

Borough Council of
**King's Lynn &
West Norfolk**



Member Major Projects Board

Agenda

Friday, 7th October, 2022
at 10.00 am

in the

**Council Chamber
Town Hall
Saturday Market Place
King's Lynn**

Available to view on:

<http://www.youtube.com/user/WestNorfolkBC>



**King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn, Norfolk, PE30 1EX
Telephone: 01553 616200**

29 September 2022

Dear Member

Member Major Projects Board

You are invited to attend a meeting of the above-mentioned Board which will be held on **Friday, 7th October, 2022 at 10.00 am** in the **Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ** to discuss the business shown below.

Yours sincerely

Chief Executive

AGENDA

1. **Appointment of Chair for the Municipal Year 2022/2023**
2. **Appointment of Vice Chair for the Municipal Year 2022/2023**
3. **Apologies for absence**
4. **Minutes from the Previous Meeting** (Pages 4 - 12)
5. **Declarations of interest**
6. **Urgent Business under Standing Order 7**
7. **Members present pursuant to Standing Order 34**

Members wishing to speak pursuant to Standing Order 34 should inform the Chair of their intention to do so and on what items they wish to be heard before a decision on that item is taken.

8. **Chair's Correspondence (if any)**
9. **Presentation on RAG Monitoring Definitions** (Pages 13 - 21)
10. **Monitoring Report** (Pages 22 - 23)
11. **Work Programme** (Page 24)
12. **Minutes of the Officer Major Projects Board held on 13 July 2022** (Pages 25 - 29)

Meetings were cancelled on:

19 August 2022
19 September 2000

Next meeting scheduled 19 October 2022.

13. **Date of Next Meeting**

9 December at 10 am in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, King's Lynn.

To:

Member Major Projects Board: Councillors R Blunt, S Dark, A Dickinson, A Kemp, G Middleton, T Parish and A Ryves

Officers:

Alexa Baker, Monitoring Officer
Vanessa Dunmall, Corporate Projects Programme Manager
Lorraine Gore, Chief Executive
Matthew Henry, Assistant Director Property and Projects/Management Team Representative
Chris Upton, Group Accountant

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

MEMBER MAJOR PROJECTS BOARD

Minutes from the Meeting of the Member Major Projects Board held on Tuesday, 26th July, 2022 at 9.30 am in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT:

Councillors R Blunt, S Dark, M de Whalley, Mrs A Dickinson, A Kemp, G Middleton, C Morley (substitute for Councillor A Ryves) and T Parish

Under Standing Order 34:

Councillor M de Whalley

Officers:

Vanessa Dunmall, Corporate Projects Programme Manager

Lorraine Gore, Chief Executive

Matthew Henry, Assistant Director, Property and Projects

Nikki Patton, Housing Strategy Manager

Chris Upton, Project Accountant

Wendy Vincent, Democratic Services Officer

By Invitation:

David Allfrey, Assistant Director NCC – Infrastructure and Delivery

Jon Barnard, NCC – WWHAR Project Manager

1 **APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR FOR THE MEETING**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

RESOLVED: Councillor S Dark be appointed Chair for the meeting.

2 **APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR FOR THE MEETING**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

RESOLVED: Councillor R Blunt be appointed Vice-Chair for the meeting.

3 **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor A Ryves, A Baker, M Drewery and D Hall.

4 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 June 2022 were agreed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

Councillor Kemp stated that future function of the Carnegie building should be considered as part of the Member Major Projects Board and the Towns Fund Hub project as it was material to the town, and that the town had a duty to its heritage building and to its assets.

5 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

6 **MEMBERS PURSUANT UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

Councillor M de Whalley was present under Standing Order 34.

7 **URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business.

8 **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no Chair's correspondence.

9 **MAJOR PROJECTS PROGRAMME RAG REPORT AS AT END JUNE 2022**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects explained that this was an evolving document to help the MMPB to have oversight progress on all major projects and advised that cash flow would be included and brought to a future meeting.

The Corporate Projects Programme Manager presented the report and reminded the Board at that last meeting there had been a more cut down version of all projects listed together with the RAG rating and little feedback had been received. There had been discussion and debate on the financial information required and this had been added. However, it was noted that due annual leave there had only been one day crossover between the relevant officers, and that the report had been developed, but would require further tweaks going forward. In summary, it was explained that the left hand side of the report remained the same with the RAG ratings being updated, but that the columns to right contained new information relating to the different financial elements and an additional commentary column had been inserted.

In conclusion, the Assistant Director, Property and Projects added that this was a tool for MMPB and that officers were happy to amend and adjust if it was felt it would help the Board to do their job better and invited comments/suggestions to improve the format going forward in monitoring major projects.

The Chair commented that this was work in progress and was a step in the right direction and reminded Councillors why the MMPB had been set up. The Chair invited comments and questions from the Board and explained that the Board could provide input by emailing the relevant officers.

Councillor Morley made the following comments and stated that he recognised this was work in progress and that significant improvements had been made to the data presented:

- Financial information – Councillor Morley did not think the information was useful how it was presented could offer suggestions to make it more useful, in particular, as a link and consistency for the capital expenditure report.
- Consistency and timing - the report presented to MMPB should be as updated as possible close to the meeting date and that it should have a stop press associated with it.
- RAG assessment – red, amber, green. In his view, Councillor Morley explained that he used it as a rapid assessment guide and would select a red box and ask for the reasons why this was red. Councillor Morley added that there was no confidence that green was green as currently presented. Comments should be consistent with what the officers said.
- Exempt Issues – find a way of presenting the commercially sensitive information to the MMPB.

