

**Greater Thetford Development Partnership Board
Minutes**

19th August 2016 10.00am – 12.00pm

Library Room, Charles Burrell Centre, Staniforth Road, Thetford, Norfolk, IP24 3LH

Chair: Graham Jermyn GJ

Attendees:

Board Members

Mike Brown MB (Thetford Business Forum), Chris Hey CH (Norfolk County Council), Paul Wheatley PW (Norfolk Police), Tony Poulter TP (Brettenham & Kilverstone Parish Council), Robert King RK (Croxtan Parish Council), Terry Jermy TJ (Thetford Town Council), Rob Walker RW (Breckland Council), Robert Campbell RC (Breckland Council – sub-group chair), Denis Crawford DC (Norfolk County Council), Richard Doleman RD (Norfolk County Council – sub-group chair), Will Van Cutsem WVC (Pigeon), Rob Cooper RC (Norfolk County Council & South Norfolk CCG),

Officers

Guests

Ian Parkes (Norfolk County Council)

Minutes

Natalie Thatcher NT (Breckland Council)

Apologies:

Adam Broadway AB (Flagship), Sam Chapman-Allen SCA (Breckland Council), Tig Armstrong TA (Norfolk County Council),

	Item	
1	<p><u>Apologies</u></p> <p>As noted above.</p>	
2	<p><u>Approval of Minutes 19/08/16</u></p> <p>The previous minutes were approved, however the following things were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the previous minutes it needs to be noted that the TEP decision had already been made and a member of the public showed concern at this. • Graham did meet with the Comms team at Breckland and noted 	

	<p>some issues with changes in the IT systems which have caused problems with those who are registered for updates. It was also mentioned that other bodies should also publicise the meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The last paragraph of the Inward Investment sub group item was queried, as the letter of support was produced and did not reflect Julie's statement at the last meeting. The last minutes are not to be changed, as they are an accurate record of the meeting, however, it is noted that this statement is not in fact correct. Graham did meet with the individual who offered support and will try to arrange a further meeting with Robert Campbell to discuss. This will then be picked up with the landowner if it is to progress further. • It was confirmed that the Croxton cycle route is one project that has been identified in the delivery of the SUE and is still on the list to happen. The details are likely to be within the design and access statement in the planning documents. • Some agenda items were discussed in private and this should be noted in the minutes as 'the item was discussed below the line' rather than missing out the item number completely. • The terms of reference for the main board should be re-circulated confirming that the sub-group chairs do in fact have voting rights as board members. These are to go on the website too. 	NT
3	<p><u>Communications Activities</u></p> <p>Ian Parkes, from Norfolk County Council, delivered a presentation on the proposed new signage for Thetford, which followed a chief exec meeting back in February.</p> <p>The work being undertaken reviewed how people travel into the town and the destinations that they want to get to, as well as the signs that would be needed for this. They also looked at the optimum ways into the town and car parks. The road layout in Thetford was also reviewed to see if any access could be made easier. A strategy for road signage to the car parks as well as some pedestrian signs has also been produced.</p> <p>The work will be completed over three phases. Phase 1 and 1a have been completed, which is the work on signs for car parks and signage from car parks to key destination/entry points. Phase 2 will then look at the highway network to see if anything could be done to make it easier in the town.</p> <p>During phase 1, the county council looked at routes into the town and found 6 that are mainly used, 3 of which being key routes. A report has now been completed which sets out the information, potential locations, and signs to be used. The report can be made available after the meeting.</p> <p>The next phase includes detailed design, consultation and engagement to agree with the strategy. This work is anticipated to run between now</p>	

