

## **Environment, Development and Transport Committee**

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, 16 September 2016  
at 10am in the Edwards room at County Hall**

**Present:**

Mr M Wilby - Chair	
Mr R Bird	Mr C Foulger
Mr A Boswell	Mr B Iles
Ms C Bowes	Mr T Jermy
Mr B Bremner	Mrs J Leggett
Mr J Childs	Mr G Plant
Mr S Clancy	Mr G Timewell
Mrs M Dewsbury	Mrs C Walker
Mr T East	Mr A White

**1. Apologies and Substitutions**

1.1 None

**2. Minutes**

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 08 July 2016 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

2.2 It was confirmed that information and a contact number for advice on removing an unauthorised encampment had been published on the Norfolk County Council website.

**3. Members to Declare any Interests**

3.1 None declared.

**4. Urgent Business**

4.1 No items of urgent business were considered.

## **5. Public Questions**

- 5.1 Nine public questions were received and the answers circulated at the meeting. (See appendix A.)
- 5.2.1 The Chairman agreed for Councillors Goodman and Spratt to ask a supplementary question on behalf of Mrs Baker in her absence, as representatives of Dickleburgh and Rushall Parish Council.
- 5.2.2 Councillor Goodman understood that the 584 BorderHoppa was a private club scheme which only paid members were entitled to use, and discussed the difficulties associated with pre-paying and pre-booking for some constituents. (See appendix B for Councillor Goodman's supplementary question)
- 5.2.3 The Assistant Director for Highways and Transport agreed to provide Councillor Goodman with a written response. She assured the Committee and Councillors Spratt and Goodman that public transport in rural areas was invested in, however, services were required to meet the bulk flow of passengers because of budget constraints. Discussion was held over the benefits of community bus services for rural areas, such as their flexibility, with recognition of the issues raised.
- 5.3.1 Mr Clarke, supported by Councillor Bearman as representative for his area, highlighted the cost overruns of the Norwich Distributor Road. He noted the response to his question and referred to his FOI (Freedom of Information) request.
- 5.3.2 Mr Clarke supplementary question: had the appropriate notice referenced in the FOI request now been put in to the European Union publications office regarding the additional costs?
- 5.3.3 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services clarified that the council had complied with all procurement regulations.
- 5.4.1 Mr Raab supplementary question: What are the future plans for waste disposal contracts in Norfolk when the existing contracts had ended and what will happen to the waste?
- 5.4.2 It was clarified that there was, at that time, a four year contract in place; before the end of that contract, Norfolk County Council would work with the Waste Advisory Group and the Waste Partnership to discuss proposals for future contracts and plans for waste disposal. No decisions had been made at that time regarding plans for the future contracts regarding waste disposal for Norfolk.
- 5.4.3 Mr Raab also asked about Norfolk's waste being incinerated in Suffolk. It was clarified that waste disposal contracts in place at that time had been agreed by the Council as an interim measure.

## **6. Member Questions**

- 6.1 None were received.

**7. Verbal update or feedback from Members of the Committee regarding Member Working Groups or bodies that they sit on.**

- 7.1.1 Mr East introduced a written update on the Norwich Western Link Project Member Working Group update, attached at appendix C.
- 7.1.2 Mr East asked for the recommendation that Councillor James Joyce be elected onto the working group to be endorsed.
- 7.1.3 The Principal Infrastructure Growth Planner confirmed that the Waste Advisory Group had not agreed their meeting date, but it was hoped to be in November.
- 7.2 The Committee **AGREED** to **ENDORSE** the appointment of Councillor Joyce onto the Norwich Western Link Project member working group.

**8. Appointments to Outside Bodies – Broads Authority**

- 8.1.1 Members were asked to consider appointing a replacement for Councillor Garrod as one of the Council representatives on the Broads Authority, since Councillor Garrod was unable to take up the appointment.
- 8.1.2 Mr B Iles and Mr N Dixon were proposed and seconded for the appointment.
- 8.2.1 With 9 votes for Mr Iles and 7 votes for Mr Dixon:
  - The Committee **AGREED TO APPOINT** Mr B Iles as a Council representative on the Broads Authority.

**9. Update from Economic Development Sub-Committee**

- 9.1 Members **NOTED** the report by the Acting Assistant Director of Economic Development & Strategy, giving an update on the issues and actions discussed in the Economic Development Sub-Committee meeting held on the 14 July 2016.
- 9.2 Mr Clancy, Chairman of the Economic Development Sub-Committee, **agreed** to find out information on the number of apprentices who completed their placements.

