

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK**MEMBER MAJOR PROJECTS BOARD**

Minutes from the Meeting of the Member Major Projects Board held on Monday, 11th September, 2023 at 10.00 am in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT:

Councillors A Beales, R Blunt, A Dickinson, A Kemp, J Moriarty, C Morley, T Parish, A Ryves and A Ware

Under Standing Order 34:

Councillor A Kemp
Councillor A Ryves

Officers:

Alexa Baker, Monitoring Officer
Vanessa Dunmall, Performance and Efficiency Manager
Lorraine Gore, Chief Executive
Matthew Henry, Assistant Director, Property and Projects/Management Team Representative

1 **APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2023 TO 2024**

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

RESOLVED: Councillor A Beales be appointed Chair for the Municipal Year 2023/2024.

2 **APPOINTMENT OF THE VICE-CHAIR FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2023 TO 2024**

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

RESOLVED: Councillor J Moriarty be appointed Vice Chair for the Municipal Year 2023/2024.

3 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Geoff Hall, Executive Director, Oliver Judges, Executive Director and Chris Upton, Project Accountant.

4 **MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

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

The minutes from the meeting held on 28 February 2023 were agreed as a correct record.

5 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

[Click here to review a recording of this meeting on You Tube](#)

Councillor Ware declared an interest as a Director of West Norfolk Housing Company and West Norfolk Property Company.

Councillor Ryves declared an interest as his wife was a Member of Hunstanton Town Band.

6 **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business.

7 **MEMBERS PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34**

Councillors A Kemp and A Ryves were present under Standing Order 34 for all items.

8 **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE (IF ANY)**

There was no Chair's Correspondence.

9 **OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT OFFICE (PMO) FUNCTION**

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

The Manager, Programme Management Office provided an overview of the role of the Programme Management Office (PMO) which currently supported the Place Directorate only (copy attached to the agenda).

The Chair thanked the Manager, PMO for the overview and invited questions and comments, a summary of which is set out below.

In response to questions from Councillor Moriarty as to why some projects had not been included, the Manager, PMO explained that projects categorised as Tier 1 were under the auspices of the MMPB. It was noted that projects categorised as Tier 2 were projects on the horizon or active but not agreed as a 'Major Project' by Cabinet. The Manager, PMO gave an example of Baxter's Plain feasibility work Projects categorised as Tier 2 and Tier 3 (ideas at early stages) were not considered by MMPB. It was further explained that the Manager,

PMO rigorously challenged the highlight reports in order that correct and meaningful information was being presented to MMPB and as the reports progressed through there was an opportunity for senior officers to challenge that the information was valid, consistent and valuable.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects reminded Members that the MMPB was a sub-committee of Cabinet and explained the role of the Board was to oversee and monitor projects and highlighted that the projects on the MMPB list were those that had been determined as a major project by Cabinet.

Councillor Blunt asked if there was a document which defined for a Tier 2 and 3 projects and who determined the category of each project. In response, the Manager, PMO explained that there was no document the process was evolving and that Tier 1 projects were those which Cabinet had determined as a major projects and MMPB oversaw and monitored.

The Chief Executive added that there was a structure of Officer Major Project (OMP) Board and MMPB and it was explained that projects in in early stages of development would go through the process and highlighted that for a project to be defined as a major project to be forwarded to MMPB, was a Cabinet decision. The PMO was a central repository to collect all information at the early stages because ultimately projects could develop and then be presented to MMPB.

Councillor Blunt commented that the categories presented confusion and that the Board needed to see a definition of a Tier 2 and Tier 3 project and would those projects be considered by MMPB. In response, The Manager, PMO explained that Tier 2 projects were active but were not overseen by the MMPB and would go through Portfolio and Panel meetings. An example was given of a Tier 3 project – originally a Town Deal project, a Town Centre Repurposing project which had been the decision of Cabinet not to proceed and was agreed that as and when funding came along the business case would be relooked at (so now Tier 3).

It was highlighted that only Tier 1 projects would be overseen and monitored by the MMPB.

The Chair, Councillor Beales commented that it would be useful to have formal clarification for Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects and added that lack of resources ran throughout the reports. He added that Tier 2 projects would remain with the Portfolio Holders but would not be invisible and would go through the process to the Regeneration and Development Panel and if there was a project of great interest or political sensitivity despite being a modest size it would go forward to MMPB.