In summary, Councillor Morley added that he could discuss the above issues raised separately with relevant officers.

In response, the Corporate Projects Programme Manager explained that the report was put together as at the end of June which was the closest date to the agenda being published but highlighted that it had been updated since the last meeting. With regard to the shading, the Corporate Projects Programme Manager undertook to work with Councillors as to what was required by the MMPB. The Board was advised that the RAG ratings had been taken from a distinct group of information, which was unfortunately not attached to this report but had been attached for the previous meeting and commented that she would speak with Councillor Morley separately to develop the report.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects added that the financial information was high level and that it was recognised that more detail would be introduced at some stage. In response to comments made relating to consistency, the Assistant Director advised that project

officers reported the information differently but regular meetings were held to consider the RAG ratings and a deeper dive could be undertaken by the MMPB on any major project identified.

The Chair invited views of the Board to explore the categories of the RAG rating and the possibility of a presentation to the next meeting on the RAG rating was achieved which was agreed by the Board.

Councillor Dickinson commented that the Agenda for the previous meeting had an appendix setting out the definition of the different ratings and that it should have been appended for this meeting bearing in mind questions being asked by Councillors. Councillor Dickinson added that at the previous meeting it has been agreed to include blue and white ratings but had not been included not done timing. The Corporate Projects Programme Manager and the Project Accountant noted the comments and the information outlined would be presented to the September meeting.

In response to comments made by Councillor Parish on the Hunstanton Bus Station and Library site and the Southend Car Park, Hunstanton and the schemes being viable, the Assistant Director, Property and Property reminded Councillors why the OMPB and MMPB had been set up and that the OMPB had looked at a multitude of issues relating to the higher build costs of both projects and had undertaken a deeper dive to check the current position and consider if it was worthwhile continuing to pursue the projects.

The Chief Executive explained that MMPB could place any major projects on their work programme if the Board wanted to “deep dive” into a specific project which could be held in exempt session if the information was commercially sensitive.

Councillor Blunt concurred with the comments made by Councillor Morley on the timing of the report and supported a stop press section if there was a significant change following the publication of the Agenda. In response, the Assistant Director explained that an email could be sent to Project Officers the day before the meeting asking if there were any changes to report following publication of the agenda, a verbal update could then be given to MMPB.

Councillor Blunt commented that any highly significant changes should be reported to MMPB.

Councillor Middleton highlighted the reasons of the importance of a verbal update of any significant changes being reported to MMPB.

The Chief Executive explained that items could be picked up as they arose but MMPB required to be mindful as some projects involved other third parties and the information and care would be required to ensure the information had been shared with the lead process. It would be necessary to consider how this process was to be managed.

Councillor Parish referred to the Parkway Scheme and mention in the OMPB minutes that there had been an increase in costs due to flood risk issued and added that this work should have been undertaken when scoping the project.

The Chair addressed the role of MMPB in the wider context of other meetings and well established procedures and explained this report was a snapshot in time of evolving projects, if there was a red rating the commentary should give confidence that the relevant reports would come forward through respective committees, Cabinet and potentially Full Council. Feedback should come back to MMPB to advise of the risk paper coming forward to give reassurance.

The Project Accountant advised that the financial information was as at end June 2022 and that there had been an opportunity for relevant officers to provide comments one day prior to the publication of the Agenda/

Councillor Morley commented that the report would benefit from an additional column looking at the spend to date to ensure consistency and would give a check on process. In response the Project Accountant explained that the next report would contain the spend to date.

AGREED: A presentation on the RAG rating/categories be received at the next meeting, to include the blue and white ratings and date be added in brackets to commentary column.

10

OVERVIEW OF WEST WINCH STRATEGIC GROWTH AREA

[Click here to view a recording of this item on YouTube.](#)

N Patton, Housing Strategy Manager and member of the West Winch project team introduced colleagues from NCC, David Allfrey, Assistant Director - Infrastructure Delivery and Jon Barnard - WWHAR Project Manager.

The Board received a presentation (copy attached to the Agenda).

The Chair thanked officers for the presentation and the ongoing work involved with the project. For the benefit of the public viewing the meeting on You Tube, the Chair provided an overview of why the Borough Council together with other local authorities were required to deliver a certain amount of houses specified by Government on annual basis to meet the housing demand within the Borough. The Chair highlighted that if the Council did not meet the target set out by Government, a penalty would be incurred and outlined the importance and drivers of the 4,000 homes proposed for West Winch.

The Chair invited questions and comments from the Board.

