

Environment, Development and Transport Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, 15 September 2017
at 10am in the Edwards Room, County Hall**

Present:

Mr M Wilby - Chair	
Mr M Castle	Mr C Foulger
Mr S Clancy (Vice-Chairman)	Mr A Grant
Ms E Corlett	Mr T Jermy
Mr P Duigan	Ms J Oliver
Mr T East	Mr T Smith
Mr S Eyre	Mr A White

1. Apologies and Substitutions

1.1 Apologies were received from Mr Chris Jones (Ms E Corlett substituting).

2. Minutes

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2017 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

3. Members to Declare any Interests

3.1 No interests were declared.

4. Urgent Business

4.1 No urgent business was discussed.

5. Public Questions

5.1 One public question was received from Mr MJ Ray; see appendix A.

6. Member Questions

6.1 One member question was received from Mr A Grant; see appendix A.

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

7.1 Mr M Castle updated the Committee from discussions held at recent briefings of the

Regional Coastal Committee; Mr Castle proposed that the reference group continue as a means to discuss and raise issues as they arose. The Chairman **agreed** with this proposal; the Committee **AGREED** to continue the Regional Coastal Reference Group.

7.2 A written update was circulated from the Norwich Western Link Member Working Group; see appendix B.

7.3 A written update was circulated from the NDR (Northern Distributor Road) Member Working Group; see appendix C. Mr C Foulger updated the Committee that a 4x4 trip around the route and a plan of the NDR had been arranged. The Committee **AGREED** the terms of reference for the NDR Member Group.

8. Proposed Internal Procedures for responding to Consultations on planning applications potentially requiring infrastructure as set out in the County Council's Planning Obligations Standards

8.1 The committee received the report outlining proposed internal procedures for responding to consultations on planning applications where there may be a requirement to secure funding for County Council Infrastructure.

8.2.1 Mr T East suggested that under evidence it would be beneficial to refer to "health provision", to acknowledge the pressure on GP surgeries and other health provision.

8.2.2 It was clarified that the Norfolk strategic framework referred to a series of frameworks including a "planning for health protocol" to engage the health community more thoroughly in the planning process.

8.2.3 The inclusion of the role of local members in the framework was noted.

8.3 The Committee **AGREED** the Internal Procedures attached to the report.

9. Hornsea Project Three Windfarm Consultation

9.1.1 The Committee discussed the report providing information on the pre-application consultation by DONG Energy for the proposal of an offshore windfarm and onshore ancillary grid connection infrastructure in Norfolk to be determined by the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.

9.1.2 The Principal Infrastructure and Economic Growth Planner pointed out that, due to the distance from shore, the turbines would not be seen, however land-based infrastructure and construction would impact on Norfolk, such as substations.

9.2.1 Cllr Butikofer had sent her views on the consultation; as local member for Holt she hoped the views of local residents would be taken into account. Weyborne had infrastructure for 2 windfarms already. She highlighted the time span for construction and the impact of this on residents and local businesses. At the recent meeting in Cromer, DONG Energy had indicated the Windfarms were unlikely to bring local jobs. Most were likely to be in their Humber base except for short term construction phase jobs. She also raised concerns over the impact on transport in the area.

9.2.2 The Principal Infrastructure and Economic Growth Planner responded that an

ecologist had been negotiating with DONG Energy regarding mitigating impact on local areas, and acknowledged the ongoing issues related to transport which would continue to be looked at. He **agreed** that the response to DONG Energy would include asking them to consider compensation for businesses due to the scale and timescales of construction and the impact this was likely to have on them.

- 9.2.3 The importance of wind energy to Norfolk's economy and the environment was noted, and that there may be scope for jobs in fabrication of turbines. It was suggested that local employment in the industry may take time due to the need for training and education.
- 9.2.4 The Vice-Chairman suggested the response asked DONG Energy to look into options for good quality compensation schemes including how communities could benefit from local community funding. The Principal Infrastructure and Economic Growth Planner **agreed** to include this in the Council's response to DONG Energy.
- 9.2.5 It was suggested that DONG Energy be asked to cover the cost of moving cables if this was ever needed for infrastructure such as road building in the future. The Principal Infrastructure and Economic Growth Planner **agreed** to include this in the Council's response to DONG Energy.
- 9.2.6 A discussion was held over the impact on the pipeline if fracking was ever considered in North Norfolk. It was indicated that due to the depth of fracking compared to cables there was unlikely to be an impact. It was reported that preliminary investigatory work in North Norfolk had found no gas, and the closest place identified as suitable for fracking had been North West Lincolnshire.
- 9.3 The Committee:
 - (1) **AGREED** that the County Council support the principle of the offshore renewable energy proposal, which was consistent with national renewable energy targets and objectives, subject to the detailed comments raised in the report being resolved with the applicant;
 - (2) **ENDORSED** the detailed comments set out in the report and Appendix A to be forwarded onto DONG Energy.

