

**Greater Thetford Development Partnership Board
Minutes**

13 October 2017 10.00am – 11.30am

The Charles Burrell Centre, Staniforth Road, Thetford, Norfolk

Attendees:

Chair: Terry Jermy TJ

Board Members

Mike Brown MB (Thetford Business Forum), Robert King RK (Croxtan Parish Council), Robert Campbell RC (Breckland Council – sub-group chair), Robert Whittaker RWh (Communities sub-group chair), Tony Poulter TP (Brettenham & Kilverstone Parish Council), Sam Chapman-Allen SCA (Breckland Council), Roy Brame RB (Norfolk County Council), Chris Hey CH (Norfolk County Council), Richard Doleman RD (Norfolk County Council), Rob Walker RW (Breckland Council),

Minutes

Natalie Thatcher (Breckland Council)

Apologies:

Adam Broadway AB (Flagship), Will Van Cutsem WVC (Pigeon), Paul Wheatley PW (Norfolk Police), Robert Hayes-Ward RHW (Norfolk PCC),

	Item	Action
1.	<p>Apologies</p> <p>As above.</p>	
2.	<p>Minutes and matters arising (from 15 September 2017)</p> <p>The minutes were agreed.</p> <p>Actions Arising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MB had sought guidance from the Forum's committee. The forum was happy to work with elected politicians but was itself apolitical. On that basis its projects could not be councillor led. • Signage will be picked up later in the agenda. • Infrastructure action for RC will be picked up later on agenda. • Town centre updates – TJ will collate the information and report it but won't be leading on it directly. It was noted that the Breckland Council lead officer for the Market Town Initiative is Riana Rudland and she will be meeting with the town council soon. • SCA actions – Once the business rates information has been approved outside of the pilot, it will be brought forward. This will be advertised to businesses with the help of the business forum. SCA misinformed the board at the last meeting regarding the town clock. The town council have been given funds but are not choosing to use this to repair the clock. • An update on communications actions will be provided under item 5 on this agenda. • Endeavouring to get Public Health to the next meeting. • RC action will be picked up later in the agenda. 	

<p>3.</p>	<p>Future Development</p> <p>At the last meeting Graham Jermyn resigned as the independent chair.</p> <p>A different structure for the Board was suggested, focusing on the representatives from the three tiers of local government. It would also include the sub-group chairs with others [non-voting] then called in to speak and engage as seen fit.</p> <p>The chair of the board could be on rotation.</p> <p>This proposed structure would bring down the potential board members from 16 to 8.</p> <p>If further resource is needed to be paid for, other partners should offer funding to help support this, as it is a partnership.</p> <p>It was suggested that the money allocated for the independent chair could fund a project officer instead, which could help support and facilitate the good work of the board. This could be further funded by the parishes, town and county council.</p> <p>A slimmed down version of the board with a project officer was supported. It was agreed that the Business Forum would have representation on both the Community Sub-Group and the Inward Investment Sub-Group where it could provide more functional support.</p> <p>It was resolved that: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board membership be an Elected Member each from the County Council, District Council, Town Council and two parish councils, and the three sub-group chairman; <i>Proposed by RB and seconded by TP. Voted and motion carried. 3 members abstained.</i> • The board agreed to have no paid independent chair. Instead this post would be elected from the board membership. <i>Proposed by TP and seconded by RB. 1 member abstained.</i> • All local authorities are to investigate what financial contribution they can make to fund project support. <i>Proposed by TJ and seconded by SCA.</i> • An officers group will form and report into the board. <i>Proposed by RC and seconded by RD.</i> <p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The terms of reference are to be updated to reflect the vote and brought back. 	

<p>4.</p>	<p>Board Objectives</p> <p>No 1: To seek and lobby for investment and improvement in strategic infrastructure</p> <p>The list of identified strategic projects has been increased and includes information about each one, with identified leads. The report also shows a list of strategic documents with a brief summary of the key points within them. The next steps are to get the linkages on each into our objectives and get Board direction on how the projects can be pursued. It was noted that train services into Thetford do not provide sufficient services, especially later in the evening, although some of this may be improved when Ely junction is enhanced. Station accessibility and parking was discussed by the community sub-group at their last meeting.</p> <p>The station is maintained by Greater Anglia. The board could do some work on how to best lobby them to make improvements that the town would like to see. It was suggested that the franchiser may ask to speak with the Town Council about using some allotment space for car parking to make it a more viable investment.</p> <p>The paper was asked to be made public and published earlier. This will be done in future, however some information was late in arriving.</p> <p>Pedestrian signage was expected to have been completed already, however this has not yet happened due to a delay in receiving the signs from the supplier. This will be completed shortly.</p> <p>Some items on the projects list may be better to be covered under some of the other objectives.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ely junction – further information needs to be identified on timescales for improvement. It is initially suggested for completion in 2019. • A14/A11 junction is not part of the list at the moment, but should be added due to not being able to turn north at that point when travelling from the east. • TEP isn't included on the list and should be put back in including foul drainage. The business forum are keen on it and would like it re-introduced. Concern was raised over the potential high price of the employment land offered by Pigeon on the TEP. <p>No 2: To promote the Greater Thetford area as a 'destination of choice'</p> <p>No update was available.</p> <p>The Thetford boundaries were questioned, as the board would like to protect the rural villages.</p>	<p>RC</p>
-----------	--	------------------

It was confirmed that the Town Council have submitted a formal request for a community governance review. A report will come out at the end of the year, with each review then going out to consultation. A more complete update will come back to the board by SCA.

