

# Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group

## Agenda

## Date

Friday 18 July 2008

### Members of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership

#### Representing Broadland District Council

Clr Stuart Clancy  
Clr Brian Iles  
Clr Andrew Proctor  
Clr Simon Woodbridge

#### Representing Norwich City Council

Clr Brenda Arthur  
Clr Steve Morpew  
Clr Brian Morrey  
Clr Alan Waters

#### Representing South Norfolk Council

Clr Derek Blake  
Clr Colin Gould  
Clr John Fuller  
Clr Martin Wynne

#### Representing Norfolk County Council

Clr Eve Collishaw  
Clr Daniel Cox  
Clr Adrian Gunson  
Clr Christopher How

#### Representing Broads Authority

Mr Alan Mallett

#### Officers

Phil Kirby	Broadland District Council
Roger Burroughs	Broadland District Council
Sandra Eastaugh	GND Partnership Manager
Jerry Massey	Norwich City Council
Paul Rao	Norwich City Council
Ken Barnes	South Norfolk Council
Paul Crick	Norfolk County Council
Mike Jackson	Norfolk County Council
Gillian Morgan	Broads Authority
Mary Marston	GO-East
Chris Starkie	Shaping Norfolks Future

## Time

1.00pm

## Place

Edwards Room  
County Hall  
Martineau Lane  
Norwich  
NR1 2DH

## Contact

Sally Clarke tel (01603) 212034

Norwich City Council  
City Hall  
Norwich  
NR2 1NH



E-mail: [sallyclarke@norwich.gov.uk](mailto:sallyclarke@norwich.gov.uk)

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS - FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE  
FLOWCHART OVERLEAF**

**MEETING:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ITEM NO:** \_\_\_\_\_ **AND TITLE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**NATURE OF INTEREST: (Please write in this space a description of your interest)**

	YES	NO
Is (or should) the Interest be registered in the Register of Members' Interests?		
If not, whose well being or financial position is affected to a greater extent than the majority of other people in the ward?		
Your own		
A family member (state name)		
A close associate (state name)		
Any person or body who has employed or appointed your family member/close associate (state name)		
Any firm in which your family member/close associate is a partner or company of which they are directors (state name)		
Any company in which your family member/close associate has shares with a face value more than £25,000 (state name)		
Any of the following in which you hold a position of general control or management: outside organisations, other public authorities, charities, pressure groups, political parties or trade unions (state name)		
Does the interest (a) affect your financial position or the financial position of a person or body described above? <i><b>(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)</b></i> (b) relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or any person or body described above? <i><b>(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)</b></i> (c) relate to scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny committee of a decision you were party to? <i><b>(If Yes the interest is prejudicial)</b></i> (d) relate to the functions of the council in respect of housing (except your tenancy), statutory sick pay, an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members, any ceremonial honour given to members, or setting the council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992. <i><b>(If Yes the interest is NOT PREJUDICIAL)</b></i>		
<b>PREJUDICIAL INTEREST</b> If you answered Yes to (a) or (b) is the interest one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest? <b>If Yes the interest is PREJUDICIAL If you answered Yes to (c) the interest is PREJUDICIAL</b>		
If prejudicial do you intend to attend the meeting to make representations, answer questions or give evidence?		

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

# DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to my interests?

- A** Does it affect my entries in the Register of Interests?  
**OR**  
**B** Does it affect the well being or financial position of me, my family or close associates; or my family's or close associates'  
 • employment, employers or businesses;  
 • companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more than £25,000 face value;  
 • business partnerships; or  
**C** Does it affect the well being or financial position of the following organisations in which I hold a position of general control or management:  
 - other bodies to which I have been appointed or nominated by the council;  
 - other public authorities;  
 - charitable bodies;  
 - bodies whose main purpose is to influence public opinion or policy
- More than the majority of other people in the ward?**
- D** Is Overview and Scrutiny considering a decision I made? If so you have a prejudicial interest.

NO

**Disclose the existence & nature of your interest**

You have a personal interest in the matter

YES

Is the interest financial or relating to a regulatory issue e.g. planning permission?

NO

**The interest is not prejudicial you can participate in the meeting and vote**

YES

You may have a prejudicial interest

- This matter relates to
- housing (except your tenancy)
  - statutory sick pay from the council
  - an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members
  - any ceremonial honour given to members
  - setting the council tax or a precept

YES

**The interest is prejudicial withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room (after making representations, answering questions or giving evidence). Do not try to improperly influence the decision**

NO

YES

Would a member of the public – if he or she knew all the facts – reasonably think that personal interest was so significant that my decision on the matter would be affected by it?

NO

Personal Interest

Prejudicial Interest

# **A G E N D A**

**Page No**

- 1 To receive declarations of interest**
- 2 Apologies for absence**
- 3 Minutes of meeting held on 24 June 2008**
- 4 Matters arising therefrom (if any)**
- 5 Joint Core Strategy (Phil Kirby)**

## **Joint Core Strategy Options Consultation**

Supporting Documents;

Final Draft Joint Core Strategy Options Consultation  
Final Draft Joint Core Strategy Options Consultation leaflet  
Consultation Questions for Regulation 25 consultation  
Categories of Consultees

- 6 Dates of Future Meetings: -**

Thursday 18 September 2008 at 2.00pm  
Thursday 18 December 2008 at 2.00pm  
Possible need for additional meeting in October 2008

Please note that the following report is attached to this agenda for information:-  
**GNDP Joint Core Strategy - Issues & Options Consultation Interim Report**

### **Note:**

**Cabinet meetings of Broadland District Council and South Norfolk Council will take place at 2.00pm or immediately following this meeting whichever is the later.**

**A light lunch will be available at 12.30 in the lobby outside the council chamber (under the marble map).**

11 July 2008

# Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group

---

Minutes of a meeting of the **Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group**, held at County Hall, Martineau Lane, Norwich on **Friday 18 July 2008 at 2pm** when there were present:

Cllr Steve Morpew – Chairman

	Representing
Cllr Stuart Clancy	Broadland District Council
Cllr Brian Iles	Broadland District Council
Cllr Andrew Proctor	Broadland District Council
Cllr Simon Woodbridge	Broadland District Council
Cllr Derek Blake	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Colin Gould	South Norfolk Council
Cllr John Fuller	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Martin Wynne	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Eve Collishaw	Norfolk County Council
Cllr Daniel Cox	Norfolk County Council
Cllr Christopher How	Norfolk County Council
Mr Alan Mallett	Broads Authority
Sandra Eastaugh – Officer	GND Partnership Manager
Graham Nelson – Officer	Norwich City Council
Paul Rao – Officer	Norwich City Council
Phil Kirby – Officer	Broadland District Council
Roger Burroughs – Officer	Broadland District Council
Ken Barnes – Officer	South Norfolk Council
Mike Jackson – Officer	Norfolk County Council
Phil Morris - Officer	Norfolk County Council
Mary Marston	Government Office – East of England
Chris Starkie	Shaping Norfolk's Future

## **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brenda Arthur, Brian Morrey and Alan Waters (Norwich City Council) and Adrian Gunson (Norfolk County Council).