10. Recommendations of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) Board

- 10.1.1 The Committee received the report on progress of the production of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) and recommendations from the GNDP.
- 10.1.2 The Principal Planner updated the Committee that Government had released their proposed methodology on housing numbers for Local Authorities; preliminary estimates suggested that house building requirements may go up for Greater Norwich and down for Great Yarmouth.
- 10.1.3 The programme detailed in the report for 21 September had been postponed.
- 10.2.1 Ms Corlett queried the levels of social and affordable housing in the numbers shown in the report. The Principal Planner clarified that affordable housing requirements were calculated using a SHMA (Strategic Housing Market Assessment) and were in the high 20%. While developing the Housing Policies it was necessary to consider the impact on viability of sites of delivering the calculated amount of affordable

housing. The Principal Planner agreed to send more information to Ms Corlett.

10.3 The Committee **AGREED** to:

- **NOTE** progress on the production of the Greater Norwich Local Plan;
- **ENDORSE** the GNDP Board's recommendations on housing provision and strategy options to help shape public consultation.

11. Recommendations of the Norfolk Duty to Cooperate Member Forum

11.1 The Committee received the report providing information on the draft Norfolk Strategic Framework and the work of the Duty to Cooperate Member Forum.

11.2.1 Concerns were raised on behalf of Dereham Town Council; they were concerned about the lack of inclusion of Dereham due to the amount of housing development there and need for more employment in the area. The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services reported that the Local Enterprise Partnership Economic Strategy would be considered at the next meeting of Policy and Resources Committee and then by full council; this report would recommend that the 3 big population centres of Kings Lynn, Norwich and Great Yarmouth and the 2 strategic transport routes, the A11 and A47 and settlements along them, were considered in terms of employment development.

11.2.2 Mr East suggested that the statement on page 53 of the report: "should clarify what was meant by 'protection and maintaining the Wensum, Coast, Brecks and the Broads'" should also include "tributaries on the Wensum".

11.3 The Committee **AGREED** to welcome and support the production of the Framework document and support the Vision, Objectives and the Agreements it contains, subject to further consideration of the comments in Appendix 1 of the report.

12. Highway Asset Performance Report

12.1.1 The Committee discussed the report highlighting performance of the highway asset against current service level priorities, based on previous Member decisions, and covering planned capital structural maintenance of the assets.

12.1.2 The Assistant Director of Highways clarified that the asset backlog was referenced against the 2007 backlog.

12.1.3 Following a risk assessment it had been identified that the frequency of highways inspections could be changed from 4 to 6 weeks, bringing an efficiency saving.

12.2.1 It was hoped the increased money put into Public Rights of Way (PROW) and staffing changes, such as a dedicated officer for PROW in area offices and strategic trails function carried out centrally, would help increase public satisfaction for PROW.

12.2.2 It was **requested** that reviewing the data from the next satisfaction survey be built into the forward plan to identify what further could be done to improve.

12.2.3 A discussion was held over trading and advertising on highways and enforcement of the protocol. Members discussed issues experienced in their constituency areas related to this. It was **AGREED** that a report be brought back to a future meeting.

12.3 The Committee:

1) **NOTED:**

a) Progress against the Asset Management Strategy Performance framework and the continuation of the current strategy and targets;

2) **REVIEWED** and **APPROVED:**

a) The proposed adoption of the Recommendations in Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure a Code of Practice

b) An improvement plan to prepare for the introduction of the Code

c) The Asset Management Framework

d) Frequency of highway safety inspections

13. Forward Plan and Decisions Taken under delegated Authority

13.1 The Committee received the Forward plan and considered the delegated decisions taken by Officers.

13.2 A report on great Yarmouth transportation in light of infrastructure changes was suggested; the interim Team Leader for Transport clarified that a comprehensive study had been carried out as part of the business case for the 3rd river crossing and resourcing to support this was currently being looked into.