Councillor Blunt commented that he understood the comments made by the Chair. The Chair, Councillor Beales confirmed that any

questions relating to Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects could be asked at Full Council.

The Chief Executive clarified the role of the PMO.

Councillor Morley commented that some form of definition was required for strategic areas to the future plan of the Council and gave an example of energy and environment section where climate change was the focus. Councillor Morley added that his recollection was that there had previously been a major project relating to energy, etc. Councillor Morley referred to following projects Refit involving Ameresco, Electric Vehicles, etc and that type of package required higher visibility because they were not things that may had a wider roll out for some and years and the Council needed to see that they were proving satisfactory in the authority's building environment. He also commented that he felt the 3G Pitch should go 'down' to become a Tier 2 project.

Councillor Kemp added that a review of the projects was required to take climate change into account.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Ryves asked if the reports were living documents and could be accessed by Members. In response, the Manager, PMO explained that the highlight reports were living documents which were updated on a regular basis. MMPB would be informed of any updates, if any, on projects following publication of the Agenda.

The Monitoring Officer advised that Tier 3 projects were operational and that information on them would be expected to remain with Portfolio Holders but that Member Access Requests would be considered and would be mindful of any exemptions which would apply in development stage and such requests would be considered on a case by case basis. Tier 2 projects were described as active not meeting the definition of a major project and whether there would be a compiled list this was not a process the Council had in terms of publishing but in terms of Member access to information it was not secret information and if a Councillor needed to know it would be considered under Member access rights.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects explained that MMPB was a public meeting and agendas and minutes were published both on Mod Gov and the Council's website and therefore accessible to all Councillors. It was highlighted that some projects contained confidential information and could not be published in the public domain whilst projects were in the developmental stage.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects reminded the Board of its role in relation to major projects.

Councillor Ryves commented that it would be useful if the documents could be available on line as a resource to enable Councillors to view the information as opposed to obtaining information via an officer. The Chair, Councillor Beales added that the points had been well made, it was acknowledged the wish of the Administration for transparency and openness and the need for confidentiality as described.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects explained that if there were any further updates to report from Project Managers following the publication of the agenda, a verbal update would be given at MMPB.

Councillor Ryves highlighted the importance of Councillors having access to the MMPB information and updates.

The Chair, Councillor Beales explained that additional resources would be considered for the PMO. The Manager, PMO explained that there were plans in place to recruit additional posts to the PMO.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects added that it was recognised with the scale of the programme of projects additional resource was required and options were being looked at.

Councillor Dickinson expressed concern that sight was possibly being lost of why the MMPB was set up in the first place and the fact that the Council had resourcing issues added weight to the argument that the Council should stick to why the MMPB was set up and what those parameters were for projects being included in the report. Councillor Dickinson highlighted the importance of the Board that it being seen to be trying to ensure as far as possible that those set of circumstances were not repeated as to why the MMPB was created.

The Chair, Councillor Beales commented that this was a point well made on why the MMPB was formed and was aware of why the circumstances emerged.

Councillor Morley added that the Council would be looking at a priority based approach to anything in terms of filling resources and there was no doubt the Chief Executive had recognised this and appointed the Executive Director, Place to put leadership in this direction and the Interim Technical Adviser previously in post, had recommended that a Project Management Office be set up. In conclusion, Councillor Morley explained that once the programme of projects/work requirements/volume was received the PMO would be resourced accordingly in order that the projects would not be delayed.

Councillor Dickinson agreed with the comments made by Councillor Morley and added that the definition MMPB started out with captured everything and that in her opinion was an excellent starting point because nothing would then fall through any of the gaps between the tiers and it could then be determined which projects did not need to be submitted to the Board.

In response to the comments made above, the Chair, Councillor Beales explained that some refining was required and priorities identified.

10

OVERVIEW OF PROJECT HIGHLIGHT REPORTING PROCESS

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

The Manager, PMO provided an overview of the project highlight reporting process and explained that since the Election in May 2023 there had been some discussion on the frequency, some uncertainty and gaps between meetings and in that void the Executive Director, Place made the decision that the 'other' major projects would report every two months. The Board was informed that the Town Deal Board projects reported on a monthly cycle and the 'other' projects on a bi-monthly cycle. The Manager, PMO advised that from April 2024 the 'other' major projects would be reported on a quarterly basis.