<p>and Christmas, with the aim to implement the new signs before the end of March 2017.</p> <p>The group discussed the consultation that is to take place, which would usually focus on known bodies and councillors. The details of the consultation will be circulated to the group once confirmed.</p> <p>The Police representative noted some potential issues with some of the routes regarding traffic and lorries. However, it was confirmed that the study is aimed at visiting traffic, rather than locals who will continue to use their traditional routes.</p> <p>It was asked that the reports are made available online and it was suggested that the consultation was split into two phases. One phase for the stakeholders around the table and the three tiers of local government and one for the public.</p> <p>Phase 2, looking at traffic management, will be an internal workshop with local authorities to discuss the scope of work and understand some of the possibilities that can be presented to further stakeholders. Some items could then be identified for a quicker implementation, and some could mean more impact and require further modelling which would overrun the work into the next financial year.</p> <p>It was questioned why the new signage work has not been done in parallel to the Riverside development. It was then confirmed that this was reviewed through the planning process, where no issues with signage were discovered, however, some site specific signs have been arranged to go up and temporary provisions will be in place if needed. Out of this planning process, it was discovered that wider work needed to be done across the whole town.</p> <p>It was stated that 22 car park spaces have been lost, rather than the 12 that were originally defined and the statement was noted as wrong. Breckland Bridge have commissioned work to look into parking in the town as a whole and it is currently ongoing. It was also noted that no plan b has been suggested to deal with on street parking increasing due to the lack of parking spaces.</p> <p>A member of the board, even as a councillor for all three levels of authorities, has not had the opportunity to engage in the details of this work. They would have preferred to have received communication earlier in order to be advocates of the work.</p> <p>Useful feedback could be provided by a local town councillor, who has been campaigning for improved signage for years, as well as the tourist information centre.</p> <p>It was pointed out that there were no issues raised by the consultant's report noting potential ill effects from the new developments. However, if</p>	<p>RD</p>
---	------------------

	<p>any issues do occur, highways will respond to them. This report was also completed as a separate entity to the riverside development and the consultations start here.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the Riverside development has 64 car park spaces and it's an open car park, but the Travelodge users will also be using these.</p> <p>In conclusion, the work being done is about providing better signage to existing car parks and key points of interest. Separately to this car park availability and capacity work is being commissioned by Breckland Bridge.</p> <p>A copy of the presentation slides were requested and agreed to be sent out following the meeting.</p> <p>It was suggested that the 1st part of the consultation was the circulation of the documents to the board, followed by a session with all councillors. The board would like the open consultation to be a positive exercise with the stakeholders and the public.</p> <p>It was noted that the cycle signs were included in the presentation so they should be done at the same time. It was also asked that they are made non-moveable as some existing ones have been adjusted to be incorrect.</p> <p>The board and Norfolk County Council have decided that the report will be circulated to bodies prior to finalisation and a response will be requested within 2 weeks.</p>	<p>IP/NT</p>
<p>4</p>	<p><u>Community Sub Group (Progress)</u></p> <p>The communities sub-group has met twice since the last board meeting. They've made some small amendments to their terms of reference and discussed communication with the public.</p> <p>Their second meeting took place in the evening and therefore was better attended by the public, with a dozen or so in the audience.</p> <p>There were a couple of questions, proposed by the audience, for the main board members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you provide more information on the GP and Dentist provision within the SUE development? At phase 4 of the development, 15 GP's and 9 Dentists will be provisioned. Further details will be covered in the Thetford Area Plan. • Further information was requested on some potential issues at Joe Blunts Lane, however it was confirmed that this is already being actioned by officers at Breckland Council. 	

	<p>The sub-group will continue to meet monthly at the moment and will pick 2 – 3 topics to discuss at each meeting. Rob Walker confirmed that the appropriate Breckland officer will be present at the meetings, depending on the topics.</p> <p>The group asked that agenda’s are published at least a week in advance and that minutes are circulated within two weeks. This will be done as far as reasonably possible.</p> <p>They would also like to ask that confidential items can be circulated to all sub-group members and that confidential papers are summarised/redacted. The board discussed the balance of public and confidential items, given the commercially sensitive information involved. The board had a conflict of views and one member suggested that this would mean another layer of people that would be unable to discuss the details, which could be criticized.</p> <p>The board agreed to the circulation of the confidential items as long as they are not discussed in a public forum and that a confidentiality agreement is put into place.</p> <p>The board also agreed that there would be no need for redaction for public items. A title and short summary of the document would be enough.</p> <p>Some board members met positively with the Breckland comms team to move the website forward. They would like it to be more user friendly and with further information about the sub-groups and projects like the SUE etc. Information on the page hits can be provided to aid this.</p> <p>The board agreed that it was happy for the Communities sub-group to continue to work with the Breckland Communications team to improve the GTDP website.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p><u>Purpose and Vision – Update on Progress</u></p> <p>Lots of information was gathered at the last meeting and Graham will be discussing this further with groups of individuals before pulling the final draft together.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>It was noted that the communities sub-group objected to the planning and projects agenda item being in the confidential section of the meeting.</p> <p>The next meeting date in December is scheduled as a meeting with an open forum. It was suggested that the board include presentations on achievements and the traffic and signage consultations (which would be presented by the board and all agencies united), as announcing the subjects may encourage further public attendance.</p>	