Councillor Kemp commented that she had expected to see the master plan for the 4,000 new houses but all she could see was a map coloured showing fields divided up for housing and that the infrastructure required for a community had not been identified on the plans. Councillor Kemp stated that in her view, therefore, the master plan was in its early stages and not ready for consultation. Councillor Kemp added that area did not bear CIL money for infrastructure which was an issue for walking and cycling links into the town. Councillor Kemp commented that the flood issues in West Winch had not been addressed by either the Borough Council, Norfolk County Council or developers.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley addressed the Board and echoed the concerns raised by Councillor Kemp. Councillor de Whalley expressed concern regarding contingency plans with the rate of inflation rising, likely changes to Building Regulations and Planning Requirements as the Council moved towards net zero economy and would like assurances that there was contingency and adaptability towards a net zero economy. Councillor de Whalley commented on the need for improvements to both the rail network and cycling routes.

Councillor Morley commented that Councillor Kemp had made significant comments which needed to be addressed.

In response to Councillor Morley on the trigger point for the building of 800 homes in advance of the planning application being submitted in advance of the planning application for the access road, the Housing Strategy Manager clarified that the Hopkins Homes application to be determined later in 2022 was for 1,100 but within the existing capacity of the A10 only 300 homes could be delivered prior to the housing access road being in place and explained that this did not stop developers submitting planning applications and that the master plan, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and comments from the Highway Authority would be taken into consideration when applications were determined. The Housing Strategy Manager NP outlined preferred option for the delivery of the housing access road with Hopkins Homes making a contribution to the cost.

In response to comments from Councillor Parish on the responses received from the consultation exercise and potential questions from the public on the provision of facilities specifically the health centre, the Housing Strategy Manager explained that there was ongoing dialogue with the health authority and that the facility was secured and that consultation would be undertaken with a wider stakeholder group to determine what health services would be available within the health centre.

In response to questions from Councillor Blunt as to what would happen post the master plan consultation, the Housing Strategy

Manager explained that once the master plan had gone through the required statutory processes it would become a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and adopted by Norfolk County Council and the Borough Council it would sit alongside the Section 106 Agreement and would give significant weight when planning applications came. It was noted that the IDP was published on the Borough Council's website.

Councillor Middleton highlighted the positive engagement with the stakeholder group which had been in operation for over a year which demonstrated how the Borough Council and NCC worked together to engage with the community in order to move forward.

Councillor Blunt commented that this was a good example of a consultation plan which had been agreed with the Stakeholder Group and it was hopeful that the same process would be undertaken with the housing access road.

Councillor Kemp asked why she could still not see the level of detail with regard to the public facilities and that the master plan was too vague to see where those facilities would be located and in her view there was not sufficient work done for the public to consult on.

In response, the Assistant Director from NCC explained that it was about working together to deliver the required infrastructure as soon as possible and the aim therefore was to deliver the housing access road as soon as possible to predate the majority of housing. It was the number of houses would take time to be delivered and there was a safeguard in place of only allowing Hopkins Homes to deliver no more than 300 homes prior to the housing access road being in place to limit the number of traffic movements to the existing A10.

In response to questions in relation to the walking and cycling routes and public transport, the Assistant Director from NCC explained that work would be undertaken to produce a Sustainable Transport Strategy which would address these issues as part of the housing access road project. It was highlighted that the Department of Transport was keen to ensure there was a clear proposal as part of business case development and hope this would allay the concerns explained with connectivity within the community and the town.

The Housing Strategy Manager reiterated that the IDP adopted in 2018 was available to view on the Borough Council's Website and that the framework masterplan would be published on a dedicated area of the council's website following Cabinet approval in early August 2022. However, the framework master plan had been presented to the Local Development Framework and Policy Development Panel week commencing 25 July and could be viewed under the Agendas for those meetings.

The Assistant Director, NCC advised that more detail on the consultation for the housing access road would be brought forward later in 2022 and highlighted the importance of working with the Stakeholder Group to develop the details required for that consultation.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects expressed concern on the line of questioning and reminded those present that MMPB was not policy development panel and reminded Members that the role of the MMPB was to programme manage and monitoring progress of major projects.

Councillor Middleton added that the Board needed to remember why the MMPB was set up to enable Councillors and the OMPB to monitor major projects and to challenge the delivery of those projects.

Councillor Morley commented that Councillor Kemp had made relevant points for existing residents and future generations living in the area.

The Chief Executive advised Councillor Kemp that the information she had requested was in the public domain and was published on the Council's website, Cabinet Agenda 2 August page 17 and that there was also a map setting out areas for the proposed school, retail and green space, etc.

In conclusion, the Assistant Director, NCC added that the county council was working closely with the Borough Council on delivery of the growth area and housing access road and would be happy to update the MMPB as the project moved forward.

The Chair thanked officers for their input into the meeting.

11 **MINUTES FROM THE OFFICER MAJOR PROJECTS BOARD 15 JUNE 2022**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

In response to Councillor Morley on the announcement from Governance confirming the reprioritisation of the Towns Fund projects, the Chief Executive explained that this was imminent.

12 **WORK PROGRAMME**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The Chair invited the Board to contact himself or the Democratic Services Officer suggesting future agenda items.

Following comments on the framework master plan and housing access road consultation exercises, Councillor Blunt explained that all comments received would be reviewed by the Stakeholder Group and

the West Winch Project Team and would be fed through the Local Plan Task Group and relevant Borough Council Committees.

Councillor de Whalley commented that with the uncertainty of the heritage lottery bid – Stage 1 it would be useful to receive an update at the 29 September MMPB.