The Chair, Councillor Beales thanked the Manager, PMO for the overview and invited questions and comments from the Board, a summary of which is set out below.

Councillor Morley expressed concern that when the Town Deal Programme Board data goes forward he saw no reason why a stream of that couldn't go to MMPB who were not Members of the Town Deal Board so that the information was received at the same time. In response, the Manager, PMO advised that the Town Deal Board Agendas and Minutes were published monthly and were publicly available on the Vision King's Lynn Website a few days after the meeting. Click on the link below to access documents:

<https://www.visionkingslynn.co.uk/document-library/>

The Monitoring Officer explained that if it was just the case of making sure Councillors were receiving the same information as the Town Deal Board when published then a separate email could be circulated.

Councillor Morley commented that his personal preference was for agendas and minutes to be available on Mod Gov at the same time as the Vision King's Lynn website. The Manager, PMO explained that this was work in progress as a separate module within Mod Gov had to be set up.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects explained that the Borough Council had Cabinet Member representation on the Town Deal Board and most, if not all, of the specific project boards.

The Chair, Councillor Beales commented that the Town Deal Board was fine but that Councillor Morley made the point of the MMPB

receiving the information at the same time as the Town Deal Board. The Chair commented that he had a concern regarding the other projects not reporting on a monthly basis and asked if quarterly reporting was enough. The Chair added that construction projects moved at a slower pace and wondered if the number of construction projects could be reported by exception and this did not work then consideration would be required on the frequency of reporting.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects advised that officers would flag up any issues to the Portfolio Holder, etc and escalate if required.

RESOLVED: The report be noted.

11 **MAJOR PROJECTS OVERVIEW REPORT**

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

The Corporate Programmes Manager presented the major projects overview report as at end July 2023. It was noted that there were 17 projects on the list – 7 green, 10 amber and the commentary provided information as to their overall status.

The Chair, Councillor Beales invited questions/comments from the Board.

There were no questions or comments.

RESOLVED: The Major Projects Overview report was noted.

12 **PROJECT HIGHLIGHT REPORTS**

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

The Manager, PMO presented the Project Highlight reports.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects explained that the Board could identify any of the projects for a “deep dive” and relevant officers invited to attend a meeting to give a presentation and answer any questions.

St George’s Guildhall and Creative Hub Project

Councillor Parish drew attention to page 21, St George’s Guildhall and Creative Hub project and explained that the Council had not agreed to underwrite the £3m whilst other funding options were explored. This had been highlighted to the Chair of the Town Deal Board and was accepted that the Borough Council could not afford to underwrite £3 m. He requested that the project definition on the report was updated.

The Chair, Councillor Beales confirmed that at the first meeting of the Town Deal Board following the May Election it was acknowledged by the Chair that the Borough Council would not underwrite the £3m and agreed that the report required updating.

The Monitoring Officer explained that as the previous Cabinet and Full Council had agreed to underwrite the £3m it would be required to go through the democratic process again to get formal agreement. A Cabinet report would be put forward to enable Councillors to consider all options which would be considered by Cabinet and ratified by Full Council for rectifying the capital programme.

Councillor Morley confirmed the report would need to go to Full Council and outlined reasons why the whole document required rephrasing accordingly.

Councillor Kemp added that these issues needed to go through a process and that the £3m was in the original budget and required Cabinet and Full Council approval and did not disagree with the variation. Councillor Kemp referred to page 22, a red RAG rating for resources for the £12m Guildhall project and the lack of capacity in the project team to oversee and apply for funding and asked what plans were in place to address this.

In response, Councillor Morley explained that the CIO had been accepted by the Charitable Commission and the Trustees had been appointed and that the report should be from the Trustees on progress and was an interim period that regarded sorting out for the £9m project.

The Chair, Councillor Beales advised that the focus was now on the £9m project.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects commented that a number of good points had been made and that there was an error in the highlight report as there has been a shift in emphasis following the new Administration and would be picked up and amended prior to the next report.

Councillor Moriarty referred to page 21 – last report resource red and resource had now moved to amber as things progressed.