	<p>It should be acknowledged that not everything is currently on the projects list. Information needs to be gathered from all agencies, brought to the board and pulled together, before looking at objectives and priorities. It has been committed that this will be pulled together in November. To compliment this, the communities group can bring forward a list of projects for the planning and projects group. The board would then like an informal meeting to discuss, before taking it to the public. It was decided that the December meeting would be too short to complete this by.</p> <p>It was agreed that the December meeting will no longer be an open forum and this will instead take place in the new year. The December meeting will now be a closed meeting, run as an informal workshop, starting at 10am.</p> <p>The 2017 dates were circulated to the group prior to the meeting and will be confirmed to go into diaries.</p>	<p>NT</p>
	<p><i>Despite the agenda stating that the rest of the meeting will be discussed in a private session, this was in fact completed within the open session.</i></p>	
<p>7</p>	<p><u>Planning & Projects Sub-Group (Progress)</u></p> <p>The projects list is largely dominated by the big developments, and all of the smaller projects still need to be picked up. There also needs to be a way to evaluate the projects that are suggested.</p> <p>The group are trying to understand what's going on in Thetford and looking at how to use the list to see what will contribute to strategic objectives.</p> <p>The projects list does highlight those that are nearing completion, or even delayed. It was asked that the list is clarified with further details on the projects so that they can be available in the public forum. It was noted though that it is a document to actively engage with and is a constant working document.</p> <p>The board can test the projects that are suggested to see if they are achievable, supported and funded.</p> <p>The projects list is the how of the board's vision for the area and helps everyone to understand what's going on.</p> <p>It was noted that large strategic objectives such as the electric supply and Ely junction should also be included. The board has no influence on these, however, they are critical to get done so that other projects can be achieved.</p>	

<p>8</p>	<p><u>Inward Investment Sub-Group (Progress)</u></p> <p>The primary objectives of this subgroup is to assist in sourcing funding for projects that have approved by the board. The subgroup also supports the promotion of projects to potential investors, e.g. promotion of the Thetford Enterprise Park.</p> <p>The subgroup is currently in talks with Norfolk County Council about how best to undertake the construction of the TEP access roundabout. Funding has been allocated to the project with the understanding that any surplus will be returned to the Thetford Sustainable Transport Fund.</p> <p>It was confirmed that there is no current S106 agreement linked to the TEP site, but that a strategic decision was taken to assist in bringing the site forward as it is a key Breckland employment site.</p> <p>There is no short term method to recover public investment in infrastructure supporting the TEP site, however this could be discussed in the future with developers, once the viability of the site has been established.</p> <p>Soft marketing for the TEP site has started (the TEP site was included in the LEP’s MIPIIM brochure). Formal marketing of the site is linked to the production of a new masterplan being undertaken by Pigeon.</p> <p>The new masterplan will be discussed at the Thetford Business Consultation event taking place on 22 November.</p> <p>The subgroup shares the aligned goal of opening up the employment land on the SUE alongside the housing development.</p> <p>It was confirmed that local authority purchase is a possible future option but is not an option that has been considered to date.</p> <p>In response to a question, it was confirmed that Breckland Council did not have an estimated land value of the TEP site in either its undeveloped or developed form. The Council will continue to explore avenues for private sector contributions to TEP infrastructure with Pigeon which might be possible should a developer come forward.</p>	
<p>9</p>	<p><u>Next Steps</u></p> <p>The following actions were summarised as next steps for the Board to take.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Report consultation 2. Away session 3. Business consultation 	

--	--	--

DRAFT