De Whalley

The following items were identified for the next meeting on 28 September 2022:

- RAG – explanation (and to include blue and white scoring)
- Guildhall and Creative Hub – An update be given to the meeting is there is anything significant to report.
- Standing Item on all future Agendas – Exempt Session – updates on commercially sensitive projects.

13 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held on 28 September 2022 at 10.00 am in Town Hall, King's Lynn.

The meeting closed at 11.38 am

RAG monitoring definitions

13

Member Major Projects Board

7th October 2022

Borough Council of
King's Lynn &
West Norfolk



Agenda Item 9

Introduction

At the MMPB meeting of 26 July an overview of the RAG ratings used on the monitoring report was requested

14

Today will cover

- Background to previous RAG definitions used
- Overview of those now in use
- Feedback from MMPB



Background

- When the MMPB was first in place, a simpler RAG system was proposed*:

15

| RED | AMBER | GREEN | BLUE | WHITE |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Significant issues exist requiring consideration by Project or Programme Board and immediate action to be taken.</p> <p>Benefits – it is probable that the intended benefit will not be achieved</p> | <p>Some (actual or anticipated) variation from the project plan but actions in hand to maintain progress.</p> <p>Benefits - some of the intended benefit may not be achieved</p> | <p>On schedule – progress in line with agreed project plan</p> <p>Benefits – it is forecast that this benefit will be achieved</p> | <p>Project / Work Package / Benefit completed</p> | <p>Being developed - Project has been approved but is in Initiation Stage</p> |

* Cabinet report June 2019



Background

- Monitoring didn't effectively 'get off the ground' in 2019
- 2020-late 2021 Impact of Covid-19 pandemic
- November 2021 – update to Terms of Reference, brought in the definition that MMPB would review projects that Cabinet decided – ie the list of Major Projects
- Early 2022 – Project Accountant role in place, Corporate Projects Programme role updated – increased capacity to work on a monitoring report

16



Monitoring Report – work in progress

- The monitoring report brought to MMPB is work in progress and is being developed following feedback received at each MMPB meeting
- ↱ • Following the list of defined projects, RAG definitions used have been reviewed
- More detailed ones proposed to assist the Board, the blue and white ratings not considered so relevant – for discussion today

| BLUE | WHITE |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Project / Work Package / Benefit completed | Being developed - Project has been approved but is in Initiation Stage |

RAG definitions

18



RAG definitions currently in use

- Taken from a government monitoring return – didn't want to 'reinvent the wheel' – BUT – if not what MMPB want, can adjust / change
- This is how the information is currently presented for each Major Project:

| Overall RAG rating | | |
|--------------------|-------|------|
| Amber | | |
| Delivery | Spend | Risk |
| 3 | 4 | 2 |

- Ratings are given by the project lead

RAG Definitions

| Delivery | Score | Spend | Score | Risks | Score |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Major issues causing significant delays (more than 6 months); processes interrupted or not carried out as planned (e.g. planning permission not secured); or significant changes to project. Project likely to under-deliver on forecast outputs. | 5 | A variance of over 50% against profiled financial forecast (total expenditure) or significant changes to project finances required (increases or decreases) due to poor or delayed delivery. | 5 | Programme includes projects with significant risks that are both high impact and high likelihood. Risk response not yet planned. | 5 |
| Issues arising causing long delays to the timetable (3 to 6 months) but no significant changes required to overall project. Outputs may still be deliverable but challenging. | 4 | A variance of between 30% & 50% against profiled financial forecast (total expenditure). Budget changes have been required due to issues with project delivery. | 4 | Programme includes projects with significant risks that are either high impact or high likelihood. Risk responses planned but not implemented. | 4 |
| Issues arising causing some short delays to the timetable (less than 3 months). Outputs still deliverable but require re-scheduling. | 3 | A variance of between 15% & 30% against profiled financial forecast Some budget changes have been required. | 3 | Programme includes projects with some risks that have medium impact and/or medium likelihood. Risk responses planned and implemented. | 3 |
| Minor issues have arisen causing only small delays. Project is on track to deliver outputs. | 2 | A variance of between 5% & 15% Small re-profiling changes to budget required. | 2 | Programme includes projects with some risks that have medium impact but low likelihood. Risk responses planned and implemented. | 2 |
| No problems. Project is on track to deliver outputs and keeping to schedule. | 1 | A variance of up to 5% . Spend is largely on track with any minor slippage expected to be picked up by end of next quarter. | 1 | All risks are tolerable with low impact and likelihood and do not require a response. | 1 |

RAG definitions – questions to the Board

- Are you happy with the split into Delivery, Spend, Risk?
- 21 • Is the ‘overall RAG’ useful or should this be dispensed with?
- What changes (if any) would you like to see?