**10. Feasibility of changes to the use of the B1111 Garboldisham – Roudham by HGV traffic**

- 10.1 The Committee received the report by the Team Manager for Network Management (Analysis and Safety) showing a review of options to help reduce numbers of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) on the B1111 in East Harling.
- 10.1.2 Councillors Askew and Edge spoke as representatives for Harling Parish Council. They confirmed that the parish council supported the recommendations and recognised that a total ban of HGVs was not feasible.

10.2.1 During discussion the following points were raised:

10.2.2 The amount of km diverted, impact of the proposed changes on increasing HGV mileage and carbon footprint and the possible additional costs for HGV companies were noted and discussed.

**# It was agreed that this minute be amended and was corrected at the Committee meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016. Please view the minutes of that meeting in order to note the correction made. #**

10.2.3 #Discussion was held over the potential impact on other areas of the County and possible safety mitigation measures which may be needed in these areas. #

10.2.4 The Team Manager for Network Management (Analysis and Safety) clarified that changes could be put in place as an experimental traffic order so that risks could be monitored; a further report would then be brought to Committee for further recommendations to be made for example regarding risk mitigation measures.

10.3.1 Discussion was held regarding the changes proposed for Southery:

10.3.2 Cllr Martin Storey, representative from Southery Parish Council, spoke to the Committee of the agricultural businesses in the area, such as British Sugar, rurality and quality of roads and their effects on road safety and traffic flow, and the next steps he felt needed to address these such as a meeting of all concerned parties. He also called for a 20mph speed outside Southery Academy.

10.3.3 Some members queried whether, in order to address concerns posed by HGVs in the village, a bypass may be needed to meet both business and resident needs.

10.4.1 With 14 votes for 2 votes against and 1 abstention, the Committee **AGREED:**

- That an environmental weight restriction be approved for implementation with an experimental traffic regulation order;

- The cost to implement an experimental order was expected to be around £90,000 which officers should seek to fund from the revenue budget for highway improvements;

- That Option 6 was recommended as the most practical way of balancing concerns of local residents with businesses and other potentially affected communities;

- The B1111 not be re-classified as this approach could be disproportionate and may not be effective in significantly reducing levels of HGVs;

10.4.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to **AGREE:**

- That following the responses received to the informal consultation on a part-time weight restriction through Southery, officers should undertake further consultations on alternatives to the currently proposed options;

- Consideration of any further changes to HGV routes in Norfolk should follow the criteria set out in Section 4 of the report;

10.4.3 The Committee **AGREED**:

- That officers investigate the possibility of a 20mph limit outside Southery Academy as soon as possible.

**11. Ash Die Back (Chalara) – Management of Norfolk County Council estate**

- 11.1 The Committee **NOTED** the report by the Head of Environment giving information on the impact of Ash Die Back (Chalara) and the risks to Norfolk's public safety, economy and environment.
- 11.2.1 The Assistant Director of Highways and the Transport and the Senior Arboricultural and Woodland Officer introduced the report and requested Members' support with conversations and engagement with land owners.
- 11.2.2 Seeking funding from the Department for Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) to support with the costs involved in addressing Ash Dieback in Norfolk, such as felling trees, replanting and liaising with landowners, was discussed.
- 11.2.3 The Senior Arboricultural and Woodland Officer clarified that burning wood from infected trees does not spread Ash Dieback and they were considering leaving felled wood for residents to take to save on disposal costs; the possible revenue from sale of wood from felled trees was highlighted.
- 11.2.4 The Assistant Director of Highways and Transport clarified that Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) remained in place for trees suffering from Ash Dieback, however, trees could be exempt from the TPO regulations if proven that they had Ash Dieback to a level which posed a danger; this equated to more than 75% dieback. Defra had been lobbied about relaxing the rules around TPOs for Ash trees which were dead, diseased or dying.
- 11.2.5 It was clarified that the responsibility for maintaining trees on land leased by Norfolk County Council was dependant on the clauses within the tenancy agreement which usually stated the tenant as responsible.
- 11.2.6 The Assistant Director of Highways and Transport planned to bring together departments and raise the report through Policy and Resources Committee to highlight the responsibilities of all departments regarding monitoring and maintenance of this issue.
- 11.2.7 The communications team would be setting up a webpage giving information about ash dieback, including preventing its spread. Articles about the disease and current research had been published in the EDP.
- 11.2.8 A concern was raised over the possible costs of dealing with Ash Dieback based on those experienced by other counties shown in the report. The Assistant Director of Highways and Transport confirmed that she would bring information to the Committee and to the Policy and Resources Committee when a more detailed forecast was known (see paragraph 18.2); the cost incurred by other local authorities had been included as a point of reference.