## **2 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2008 were confirmed as a correct record.

## **3 JOINT CORE STRATEGY**

Phil Kirby presented the report and explained that the purpose of today's meeting was to seek agreement to the content of the options consultation

document, the questionnaire, the public newsletter and the timetable. It was also proposed that delegated authority should be granted to the GNDP Director's Group to approve any further minor editing changes to the text and maps of consultation documents as required.

The Policy Group then considered the content of these documents in turn and agreed a number of amendments as follows:-

### **Options Consultation Document**

- Policy 13 (page 56) – (a) the deletion of the words 'an element of' from point b and (b) the addition of a further bullet point referring specifically to the issue of energy efficiency.
  
- Policy 6 (page 48) – amend the approximate housing provision shown for Harleston from 300 to 200-300 and make any other corresponding changes in the document where this appears.
  
- Policy 7 (page 49) – amend the number of dwellings shown for Loddon/Chedgrave from 100 to 100-200 and make any other corresponding changes in the document where this appears.
  
- Policy 2 (page 43) – remove the reference to Coltishall from the penultimate bullet point.

### **Questionnaire**

- Question 1 – replace the word 'dependencies' with 'infrastructure requirements'.
  
- Question 2 – amend to read 'Are you aware of any major issues that would prevent delivery of this proposed policy?'

### **Newsletter/Leaflet**

- The first paragraph on page 89 being amended to refer to 'Broadland Norwich and South Norfolk' rather than 'Norwich and the areas that surround it' and state that they 'will deliver' rather than 'face' considerable growth.

## Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group

---

- The second paragraph on page 89 being amended to include reference to the Broads Authority.
- The second sentence to the third paragraph on page 89 being amended to indicate that all households 'received' rather than 'were delivered' the leaflet and questionnaire. The final sentence being amended to include reference to 'new homes and jobs' rather than just new homes and to include a signpost to the potential options for large-scale development.
- The fourth paragraph on page 89 to include reference to how and where the full report can be accessed.
- The sixth paragraph on page 89 being amended to reflect the fact that it is ultimately for the individual local authorities to decide on the single plan to guide future development.
- The second sentence in the first paragraph on page 91 being amended to indicate that the 47,500 new homes 'will be planned for' rather than 'will have to be provided'.
- The words 'be able to' being deleted from the heading under the first paragraph on page 91.
- The section on evidence studies on page 92 being amended to include reference to other studies that might be considered and the website address for additional information.
- The section on the local options for new homes on pages 93 and 94 being amended to reflect the dilemma between bolting on to existing development or planning a new town. The section should also stress the connection of Option 2 to the bypass. The officers to check that the most up to date figures are included in this section at the time of publication with any consequential amendments made to the table on page 58.
- The back cover of the leaflet being amended to include the GNDP office telephone number.

The Policy Group also discussed the proposed categories of consultee and the need to ensure that the right groups/people were consulted. Phil Kirby explained that it was intended that the full consultation document should only be sent to technical experts, service providers and community groups in Norwich, in lieu of town and parish councils. The main body of consultees

would receive a covering letter and the leaflet drawing attention to the main document. Phil Kirby undertook to circulate the full list of proposed consultees to all members of the Policy Group for comment before it was finalised.

**RESOLVED** to –

- (1) subject to the amendments minuted above and any consequential amendments necessary to ensure consistency throughout the documentation, approve the content of the questionnaire to consultees, the leaflet and the Growth Options report which includes three options for major growth as the basis for consultation on the Joint Core Strategy to satisfy Regulation 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England)(Amendment) Regulations 2008;
- (2) agree the timetable to prepare the Joint Core Strategy and the approach to consultation which is focussed on the relevant 'specific' and 'general' consultation bodies together with widespread information to residents and businesses;
- (3) note that the full list of consultees will be circulated to all members of the Policy Group for comment before it is finalised;
- (4) ask that the recommendations from this Policy Group are reported to the partner authorities for formal approval by their respective cabinets/executives, who will be recommended to formally approve recommendations '1' and '2' above;
- (5) grant delegated authority to the GNDP Director's Group to approve further minor editing changes to the text and maps of consultation documents as required.

**4 ECO TOWNS - UPDATE**

Phil Kirby updated the Policy Group on the current position on eco towns. Following opposition to Coltishall a preferable location had now been identified centred around Rackheath. He tabled a statement prepared by the GNDP Director's Group supporting a site based around Rackheath but at the same time making it clear that such support was conditional on funding for the necessary infrastructure.

A member drew attention to the imminent publication of a study by Matthew Taylor MP on planning issues including a new approach to



housebuilding around market towns and the implications for villages.

**RESOLVED** to approve the principles of the statement tabled at the meeting and grant delegated authority to the GNDP Director's Group to negotiate with the CLG prior to its formal submission.

## **5 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Sandra Eastaugh suggested that the next meeting, which would include a tour of the Whitlingham Treatment Works, should be deferred until after 29 September. She suggested that an additional meeting should also be scheduled for the last week in October or the first week in November when consultation on the Joint Core Strategy had finished.

**RESOLVED** to –

- (1) defer the meeting currently scheduled for 18 September to a date to be determined in the 2 weeks following 29 September;
- (2) schedule an additional meeting for the end of October/beginning of November;
- (3) ask Sandra Eastaugh to consult members on alternative dates for the above meetings;
- (4) note the existing arrangements for a subsequent meeting at 2.00pm on Thursday, 18 December 2008.