| No. | Heading | Scheme | Brief description | Strategic fit | Cabinet date(s) | Lead Portfolio | BCKLWN Project Sponsor | RAG ratings as at end August 2022 (see definitions at end of report) | Funding Source | Funding Source Amount | Total Budget | Spend To Date | Remaining | Finance Categorisation | Budget 2022-23 (31st August) | Spend in 2022-23 (31st August) | Remaining 2022-23 | Commentary on financial position / implications of project not being delivered / slippage |
|-----|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Carbon Reduction Strategy | RE:Fit Scheme | Phase 1 – energy efficiency schemes – streetlighting to be completed Phase 2 – carbon reduction schemes - funded by grant of £3.8m from Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (PSDS), covers various works over 9 sites. | - Part of Climate Change Strategy & Action Plan to Cabinet Sept 2021 - Grant funding accepted | 21-Sep-21 | Environment | Stuart Ashworth | Overall RAG rating | Grant Funded | -£3,851,680 | £3,851,680 | £3,797,250 | £54,431 | Publicised - Major | £942,730 | £888,300 | £54,431 | Phase 2 - issued practical completion, now in defects period. Phase 1 may be altered to remove streetlighting as more competitive to complete outside of the Re:Fit scheme. Commentary updated 29.09.,2022 |
| | | | | | | | | Green | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 1 1 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | NORA & Enterprise Zone | Road infrastructure and utilities | Infrastructure – roads and services. Funded via Business Rates - deal with LEP and other Norfolk LA's via Business Rates scheme. Site commencement anticipated early 2022. | - Helps deliver strategic employment development land - Contractually committed | 24-Sep-19 | Development & Regeneration | Matthew Henry | Overall RAG rating | Business Rates Retention | -£8,521,560 | £8,521,560 | £306,934 | £8,214,626 | Publicised - Major | £6,047,240 | £215,264 | £5,831,976 | Some delays on delivery. 36 week construction time frame. |
| | | | | | | | | Amber | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 3 4 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3A | NORA & Enterprise Zone | Development of spec units | Phase 1 - Spec Build Units Will deliver 2no. 5,000 sqft. Offices and 2no. 10,000 sqft. light industrial units. LEP Funding Agreement in place. | - Delivery of business premises to accommodate local or other businesses - Contractually committed | 24-Sep-19 | Development & Regeneration | Matthew Henry | Overall RAG rating | LEP Funding | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | Exempt | £0 | £0 | £0 | Construction is underway on this phase. |
| | | | | | | | | Light Green | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 2 1 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | NORA & Enterprise Zone | Development of spec units | Phase 2 - Spec Build Units 2no. 10,000 sqft. light industrial units – subject to LEP funding (TBC). Out to tender Autumn 2021. | - Delivery of business premises to accommodate local or other businesses - Contractually committed | 24-Sep-19 | Development & Regeneration | Matthew Henry | Overall RAG rating | LEP Funding | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | Exempt | £0 | £0 | £0 | Delivery has been delayed due to tender processes, consultant performance and resources. Not yet out to tender so spend in line with plan currently. |
| | | | | | | | | Amber | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 4 1 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Major Housing | NORA 4 | Mixed tenure scheme total 105 dwellings. First units on this development being delivered December 2021. Completion anticipated May 2023. | - Development partnership with Lovells to deliver 1,000 homes - Fits with Corporate Business Plan objective no 2 | 04-Feb-20 | Development & Regeneration | David Ousby | Overall RAG rating | Capital Receipts / Internal Borrowing | -£14,657,020 | £14,657,020 | £7,310,765 | £7,346,255 | Publicised - Major | £9,716,820 | £2,975,065 | £6,741,755 | Majority of Houses expected to be sold, with over 100 signed contracts, in 2022/23 forecasting c18m in Sales Receipts which should cover the Total Project generating a surplus c£3m+ which is used to fund the capital programme. To date Received £606k of Sales Receipts from 3 House Sales. AHG received historically covered the initial construction budget |
| | | | | | | | | Green | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 1 1 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Major Housing | Parkway, Western side, KL | New development of mixed housing. Currently awaiting determination by planning. | - Development partnership with Lovells to deliver 1,000 homes - Fits with Corporate Business Plan objective no 2 | 15-Jun-21 | Development & Regeneration | David Ousby | Overall RAG rating | Capital Receipts / Internal Borrowing | -£34,347,880 | £34,347,880 | £803,920 | £33,543,960 | Publicised - Major | £800,000 | £256,040 | £543,960 | Grants expected the majority of costs for 2022/23. Sales of Housing not expected to take place until 23/24 forecasting c16.4m and in 24/25 c22.8m. Overall Forecasting £844k Surplus to fund the Capital Programme. AHG received historically covered the initial construction budget |
| | | | | | | | | Light Green | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 2 2 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Major Housing | Salters Road, King's Lynn (also known as Columbia Way) | Development of 78 units. Works have commenced on site. | - Development partnership with Lovells to deliver 1,000 homes - Fits with Corporate Business Plan objective no 2 | 16-Mar-21 | Development & Regeneration | David Ousby | Overall RAG rating | Capital Receipts / Internal Borrowing | -£14,329,920 | £14,329,920 | £2,862,082 | £2,026,458 | Publicised - Major | £2,606,870 | £835,622 | £1,771,248 | Sales of Housing expected to take place in 2022/23 forecasting c8.7m and in 2023/24 c6m. Overall Forecasting £466k Surplus to fund the Capital Programme. AHG received historically covered the initial construction budget |
| | | | | | | | | Amber | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 3 3 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Major Housing | Bus Station and NCC Library Site (St Edmunds Terrace), Hunstanton | Development of 47 units and a new library site. Scheme will also include a 'changing place' as part of the accessible toilet (public conveniences). Planning achieved earlier in 2021. | - Development partnership with Lovells to deliver 1,000 homes - Fits with Corporate Business Plan objective no 2 | 02-Feb-21 | Development & Regeneration | David Ousby | Overall RAG rating | Capital Receipts / Internal Borrowing | -£10,453,990 | £11,224,930 | £302,468 | £10,922,462 | Publicised - Major | £750,000 | £8,918 | £741,082 | The Scheme is currently being reviewed to understand if this Project is still viable |