No 3: To improve access to health services and the ability of people to adopt healthier lifestyles with improved leisure and recreation opportunities

The board lead for this needs to be amended and TP will take this on temporarily.

The leisure centre has expanded due to the demand. The forestry commission are in discussion to link leisure offerings to the town.

No 4: To revitalise Thetford town centre and improve connectivity with public and other forms of transport

A lottery bid has not yet been put together but will be shared with the communities sub-group before submission.

Heritage has been looked at and further investment is hoped to be leveraged in.

The town council will provide a written report on the market town initiative and heritage lottery bid.

No 5: To ensure a good supply and mix of quality housing with choice and opportunity for all

TJ will lead on this objective, work with the housing contact and bring a report forward.

MB explained that social housing was a priority item from their business leaders meetings as attracting and keeping young skilled labour was critical. On that basis he sought clarification on the lack of viability on the first stage of the SUE at 10% when a proposal for development east of Arlington Way included 40%, albeit with 10% allocated to the land owners employees.

The Breckland council policy suggests that 40% of a site should be affordable housing. It was confirmed that as it stands, the Thetford SUE site is not viable at this level of affordable housing, and instead, there is only 10% in the first phase. The percentage will be reviewed after each ongoing phase of development.

The Board agreed that other ways in which the objective could be met needed investigating.

No 6: To encourage economic vitality in Greater Thetford and enhance education and learning opportunities to ensure residents can access jobs and skills near where they live

	<p>No update available.</p> <p>It was suggested that the new officer group would be the forum in which to bring in those able to affect children's services decisions (schools).</p> <p>There is an opportunity to upfront fund schools by bidding to the government.</p> <p>Actions: CH will email an update on timeline dates for schooling with the SUE.</p>	CH
5.	<p>Communications</p> <p>A formal report will come to the next board meeting.</p> <p>The communications update provided at the last meeting has been reviewed and could form part of a new protocol going forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A press statement is to be agreed following each meeting. • The partner & objectives pages on the website will need updating with the new arrangement. • The job description for the project support role should include updating the website and completing the communications work. 	
6.	<p>Thetford SUE Update and TEP update</p> <p>If granted, the HCA funding bid that has been submitted will help to meet the infrastructure needs of the TEP and SUE sites.</p> <p>Talks with Network Rail are underway regarding the need to take utilities underneath the railway line.</p> <p>It is too early to say when the site would be available to market. Only an initial estimate of employment space has been provided, however more detailed figures will be worked out.</p> <p>Employment land prices on this site were questioned but exact figures of land value were not known by those in attendance.</p> <p>Work has been done with the Norwich/Cambridge Tech Corridor initiative and now that they have employed someone to the project, they will help to advertise sites like this.</p> <p>More market research will be done in the next 2 – 3 months, which will be followed by active marketing.</p> <p>More information on TEP market conditions will be provided once the market research has been undertaken.</p> <p>A decision about the roundabout has not yet been made by Norfolk County Council, however it was confirmed that any underspend from this will go back into the pool and there is a process to take on how it is then reallocated. The board may have input into this process, but the actual decision will be taken by Norfolk County Council.</p>	RC

	<p>It was confirmed that Thetford is included as a growth location within the LEP paper. In order to receive funding from the LEP, a business case would be needed to be submitted for specific things. Ideas for this could be provided by the sub-groups.</p>	Sub-groups
7.	<p>Sub Group Updates</p> <p><u>Communities</u></p> <p>There was a lack of support at the last meeting for a minute taker.</p> <p>TJ will ask that as a default the town council could assist in providing a clerk, given the meeting takes place there. Breckland will endeavour to help where they can.</p> <p>Feedback on the cycling and walking investigations is now available and a report will be brought back together on information about what's available and what's needed.</p> <p>The terms of reference are reviewed annually, along with the board membership. This will also need changing in line with the wider review.</p> <p>It was confirmed that no member of the youth council can be included, however, a younger member can be sought from elsewhere if needed, i.e. the Breckland Youth Advisory Board.</p> <p><u>Inward investment</u></p> <p>The membership will be reviewed once the officer group has been put in place.</p> <p><u>Planning and projects</u></p> <p>The membership and objectives will be reviewed once the officer group has been put together.</p> <p>Thetford is in the first wave of the Norfolk CC market towns transport study. A small amount of funding has been allocated for these (up to £20K each). The initial scoping meeting has taken place for Dereham and it was suggested that the Thetford meeting is combined with a GTDP meeting.</p> <p>Phase 2 of the signage works look at car parks and pedestrian signage and a quick win traffic study. Although this is a separate item, it will link into the market towns transport study work. The Norfolk County Council report that went to their council meeting should be circulated.</p>	<p>TJ</p> <p>RD</p>
8.	<p>Organisational updates</p> <p>The Charles Burrell Centre has received £112k funding to create storage/office space and start-up units. The funding needs to be 1/3 match funded and any fundraising ideas are welcome.</p>	

	Chris Hey announced that he would be retiring at the end of November and therefore will not be attending any further GTDP meetings. The Board thanked him for his support.	
9.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>A sign-in sheet for public attendance was suggested for future meetings.</p> <p>It was noted that currently there is no disabled access at the railway station. The highway is unregistered and responsibility is unknown. Breckland / Norfolk CC will look into it.</p> <p>The late papers for this meeting are to be uploaded online.</p>	RW/RD
10.	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>15 December 2017 at 10.00am at the Church on the Way</p>	

[End of Notes]