CHAIR

## Report to Policy Group 18<sup>th</sup> July 2008

### **Joint Core Strategy – Regulation 25 consultation on growth options**

#### **Purpose of this report**

1. At the 24<sup>th</sup> June 2008 GNDP Policy Group, Members considered reports and agreed a way forward for the joint core strategy. This report confirms the choices made by Members about moving forward to the next stage and reports on progress to carry out the tasks set.
2. Attached to this report are draft final versions of documents prepared for consultation on the next stage of Joint Core Strategy under Regulation 25 of new plan-making procedures recently introduced by the government.
3. The documents, timetable, and procedures in this report are for specific consideration and endorsement by the GNDP Policy Group before formal approval and authority to commence consultations by the cabinets and executive of the district councils.

#### **Background**

4. The GNDP is co-ordinating and managing the preparation of the joint core strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (excluding the Broads Executive area), with Norfolk County Council. This is part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) and will promote, guide and manage development of the three districts up to 2026. The joint core strategy has to meet challenging growth targets for new homes and jobs set by the East of England Plan. The strategy must also plan for a wide range of essential infrastructure and more sustainable transport to support regeneration, development and growth in existing and new communities. In short, the joint core strategy needs the GNDP to carefully consider how these requirements will be addressed.
5. Work on the joint core strategy started in 2007 and the 'issues and options' public consultation took place over 12 weeks from November 2007 to February 2008. Major evidence studies have been carried out and most have issued final reports. At the same time the sustainability appraisal scoping report and appraisal of emerging options has been undertaken in parallel with the development of the strategy.
6. In June 2008 the government brought in major changes to plan-making procedures. The 'issues and options' stage is replaced by a new consultation (regulation 25) on the 'content' to be included in the joint core strategy and the 'preferred options' stage is removed altogether. Although the GNDP has

already consulted on 'issues and options', it now needs to carry out a new consultation on the 'content' that should be in the plan.

7. In October this year, following the joint core strategy options consultation, the GNDP Policy Group will need to agree its strategy for regeneration, development and growth – including decisions about how and where larger-scale growth will be provided.

### **Update on progress**

8. At its meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2008, the GNDP Policy Group considered progress on the joint core strategy. Members were alerted to the impact on the timetable of new government regulations for plan-making and they were also advised about the impact on timing of significant additional work to evaluate new growth options.
9. Officers continue to make every effort to meet the over-riding instruction from Members that the joint core strategy should be adopted by March 2010. The timetable however, has already been delayed because of concerns raised through the joint LDF working group about some of the places suggested for large scale growth. At the June meeting officers reported in detail about on a range of locations that could be considered for large-scale growth. Members asked that the forthcoming consultation document included three separate proposals for combinations of places for major growth.
10. Members should note that neither the GNDP nor councils' individual cabinets/executive are being asked to decide on a definitive growth strategy at this stage.

### **Actions from GNDP Policy Group**

11. Officers are working on arrangements for a short, focussed Regulation 25 consultation starting as soon as possible which targets specific organisations some of whom will have a critical role in delivering services, infrastructure and funding for growth. Consultees will be asked to comment on the delivery of the strategy, and (where appropriate) how their organisations could support delivery of different options.
12. A public newsletter has been prepared which summarises progress since the issues and options stage, why the current consultation is happening, what we are consulting on, a timetable for the next steps, and the appropriate time for people to make representations. Whilst this is not a widespread public consultation, all consultation documents will be freely available.
13. A 'growth options' consultation document has been prepared – this is as concise as possible, containing an updated spatial vision, objectives, over-arching principles for sustainable development, and three separate proposals for combinations of places for major growth.

### **Other issues for resolution**

14. A full sustainability appraisal is not required at this stage. Consultation on the scoping report and the sustainability objectives for the plan took place last winter and is not being repeated. Sustainability Appraisal is a requirement for the draft plan and as this is progressed, the SA will continue to be developed and audited to make sure it is easily-understood, robust and objective. This will add confidence to the findings and the role of SA in helping to develop a more sustainable strategy.
15. Whichever growth option is selected we will have to deliver at least the minimum housing requirements set by the East of England Plan. The strategy will also need to deliver growth that is public transport focussed. Officers are continuing discussions with the Highways Agency to ensure trunk road improvements can be delivered.
16. Some Members wanted places for major growth to be phased to enable a range of other locations to be more attractive to developers. Officers advise that a choice of major growth locations is needed at the same time, rather than in sequence, if the plan is to be flexible and demonstrate that the minimum regional housing requirement will be met by 2026. A plan which phases major growth locations risks being undeliverable.
17. Further work is still needed to develop approaches to a possible Community Infrastructure Levy. The consultation document will show how a CIL may work, but at this stage no sums can be quoted on how much a levy could be.

### **The consultation material presented for approval**

18. Consultation questions that ask consultees to provide information and evidence to help develop the draft plan, and for key service and infrastructure providers, to ask which ones they could commit to, and help deliver.
19. A growth options report which is the main document, which will be freely available for consultees and for reference more widely. It draws on feedback from earlier public consultation under the previous procedures, and offers well-developed content that could form the basis of a draft plan. It is published for technical comment of specific organisations.
20. Information leaflet to update the public about why the current consultation is happening and how it relates to the last one. The leaflet describes the latest spatial vision and objective, and explains the current options for regeneration, development and growth. It also provides information about how and when widespread public involvement will happen at the draft plan stage.

## The approach to consultation

21. At this (Regulation 25) stage of the new plan-making procedures, councils have to:
  - a. decide which 'specific', 'general' and 'other' consultation bodies to consult;
  - b. whether to consult residents and businesses in the area.
22. The consultation document lists the organisations whom the GNDP will consult. These include parish councils but because there is none in the City of Norwich, the GNDP will consult residents groups, community groups and other local organisations instead to achieve broad and appropriate level of representation.
23. This approach to consultation was discussed and the instructions officers took from the GNDP Policy Group are set out below so Members can clearly see the implications of their strategy. Members are asked to confirm this is the course of action they wish to take so these decisions can be recorded and explained confidently. The approach which reflects Members' intentions is below:
  - a. Given there had been a previous 'issues and options' stage with widespread public involvement earlier in the year, this current stage is seen as a further information-gathering stage;
  - b. the current consultation is not a draft plan, which will be the formal stage when public consultation is required;
  - c. the current consultation is aimed at a broad cross section of organisations, including parish councils and local strategic partnerships that can advise on how realistic and deliverable different growth options are. Some will have a direct role in funding and delivering services and infrastructure and they will be asked about how and whether they could commit to any of the options presented;
  - d. at this stage the GNDP is only inviting *evidence* from stakeholders to inform choices about a growth strategy. Consultees will be asked to focus on specific questions about how different places for growth could be delivered including the timing and funding of infrastructure. Representations will be considered if they provide information relevant to the technical inquiries being made by the GNDP. Any comments expressing only general views or matters not of immediate relevant will *not* be considered.
  - e. full public consultation at this stage would add three months to the timetable (1 month prior to consultation to create a different type of consultation document which is integrated with the e-consultation system, and at least 2 months after consultation to analyse representations and frame suggested responses).

