**Greater Thetford Development Partnership Board**

**Minutes**

Friday 24th June 2016 10.00am – 12.00pm

Kings House Council Chamber, King Street, Thetford, Norfolk, IP24 2AP

**Chair:** Terry Jermy TJ (Thetford Town Council)

**Attendees:**

**Board Members**

Denis Crawford DC (Norfolk County Council), Mike Brown MB (Thetford Business Forum), Chris Hey CH (Norfolk County Council), Joanna Walmsley (Norfolk Police - substitute), Rob Cooper RC (Norfolk County Council & South Norfolk CCG), Tony Poulter TP (Brettenham & Kilverstone Parish Council), Terry Jermy TJ (Thetford Town Council), Julie Kennealy JK (Breckland Council) & Tig Armstrong TA (Norfolk County Council), Robert Campbell RC (Breckland Council – sub-group chair),

**Officers**

**Guests**

**Minutes**

Natalie Thatcher NT (Breckland Council)

**Apologies:**

Richard Doleman RD (Norfolk County Council – sub-group chair), Will Van Cutsem WVC (Pigeon), Adam Broadway AB (Flagship), Robert King RK (Croxton Parish Council), Paul Wheatley PW (Norfolk Police), Anna Graves AG (Breckland Council), Graham Jermyn GJ (Independent Chair)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item** | |
|  | Introductions were completed around the table.  Public Section of the meeting:   * Positive comments that board were improving openness and transparency. Wider advertising on member’s respective websites would improve things further. * More information on the projects list (that was circulated with the papers) was requested. A paragraph on each of the projects, posted on the website, was suggested. * It was confirmed that the majority of the communities sub-group members were in the room and that the meeting was advertised in the Thetford and Brandon Times and on social media. * More information was requested with regard to future plans and progress. |  |
| **1** | **Approval of Minutes 14/04/16**  The minutes of the previous meeting were approved and the following actions discussed:  It was confirmed that the updated Terms of Reference will be circulated with the minutes of this meeting.  Item 6 – MB raised that due consideration should be given to providing space on the TEP for existing Thetford based businesses. It was confirmed that this was part of the TEP’s project planning.  A presentation on future skills needs will come to a meeting in the autumn.  It was noted that a date for the agreed presentation about the GTDP to Norfolk County Council’s Economic Development subcommittee will be confirmed once the committee have a new chairperson in place. |  |
| **2** | **Rob Cooper Presentation**  The presentation was to briefly explain the structure of health provision and provide some indication of needs.  Health provision:  Since the primary care trusts have changed, NHS England sits as the responsible commissioner. South Norfolk commissions acute care provisions and the CCG also commissions community healthcare.  The population is expected to increase by around 5% in the next 10 years with a higher proportion of older people. Meaning that emergency hospital demand will increase by 30%. There is likely to be an increase of 10,000 more people living with chronic heart disease, dementia, strokes and diabetes as they live longer. The spend on health in Norfolk will increase because of all of these factors, with rising costs as more people go to hospital. The aim is to reduce the number of people needing emergency healthcare and improve the suitability of local healthcare provision.  The Thetford provision includes; School Lane surgery and healthy living centre, which are part of the same practice (the healthy living centre has room to expand), and the Grove, which is the other main practice. Different sorts of intervention are needed in the town and the majority of patients are either under 25 or over 65.  Two health reports for Breckland have been produced, which show that generally, local people are healthy and living longer than the national average, even though there are low levels of physical activity, smoking and diabetes is slightly higher (than the national average), as is childhood obesity.  The Thetford surgeries are working closely with those in Watton to provide more efficient local services but they have a small amount of funding to develop this initiative.  Currently, patients deal with a small practise team and complex needs are referred on. In the new model, they are aiming for an expanded team with more support available either close to the practice or within it.  There is a timescale of 2-3 years to work with the CCG to see what level of support services can be built up close to the practices. The CCG are keen to support Thetford practices on following this through.  Concerns were raised that the primary care facilities are full and with the population growth, no one is looking at how the new practice needed will be funded.  One of the possible solutions is that the GP’s think they are more effective as a combined team and that planning together will help find ways to work more efficiently.  The plan is to bring services into the locality and make access quicker and smoother.  It was suggested that as S106 delivers school sites, could health provisions also be picked up by this same mechanism?  Rob Cooper confirmed that he could help to bring in the right people to progress various health concerns raised by several members of the board. |  |
| **3** | **Communications Activities**  Nothing to report. |  |
| **4** | **Communities Sub-Group**  The Community sub group went through their new member applications a couple of weeks ago and four individuals were chosen, three of whom are in the room today.    In addition, three local council representatives have been chosen and an informal get together of the full seven members will be organised before the group moves forward. |  |