The Chair, Councillor Beales that the Town Deal Board project was in his Portfolio and the Assistant Director, Property and Projects had referred to Portfolio Holders and added that Councillor Ring has the most detailed knowledge of this project and consideration should be given as to how to bring in that knowledge in relation to the CIO and wider membership of MMPB.

Councillor Ryves referred to the Guildhall project and asked if it was now a £9m project does the underlying deflection of the budget reflect that as there was an ambiguity if it was being presented as a £12m

with the relevant infrastructure. In response, the Chair, Councillor Beales advised it was investigative work that the Guildhall had not been assessed in its lifetime and would be fully assessed and the budget would have to fit accordingly.

Councillor Ryves commented that he was not aware that the underwriting had been agreed by Full Council. In response, the Monitoring Officer explained that it had been definitely underwritten, but at the same time the Cabinet report and the recommendation made it absolutely clear that there was to be an options paper brought back so that Cabinet could again look at this “floating £3m” and that she fully understood the Administration’s policy position on that but it was formally underwritten with the strict proviso that another options paper would come back on the £3m.

Councillor Parish, Leader explained that he had taken advice on what he could do/not when he became Leader of the Council and advised that he could refuse to underwrite the £3m and made it public and informed the Chair of the Town Deal Board that the Council could not afford to underwrite the £3m which had been accepted.

The Monitoring Officer undertook to meet with Councillor Parish outside of the meeting regarding authority as Leader and the process required to amend the underwriting decision previously made by Full Council to remove the underwriting from the Capital Programme.

Councillor Dickinson explained that the £3m had been allocated in the capital programme which was approved by Council as part of the Capital Programme and added that she agreed with the Monitoring Officer in that the Cabinet report was specific in terms of a provisional underwriting and a further report would be brought back and that there were two aspects to this.

In response to questions from Councillor Morley regarding the current position of the Guildhall Informal Working Group, Councillor Moriarty undertook to clarify the position. The Monitoring Officer explained that the terms of reference for the informal working group could be examined outside of the meeting to determine if the terms of reference had been fulfilled and if there was any purpose to continue.

Following a discussion it was agreed that MMPB would undertake a “deep dive” into the Guildhall project at a future meeting.

Parkway

Councillor Parish referred to page 75 – Parkway and advised that the title had been amended to Florence Fields and a Cabinet report was being drafted to change the tenure mix.

The Chair, Councillor Beales confirmed there was ongoing work to explore tenure mix.

Councillor Morley asked if there was still opposition to the Florence Fields development and if so what could be done to address the concerns raised. Councillor Ware advised that she had attended a meeting with project officers a couple of months ago and added that clearly the project was underwritten by the funders on the particular basis of tenure and explained that it could not be changed without negotiations and added that she thought those negotiations had not taken yet place.

The Chair, Councillor Beales commented that there was a significant amount of work being carried out on the financial implications of altering the tenure mix and the economic possibilities.

The Monitoring Officer explained that the Cabinet Report had stated that a report on tenure mix was intended to come forward in October 2023 but advised that there was some slippage as what had been identified and that the tenure mix paper would need to be tied in with a financing paper with the companies because whilst we know the financing arrangements this would feed into the tenure mix discussion and that this would now be around January 2024 after the financing decision.

Councillor Ware commented further on the local opposition point. Letters have been written to businesses, residents, etc and added that she was attending a local school meeting to discuss a presentation because there was opposition but she thought the Council could do some good public information on the benefits that will arise for the area which she did not feel had been well presented to date. The Chair, Councillor Beales invited Councillor Ware to discuss this outside of the meeting to remedy the situation.

Councillor Ryves referred to Parkway and the output figures being 65% open market sales units and commented this was a grey area. In response, the Chair, Councillor Beales explained that it remained to be seen but the political objective was to increase the percentage of private rented sector and affordable rented.

Following a further question from Councillor Ryves in that any major changes would require Full Council approval, the Chair, Councillor Beales advised that any major changes would require Full Council approval and advised that preparatory work was being undertaken to put into the democratic process and all Councillors would have the opportunity to comment.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that any major changes would require the approval of Full Council.