| | | | | | | | | Dark Amber | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 5 4 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Major Housing | Southend Road coach / car park, Hunstanton - potential new development of mixed housing. | Potential for 32 units, 15% of which need to be affordable. Planning achieved earlier in 2021. | - Development partnership with Lovells to deliver 1,000 homes - Fits with Corporate Business Plan objective no 2 | 16-Mar-21 | Development & Regeneration | David Ousby | Overall RAG rating | Capital Receipts / Internal Borrowing | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | Exempt | £0 | £0 | £0 | The Scheme is currently being reviewed to understand if this Project is still viable |
| | | | | | | | | Light Green | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 2 2 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | West Winch Growth Area | West Winch. Between 3,500-4000 New Dwellings allocated in local plan. | BCKLWN leading in an overall collaboration agreement with the multiple owners of the land identified within the Local Plan Allocation to deliver a strategic housing allocation. Significant infrastructure requirements. Working with NCC and Norfolk County Council. | - This Growth Area is the main allocation for housing in the local plan - To meet priorities housing need, and the F40 objectives of the Norfolk Suffolk Economic Strategy as a Growth Location | 13-Nov-18 | Development & Regeneration | Geoff Hall | Overall RAG rating | Business Rates Pool | -£500,000 | £1,000,000 | £0 | £1,000,000 | Publicised - Major | £0 | £0 | £0 | All funding should be utilised by March 2023 and Borough Council project elements complete. Some of the £1million will be recovered from land owners over a period of upto 18 years. Exact percentages/proportions currently are being considered. |
| | | | | | | | | Dark Amber | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 4 2 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Regeneration | South Gate area regeneration | Redevelopment of gateway site into King's Lynn. Includes potential acquisition of sites, master-planning, road scheme and infrastructure. Cabinet agreement to progress summer 2020. Links to NCC Levelling Up Fund application for the roundabout. | - Within the Town Investment Plan (TIP) - Forms Part of HAZ programme - Funding secured for master-planning from Business Rates Pool | 15-Jun-21 | Development & Regeneration | Duncan Hall | Overall RAG rating | Borrowing | -£630,000 | £630,000 | £89,440 | £540,560 | Publicised - Major | £540,560 | £0 | £540,560 | Timescale of Masterplanning element of project remain slightly changed, to allow for inclusion in NCC's LUF bid submission, this additional time is also being used to elevate the output of the masterplan, it will now be a document that can be used as a Supplementary Planning Document. This slight change in timeline and consultant fee will not have an implication on the delivery of the project. |
| | | | | | | | | Light Green | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 2 2 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Town Deal | St George's Guildhall & Creative Hub | Refurbishment of the Guildhall and provision of co-working & studio space in the White Barn NB rating is on Business Case development at this stage | - Agreed under the Town Deal with government | 24-Aug-21 | Business, Culture & Heritage | Duncan Hall | Overall RAG rating | Town Deal Grant | -£8,097,180 | £12,174,090 | £90,986 | £12,083,104 | Publicised - Major | £321,060 | £0 | £321,060 | The National Heritage Lottery bid for £575k was unsuccessful and other funding sources are being explored. RAG ratings updated 29.09.2022 in light of additional information. |
| | | | | | | | | Amber | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 3 2 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Town Deal | Active & Clean Connectivity | Package of measures to support active & clean connectivity including priority schemes from the Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan inc Active Travel Hub and Travel Plan Fund NB rating is on Business Case development at this stage | - Agreed under the Town Deal with government | 24-Aug-21 | Business, Culture & Heritage | David Ousby | Overall RAG rating | Town Deal Grant | -£4,232,870 | £6,255,620 | £270,908 | £5,984,712 | Publicised - Major | £144,000 | £17,241 | £126,759 | Treasury 'Green Book' compliant Business Case in preparation; will be taken through the agreed Local Assurance Framework as part of its agreement. |
| | | | | | | | | Light Green | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 2 1 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Town Deal | Riverfront Regeneration | First phase, including Outer Purfleet and Custom House exhibition space, 'Sail the Wash' dry side infrastruct., South Quay public realm NB rating is on Business Case development at this stage | - Agreed under the Town Deal with government | 24-Aug-21 | Business, Culture & Heritage | Geoff Hall | Overall RAG rating | Town Deal Grant | -£4,178,940 | £4,178,940 | £32,983 | £4,145,957 | Publicised - Major | £300,000 | £50,358 | £249,642 | Treasury 'Green Book' compliant Business Case in preparation; will be taken through the agreed Local Assurance Framework as part of its agreement. |
| | | | | | | | | Light Green | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 2 1 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Town Deal | Public Realm – 'Rail to River' | Improve the perception of the town centre 'Rail to River' route to create a distinctive and quality public realm. NB this project is in the delivery phase | - Agreed under the Town Deal with government | 24-Aug-21 | Business, Culture & Heritage | David Ousby | Overall RAG rating | Town Deal Grant | -£245,000 | £245,000 | £34,385 | £210,615 | Publicised - Major | £216,570 | £5,955 | £210,615 | Some issues arising causing some short delays to the timetable (less than 3 months). Outputs still deliverable but require re-scheduling. |
| | | | | | | | | Light Green | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Delivery Spend Risk 3 2 2 | | | | | | | | | | |

