

From: DfT]
Sent: 3 August 2015 12:37
To: DfT]
Cc: DfT]
Subject: E: Sub - Norwich Northern Distributor Road - Cost Increase

NNC would pay the other c£10m. Meaning they end up paying around £15m in total.

[DfT]

[DfT] | xxxxx, Department for Transport
x/xx GMH | 020 7944 xxxxx |

From: [DfT]
Sent: 13 August 2015 12:34
To: [DfT]
Cc: [DfT]
Subject: RE: Sub - Norwich Northern Distributor Road - Cost Increase

Thanks [DfT], think I get it

So we'd be paying 77.8% of the increase, excluding Postwick - £14.9m

NNC would pay 22.1% of in the increase, excluding Postwick - £5.25m

Total: £20.15m (£87m + 20.15m =~ £106m)

So the other ~£10m (of the ~£30m increase) includes Postwick, I guess? Where's that coming from?

xxxx

xxxx xxxxx | xxxxx, Department for Transport
x/xx | 0207 944 xxxxx | xxxxxx

Please note that all e-mails and their attachments sent by a Private Secretary on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision or comment made by a Minister, or note of a Ministerial meeting, should be filed appropriately by the recipient. DfT Private Office does not keep official records of such e-mails or documents attached to, or forwarded with, them.

From: [DfT]
Sent: 12 August 2015 13:19
To: [DfT]
Cc: [DfT]
Subject: RE: Sub - Norwich Northern Distributor Road - Cost Increase
Importance: High

I have now obtained the correct figures from Norfolk CC. It is a bit confusing so happy to discuss.

The request for an additional £14.9m is based on a pro-rata share of the cost increase

for the scheme we are helping to fund between the A47 and A140 (it being 77.8% of the increase – that % being the share of the original cost we have agreed to pay.) That would mean NCC are paying an additional £5.25m (22.1%). The 50:50 share as included in yesterday's press release is based on the share of the increased cost of the full scheme - A47 to A140 - and it just so happens that our £14.9m share is almost half of the £29.9m increased cost.

I think this means that there are three options for the Minister:

- Continue to reject any cost increase
- Pay the pro-rata amount requested - £14.9m
- Pay a different % share of the cost increase for the scheme we have agreed to fund which at 50% would be £9.57m (say £10m)

Whilst NCC would not be entirely happy with the third of these I am sure they would reluctantly accept it although it may cause some delay to the approval whilst they digest and approve the revised funding.

As regards the comments of the Leader of Norfolk CC in his press notice (copy attached) this is of course political but my contact in Norfolk has said the following:

- The reference to Norfolk being disadvantaged by Government decisions (and note these are more political points) is the removal of Waste PFI credits, the delay in reporting the outcome of the Willows public inquiry and, more recently, the decision to award Academy status to the Hewitt School, against the wishes of the Authority.

As I say I would be happy to discuss.

[DfT] | xxxxxxxxxxxx, Department for Transport
x/xx GMH | 020 7944 xxxx |

From: [DfT]
Sent: 12 August 2015 10:54
To: [DfT]
Cc: [DfT]
Subject: RE: Sub - Norwich Northern Distributor Road - Cost Increase

Thanks. I am checking the numbers with Norfolk as they seem to have changed slightly since I sent up the submission. Their public request is for £14.9m additional DfT funding to cover half of the £29.9m shortfall (they will pay £15m extra). However that seems to include £1m to cover an increase in the cost of the Postwick Junction element of the scheme which is currently under construction. We should not agree to this as they should bear any cost of schemes under construction. That means the most we should be paying is £13.9m but we could reduce this to £10m.

You should be aware that we are likely to receive letters from local MPs supporting the request for additional funding

[DfT] | xxxxxxxxxxxx, Department for Transport
x/xx GMH | 020 7944 xxxx |

From: [DfT]
Sent: 11 August 2015 16:30
To: [DfT]

Subject: Re: Sub - Norwich Northern Distributor Road - Cost Increase

Hi [DfT],

The Minister's pretty sympathetic, and is open to providing some of the money.

Figures seemed a bit unclear, could you clarify the cost increase?

XXXX
XXXX XXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Department for Transport
x/xx, Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road,
London, SW1P 4DR

0207 944 xxxx

Please note that all e-mails and their attachments sent by a Private Secretary on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision or comment made by a Minister, or note of a Ministerial meeting, should be filed appropriately by the recipient. DfT Private Office does not keep official records of such e-mails or documents attached to, or forwarded with, them.

From: [DfT]
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 09:40 AM
To: [DfT]
Subject: FW: Sub - Norwich Northern Distributor Road - Cost Increase

Has the Ministers considered this submission? It is becoming more urgent as Norfolk CC are today having to come public on the cost increase and will say they have sought additional funding from the Department.

Happy to discuss.

XXXX XXXX | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, Department for Transport
x/xx GMH | 020 7944 xxxx |

From: [DfT]
Sent: 05 August 2015 11:48
To: Andrew Jones_MP
Cc: [DfT]
Subject: Sub - Norwich Northern Distributor Road – Cost Increase

Please find attached a submission on the following issue:

Norwich Northern Distributor Road – Cost Increase

Issue

1. Whether to agree to provide additional funding (up to £15.8m) to Norfolk C.C. to cover the increased cost of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road.

Recommendation

2. That you note the options at paragraph 7 [in the submission] and provide a steer on your preferred option

Timing

3. Routine - however Norfolk cannot submit the final approval bid for the scheme until they can confirm that all the funding is available and have asked for an early response so as to keep up the momentum.

Clearance

4. This submission has been cleared by Finance and Press Office.

[DfT]

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

x/xx GMH, Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road, London, SW1P 4DR
020 7944 xxxx

Follow us on twitter @transportgovuk