13.3 The Committee:

- **REVIEWED** the Forward Plan at Appendix A of the report;
- **REQUESTED** that reports on the following would be put onto the forward plan:
 - a) reviewing data from the next NHT (National Highways and Transport) public satisfaction survey to identify further improvements;
 - b) trading and advertising on highways and enforcement of the protocol;
- **NOTED** the delegated decisions set out in section 1.2 of the report.

14. Finance Monitoring

14.1 The Committee considered the report providing information on the budget position for services reporting to the Committee for 2017-18, revenue budget including forecast over or underspends and identified budget risks, and an update on the forecast use of reserves and details of the capital programme.

14.2 The Committee **NOTED:**

a) The forecast out-turn position for the Environment, Development and Transport Committee.

b) The capital programme for this Committee.

c) The current planned use of the reserves and the forecast balance of reserves as at the end of March 2018.

15. Major Infrastructure Improvements

15.1 The Committee received the report providing an update on progress to date for the three priority infrastructure projects being undertaken by the County Council, the Great Yarmouth 3rd River Crossing, Norwich Western Link (NWL) and Long Stratton Bypass.

- 15.2.1 The risk of a more expensive option being found to be the most preferred during consultation was raised; the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services pointed out that the key issue for consideration was value for money for the public and that the consultation would inform the planning application.
- 15.2.2 The percentage of building work costs for the long Stratton bypass from private contributions and public funds was queried. The Major Projects Manager clarified that further work was needed to see what the Council's contributions would be.
- 15.2.3 The Major Projects Manager confirmed there was a limit in the Long Stratton Area Action Plan setting out how many houses could be built in the village.
- 15.2.4 The Chairman thanked the Committee for their commitment to infrastructure.
- 15.2.5 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services made reference to point 2.9 of the report about a bid being made to the Department of Transport to make changes to Hempnall junction. It was hoped the outcome of the bid would be known by the end of October 2017.
- 15.3 The Committee:
- **NOTED** and commented on the progress of the infrastructure projects provided in the report;
 - **NOTED** the decision made regarding the continuation of the Great Yarmouth 3rd River Crossing project at risk ahead of confirmation of funding by Department of Transport as set out in Appendix B to the report.

16. Transport for Norwich (TfN) and Northern Distributor Road (NDR) update report

- 16.1 The Committee discussed the report giving an update on progress towards delivering the Transport for Norwich programme of works since the update given in July 2016.
- 16.2.1 It was noted that if the route was opened in stages publicity and signage would be put in place to identify the routes available.
- 16.2.2 A concern was raised over pedestrian visibility at the pedestrian crossings during the construction of cycle improvement works on Newmarket Road. This will be followed up by the Transport for Norwich / City Agency Manager.
- 16.2.3 Ms Corlett queried why no money had been set aside for secure cycle storage along the route particularly in social housing. The Transport for Norwich / City Agency Manager clarified that funding for cycle parking had been included in the overall bid, but was provisionally planned for places with the most demand for cycle parking such as Norwich. He added there may be an opportunity to look for other areas of secure cycle storage along cycle routes and asked for feedback.
- 16.2.4 The Transport for Norwich / City Agency Manager clarified that the Sustainable Travel Transition Fund had guidelines for where funding was directed which was primarily areas of housing and jobs growth and therefore there were restrictions on where it could be used. The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services had been working with the Member Cycling and Walking Champion Mr S Eyre on the use of railways as safe cycle routes into market towns.

- 16.3 The Committee:
- i) **COMMENTED** on the projects set out in this report as part of the ongoing commitment to deliver the Transport for Norwich (Transport for Norwich) plan
 - ii) **NOTED** the latest update on progress of the NDR project and **AGREED** to the phased opening of sections of the NDR as set out in the report (section 3).