- f. the new government regulations prescribe fewer stages of consultation than before but do not prevent additional consultations taking place, although this would delay the plan-making timetable.
- g. If, by October 2008 it is clear that further detailed work is required on major growth locations, there would be a six months delay to the programme and the March 2010 deadline for adoption would not be achievable.

### Consultation and high level timetable

24. The timetable to adoption applies where the selected growth option does not involve significant additional evaluation and modelling (ie option 1 in the growth options report). If Members decide to selected options 2 or 3 then significant additional work will be needed that will add six months to the timescales set out below.

18 <sup>th</sup> July 2008	GNDP Policy Group South Norfolk & Broadland Cabinets
23 <sup>rd</sup> July 2008	Norwich City Council Executive
3 <sup>rd</sup> August – 26 <sup>th</sup> September 2008	Regulation 25 consultation (8 weeks)
October 2008	GNDP consider responses
November – December 2008	Produce draft plan
January 2009	GNDP & Councils' cabinets/executive approve draft plan
April – May 2009	Publish draft plan & public consultation (6 weeks)
September 2009	Submit draft plan to Secretary of State
January 2010	Public examination
March 2010	Adoption

### Conclusion

25. Once the GNDP Policy Group and councils' cabinets/executive have confirmed decisions about the Regulation 25 stage, the consultation material and final arrangements will be completed and documents published and publicised.

26. Officers are working to deliver a key GNDP objective to adopt a sound joint core strategy by March 2010. The approach to consultation and the plan-

making process described timetable has previously been reported to, and endorsed by GNDP members. It is proposed in this way to keep the programme on target. This report clearly identifies how timescales will be delayed by different choices about consultation methods and, as described above, if more detailed work is needed to analyse and justify growth options 2 or 3.

## **Recommendations**

1. That Members agree the content of the covering letter to consultees, the leaflet and the growth options report which includes three options for major growth as the basis for consultation on the joint core strategy to satisfy Regulation 25 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008;
2. That Members agree the timetable to prepare the joint core strategy, and the approach to consultation which is focussed on the relevant 'specific' and 'general' consultation bodies, together with widespread information to residents and businesses.
3. That the recommendations of the GNDP Policy Group are reported to the partner authorities for formal approval by their respective cabinets/executive, who will be recommended to formally approve recommendations (1) and (2).
4. That Members delegate authority to the GNDP Directors Group to approve further minor editing changes to the text and maps of consultation documents, as required.

Author of report: Paul Rao  
Tel: 01603-212526  
Email: p.rao@gndp.org.uk

## **Background documents:**


Joint Core Strategy, issues and options report, November 2007

Joint Core Strategy, issues and options consultation report, July 2008

Sustainability appraisal scoping report, December 2007

Report on 'Joint Core Strategy progress' to GNDP Policy Group 24<sup>th</sup> June 2008

# APPENDIX 1. Joint core strategy –high level timetable





<b>Document Circulation and History</b>	
Prepared by:	Steve Osborn Planning Consultancy and GNDP Planning Sub Group
Inspected and Approved by:	
Date of issue:	20 May 2008

<b>Version</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Changes</b>
Draft a	Draft	14 March 2008	Richard Squires	First Draft
Draft b	Draft	19 March 2008	Richard Squires	Updated information and GNDP Policy group comments
Draft c	Draft	14 April 2008	Richard Squires	Comments from consultation group
Draft d	Draft Final	20 may 2008	Stephen Osborn	Added sections relating to Policies and Appendix from Long Questionnaire
Draft e	2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft Final	20 June 2008	Phil Morris	Further editing
Draft f	3 <sup>rd</sup> final draft	3 July 2008	GNDP Planners	Revised format and further editing
Draft g	4 <sup>th</sup> final draft	9 July 2008	GNDP Planners	Further revision to format and editing

**Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) Joint Core Strategy**

**Interim report on community & stakeholder participation during the  
'Issues and Options' stage**

**CONTENTS**

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	8
2. Consultation methods used	8
3. Issues & Options Full Report - Results Analysis	12
4. Analysis of Responses by Policy Theme –Policies for Places	14
5. Analysis of Responses by Policy Theme – Area-Wide Policies	30
6. Implementation and Monitoring – Responses to Consultation	43
 <b><u>Appendices</u></b>	
Appendix 1: Joint Core Strategy Issues Workshops 2007	45
Appendix 2: Joint Core Strategy 'Issues & Options' - stakeholder meetings and presentations	48
Appendix 3: Exhibition attendance figures	50
Appendix 4: 'Have Your Say' Youth Conference 7 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2008 - 'Saying it Better' workshop report	55
Appendix 5: Young peoples' questionnaire	63
Appendix 6: Analysis of Issues & Options Summary Leaflet - Monitoring information & representativeness of respondents	65
Appendix 7: Analysis of Responses on Full Questionnaire	82
Appendix 8: Local Survey of Long Stratton Residents	116

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Sustainable Development**

Respondents gave broad support to the statements of Vision and Objectives in the report. Comments made it clear that, in general, respondents considered these to be of a quality of life that they would want.

Respondents expressed concern about the acceptance of housing growth, the need to focus on maintaining and enhancing the sustainability of small rural settlements and the need for the vision to be more creative and locally distinctive.

There was some priority given to the strategic principles of “infrastructure and service planning and delivery” and “environmental impact” as criteria for judging where and when growth is acceptable.

Respondents gave strong support to measures that ensure that new development is sustainable in terms of its energy efficiency and in relation to using renewable sources of energy. A suggested target of 20% of energy requirements was also supported.

### **Spatial Hierarchy**

There was broad support for the definition of the spatial hierarchy as proposed in the Issues and Options document both in terms of the broad hierarchy as a whole, and in relation to the definition of Market Towns and Key Service Centres in the settlement hierarchy. Respondents identified a number of facilities that can be used to define the next level of ‘secondary rural settlements’ – notably public transport access to work, a village hall, a convenience store and a primary school.

There was general agreement that development outside the hierarchy of settlements should be strictly controlled. However, some people wanted to see an exception to allow for development to support settlements with a limited range of existing services.

