

**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), Julie Kennealy JK (Breckland Council), Tig Armstrong TA (Norfolk County Council), Robert Campbell RC (Breckland Council – sub-group chair) & Sam Chapman-Allen SCA (Breckland Council), Denis Crawford DC (Norfolk County Council), Matt Thomas MT (Flagship – Adam Broadway Substitute)

Officers

Guests

Minutes

Natalie Thatcher NT (Breckland Council)

Apologies:

Richard Doleman RD (Norfolk County Council – sub-group chair), Will Van Cutsem WVC (Pigeon), Rob Cooper RC (Norfolk County Council & South Norfolk CCG), Adam Broadway AB (Flagship),

	Item	
	Graham Jermyn introduced himself to the board and the public members in attendance, as the new independent chair for the Greater Thetford Development Partnership.	
1	<p><u>Approval of Minutes 24/06/16</u></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting were approved following the below amendments:</p> <p>It was suggested that item 2 did not reflect the importance of the health care provisions in the SUE. A simple sentence is stated but has been requested to be extended to include the importance of it.</p> <p>The first bullet point of the public section was requested to change to</p>	

	<p>include further issues on transparency. This will include the suggested text provided.</p> <p>It was asked that further details are given in relation to the concerns raised over the support of money being allocated to the TEP. Although the decision was made democratically, the process of the information on offer was suggested as flawed.</p> <p>There was concern from the public perspective and some members that the decision was being rushed into with no vision or strategy. This was suggested as not being reflected accurately in the minutes.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the vote took place and all but one member of the board voted. No other board member has come back with concerns over the question to vote. Therefore the decision will stand.</p> <p>It was stated for the board that the reallocation of Moving Thetford Forward monies was not to sit in any pot but to forward fund the initial works on the TEP and to achieve further funding from elsewhere (which it has done) as well as undertake some preparatory work.</p> <p>One of the main issues was not having information available for members prior to the meeting, considering that the initial thoughts were brought up in the LEP meeting that took place in May.</p>	
<p>2</p>	<p><u>Strategy and Vision of the board</u></p> <p>An email was sent out to the board asking them to give thought to the purpose and vision of the partnership and their contributions.</p> <p>The following comments were received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board should advise on the growth of the area. In particular, I look at the growth and how it will affect the community and how it can be policed in the future. The board strategy should be to advise on the correct way to encourage growth. • The purpose is to ensure that sustainable growth is delivered with infrastructure and housing etc. • The objectives are to bring together a collective of willing participants to shape the town and share information together. • The context of the board is to bring forward and interact on infrastructure developments. • The Board provides access to all top officials in the council to push ideas for Norfolk County Council to act upon as it has a big strategic role in the area. • The purpose of the Board is an opportunity for a conduit between the county council and the public, testing ideas and influences back and forth. • The Board should recognise the importance of linking together and moving forward, committing to working with partners around the table and the local community. • The interest of Greater Thetford should be safeguarded, and offer a sense of wellbeing and pride for citizens. The establishment of employment areas are a priority. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board need to all row in the same direction. A priority is to realise the maximum benefits possible from growth. Thetford residents need to be represented and highlight opportunities from the ground. • The board should ensure growth benefits are maximised and losses are minimised in the rural area. • The board should help to integrate the SUE into the community. The wider vision is to make the area a hub for business etc. in the East of England and to do that, the board should lobby to remove any serious impediments that get in the way. • The board will be involved in skills, tourism, transport and investment to ensure that Breckland and Thetford have as much opportunity as possible to grow with existing and new businesses. • The board should combine individual organisations' visions and views into one, as a partnership. Involvement and engagement with the community includes better communication and information flow and will involve the community to help shape the partnership. <p>Thanks was given for the thought to the questions asked.</p>	
3	<p><u>Communications Protocol Reminder</u></p> <p>The board were reminded of the importance of the communications protocol, particularly with regards to confidential items.</p>	
4	<p><u>Communications Activities</u></p> <p>It was requested that some spare papers are printed for public members.</p> <p>Further promotion and transparency of the board was agreed as needed, however it is the responsibility of everyone to ensure this happens. No one party alone is relied upon to cover it. Each organisation should recognise the existence of the board, refer to the board and promote each meeting.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graham will have a meeting with Breckland's communications team and bring back some future options for improved comms. <p>The Thetford and Brandon Times recently printed an incorrect report, but it was confirmed that the error had originally appeared in a copy of the LEP papers. The board asked the reporter present if they could confirm details of where the roundabout will be.</p> <p>A request was received again for a website page giving details of each of the local projects with further information.</p> <p>The Communities sub-group has an action to look at the ways the group communicates with the public. This will come back to the next meeting, if not beforehand by email.</p>	<p>GJ</p> <p>Communities Group</p>