| **5** | **Planning & Projects Sub-Group**  The Projects & Planning sub group is up and running and have now met twice and have started work on the integrated delivery plan, which was commissioned by the board.  Their key steps so far are to reach out and make contact with all organisations working in the Greater Thetford area that are planning to undertake projects. They will then examine the S106 agreement for the SUE and study the infrastructure support work that is expected to be delivered as part of the SUE project.  The first issue of the integrated delivery plan spreadsheet is the result of that initial work. This is the first time a consolidated list of projects has been produced, identifying who is delivering what and project timelines.    It was good to see this consolidated list of projects and thanks were passed on to Richard Doleman and his team for this work.  It was confirmed that this documentation of projects is very valuable and the housing trajectory identified gives a useful indication of the education needs. The education department have looked at the capacity of the high school, which has space, and they’ve identified no further need until 2020.    The board were keen to progress an overall vision and strategy for Greater Thetford. The board noted progress beginning to be made, with work happening on both the housing and TEP sites.  It was suggested that the board’s role is to oversee the projects being delivered and use its influence to ensure that Greater Thetford projects are priorities with other agencies.  The board confirmed the importance of working with the communities sub-group, to ensure that the public are involved with identifying priorities.  **Action:**   * **The communities sub-group were asked to formalise how they want the other groups to engage with them.**   There wasn’t a specified list of projects agreed during the growth deal and the amount allocated to sustainable transport is £1.5m out of the £2.3m total allocation. There is an opportunity to request a change of purpose for some of the funding towards the construction of the TEP access roundabout.  Some members advocated strong support for this as it will help kick start the TEP and SUE projects.  It was confirmed that some MTF monies have already been allocated to the TEP and this money could be added to the investment in the TEP project.  Further investment in the site at this time could improve the chances of a successful bid to the LEP (for the improvements to the Electricity Supply).  It was confirmed that there would still be some money left to use for cycle lanes and it could also cover a separate project that has been identified for traffic movement and signage in the town.    Breckland Council have already secured support from some of the pooled business rates for allocation to the TEP, which could also be contribute to the TEP roundabout project, so there is some flexibility to the funding for the town.  The town council and the board have both been very clear that the TEP is a priority.  Public comments:   * How are the community going to perceive money allocated for transport being spent on something else? * There is concern over the power costs and asked why a business can’t fund the power on the site. It was explained that the current TEP site is not viable if it relied on the private sector to pay for the power upgrade.   It was confirmed that the LEP need to know if the transport monies reallocation is supported by GTDP as soon as possible, as the allocation of the monies needs to be agreed if the TEP roundabout is to proceed on schedule.  The board voted and agreed to support the reallocation of the money. |  |
| **6** | **Inward Investment Sub-Group**  It was stated that this sub-group’s focus is to look for money for projects, help define the selling proposition of sites and get involved in supporting the marketing of key sites.  The sub-group is currently focussing on the TEP site, as it is the biggest employment growth project currently ongoing. The strategic view is that the location of Thetford, midway between Norwich and Cambridge, is an asset, however Thetford does not yet have a sufficient inward investment reputation and needs further marketing. The current A11 corridor brand is being used to help with this.  The current plan for the TEP is to get the access roundabout underway as soon as possible and then tackle the electricity power upgrade. Both of these projects are essential if we are to attract new investment for the site and to provide a high quality grow-on space for existing business in Thetford that would like to expand.  The subgroup will not be producing the masterplan, but the information gathered will feed into the consultation with business that is planned for the autumn. |  |
| **7** | **TEP Masterplan & Local Business Consultation**  The TEP site is high priority for a number of organisations and was a project the board also agreed was a priority, in order to deliver growth and enable further investment and a bigger strategic vision for Thetford.  It was confirmed that a letter of commitment to supporting the early investment works needed to secure grant funding has been received this week from the Crown Estate.  It was requested the GTDP board agree to lead a comprehensive business consultation to include both the TEP and additional employment sites within the SUE. It was agreed Robert Campbell would co-ordinate this.  **Action:**   * **The board would like to see further information (TEP business plan) and a written status update report is to be produced for the next meeting.** |  |
| **8** | **AOB**  The board approved the decision that the Inward Investment sub-group chair is Robert Campbell, as elected by the sub-group.  It was agreed to proceed with the next scheduled board meeting on 19 August, despite concerns raised from some members of the board (holiday absences). |  |
| **9** | **Next Steps**  The following actions were summarised as next steps for the Board to take.   1. The strategy and vision of the board is to be picked up by the new chair and will be a first agenda item on the next meeting 2. The Community sub-group will identify their chairperson, who is requested to attend the next board meeting 3. The Community sub-group is to look at how it engages and communicates with the community 4. Robert Campbell is to bring back a report on the TEP site | **GJ/Agenda Item**  **Com Sub-group**  **Com Sub-group**  **RC** |