

**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**