

**Greater Thetford Development Partnership Board  
Minutes**

21<sup>st</sup> April 2017 at 10.00am

The Charles Burrell Centre, Staniforth Road, Thetford

**Chair:** Graham Jermyn GJ

**Attendees:**

**Board Members**

Mike Brown MB(Thetford Business Forum), Tony Poulter TP(Brettenham & Kilverstone Parish Council), Robert King RK(Croxton Parish Council), Terry Jermy TJ (Thetford Town Council), John Newton JN(Sub)(Thetford Town Council), Robert Campbell RC(Breckland Council – sub-group chair), Denis Crawford DC(Norfolk County Council), Richard Doleman RD(Norfolk County Council), Rob Walker RW(Breckland Council), Robert Whitaker RWh(Communities sub-group chair), Robert Howes-Ward RHW(Primary Care/Health Care), Caroline Money CM(Norfolk County Council), Adam Broadway AB(Flagship), Paul Wheatley PW(Norfolk Police)

**Minutes**

Helen McAleer HM(Breckland Council)

**Apologies:**

Sam Chapman-Allen SCA(Breckland Council), Will Van Cutsem WVC(Pigeon), Chris Hey CH(Norfolk County Council)

Item		
	<p>Robert Howes-Ward was welcomed to the Partnership and introductions were made round the table.</p> <p>The meeting would start with a Private session which would be followed by a public session. The Chairman had received some criticism about lack of transparency and he asked for a view about having a pre-meeting instead of a private session. He recognised the need for transparency, but felt it was critical to complete the work on vision and objectives and to reach agreement before making that public. Once agreement had been reached progress could be made.</p> <p>RW thought that private sessions were OK as long as they were used appropriately. It would also be helpful if support officers could meet between Board meetings.</p> <p>TJ did not have a problem with using private sessions, as long as the public part of the meetings was better publicised to promote engagement.</p> <p>RWh agreed that there was a place for private discussion but it needed to be made clear to the public what was being discussed and why it needed to be in private and a summary of outcomes should be available for the public record.</p>	
	<b>PRIVATE SESSION</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Review of Vision and Objectives and Key Issues, agreement on consultation and publication.</b></p> <p>RW tabled a paper which set out the outcomes from the last meeting and the away days. Some amendments had been made to the</p>	

	<p>Objectives to make them plainer and minor additions had been made in accordance with suggestions from the last meeting.</p> <p>After discussion it was agreed that RW would make the changes suggested and circulate the amended list which could then be signed off in public at the next meeting.</p> <p>The six Objectives were <b>AGREED</b>.</p>	RW
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Planning and Projects Sub Group's proposals re Green Infrastructure</b></p> <p>This item had been included on the agenda because of its relationship to the objectives.</p> <p>It was agreed that the covering report could be made public and the Chairman asked for the proposals to be considered in the open session of the meeting.</p> <p>The Chairman asked that the contribution that Richard Wills had made to the firming up of the aims and objectives by facilitating the away days be minuted.</p>	
<b>PUBLIC SESSION</b>		
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Apologies.</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from William van Cutsem, Sam Chapman-Allen and Chris Hey.</p> <p>On behalf of Board, the Chairman thanked Tig Armstrong and Rob Cooper for their contribution to the board and welcomed Robert Howes-Ward as Rob Cooper's replacement.</p>	
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Minutes and Matters Arising from meeting of 17 February 2017.</b></p> <p>The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2017 were agreed and the following matters were noted:</p> <p>Item 3: A Public Space Protection Order was out for consultation. Feedback was encouraged and additional copies of the consultation were requested to be made available in places such as the Charles Burrell Community Centre.</p> <p>Item 5. The Scouts had been put in contact with the Asset Team. With regard to the Cottage Hospital, RHW was on the Board to represent local surgeries. Grove surgery were working on a small extension to the rear but that was being frustrated by lack of space. The cottage hospital site was immediately behind the surgery. It used to be in public ownership. He was trying to work with NHS England on an estate strategy for health care and he asked if the cottage hospital site was still under review.</p> <p>RW advised that a petition about the cottage hospital had been considered by BDC Council. The site was in private ownership and following receipt of the petition, the owners had been contacted and</p>	RW