17. Strategic and Financial Planning 2018-19 to 2021-22

- 17.1 The Committee considered the information contained within the financial planning report setting out Policy and Resources Committee's guidance to the Committee on the actions required to support preparation of a balanced budget for 2018-19, an overview of the Council's budget planning process, principles for this year's budget setting activity, and the latest forecast gap for budget planning purposes for the period 2018-19 to 2021-22.
- 17.2 It was noted that in the recommendations on page 127 and 128 of the report, "error reference source not found", should read "section 3".
- 17.3 The Committee:
- 1) **NOTED** the budget planning guidance for 2018-19 agreed by Policy and Resources Committee and in particular **NOTED**:
 - a. the budget assumptions set out in the report;
 - b. the budget planning principles for 2018-19;
 - c. the forecast budget gap of £100.000m reflected in the Council's latest financial planning;
 - d. the allocation of saving targets for the medium term financial strategy (MTFS) period 2018-19 to 2021-22 to Departments and Committees, noting the existing savings for 2018-19 and beyond which were agreed as part of the 2017-18 budget round;
 - 2) **CONSIDERED** and **AGREED** the service-specific budgeting issues for 2018-19 as set out in section 3 of the report.
 - 3) **CONSIDERED** whether any planned 2018-19 savings could be implemented during 2017-18 to provide an in-year saving;
 - 4) In order to help close the forecast 2018-19 budget gap (as defined in recommendation 1 c), **COMMISSIONED** officers to report to the October Committee cycle:
 - a. whether any savings identified for 2019-20 had the capacity to be brought forward to 2018-19;
 - b. to identify alternative new savings for 2018-19;
 - c. to identify further savings for the future years 2019-20 to 2021-22 to close the budget gap identified in those years.

18. Norfolk Waste Partnership and Waste Services

- 18.1 The Committee received the report outlining a summary of recent and planned activities of the Norfolk Waste Partnership.
- 18.2.1 The Head of Waste reported that Norfolk was ahead of the UK and England national average recycling rates.
- 18.2.2 Mr East noted the good work of the Waste Advisory Group (WAG) shown on page 151. He **proposed** that the group were replaced by one with a similar function but

different name. This was seconded by Mr Jermy. With 4 votes for and 9 votes against the Committee **voted against** this proposal.

18.2.3 The Head of Waste clarified that impact of the current recycling campaign would be seen in the recycling contamination rate which was currently at 13%. Future campaigns would focus on specific contamination materials such as nappies.

18.3 The Committee

1. **SUPPORTED** the continuing work of the Norfolk Waste Partnership and the County Council's active involvement and ongoing commitment to its activities to reduce waste, increase recycling and deliver service improvements; agreed
2. **ADVISED** that there was not a need to establish a successor to the Waste Advisory Group;
3. **EXPLORED** within the Norfolk Waste Partnership the merits of different approaches to helping fund recycling and waste reduction initiatives. agreed

19. Market Town Network Improvement Strategy

19.1 The Committee considered the proposal outlined within the report to facilitate sustainable development of Norfolk's market towns' and larger villages' by improving access to public transport and reducing congestion.

19.2.1 So far Dereham Fakenham, Diss and Swaffham had expressed an interest.

19.2.2 The Chairman proposed increasing the top four as indicated in the report to a top five, by including Swaffham (to make a top 5 of Dereham; Long Stratton; Thetford; North Walsham; Swaffham). The proposal was **DULY AGREED**.

The Committee **AGREED**:

1. The scope of the market town studies as set out in Section 1.2 of the report;
2. The top five (as detailed in paragraph 19.2.2 above) and second three towns from the list at Section 1.3 to form the first two years of the programme.

20. Exclusion of the Public

20.1 The Committee **AGREED** to exclude the public for agreement of the exempt minutes.

21. Exempt Minutes

21.1 The exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 21 June 2017 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

The meeting closed at 11:25 am

**Mr Martin Wilby, Chairman,
Environment Development and Transport Committee**



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language, please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020, or Text Relay on 18001 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

MEMBER & PUBLIC QUESTIONS TO ENVIRONMENT, DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE: FRIDAY 15 SEPTEMBER 2017

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5.1 Question from M J Ray

Will the committee please uphold the current Traffic Regulation Order and thereby prevent the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk's attempt to open part of Harding's Way to "max legal HGV" traffic, in line with assurances given in the past that this safe walking and cycling route between South Lynn and Whitefriars School would only be used by buses, or, if not, could you please tell users of this route what you feel has changed, such as whether you believe HGVs are now safe to drive among schoolchildren and others walking and cycling?

I thank you for your attention and await your reply with interest.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Norfolk County Council has been involved in the development of the King's Lynn Riverfront Masterplan and at an officer level is supportive of the aspirations to regenerate the area.

