6. *Some form of minutes, meeting notes or summary should be published after every GTDP Board meeting, sub-group, or Officer group meeting.*
The officer group meeting would not always have minutes, but the chairman of each group should feed into the Board meeting.
7. *The GTDP website needs to be updated to include details of the current Board members.*
As previously mentioned, the website would be updated following agreement of the terms of reference.

RWh asked for a specific page on the website for each objective. The Chairman suggested that when the objective re-fresh had taken place then this would be considered.

17/18 THETFORD SUE / TEP UPDATE

It is expected a decision on the grant would be made in January 2018.

18/18 GREATER THETFORD DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP SUB GROUPS

(a) Communities

Action By

A report had been submitted raising public concerns about the state of the surface of Station Lane. Norfolk County Council had said this was not a public highway and the Sub-Group asked the Board to recognise the importance of maintaining public rights over the route, and for NCC to look again at the legal status. RD confirmed NCC had already carried out extensive research which required significant resource.

It was agreed the Officer group consider the proposals available and report back to the Board.

TJ suggested that consideration should be given to the north end of the station, by moving the allotments to a suitable venue, thus gaining access to the north which would aid traffic issues as well as solving the disabled access. TJ would raise the issue with the Town Council.

(b) Inward Investment

Nothing to report.

(c) Planning and Projects

Nothing to report.

19/18 ORGANISATIONAL UPDATES

Nothing to report.

20/18 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Future agenda items to include:

- Officer working group to set the objectives, and suggest priorities for the Board going forward
- Invite the Director of Public Health for the next meeting (February), and in addition, the April meeting would have a 'Health' focus (Director of Public Health and Clinical Commissioning Group to be invited)
- Infrastructure
- Breckland Council to investigate access at the bottom of the TEP site.
- Parish and Town Councils to consider cemetery land available and report back.
ACTION - TP to liaise with Pigeon regarding the provision of a cemetery under the SUE provision.
- Formal report on Communication at the next meeting.

21/18 2018 MEETING DATES

The Chairman could not attend on Fridays, so asked if possible future dates were arranged, but to avoid the Breckland and Norfolk County Council Calendar of meetings.

Action By

22/18 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

RW asked for feedback following the suggestion of funding officer support for the GTDP. Whilst some finance would be available from Breckland, further funding support would be required from Thetford Town Council and Norfolk County Council. Norfolk County Council asked for a firm proposal in order to provide clarity and stimulate discussion.

TJ asked for further information in order to take to a future meeting of the Town Council, as he was very keen on officer participation. It was also suggested that the Town Council could host the position.

RW would provide more detail on the position to formalise the request and share across councils asking for financial input to resource the post.

23/18 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the meeting was agreed in principle, Friday 16 February 2018, venue to be confirmed.

The meeting closed at 12.17 pm

CHAIRMAN