Respondents supported the need to give priority to brownfield site development, so far as possible. There was also some concern about the impact of ‘urban sprawl’ and loss of character on some areas surrounding Norwich.

There was general agreement that public transport and where feasible walking and cycling links need to be improved to give better access between rural areas and Key Service Centres, Market Towns etc.

### **Locations for major growth and change in the NPA**

While a significant minority place equal importance on wide ranging criteria when a preference is expressed the 3 most important factors for locating growth are: easy access to facilities by walking, cycling and public transport ; the ability of new and existing infrastructure and transport to support growth; and minimising the impact on the environment.

Respondents supported the option of large scale urban extensions and a possible new settlement by a small margin (34% to 31%) over a more dispersed pattern of growth. An option of an even larger scale of concentration in one new town south of Norwich was suggested in a limited number of responses.

Technical consultees and infrastructure providers tend to favour concentration in larger scale developments. The development industry tends to support a combination across all three options with elements of large scale, medium scale and smaller scale growth..

Different locations for development were favoured in responses to the Long and Short Questionnaires although there is significant overlap between them. In the Short Questionnaire responses (taking account of all expressed preferences) a majority were in favour of the South-west, South-east, Wymondham and North-east/East sectors. In the Long Questionnaire responses the most favoured individual locations were the North-east, South-west, and Wymondham and an overall strategy for large scale growth to be focussed on these three locations, either solely or in combination with one or more additional locations, received majority support (53%).

Whilst the Long Questionnaire gave results in favour of growth to provide a Long Stratton bypass, the local survey (undertaken by South Norfolk District Council) indicated that local people are evenly divided for and against such a solution. Only a minority of local people would support a development in excess of 1500 dwellings.

## **City Centre**

Respondents gave broad support to the proposed hierarchy of centres, which recognises the city centre as the strategic centre for growth and the economic driver for the sub-regional economy. The need for a range of city centre service functions beyond retailing was also recognised, including facilities for education and training, health and young people.

Respondents supported focused employment growth in the city centre, although the majority accepted that some office jobs would need to be created outside this main focus. There was also strong support for promoting brownfield development generally and providing for a mix of uses especially in the city centre.

In several respects respondents recognised that new development needs to be appropriate to the history and heritage of the city centre and at appropriate densities.

There was considerable support for retail growth to be concentrated in the existing retail area and majority support for this to include the Anglia Square/ Magdalen Street area, but little support for wider expansion of the retail area.

For leisure development respondents supported a strategy that would provide a wider range of facilities for all age groups.

There was significant concern about traffic congestion and most respondents accepted the need to improve public transport, cycling and walking facilities, although respondents also wanted to maintain car access.

## **Suburbs and Fringe**

Respondents agreed with the overall approach to development within Norwich and the urban area including the sequence of preferred sites from the city centre to areas on the edge of the urban area where accessibility is poor.

In relation to skills and training respondents supported a range of initiatives outlined in the document.

The responses generally accepted the need for more bus priority measures in the urban area, although the option selected suggested that this could be done without loss of capacity for the private car.

Respondents supported the need to focus area-wide regeneration on specific areas where deprivation would be addressed. These included a number of deprived city areas.

## **Definition of Norwich Policy Area**

The majority of respondents support the current boundary of the NPA

A small number suggested either enlarging or shrinking the boundary, to the south or south-west.

## **Town Centre Hierarchy**

Respondents gave overwhelming endorsement to the hierarchy of centres as defined in the Issues and Options document.

There were a few suggested changes with some additional settlements suggested for inclusion, but no overriding support for any particular one of these.

## **Housing**

Respondents expressed concerns that smaller settlements should be allowed sufficient growth to sustain their services and sense of community.

On the other hand some people opposed the overall level of growth in housing numbers being proposed.

Respondents supported measures to extend provision of affordable housing by reducing threshold levels at which the policy is triggered and by widening the scope for private sector projects to be included. Comments supported the need to provide for housing needs.

In relation to gypsies and travellers, responses showed support for transit sites close to the A11 and A47 routes through the area. Respondents also favoured (by a small margin) the provision of more smaller sites, rather than large sites for travellers, but opposed provision of sites within the growth areas.

## **The Economy**

Respondents considered that additional jobs would be best located in areas with good accessibility by both road and public transport. Comments sought to ensure that all sectors of the economy would have opportunities to expand.

The responses across several questions showed strong support for more 'home working' and for mixed use solutions to employment growth. This included the idea of live/work units and a more flexible approach to issues relating to working at home.

Respondents supported a range of measures to promote and encourage training and learning opportunities related to the needs of business.

Respondents also generally supported measures to assist small business growth and especially solutions related to residential areas and mixed uses.

## **Strategic Access and Transportation**

Transport improvements are given a high priority in the response for improving the local environment and are among the highest criteria for selecting growth locations.

Respondents favoured strategies to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use in both the urban and rural areas and market towns, while recognising that there are areas where the private car is the only available and practical means of transport.

To reduce the need to travel, the most popular solutions included co-location of homes, shops, services and jobs and increased working from home.

There were different views expressed between the main questionnaire and the local survey (carried out by South Norfolk Council) about Long Stratton and the need for growth to fund a bypass of the village. Overall there is some degree of support for a degree of growth to support a bypass.

To help reduce rural deprivation public transport should be improved to local facilities and in some instances, services should remain even if they are not economically viable.

## **Environmental Assets**

Respondents gave significant weight to environmental issues in the local area and especially to avoiding development that would impact adversely on sensitive areas and, in particular, designated sites and landscapes.

When considering the criteria for selecting areas for growth, respondents put environment impact as the highest priority factor, which is consistent with several other responses on the growth issues.

Respondents overwhelmingly agreed that nationally and locally protected sites and landscapes should be protected from the impacts of growth and that in addition certain additional areas should be protected. This response also supported using the Ecological Network map and the Norfolk BAP.

## **Community Life and Culture**

A number of comments gave high priority to provision of more services and community facilities especially in smaller communities in rural areas.

For the urban area and the city centre in particular there was concern for more provision of cultural and leisure opportunities.

Respondents supported the idea of using dedicated community workers to assist in community development in new communities.

Respondents supported a range of options to overcome rural deprivation with particular emphasis on improvement to public transport accessibility and promoting a wider range of uses of existing community venues in rural areas.

## **Policies for Implementation and Monitoring**

Respondents generally supported the idea of a tariff system with this being assessed across the wider area to take account of all infrastructure needed to support the growth.