- 11.2.9 Mr Plant proposed a change to recommendations 3 & 4 seconded by Mr Clancy:
- Recommendation 3 to read: **we would request** financial support from Defra... and;
  - Recommendation 4 to read: **instruct officers to** engage with landowners...
- 11.2.10 The Environment and Planning team were working closely with the John Innes Centre (JIC) and UEA; the JIC were researching the genes responsible for resistance and hoped to develop a device that would enable rapid identification of disease tolerant trees by testing the leaves in situ, without having to remove them from the tree.
- 11.3.1 Extra costs regarding Ash Dieback would be put into a budget to be brought back to the Committee at a future meeting (see paragraph 18.2).
- 11.3.2 The Committee **AGREED**:
- The suggested approach to work in collaboration with the Policy and Resources Committee to deal with the council-wide responsibilities for public safety and property;
  - That the Council would request financial support from Defra;
  - To instruct officers to engage with landowners where their trees would affect Norfolk County Council (e.g. Trees next to roads) to reduce the resource implications for Norfolk County Council and streamlining the procedure to charge landowners if we had to undertake work on their behalf;

## **12. An update on Air Quality Management for Norwich City**

- 12.1 The Committee received the report by the Norwich Area Transport Strategy / City Agency Manager giving information on the Norwich Air Quality Action plan and responses to issues raised in the Environment, Development and Transport Committee meeting on 8 July 2016.
- 12.2.1 A member gave background to this report and on the County Council's responsibility to reduce air pollution to within the "legal Air Quality limits" outlined on page 22 of the appended Norwich Air Quality Action plan; these were taken from the EU Ambient Air Quality Directive:
- Following a Supreme Court Case in April 2015 regarding the Government's progress towards meeting these legal Air Quality limits, a further legal challenge was brought in 2016 on the grounds that the Government had failed to produce a plan which met compliance with the legal Air Quality limits, which was due to be heard in the High Court in October 2016.
  - There were areas in Norwich known to be in breach of the legal Air Quality limits.
  - The member suggested that more action should be taken, as Central Government were likely to transfer responsibility for delivering results in meeting these limits onto Local Authorities, which may have a financial or other impact on Norfolk County Council.
- 12.2.2 Discussion was held over the level of traffic in Norwich City Centre and the

associated difficulties in addressing air quality. During a twinning visit to Germany, a member had the opportunity to see examples of technology which could support air quality improvements, such as Hydrogen fuelled buses.

12.2.3 Members queried which other areas of Norfolk were areas of concern for air quality.

12.3 The Committee **NOTED** the report and appendices.

12.4 Mr T Jermy left the meeting at 11.53

### **13. Opportunities to increase commercial activity for the highways service**

13.1 The Committee **considered** the report by the Head of Highways outlining potential business model options for the delivery of highway services.

13.2 Mr A White declared an “other interest” that he uses the highways laboratory, mentioned in the report.

13.3.1 It was confirmed that the estimated net profit figures would be included in the business case when drawn up.

13.3.2 The Head of Highways agreed to provide a definition of “Section 95 LG Act 2003” referenced on page 147.

13.4 Mr B Bremner left the meeting at 11.58

13.5 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:

- Instruct Officers to develop a Business Case for presentation to Environment, Development and Transport Committee within 12 months to help inform the potential for a more commercial trading organisation.

### **14. Finance Monitoring**

14.1 The Committee received the report by the Finance Business Partner for Community and Environmental Services giving information on the budget position for the year 2016-17.

14.2.1 The Assistant Director for Highways and Transport clarified that the potential increased costs related to the Norwich Distributor Road highlighted areas at risk of additional cost. Further information on costs would be brought to future meetings.

14.2.2 A briefing on the incentives to help reduce costs, within the contracts related to the construction of the Norwich Distributor Road was requested for the meeting on 14 October 2016. (See paragraph 18.2)

14.3 The Committee **NOTED** the forecast out-turn position for the Environment Development and Transport Committee and the current risks to the budget as highlighted in the report.

## **15. Performance Management**

- 15.1 The Committee **reviewed** and **NOTED** the performance management report by the Senior Analyst and the vital signs report cards.