Southend Road, Hunstanton

Councillor Parish referred to page 84, Southend Road, Hunstanton for the delivery of 32 flats (open market and affordable units) and that he had been present when the application had been considered several times by the Planning Committee. Councillor Parish explained that at the penultimate Planning Committee he proposed that officers should ensure that the development couldn't be holiday accommodation and ensure that it was offered to local residents. Officers came up with a solution which was proposed at the final Planning Committee where approval was granted. The flats were to be offered to local people and protected from second homes and holiday flats. Cllr Parish said that the minutes were vague which would not determine it but the recording was available and would confirm the decision.

The Monitoring Officer undertook to check the recording of the Planning Committee to clarify the decision and include this in future Project Highlight Reports so that the position was clear. The Chair, Councillor Beales added that within the working environment and the officer team, the definite understanding was that the flats were to be offered first to local residents and the same ambition was also for Florence Fields.

Councillor Blunt concurred with the comments made by Councillor Parish.

Councillor Morley commented that had undertaken a recent site visit with the Chair, Councillor Beales and added that progress had not been made as much as expected. Councillor Morley highlighted the figures set out in the financial summary spend to date in this financial year was £598,761 which was £2,299,283 behind forecast and commented that there had not been as much progress as expected. Councillor Morley added that the comments indicated that there was an issue about the cavity wall risk and that more detail should be explained in the highlight report. In response, the Chair, Councillor Beales suggested that the Board undertook a "deep dive" into Southend Road, Hunstanton project.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects explained that this was an evolving process and the specific queries raised would be discussed with the relevant Project Manager and responses reported back to the next meeting of MMPB.

The Chair, Councillor Beales highlighted the importance of needing a reporting process being place.

Councillor Morley added that when the risk was identified by the Project Manager, commentary should be issued to explain what the issue was and the degree of risk.

Councillor Morley suggested that MMPB could be invited to submit questions in advance of the meeting, upon receipt of the papers, in order that a response could be given at the meeting.

Councillor Ryves asked Councillor Morley what were the financial impacts if the Council moved towards restrictions for purchase of the flats. Councillor Morley explained that the financial assessment had been agreed by the Leader. The Chair, Councillor Beales explained that this was a question he had asked the corporate project officer team and had been informed that officers were not concerned with the impact because there was enough demand for local buyers.

Councillor Moriarty commented that he was not aware of the process in the past but asked if the Chair would be minded to have a sifting session prior to each meeting, which the Chair, Vice Chair and officers would attend and invite in advance of that any deep dives required and also when the Agenda was published, if there were questions be submitted in advance to officers.

The Chair, Councillor Beales suggested that a deep dive of one of the projects be presented to the next meeting either the Guildhall, King's Lynn or Southend Road, Hunstanton and invited comments from the Board or identified at a sifting meeting.

Councillor Blunt commented that his preference was to identify a deep dive project at the end of this agenda item.

Southgate, King's Lynn

Councillor Parish referred to page 93 Southgate and commented on the overall rating – green and referred to a recent article in the local newspaper which had implied that more money was required in order to complete the project and that this might not come forward yet because of increased cost and asked if there was a funding issue. Councillor Kemp explained that her understanding was that the project was funded last year by a £24m levelling up grant which had been awarded against the cost of £26m and added that Norfolk County Council had agreed to provide the remainder of the funding.

Councillor Morley stated that the Southgate had been split into two project reports for Southgate - Master planning and STARS project. Councillor Morley pointed out the highlight report stated that the Department of Transport still had to ratify the funding for the gyratory. In conclusion, Councillor Morley suggested that the Board undertake a deep dive of both Southgate projects.

Following comments on from the Board on the grants received to develop the projects, Councillor Kemp explained that her understanding was that part of that funding, STARS was a wider project which included changing the gyratory around King's Lynn so that was included in the £24m as well as work to the Southgate. Councillor Kemp commented that Members should be aware that the project was not a decongestion scheme and had been said that it could lead to greater queues at various times of the day and that was a worry and therefore the Council should not promote a scheme which could

cause more congestion than at present and this was of great concern and stated she wished it to be put on record.

The Chair, Councillor Beales stated that Southgate would be added to the list of deep dive projects.