Respondents supported a discount on any tariff for brownfield sites.

Responses suggested the level of tariff will have to take account of the viability of development and that funds should be managed locally, but by some body other than the local councils.

## **1. Introduction**

The public participation during the Issues and Options stage comprised a number of involvement methods, each of which were designed to ensure as high a level of response as possible to the Issues & Options report. This approach ensured the GNDP authorities paid full regard to each of their Statements of Community Involvement (each authority has prepared and adopted its own). The participation exercises sought to encourage the return of individuals' views as well as the response of representative groups in the local communities.

The start of the consultation period for the Issues and Options was marked by a launch to an invited audience on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2007 at an event held at St Andrews Hall in the City Centre. Public consultation started on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2007.

This report details the range of methods used and the results of the various questionnaires that were used to gain responses which will inform the next steps in the production of the Joint Core Strategy.

## **2. Consultation Methods Used**

### **a) Pre-production 'Issues Workshops'**

Between June and July 2007 a series of nine Issues Workshops were held at a variety of locations in the Greater Norwich area, in order to help inform the production of the Issues and Options report.

A range of public, private and voluntary sector organisations were invited to these workshops, each of which dealt with a different theme. These were as follows:

- Community life
- Culture and leisure
- Economy
- Environment
- Housing
- Transport
- City centre / regeneration
- Rest of the Norwich Policy Area & growth issues
- Rural area

Details of the date and location of each workshop, as well as those organisations in attendance at each, are set out in Appendix 1.

### **b) Issues and Options Report**

The full Issues and Options report was sent to all statutory consultees (some 350 in total), taken from the GNDP consultation database at the start of the consultation process. This database is an amalgam of all of the GNDP authorities' individual LDF consultation databases. Statutory consultees include neighbouring local authorities, neighbouring parish councils and all of the parish and town councils of Broadland and South Norfolk districts.



The full document was also available for reading at all libraries in the GNDP area and in all the Council Information Centres (Aylsham, Diss, The Norfolk and Norwich Millennium Library and Wroxham as well as the Harleston Community Information Point. Additionally the exhibition and documents were available on the Broadland Mobile Information Centre). In the areas of the GNDP covered by Civil Parish Councils two copies were sent the Clerk of the Parish Council (or Parish Meeting) together with a request that one copy was made available to parishioners.

The Report was also made available at all exhibitions (see below) and was sent to anyone requesting it from either of the GNDP authorities.

The Issues and Options Report was made available for viewing on the GNDP website (a link to this was included on the constituent councils' websites). The website address for the GNDP was also publicised in the full report, the summary leaflet and in the exhibition material.

Stakeholders were encouraged to respond to the Issues and Options Report using the online consultation facility, provided through JDI. However, a hard copy response form was also produced for those individuals who preferred to respond by hand. This was available on request and could also be picked up at the exhibitions that were held in the area (see section 3 below).

### **c) Summary Leaflet**

A summary leaflet version of the Issues and Options report was sent to every home in the GNDP area (approximately 150,000 homes) during the first couple of weeks of the consultation period. This leaflet included a reply paid section that allowed people to complete and return a short questionnaire; it also included details of how all returns would be entered in a draw for a prize of £100.

The document summary leaflet was also sent to some 3600 other organisations on the GNDP consultation database, including environment, heritage and community groups, landowners and developers, housing associations, health and social care groups, black and minority ethnic groups, utility providers, and individuals who have expressed a wish to be kept informed.

Like the Issues and Options Report, the summary leaflet was also made available for completion on the GNDP website.

### **d) Exhibitions**

41 exhibitions were held between 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2007 and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2008, at 30 venues across the GNDP area. These were held throughout the week (including weekends) and at various times of day. The exhibitions were held in a variety of locations such as superstore car parks, community halls, shopping malls, market stalls and in a city centre shop. Officers from the GNDP authorities staffed all the exhibitions and were available to help with enquiries and answering questions.

In summary, a total of 2,036 people were recorded as having attended the exhibitions mentioned above (although this probably understates actual attendance at busy

times). 544 were recorded as attending the supermarket roadshows that were held, and 1492 attending the venue-based exhibitions.

Detailed exhibition attendance figures are set out in Appendix 3.

The exhibition displays were also available for viewing on the GNDP website.

#### **e) Hard-to-Reach groups**

Consultants (SMRC Research) were appointed to ensure that a variety of hard-to-reach groups had the opportunity to get involved in the consultation. Their work took the form of on-street interviews with target groups and developing a young people's questionnaire which was sent to schools and colleges for completion by pupils and students (this became the output of the 'Have Your Say' conference – see Appendix 4).

SMRC facilitated the completion of 612 questionnaires by adults, although this figure is not broken down by location. Locations that were visited by SMRC include Castle Mall, Jubilee Centre, Norman Centre, Riverside (Morrisons), Earlham House and Clover Hill. They reached 64 single parents, 99 people from the 75+ age category and 60 disabled people. 100 people were also interviewed from deprived wards in the Greater Norwich area.

SMRC also completed questionnaires with people in the Rates Hall at Norwich City Council and interviewed people across City Council wards.

Other work to engage with 'hard-to-reach' groups, undertaken by the GNDP, included a presentation on the Issues and Options to the Broadland Disabled People's Partnership at their meeting held in December 2007.

An article regarding the consultation was also featured in the winter 2007 issue of Norwich and Norfolk Race Equality Council's 'Black and White' newsletter.

A schools conference, 'Have your Say', was held on 7<sup>th</sup> February at the Kings Centre in Norwich with young people from 7 High Schools from within the Greater Norwich area attending. One of the workshops (entitled 'Saying It Better') resulted in the students designing their own Issues leaflet based on the themes from the summary leaflet. This was produced and 100 copies were sent to each school for their peers to complete. In total, 646 completed questionnaires were received, the analysis of which features as Appendix 4 of this document. A copy of the questionnaire that was developed is included in this report as Appendix 5. Whilst the return of these youth questionnaires was strictly outside the time period for the main consultation, we accepted that this was necessary in order to give young people a chance to respond.

#### **f) Meetings held with and presentations to various stakeholders**

A variety of specific meetings have been held with stakeholders and other interested parties, such as property and professional groups, meetings of interested organisations etc.

Some of these meetings have been small in scale and have comprised solely of officers to discuss more technical issues. Others have spread the discussion to community representatives such as Headteachers and Chairs of Governors of the area's Secondary Schools.