## **16. Risk Management**

- 16.1 The Committee received and **NOTED** the report by the Chief Internal Auditor providing information from the latest Environment, Development and Transport Committee risk register as at the beginning of June 2016 and **reviewed** the risk data, information, and analysis presented in the report.
- 16.2 The Committee **CONSIDERED**:
- The progress with Risk Management since the last Environment Development and Transport Committee meeting;
  - The changes to exceptions risks and other departmental risks;

## **17. Decisions taken under delegated authority**

- 17.1 The Committee received and **NOTED** the report by the Business Support & Development Manager for Community and Environmental Services, setting out relevant decisions taken under delegated powers by the Executive Director within the Terms of Reference of the Committee between the 8 July and 31 August 2016.

## **18. Forward Plan**

- 18.1 The Committee **reviewed** and **NOTED** the Forward plan for the Environment, Development and Transport Committee.
- 18.2 The following were requested during discussion at the meeting:
- Extra costs regarding Ash Dieback would be put into a budget and brought back to the Committee at a future meeting (See paragraphs 11.3.1 and 11.2.8)
  - A briefing on the incentives to help reduce costs within the contracts related to the construction of the Norwich Distributor Road was requested for the meeting on 14 October 2016. (See paragraph 14.2.2)

The meeting closed at 12:10pm

**Chairman**



**PUBLIC QUESTIONS TO ENVIRONMENT, DEVELOPMENT AND  
TRANSPORT COMMITTEE: FRIDAY 16 SEPTEMBER 2016**

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

**5.1 Question from Suzanne Jones**

Why are we continuing to tolerate illegal levels of air pollution in our city centre?

**Response by Chairman of EDT Committee**

An Air Quality Action Plan is in place resulting from the declaration of the AQMA in central Norwich following the continued exceedance of the annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>).

Included in the report is a table that outlines measures and strategies that have been deployed over the last ten years that have improved air quality. The report also highlights future measures which will ease congestion and improve air quality.

**5.2 Question from Andrew Cawdron**

It is only nine months since an extra £29.9 Million was authorised for expenditure on the NNDR and a year since an extra £1.0M was noted for design development on the bridges. How is it that an extra £2.3 M is now requested for the Rackheath Rail and Road crossings and could the breakdown of this be provided for delay, design development and supervision? This is an extraordinary amount of extra public funding required for a section of works that should have been properly budgeted for previously.

**Response by Chairman of EDT Committee**

The potential additional costs of up to £2.3m are a direct result of a change to the construction methodology required by Network Rail. Until we have concluded negotiations the breakdown is not available.

**5.3 Question from Cllr Denise Carlo**

The Council Report on 2 September reported an increase of £1m in land costs from £16.2m to £17.2m. At this point £1.7m of these costs had been expended, which means that further costs of £15.5m were expected. It is presumed that the budget reported to the Council in September was at current indexation. Knight Frank's indices for 4Q/2015, 1Q/2016 and 2Q/2016 indicate that land prices fell by 6.4%. The £3m now reported is a 20% in less than a year increase rather than a 6.4% reduction. Please detail how this extra is calculated.

**Response by Chairman of EDT Committee**

The potential additional costs for final land value will be established once negotiations are complete. It would be premature to speculate on any assumed percentage change.

### 5.4 Question from Tony Clarke

In a written response to my FOI request (11 December 2015) about the cost overrun on the NDR contract Norfolk County Council Stated that "... no notice was given to the EU publications office regarding the additional costs to the contract." As this notice is required under the Public Contracts Regulations 2015, please explain why the Regulations were not complied with.

#### *Background*

*The Public Contracts Regulations 2015, 72 states that contracts may be modified subject to a number of conditions and under (3) "Contracting authorities which have modified a contract ... shall send a notice to that effect, in accordance with regulation 51, for publication." The next paragraph states (4) Such a notice shall contain the information set out in part G of Annex 5 to the Public Contracts Directive. Part G, paras 4, 5, 6 require a detailed breakdown of the additional costs and the circumstances which rendered necessary the modification.*

#### **Response by Chairman of EDT Committee**

The Council has complied with all procurement regulations.

### 5.5 Question from Sandra Bogelein

What is the latest overall cost of the scheme, including money expended prior to 2011/12 for which outside funding is not being provided, financing costs and an estimate of costs payable under the land Compensation Act over the 6 year period following completion?