Councillor Ryves added that his understanding was that the project included provision of 150 residential units and asked how the units would be funded. In response, the Assistant Director, Property and Projects explained that there were two projects and the road, etc had been the subject of discussion for a number of years. The Board had received an overview of the land assembly acquired including Brownfield site for development and funding available would be considered at a later date. The Manager PMO explained that according to the highlight report, the outputs for the master planning for Southgate included 115 housing units but that it was too early to estimate the cost. The Chair added if the context could be added to the report as it was an important point.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects explained that in addition to the Council's Regeneration Team undertaking the master planning exercise, small slithers of land were being made available to deliver the road infrastructure. The Board was advised that the master plan indicated what the site could accommodate but the costing and viability studies had not been carried out because the road did not currently exist and would be looked at in the future.

Councillor Morley provided an overview his understanding as to why the project had been split into two separate reports.

NORA – Development Spec Units Phase 2

Councillor Morley referred to page 65 and commented that the summary indicated red and the project had been stopped and asked if it affected the other Town Deal projects relating to the Active Travel Hub, etc and asked whether there was a link that meant other projects were also required to be looked at with more scrutiny. In response the Assistant Director, Property and Projects explained that route of Nar Ouse Way and that the Enterprise Zone phase 1 and phase 2 was on the east and the active travel hub was on the west. Phase 1 and 2 were separate from the Active Travel Hub.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects advised that the Council had gone out to tender but had been too high for Phase 2 and was pushed back in the Capital Programme to see if a better price could be obtained in the future.

Councillor Morley asked if the project needed to be revisited to see if was a feasible project. In response, the Assistant Director, Property and Projects explained that road infrastructure had been put in place

into eastern side which open up 38 acres of development land and it was hoped would attract the private sector investment.

The Chair, Councillor Beales added that his understanding was there was no infrastructure impact on the Hub and sought clarification for the next meeting.

The Chief Executive explained that the issue in relation to the spec units phase 2 was a funding issue for that project in that the Council had funding with the new Anglia LEP and with the increases in prices the Council had to go back and there was an issue securing the funding. It was highlighted that there were different issues alongside the rising costs from the Towns Fund project.

In response to questions from Councillor Blunt on the Enterprise Zone infrastructure project impacting on other phases and the South Lynn Surgery, the Assistant Director, Property and Projects explained that there were several projects coming together at the same time and the NHS had a hard time line to deliver the surgery to be open at the end of March 2024 and provided an overview of the reprofiling of the road infrastructure and delays of other projects.

Councillor Kemp stated that in her view the surgery should be listed as a major project and expressed thanks to the Assistant Director, Property and Projects and his team for progress the project.

Riverfront Regeneration Project

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects responded to questions and comments from the Board.

Councillor Morley commented that consideration should be given to undertaking a deep dive on the Riverfront Regeneration Project.

Following questions from the Chair, Councillor Beales on the content of the Regeneration and Development Panel and the link with the deep dive of projects by the MMPB, the Assistant Director, Property and Projects confirmed that update reports on projects could be presented to the Regeneration and Development Panel.

Councillor Dickinson suggested that two deep dives be undertaken at the next meeting.

It was agreed by the Board that deep dives would be undertaken on the Southgate and Southend Road at the next meeting.

RESOLVED: MMPB would undertake a “deep dive” into the following projects and these would be programmed:

- Guildhall, King’s Lynn.
- Southend Road, Hunstanton.

- Riverfront Regeneration.
- Southgate – Master planning and STARS.

13 **WORK PROGRAMME**

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

The following items were identified for the next meeting:

Post Project Evaluation Terms of Reference – NORA 4
Deep Dive – Housing Development, Southend Road, Hunstanton
Deep Dive – Southgate, King's Lynn
Update on the Guildhall, King's Lynn focussing on the new CIO and plans of the Trustees

The items listed below were identified for a future meeting:

Deep Dive – Guildhall Project
Deep Dive - Riverfront Regeneration Project

14 **FOR INFORMATION: MINUTES FROM THE OFFICER MAJOR PROJECTS BOARD MEETINGS**

West Winch Growth Area – 16 August 2023

In response to questions from Councillor Ryves on the risks relating to West Winch from the Officer Project Board Meeting, Councillor Moriarty advised that he received regular updates from the Project Officer.

The Manager, PMO explained that there was one emerging risk identified at the 16 August meeting but subsequent to the meeting it was reported by the Project Officer that there was no change as set out in the highlight report at the end of July 2023.

15 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

13 December 2023, at 11 am in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, King's Lynn.

The meeting closed at 11.56 am