We have already identified a number of issues with the Masterplan that will need detailed consideration relating to transport and car parking and are keen to understand the precise proposals.

The position is that the current local politicians are not bound by previous decisions and could make different ones. However, the case for change would need to be robustly made and clearly define the benefits and satisfactorily address all the other negative issues with appropriate mitigation and be based on robust evidence and assessment work.

The existing traffic order permits the use of Hardings way for buses and cyclists; pedestrians are also able to use the route. If there was a proposed change in use, the existing TRO would need to be revised which would be subject to the usual consultation process.

6. MEMBER QUESTIONS

6.1 Question from Cllr Andy Grant

I would like to ask a question and raise an issue in relation to Church Walk in the parish of Bradwell.

Church Walk is a road leading from Green Lane, past green space, the Woodlands Primary Academy and onto a narrow country lane and several homes.

The first 100 meters and the footpath that runs up until the school has been adopted and maintained by Norfolk highways. The road from the split until the school is unadopted. NPS and GYBC property services have looked into it and concluded it does not belong to anyone.

The fact that a primary school is on an unadopted road where a speed limit is unenforceable in law and where parking restrictions cannot be in place is wrong. The fact that someone can drive at 60mph past this school and not be prosecuted has got to be unique.

My predecessors have all tried and all councillors within Bradwell South would like this road looked into seriously. Without any jargon or passing the buck what advice can officers give to me to tell parents and residents that can reassure them that we as a council take pupil safety seriously? Only last year a young boy was knocked down by a car and all I can say is I'm trying.

Adopting the road will not solve everything but it will mean enforceable parking and speeding, it will mean that bushes and trees that overhang the road are in order. The road itself has received surface dressing at some point, its potholes have been marked and makes no sense not to adopt.

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Whilst Norfolk County Council can fully understand this request, unfortunately we are not able to just 'adopt' land as highway, as it has to be brought up to an acceptable standard by the owners of the land and 'dedicated' through certain legal processes. This would be difficult, as it would appear no owners appear likely to have come forward in the past when ownership has been researched.

Norfolk County Council does take pupil safety seriously and has previously provided highlighted crossing points (albeit on the adopted section of the road) and undertaken safer journey to school studies/travel plans with the school. Some maintenance of the un-adopted section leading to the school will be undertaken from time to time by our highways team to assist with the safe usage of the school. The trees and bushes mentioned would remain in private ownership, even if the road could be adopted, however we would be happy to help by writing to the adjacent properties to highlight that their vegetation is hindering access to the school. There does obviously have to remain an onus on drivers to act responsibly whether on highway or private accesses.

Norwich Western Link Project - Update for EDT Committee from Working Group (for 15 September 2017)

Further to previous meetings of the Norwich Western Link Project (NWL) Member Working Group and the report provided at the 8 July 2016 EDT Committee meeting, a meeting was held on 13 September to provide an update for the Member Group. The following provides a brief summary of the meeting:

1. The Member Group has a new Chair (Cllr Stuart Clancy). Cllr Clancy set out the aspiration of the Group is to oversee the delivery of the project to achieve target dates and budgets and avoid delays and cost over-runs; The project has cross-party support and the ambition is that all involved must be focussed to ensure that the project is delivered.
2. Highways England (HE) latest proposals for the A47 from North Tuddenham to Easton were discussed in some detail following their preferred route announcement in mid-August. A plan that has been discussed with some of the parish councils was reviewed. There were a range of points made by the Group that will be fed into a planned meeting with HE on 21 September. These include concerns regarding community severance (are too many local roads being closed), the location and form of the junctions shown, what the modelling shows in relation to traffic redistribution on the local county road network, the implications for HGV's on the local network, whether sufficient opportunities have been taken to utilise the old A47, in particular whether consideration has been given to bus operations and access and local walking and cycling routes (including public rights of way).
3. The Member Group received an update summarising the ongoing NWL project activities planned to be completed ahead of a detailed report being provided to EDT Committee in October. Details have been discussed with Natural England and the Environment Agency. Project costings, appraisal and funding options will be included as part of the work that will be reported in October. Details were also discussed regarding the plans for stakeholder engagement for the project and this will be included in the October report.
4. The Local Plan Review process was briefly discussed, noting that a report providing an update is on the September Committee agenda. An update on the Food Hub proposals and the associated Local Development Order (LDO) was provided by Cllr Clancy. The LDO was reported to BDC Cabinet in May and was agreed subject to a screening decision being considered by the Secretary of State. That decision, and the Order, have been confirmed and the developer is now working to deliver the Food Hub as soon as possible.
5. The next local group meeting (with parish council representatives) is planned for 20 September-and details were discussed with the Member Group. This meeting will provide an opportunity for further feedback on the specific project objectives from each community, provide an update on project progress, give an opportunity to discuss details with HE regarding their A47 proposals and the implications for the NWL, and provide a chance to discuss the project stakeholder engagement. Feedback from this local group meeting will be incorporated in the October Committee report.