	<p>were now in pre-planning consultation about a positive use of the site. RW would keep the Board updated on progress.</p> <p>TJ had been contacted by the GPs from Grove Surgery and he thought there was potential for an exciting project which the Board could facilitate. Further discussion between TJ and RW would take place outside the meeting.</p> <p>Item 8 – Health and LEP representatives would be invited later in the year once the aims and objectives had been confirmed.</p>	<p>RW</p> <p>TJ/RW</p>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Matters arising from work on Vision and Objectives</b></p> <p>These would be amended and circulated ready for sign off and agreement of a work programme at the next meeting.</p>	<p>RW</p>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>Communities Sub Group (Update)</b></p> <p>The following matters from the Sub-Group were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• King Street Square – possible health and safety issues were raised by MB. The issues would be flagged to the Town Council as the responsible authority.</li> <li>• Thetford Bus Interchange - DC as the NCC representative was asked to seek a response to the concerns raised.</li> <li>• The GTDP website – content needed improvement. Andy Prior was waiting for feedback before updating the site.</li> <li>• The sub-group would meet bi-monthly in future at King's House.</li> <li>• A Cycling and Walking Routes survey was being carried out and the sub-group were assisting that work.</li> <li>• Concerns had been raised about GTDP lack of transparency and late papers.</li> <li>• The sub-group had not been notified about the PSPO consultation before it commenced.</li> <li>• Information on the SUE development was requested. RW would contact Pigeon for an update. Rumours about the school provision needed to be clarified.</li> <li>• Concern had been expressed about burial provision.</li> </ul>	<p>JN</p> <p>DC</p> <p>RC/RD/RW</p> <p>RW/WVC/ CH</p> <p>TJ/JN</p>
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Planning and Projects Sub Group (Update)</b></p> <p>The sub-group had met on 24 March and had considered the objectives being set by the Board and reflected on how the group could help to identify projects which the Board could prioritise for future delivery.</p> <p>There was a lot of evidence available but it was not always easily accessible and there would definitely be a benefit to bring that evidence together and make it available.</p> <p>RD said it would be good to have steer from the Board on what the sub-group should work on; it could then develop a programme of activity.</p>	

	<p>It was <b>AGREED</b> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Planning &amp; Projects Sub Group should expand the review of the existing evidence base to cover further key themes. The Planning &amp; Projects Sub Group to suggest further themes for the Board that warrant further evidence review.</li> <li>• The Board would agree how potential projects should be considered by the GTDP to develop and deliver priorities;</li> <li>• A review of the Planning &amp; Projects Sub-Group's Terms of Reference be undertaken.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Inward Investment Sub Group (Update)</b></p> <p>The Sub Group had met to review and comment on the six objectives. It had also considered its Terms of Reference.</p> <p>The sub group had been set up to look for funding to support projects, but it had not received any requests for assistance.</p> <p>MB said the Business Forum were frustrated by the lack of progress with the TEP. In particular, the allocation of over £500k from Breckland Council funds towards a roundabout that did not appear to be going ahead.</p> <p>MB asked for more detail at the next meeting including the funds that have been raised for the TEP project and timescales for further progress.</p> <p>RC explained that that was a large on-going project which was being driven separately from the sub group. The role of the sub group was to focus on new projects. He had attended meetings about the design of the TEP roundabout and more work was being done to re-cost the project.</p> <p>The Chairman confirmed that as pressure points arose the Board would lobby and provide input, but at the previous meeting he had made clear that the Partnership was not just about the TEP and the SUE. It needed to be involved in other things.</p> <p>TJ asked who was leading the TEP project and he was advised that NCC would design and project manage the roundabout. The contractor has not been chosen yet. He was still not convinced that it would go ahead.</p> <p>RC explained that there were a number of constraints to the site, including a lack of access, shortage of power and no utilities. They were all detrimental to getting private investment. It had been agreed that removing one of those by providing a roundabout access would encourage private investment. To bring new business to Thetford a new tech site was needed. Discussion with partners was on-going about potential funding for power.</p>	

	More detail would be provided at the next meeting.	RW/RC
<b>9.</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>  None.	
<b>10.</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>  The next meeting will be held on Friday 16 June 2017 at 10.00am in the Back Hall, Church on the Way, Grenville Way, Thetford, IP24 2JH.	

Meeting closed at 12.00noon.