Appendix 2 attempts to capture the range of consultations (but is not necessarily fully comprehensive)

DRAFT

### 3. Issues & Options Full Report - Results Analysis

#### *Level of Response Received*

The table below sets out the number of representations received on the full Issues & Options Report, as a total and split by whether they were hard copy representations (i.e. using the questionnaire booklet) or electronic responses (using JDI) :

Document	Hard copy representations	Electronic representations	Total representations
Issues & Options Report	4,749 (70.9%)	1,950 (29.1%)	<b>6,699</b>

The total figure is now broken down to indicate the total number of supporting comments, total objections and the total number of comments received.

<b>Total Supports</b>	1,989 (29.7% of total comments)
<b>Total Objections</b>	702 (10.5% of total comments)
<b>Other Comments</b>	2,691 (40.2% of total comments)
<b>Total Comments Received</b>	6,699

**N.B. these figures indicate individual representations and not numbers of individuals responding.**

It should be noted that each representation is a single answer to one of the questions. It is possible to estimate how many individuals or organisations have responded on the full document, but not to give precise figures. At present, the highest number of representations on any one question is 190 (on question 1 and 3), indicating that there are at least this many respondents whose representations have been captured. The average number of respondents per question was 129.

#### ***Comments on the Consultation Process***

Several respondents commented on aspects of the overall consultation process and/or particular exercises.

Some felt the whole exercise was one of public relations for the Greater Norwich Development Partnership. Others criticised the language used for being too technical and complicated.

In general, however, the respondents were happy that the consultation reflected the scale of the issues involved and the importance of the choices to be made. One respondent complemented the Partnership on tackling the issues of the scale of growth in a realistic manner, even if the respondent did not favour such scale of growth.

Concern was expressed at certain perceived 'mistakes' on the plans or in the description of the key locations for growth. These included:

- Similarity in colour between the Broads area and the growth locations.
- Omission of the name 'Wymondham' from that growth location.
- Confusion about what constituted the 'preferred growth option' comprising North East, South West and Wymondham.
- Lack of clarity about whether the brownfield/urban option shown as number 11 on the diagram, was included as a growth location.

It should be noted that the full Issues and Options report contained an error in numbering two questions as 33, the second of which should have appeared as 34. This did cause some confusion to respondents.

The response of young people suggests that the main mode of consultation had largely bypassed them, being addressed to householders/adults. Very few had heard of the consultation exercise, even though by the time of the youth conference it was in its last days (Have Your Say Youth Conference, Introduction to Day, F and G = 15% and 10% respectively). They felt the questions posed in the consultation leaflet were too complicated and used technical language (Have Your Say, workshop 2). They produced their own consultation leaflet with a design they felt more suitable for young people (see Appendix 4). The concluding comments show a wish for young people to be involved in the process at future stages in the development of Greater Norwich (Have Your Say Conference, feedback form).

The results from the long questionnaire are presented in Appendix 7. This material is incorporated in the analysis by policy themes and by growth locations, which follow in Chapters 4 and 5.

## Analysis of Responses by Policy Theme – Policies for Places

The next section brings together results from each of the main consultation processes organised under “policy themes” and dealing with locational “Policies for Places”. This is followed by Section 5 dealing with generic “Area-wide Policies”. These themes have been developed since the Issues and Options consultation report, so do not directly relate to the sections in that document, but include all the responses received in one section or another.

### **4a Policies for Places Theme = Spatial Hierarchy**

#### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

##### Long Questionnaire

- Q1) Spatial Vision to 2026
- Q2) Spatial Planning Objectives
- Q3) Settlement Hierarchy
- Q5) Definition of Market Towns
- Q6) Definition of Key Service Centres
- Q7) Services necessary to define Secondary Rural Settlements
- Q8) Grouping of Secondary Rural Settlements form a Key Service Centre
- Q9) Development in rural areas
- Q21) Large Scale Office Development
- Q34) Transport in Rural areas and Market Towns
- Q35) Improving accessibility to jobs and services in villages
- Q38) Tackling rural isolation
- Q41) Provision of affordable housing for Norwich
- Q47) Access to rural commercial activity from defined settlements

##### Short Questionnaire

- Q1) Spatial Vision
- Q3) Principles influencing the location of growth locations
- Q4) Spatial distribution of growth
- Q5) Locally specific issues
- Q7) Locations for job provision

#### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

The responses to a wide range of questions can be related to the spatial hierarchy, as illustrated by the list above. However these elicited some broadly similar responses across a number of questions.

When questioned about locations for growth most people (79%) agreed with the suggested hierarchy for managing the scale of growth (Short Questionnaire Q4). Of those who suggested alternative approaches 16% wanted more growth outside of Norwich, across villages or in a new town, 9% were opposed to any growth at all while 7% suggested all growth should be within Norwich.

There was also broad support for the definition of the spatial hierarchy in the full document (Q3 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 59%). Some comments suggested that development should be more widely spread throughout the hierarchy, especially where it would be sustainable (Q3 Long Questionnaire – comments = 11). There was some support for the concept of one 'New Town' to accommodate most of the growth (Q3 Long Questionnaire = 9 comments).

Responses across a number of questions supported priority for bringing forward brownfield sites in the urban area. This gained 129 comments on the Vision for the area (Q1 Short Questionnaire) and 77 comments on the locally specific issues in the urban area (Q5 Short Questionnaire). There were a few comments to this effect in relation to the hierarchy of settlements (Q3 Long Questionnaire).

Then there was a significant level of response supporting a wider spread of growth to enable smaller settlements in rural areas to maintain viable services and communities (Q1 Short Questionnaire = 109 comments; Q4 Short Questionnaire = 1175 comments; Q2 Long Questionnaire = 12 comments; Q3 Long Questionnaire = 11 comments). There were also some comments disagreeing with Norwich as the focus of growth (Q1 Short Questionnaire = 81 comments).

From the opposite viewpoint, some people responded that all growth should be concentrated in Norwich (Q4 Short Questionnaire = 523 comments) or that the Norwich Policy Area should be the major focus of growth (Q1 Long Questionnaire = 9 comments).

There was a frequent concern about 'urban sprawl' and loss of character of areas surrounding Norwich (Q5 Short Questionnaire = 77 comments; Q1 Long Questionnaire = 8 comments).

Respondents supported the definition of Market Towns (Q5 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 70%), although some comments suggested a number of other places could be included in the list (Q5 Long Questionnaire – 11 comments). Some people also commented that development in market towns should be sympathetic to their character (Q5 Long Questionnaire – 8 comments).