#### **Response by Chairman of EDT Committee**

Scheme costs for the NDR up to and including 2011/12 amount to £12.7m. The project budget from beyond this date is £178.95. The report before Members today identifies potential additional costs of up to £6.8m.

### 5.6 Question from Cllr Simeon Jackson

The increase is stated as £1.25m for "additional excavation, fill and compaction" (point 3.8 on p158 of the reports). Does this mean that the detailed site survey required extra depths because of unsuitable sub-base material or a general adjustment to the cut and fill assumptions?

#### **Response by Chairman of EDT Committee**

Detailed survey work was not possible to complete before full site access was available, resulting in the additional works described.

### 5.6a Supplementary question from Cllr Simeon Jackson

I understand that there is a cost sharing for extras and savings in the contract with Balfour Beatty. Will this contract extra be reduced for Balfour Beatty's contribution?

### **Response by Chairman of EDT Committee**

Yes, under this form of contract, the out-turn financial risks are shared between Norfolk County Council (the Employer) and Balfour Beatty (the Contractor) in an agreed proportion. At this stage, negotiations are ongoing any further comment could prejudice the outcome of these negotiations.

### **5.7 Question from Bryan Robinson**

*The committee is discussing the further reported increases of £6.8m above the £178.95 approved cost.*

The Council report on 2 September 2015 noted a figure of £19.75m for Preparation, Risk and Contingencies. What is the allowance for Risk and Contingencies in this figure and on what has it already been expended to result in the reported costs being a net extra to the budget?

### **Response by Chairman of EDT Committee**

The Risk and Contingency allowance figure is £5.02m for this project and has been allocated against a number risks and variations. The potential additional costs are a net extra to the budget.

### **5.8 Question from Ann Baker**

During the summer months the Parish Council has been contacted by residents regarding the 'Simmonds 584 Bus Service,' which has been contracted to another company with devastating implications.

The question therefore is:

"Dickleburgh & Rushall are within the catchment area of Church Hill Surgery, Pulham Market. When the Surgery was closed the importance of public transport was made clear, the bus service providing the only way for the vulnerable, the elderly and anyone without a car to reach the Surgery.

The awarding of the service and reduction in service by a new bus company, is preventing those most in need reaching the Doctors Surgery.

There are no alternate options, what do the EDT propose to do for those residents of Dickleburgh & Rushall who are unable to reach their Doctor?"

### **Response by Chairman of EDT Committee**

NCC fully subsidise the 584 service. In the past Simonds have operated it. When this contract ended, a new contract was awarded to Semmence starting this September. The new service maximises vehicle resource and has a reduced frequency that reflects previous usage and is (and was previously) focussed on accessing Diss. It also now provides for the Diss Town service, so passengers have options to travel to and around Diss.

It is always difficult to have a scheduled bus route that covers all options, especially where demand is very low and therefore unsustainable. In this case, all passengers from the villages mentioned are able to access the surgery in Diss, as the new service operates to the Health Centre at times

suitable for people if they need appointments. Concessionary fares are valid.

It is correct that the 584 does not now give options to Dickleburgh surgery itself, but there is transport provision supplied by BorderHoppa Community Transport scheme. This is supported by the Council and they are based in Rushall. Passengers can book in advance from the village to the surgery. There is a membership fee and a fare, as concessionary passes are not valid on this service, but it does provide for these essential journeys. (please contact 01379 854800 or go to [borderhoppa.org](http://borderhoppa.org)).

### **5.9 Question from Mr Robert Raab**

Now that Norfolk's County Council is Against Burning Norfolk's Non-Recyclable Waste, How will the Norfolk's County Council be getting Rid of Norfolk's Non – Recyclable Waste after the Contract of Sending Norfolk's Non – Recyclable Waste to the Suffolk's Incinerator comes to an End ?”

#### **Response by Chairman of EDT Committee**

The County Council has two waste policies that are most relevant to this question. Firstly, that

‘Any proposed waste treatment facility in Norfolk will reduce dependency on landfill and must be further up the waste hierarchy than incineration’ and secondly that

‘Incineration of waste or fuel derived from waste is accepted outside Norfolk and any such arrangements should be reviewed by Committee on an annual basis’.

The agreement with Suffolk County Council for dealing with part of Norfolk's waste, is not at odds with Norfolk County Council's approach to dealing with left over rubbish. It should also be noted that this arrangement only meets around 20% of our requirements. The other left over waste is treated via three contracts with different companies that are in place to 2020 and can be extended to 2021.