For more details, please contact David Allfrey (Infrastructure Delivery Manager).
Tel 01603 223292

NDR- Update for EDT Committee from Working Group (for 15 September 2017)

At the EDT Committee meeting held on 21 June 2017, it was agreed that a Member Group would be formed to provide increased scrutiny of the closing stages of the delivery of the NDR. An initial meeting of the Group was held on 28 July 2017, and a further meeting was held on 14 September. The following provides a brief summary for Committee of the recent meeting:

1. The Member Group has agreed that Cllr Colin Foulger will be Chair. The terms of reference for the Group have been developed following the initial meetings and are attached to this note for Committee to review and agree.
2. The contract administration is being managed via a web based system - Cemar. The Member Group received a demonstration of the system and had the opportunity to raise questions on the details around the management of Early Warnings, Compensation Events and how the contract notifications and administration work in practice. The system has joint access for both the NCC and Balfour Beatty teams to ensure there is only one version of the necessary project administration.
3. The Group were updated on progress relating to the road construction programme, which is in line with details included in the report being presented to Committee. It remains a determination for all involved with the project to complete the works as quickly and efficiently as possible to ensure the overall project cost is kept as low as possible.
4. An update on current and planned audits was provided. There are three key areas being reviewed currently; land acquisition process and authorisations; contract administration and management processes; defined cost review. It was agreed that details will be reported to the Member Group as the reports become available.
5. The Group were updated on the latest commercial position on the project. Details are not provided in this note due to their commercial sensitivity and to respect the Committee decision at its meeting on 21 June that these details must remain confidential.
6. It has been agreed that a site visit will be arranged for the Member Group on 12 October 2017.

For more details, please contact David Allfrey (Infrastructure Delivery Manager).
Tel 01603 223292

DRAFT - For agreement of meeting 14 September 2017

Terms of Reference for the NDR Member Group:

Introduction

At its meeting on 21 June 2017 the EDT Committee received a confidential report setting out the budget position for the project. The reason the report was confidential was set out at Committee as "if the information in this report were to be disclosed or otherwise made public; the Authority's ability to manage the difficult and commercially sensitive dialogue necessary with the supplier of the NDR contract in the coming weeks and months would be significantly compromised, in particular it is necessary to ensure key financial information and associated decision making is not disclosed".

As part of its consideration of the report details the EDT Committee decided that it wanted to set up an NDR Member Group to oversee the close out of the project delivery and the resolution of the final account.

Members of the Group

Committee agreed that the following Members should be part of the NDR Member Group:

Colin Foulger (the group agreed Colin would chair the meetings)
Judy Oliver
Anthony White
Terry Jermy
Tim East

Officers would attend the meetings as needed, however key project leads are David Allfrey (Infrastructure Delivery Manager) and Brett Rivett (NDR Commercial Team Manager).

Scope of Member Group

The Group agreed the following as its primary role (all of which takes into account the attached notes for guidance for Member Groups):

1. To receive updates on the project construction progress and any key issues.
2. To review project details relating to the commercial, legal and budget position of the project.
3. To receive updates and comment on any key remaining risks.
4. To monitor cost implications taking account of the key headings presented in the confidential 21 June committee report (a copy has been provided to the Member Group in confidence) and to challenge the details.
5. To question the details behind cost changes and cost increases and seek further details if needed and identify good practices.
6. To receive and review any audit details.
7. To receive details on any negotiations being undertaken with the main contractor and provide comments on these.
8. To develop and agree brief update reports to advise Committee.
9. To provide verbal updates at Committee (but taking into account the confidential nature of the information).