Agenda Item 10

| ID | Type | Accountable Body Role | Description | Notes | Start Date | Sector | Location | Overall RAG rating | | | Funding Source | Start | End | Current | Total | Status | Budget | Actual | Notes | |
|----|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-------|------|-----------------|-------------|------------|---------|------------|--------------------|----------|--------|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | Delivery | Spend | Risk | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Town Deal | Multi-User Community Hub <i>(accountable body role only)</i> | New town centre 'one-stop-shop' for a range of services inc relocated library, to provide skills and training opportunities. <i>NB rating is on Business Case development at this stage</i> | - Agreed under the Town Deal with government | 24-Aug-21 | Business, Culture & Heritage | Duncan Hall | Amber | | | Town Deal Grant | -£7,400,000 | £7,400,000 | £22,320 | £7,377,680 | Publicised - Major | £750,000 | £0 | £750,000 | Project lead is Norfolk County Council - BCKLWN role is accountable body for Town Deal funding only. Treasury 'Green Book' compliant Business Case in preparation; due to be agreed by the Town Deal Board on 30.09.2022. |
| | | | | | | | | 2 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Town Deal | Youth & Retraining Pledge <i>(accountable body role only)</i> | A package of support for youth skills and adult retraining provision for the immediate and short-term impact of Covid-19. <i>NB this project is in the delivery phase</i> | - Agreed under the Town Deal with government | 24-Aug-21 | Business, Culture & Heritage | Duncan Hall | Green | | | Town Deal Grant | -£442,000 | £442,000 | £0 | £442,000 | Publicised - Major | £442,000 | £0 | £442,000 | In delivery phase with a package of support for youth skills and adult retraining provision. The Borough Council financial impact is limited. Norfolk County Council are lead partners with the Town Deal supporting £442k of revenue costs. |
| | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Sports Facilities | 3G pitch | Development of additional 3G pitch to provide extra capacity for football provision | - Assist with community cohesion and social engagement through sport | 16-Nov-21 | People & Communities | Neil Gromett (Alive WN) | Light Green | | | Borrowing | -£350,000 | £350,000 | £0 | £350,000 | Publicised - Major | £350,000 | £0 | £350,000 | Project currently with Football Foundation undertaking desktop survey. |
| | | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

MEMBER MAJOR PROJECTS BOARD WORK PROGRAMME 2022

| DATE OF MEETING | TITLE | LEAD OFFICER |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 20 July 2022 | Overview of West Winch Strategic Growth Area | N Patton H Wood-Handy |
| | Overview of the current Major Projects Programme | M Henry/V Dunmall |
| | Work Programme 2022 | |
| | | |
| 7 October 2022 | Overview of the current Major Projects Programme | M Henry/V Dunmall |
| | Presentation on RAG definitions | V Dunmall |
| | Work Programme 2022 | |
| | | |
| 8 December 2022 | Hunstanton Bus Station and Library | D Ousby |
| | Work Programme 2023 | |
| | Schedule of Meetings 2023 | |

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

OFFICER MAJOR PROJECTS BOARD

**Minutes of the Meeting of the above held on Wednesday, 13th July, 2022
at 9.30 am in the Remote Meeting Room, Microsoft Teams**

PRESENT:

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Jemma Curtis | - | Regeneration Programmes Manager |
| Michelle Drewery | - | Assistant Director |
| James Grant | - | Principal Project Manager |
| Duncan Hall | - | Assistant Director |
| Geoff Hall | - | Executive Director |
| Matthew Head | - | Internal Auditor |
| Matthew Henry (Chair) | - | Assistant Director |

| | | <u>ACTION</u> |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | <p><u>APOLOGIES</u></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from A Baker, V Dunmall, L Gore, G Greaves, D Ousby and C Upton.</p> | |
| 2 | <p><u>MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING</u></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2022 were agreed as a correct record.</p> <p><u>Matters Arising</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refit – next stage Post Project Evaluation. • KLIC Follow Up Report – 3 actions to complete: Terms of Reference for OMPB and MMPB, establish Project Delivery Group. M Henry to action. | |
| 3 | <p><u>ONE PUBLIC ESTATE FUNDING</u></p> <p>J Grant provided an overview of the One Public Estate Brownfield Land Release Funding workshop on 4 July 2022. The key elements are set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All information remains under Embargo, likely to be released to the public later this week. • Applications must be submitted by 23:59pm 19 Aug 2022. | |