In terms of establishing a longer term approach this Committee, at its meeting on 08 July this year, recognised that the authorities in the Norfolk Waste Partnership responsible for collecting waste were in a process of evaluating alternative approaches to delivering waste services that are capable of improving recycling and reducing costs. Recognising that this could affect how much left over rubbish we have and what its composition is this Committee at the same meeting decided that the County Council's approach to its longer term residual waste services, ie beyond 2020, should be established after the direction of services provided by the Norfolk Waste Partnership is clear.

Supplementary question for:

NCC Environment, Development and Transport committee

Edwards Room 10.00 pm Friday 16<sup>th</sup> September 2016

Regarding the 584 bus service.

Andrew Goodman – Dickleburgh and Rushal Parish Council

The changing of a simple thing like a bus timetable may appear, on the face of it, nothing much. After all, we are informed, there was monitoring research and the conclusion drawn, was that there was not sufficient journey time demanded.

The bus service will therefore be provided for workers and school students at the start and the end of the day. Provided they can access the new reduced route.

And significantly the planners, the NCC employees, employed and paid for by the people of Norfolk, town and village, rich and poor alike have had the foresight to lay down the tender to last for 5 years. Their research must therefore obviously have taken into account the changing demographic of South Norfolk over the next 5 years and critically the rural poor for it is them that are ~~paying~~ the price. Not just for the salaries of those creating the tender and ~~excluding them from the~~ service but also they are the ones paying the cost of the failure to ~~take~~ into account their needs and ability to access their local GP.

Will the committee agree that rural poverty and the needs of the rural elderly are a concern that supersedes this policy. It is unacceptable to not take these basic factors into account when considering rural communication and transportation systems and creating tenders. Will the committee resolve to remedy this situation immediately before we have more poor and old isolated in their homes because a basic right of transport, that is held as universal in most parts of this country is denied them with all the consequences that that entails.

Currently there are plans on the table for around 50 additional homes in Dickleburgh. Quite clearly this will only exacerbate the problem. It does not need to happen

## **Norwich Western Link Project – Member Working Group update (16 September 2016)**

Further to previous meetings of the Norwich Western Link Project Member Working Group and the report provided at the 8 July 2016 EDT Committee meeting, the Member Group met again on 14 September. The following provides a brief summary of the meeting:

1. A request was received from Weston Longville Parish Council seeking representation of their local member (Cllr James Joyce) on the Member Group. It was therefore discussed, proposed and agreed at the meeting that Cllr James Joyce be co-opted onto the Group. However, a change to the group needs to be formally agreed by Committee and the Chair of the Member Group (Cllr Tim East) agreed to make this request at the 16 September EDT committee meeting.
2. Since the 8 July Committee report, approved by EDT Committee, an update on the next phases of work in delivering the project was provided for the Member Group. This was a summary of the activities to be undertaken in the 6 month sections as set out in the Committee Report. One of the early stages of work being developed is a meeting with each of the communities most affected by the project. The Member Group asked for a clear terms of reference to be developed for the proposed stakeholder group.
3. Whilst an overview of activities to be undertaken in the next year was provided, it was also agreed that for the next meeting of the Group a more detailed delivery programme for the entire project will be developed, taking into account key milestones, such as the opening of the NDR, the progression of the A47 Easton to North Tuddenham dualling, the proposed Food Hub development and the Local Plan review.
4. Stephen Scowen from Broadland District Council (BDC) joined the meeting to provide an update on the Food Hub proposals and the associated proposed Local Development Order (LDO) that is being progressed by BDC. It was confirmed that a report on the LDO will be taken as soon as possible to the BDC Cabinet, hopefully towards the end of October, setting out the next steps and seeking approval to proceed. It was agreed that Stephen will attend the next meeting of the Group to provide a further update on progress.
5. An update was provided on the latest position that Highways England consultants have reached in developing the Easton to North Tuddenham A47 dualling project. They are continuing to refine 3 or 4 main options that will be developed further and taken forward for formal consultation possibly now before the end of 2016. Their programme still remains that they are hoping to start construction early in 2020 following conclusion of the necessary statutory processes. The Member Group have asked officers to ensure there remains ongoing dialogue and input to the Highways England project proposals as they develop and the Group also asked that efforts are made to reinforce the need to deliver that scheme as soon as possible.

For more details, please contact David Allfrey (Major Projects Manager).  
Tel 01603 223292