<p>5</p>	<p><u>Communities Sub-Group</u></p> <p>Three members of the sub-group were in attendance of the meeting. They have had one informal meeting so far to have an opportunity to understand the perspectives of each other.</p> <p>All members are in place, however there is no chair yet in place. This will be confirmed shortly and the chair will be in attendance at the next meeting.</p> <p>The group have had a good discussion on their priorities and their next meeting will be in early September, with a sole focus on communication feeding back and forward.</p> <p>Thanks were passed to Tony, Bob and Terry for their help in getting the communities group in place.</p> <p>Concern was raised over a lack of communication, with some emails sent from members but not shared with the rest of the board.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p><u>Planning & Projects Sub-Group</u></p> <p>The Planning and Projects sub-group have met again and met with both other sub-groups and are further working on the delivery plan. New projects have emerged and they have been included on the plan. More information is being added into the document at this stage. Where utilities are involved, getting information on start dates and triggers is difficult and some information is missing in this area. The next iteration will take note of the vision and strategy as the objective of the document is to respond to the vision and strategy.</p> <p>The cumulative delivery for activities in the SUE looks to have been delayed, but this was confirmed that it is in response to one of the developers.</p> <p>Initial meetings have taken place with the developer regarding the schools site location and infrastructure has been discussed. A completion date is being looked at for 2019/20. It takes 4 years from the start of the process to the end, so the preparatory phase of work will begin soon.</p> <p>The board asked for more clarity on the Croxton cycle route and whether this project is still likely to happen.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tig is to speak with the developers. 	<p>TA</p>
<p>7</p>	<p><u>Inward Investment Sub-Group</u></p> <p>This sub-group will help to develop the unique selling points for the developments.</p> <p>They have been doing a lot of work on the USP for the TEP site and studying a report on Cambridge and their lack of quality business space and housing etc. This gives Thetford the opportunity to present itself as</p>	

	<p>an alternative. The Cambridge paper does actually identify Thetford as an ideal commuter town. The group are positioning Thetford as a place to do business, not just a commuter town.</p> <p>Work has also been done on the A11 technology corridor, and placing Thetford's offer within the context of that umbrella. They have spent time on the business consultation programme but will describe that in more detail once the paper has been completed.</p> <p>They have a reasonably good plan with the TEP site and are progressing things in the right order. The group are pitching with the LEP as hard as possible for support, but it is work in progress. The site has taken so long as it's a difficult proposition to bring to market, but it has come forward lots since the recession.</p> <p>The group discussed correspondence received by the chair from someone offering investment into the TEP site. Julie Kennealy confirmed that the offer was not made through her.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graham is to meet with the individual to discuss and will take this forward. 	GJ
9	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>At the last Thetford town council meeting, councillors were concerned about traffic flow and car parks, considering the new Riverside development. They would like County Council officers to present information on this to the Thetford town council. It was confirmed that County Council was consulted as part of the planning process for the Riverside development and nothing was noted during this process. As the staged opening approaches, temporary measure can be put in place if needed.</p> <p>A study was commissioned and the first draft completed, looking at how the highway network can improve the flow in the town centre, way finding to car parking and linking car parks to key destinations. The first draft has been seen this week and discussions about the next steps will take place when the author is back from leave. If there are issues that emerge with the completion of Riverside, they can be picked up in the study. A presentation of the draft report will be offered to town councillors before a final version is presented to the board.</p> <p>The first draft of the car parking report is also back. Both studies are two largely separate exercises at the moment, however the two will be brought together to align to a single view. This draft report can also be presented at the same time and would be done by Breckland.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>Foot traffic needs to be looked at further and Tig will look at the possibility of extending the study to include cycling.</p>	TA

	<p>It was confirmed that the car park at School Lane will not be taken out of service in September as previously thought. It was asked that significant thought is given to car parking and traffic soon as the Riverside scheme will open in the next few months. Signage can be implemented at short notice, but permanent signs can be put into place once confirmed. Signage is also likely to be provided by each of the companies moving into the site.</p> <p>Julie Kennealy was thanked for her time and efforts in these meetings, as she is leaving Breckland Council. Rob Walker will take her place on the board.</p> <p>The next meeting is scheduled for the 21st October and 2017 dates will start to be put together.</p>	
10	<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. Graham will do some work on the strategy and vision and bring back. 2. Graham is to meet with Chris Kennard at the business forum, to discuss the TEP correspondence. 3. Graham is to work with the Breckland comms team to work on communications. 	<p>GJ</p> <p>GJ</p> <p>GJ</p>