- There are no limits on the amount of applications that can be made.
- Application must be made for land already owned by the Borough Council, to be utilised for house building.
- The total fund totals £180m, with £40m to be released 2022-2023,
- Further 3 years of funding rounds, we could therefore prepare for future rounds,
- Applications must be made via our OPE Partner.
- The fund will cover capital costs that release the land for development, i.e., site levelling, demolition, access, etc.
- The fund has been tweaked from former funds to better assist areas with lower land values that have struggled to achieve the necessary BCR.
- BCR targets have been lowered from 1.5 to 1.
- Work must be contracted by end of March 2023, and the land must be released for development by March 2026.
- Applications must demonstrate a housing need.
- A red book valuation may be needed to support viability appraisal.
- The fund will not cover any cost overrun. Inflation must therefore be taken into account.
- Title information must be provided as part of the application.
- Part of the determination will be made on an areas "Place Based Matrix" 50%. A score than has been given to each local authority area. Areas with lower land values score higher in this area.
- As long as the land is released then it can be developed by any party, i.e., directly or sold.
- Release means:
 - Unconditional contract, or
 - Transfer to development vehicle, or
 - Footings, or
 - (custom and self-build) exchange on first plot.
- Planning consent it not technically necessary for release, but the release model will likely be contingent on this.
- Can be used in conjunction with other funding. Check with both funders. Other funding must not be for land release.
- Can be used for building refurb is there are abnormal costs and a viability gap.
- Cannot be used to cover planning fees.
- Development of land should be promoted by current local plan.
- There is not max award. In the past the average award has been for sites of 50 – 60 units, and around £10k per plot.
- Whilst there is no direct correlation between the finding ask and the amount of units, due to the nature of the competitive processes sites with a lower ask per plot will likely score better.

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council, national, and international procurement rules must be followed. • The detention of Brownfield land will be in accordance with the NPPF definition. • Long leasehold releases will be considered. • A number of the other attendees seem concerned about the application timeframes and are concerned they may not be able to submit in this period. There may therefore be little competition if the Council made a strong application. <p>The Board discussed sites that meet the criteria.</p> <p>The following potential sites were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southgates - (brownfield could support site clearance). J Curtis advised that there was enough information to support an application but resource was required to co-ordinate and submit the application. • Hardings Way – (could include mixed used development). <p>AGREED: J Curtis to contact M Evans on behalf of the Borough Council to find out if he has capacity to undertake the work on Southgates for the Council to submit a bid by the deadline of 19 August 2022.</p> | JC |
| 4 | <p><u>TOWNS FUND UPDATE - J CURTIS, D HALL</u></p> <p>J Curtis, D Hall provided a verbal update, a summary of the key points are set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waiting outcome of approval from Government on re-prioritisation of projects. • Guildhall Project – submission document to be signed off by the Town Deal Board 15 July 2022. • Final 3 business cases remaining – Active and Clean Connectivity, Multi-User Hub (NCC leading project, to be presented to Town Deal Board 15 July 2022, NCC be invited to attend Town Deal Board 15 July 2022), Riverfront (positive meeting held with Historic England 12 July 2022, information to be forwarded to commence business case modelling). | |
| 5 | <p><u>UPDATE ON ALL MAJOR HOUSING PROJECT SCHEMES - J GRANT</u></p> <p>J Grant provided a verbal update as set out below:</p> | |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| | <p><u>NORA 5</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract discussions ongoing with H21 and Lovells to determine if the scheme is viable. • PID to be presented to future OMPB. <p><u>Waveney Road, Hunstanton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-application submitted. <p><u>Bus Station, Hunstanton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant progress since the previous meeting. • Ongoing discussions regarding transport/travel. <p><u>Nora 4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works progressing on site – no significant update. <p><u>Southend Road, Hunstanton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works progressing on site – no significant update. <p><u>Salters Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding legal issues working towards resolution. <p><u>Parkway</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post planning appraisal completed. <p><u>Lynnsport 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post planning appraisal completed. <p>AGREED: A summary of the Borough Council’s contracts with Lovells be presented to the next OMPB.</p> | |
| 6 | <p><u>RESOURCE REQUIRED FOR PROJECT DELIVERY</u></p> <p>This item was deferred to the next meeting.</p> | |
| 7 | <p><u>WEST WINCH RISK REGISTER - N PATTON</u></p> <p>N Patton drew the Board’s attention to the following risks:</p> | |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| | <p><u>Risk Improved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2a Planning application for the road – reasons were outlined as to why the risk had slightly improved. • 9b Costs – Costs - Housing Delivery • 14 Reduction in total delivery – small improvement in the risk following the Department of Transport announcement. <p><u>General Points</u></p> <p>It was explained that it had been agreed to keep 2a Planning application for the road and 3 Funding as separate entries as critical dependencies had been identified.</p> <p>J Grant advised that the potential largest increase would be relating to utilities (13% increase). N Patton to feed into West Winch Project Board Meeting 14 July 2022 as an emerging issue.</p> | |
| 8 | <p><u>WORK PROGRAMME 2022</u></p> <p>The following items were identified.</p> <p><u>19 August 2022</u></p> <p>Resource required for Project Delivery (Deferred from 13 July) Levelling up Fund (resource/team) – D Hall (to be clarified at Project Group Meeting) Street Lamps Refit Programme – M Henry to liaise with S Ashworth/R Wiseman Refit 2 – Post Project Evaluation Summary of Contract with Lovells – J Grant Feedback/actions from MMPB on RAG</p> | |
| 9 | <p><u>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</u></p> <p>19 August 2022, 2 pm, Microsoft Teams.</p> | |

The meeting closed at 11.22 am