Respondents supported the definition of Key Service Centres (Q6 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 62%). Some people, however, found the distinction between Market Towns and Key Service Centre confusing (Q6 Long Questionnaire - 12 comments). Comments suggested that public transport accessibility was seen as an important criterion (Q6 Long Questionnaire – 11 comments). In comments on the definition there were some suggested additional criteria such as the inclusion of sport and leisure facilities (7 comments) and a Post Office (5 comments) as well as a range of other factors.

In relation to other 'secondary rural settlements', we suggested a list of criteria and asked which were the essential ones and which were unnecessary. Respondents supported public transport (for the journey to work) (63 comments), a village hall (58), a convenience store (55) and a primary school (46) as the most important (Q7 Long Questionnaire). A library (30 comments) and a secondary school (31 comments) were seen as unnecessary at this level in the hierarchy (Q7 Long Questionnaire).

In relation to whether groupings of settlements could be defined as a Key Service Centre, the responses were ambiguous. The highest number of responses were comments of various kinds (Q8 Long Questionnaire; Other comments = 43%, Yes = 38%). These mainly specified qualifications on the concept, for example

- Only where settlements are close together (cycle or walking distance)
- Only where appropriate services were provided and these were coordinated between the settlements.

There was general acceptance that development outside of the hierarchy of settlements (i.e. in rural areas) should be strictly controlled (Q9 Long Questionnaire – No (i.e. consistent with government policy) = 44%).

The settlement hierarchy principle was also supported in that respondents agree that housing need that cannot be met in the city of Norwich should be satisfied in the surrounding Norwich Policy Area (Q41 Long Questionnaire – agree = 73%)

### **Large Scale Office Development**

In other respects the hierarchy was also supported. For office development respondents supported the option that would focus office development in the city centre, accessible district centres and allocated sites outside these centres (Q21 Long Questionnaire; option c = 44%). There was a slightly lesser degree of support for insistence that major office development should be limited to the city centre only (Q21 Long Questionnaire; option a = 33%).

### **Transport Links**

In relation to links between settlements and rural areas there was general agreement that public transport and where relevant walking and cycling links should be enhanced to improve accessibility (Q34 Long Questionnaire – option b = 62%; Q35 Long Questionnaire – option c = 37% and option a = 37%; Q38 (rural deprivation) Long Questionnaire – option a = 28%).



## **4b Policies for Places Theme = Locations for major growth and change in NPA**

### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

#### Long Questionnaire

- Q1) Spatial Vision to 2026
- Q3) Settlement Hierarchy for Growth and Development
- Q10) Principles of Growth
- Q11) Strategy for delivering Growth Options
- Q12) Potential Locations for large-scale growth
- Q13) Pattern of Growth Locations.
- Q16) Gypsy and Traveller sites in new growth locations
- Q22) Strategic employment locations
- Q26) Large scale commercial and retail development
- Q32) Promotion of major growth at Long Stratton to justify bypass
- Q37) Community development in growth areas

#### Short Questionnaire

- Q1) Vision of the area
- Q3) Principles influencing the location of growth locations
- Q4) Spatial distribution of growth
- Q6) Locations for Growth
- Q7) Employment growth locations

#### Other Sources

- Local survey of Long Stratton Residents. (see Appendix )

### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

The key strategic locations for growth were set out in each of the consultation documents. Responses were concentrated on questions dealing with those locations, but there were other interesting responses dealing with the strategic locations in other parts of the consultation.

In this analysis, we have not referred to responses dealing solely with specific sites, of which there were a significant number, since those will be referred to the Strategic Housing Land Availability appraisal to assess their suitability in the context of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy will not allocate such specific sites. Where such site specific responses also referred to the strategic principles affecting the choice of location, then those aspects have been taken into account and included in this analysis.

## General

A number of people responded to the Vision by commenting on the broad location of growth (Q1 Long Questionnaire and Q1 Short Questionnaire). Comments suggested variously that:

- Major growth should be located close to Norwich urban area (Q1 Long Questionnaire – 9 comments)
- Greater emphasis should be placed on the role of market towns and smaller rural settlements (Q1 Short Questionnaire – 109 comments)
- There is a need for new settlements or one 'New Town' (Q3 Long Questionnaire – 9 comments)
- There will be a need to develop criteria in order to accept smaller sites in the early stages before the larger locations identified here can commence.
- Norwich should not be the focus for growth (Q1 – Short Questionnaire 81 comments)

Respondents gave broad support to the definition of the spatial hierarchy in the document (Q3 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 59% against No = 23% and comments = 17%). Some comments suggested that development should be more widely spread throughout the hierarchy, especially where it would be sustainable (Q3 Long Questionnaire – comments = 11). Some comments gave support for the concept of one 'New Town' to accommodate most of the growth (Q3 Long Questionnaire = 9 comments).

## Locational principles

We asked which criteria for the location of new communities were the most important. Respondents gave highest priority to

- good access by walking, cycling and public transport;
- existing and new infrastructure to support planned levels of growth
- minimising the impact on the environment including open space, wildlife and flood risk.

(Q3 Short Questionnaire – these three scored highest both on first preferences and on overall scores when combining the total of first, second and third preferences).

Respondents supported the broad principles for management of growth (Q4 Short Questionnaire – Yes = 79%). A minority felt that more growth should be outside Norwich (Q4 Short Questionnaire – 1175 comments or 16%).

Similarly on the Long Questionnaire we asked about the principles behind the selection of the growth locations. Again infrastructure and service planning and delivery and the environmental impact were considered most important. The criteria of market delivery and timescale were shown to be of lower priority (Q10 Long Questionnaire).

We then asked about the overall approach to growth in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA). The largest support, at 35%, was for the option of large scale urban extensions and a possible new settlement, against 31% in favour of dispersed growth in a large number of areas. Comments showed that some respondents favoured much more widespread dispersal - even outside the Joint Core Strategy area. Some

people favoured a mixed approach with some large sites but also a wider dispersal of smaller amounts of growth (Q11 Long Questionnaire – 10 comments).

### Preferred Locations

The location plan in both the leaflet and the full Issues and Options report identified options for areas that could be appropriate for large scale growth. While the leaflet gave no additional information on the locations, the full Issues and Options report provided a broad analysis of some apparent pros and cons of each. These locations were the subject of a number of responses (for full details see Appendix 7).

We asked for peoples top four preferences for large scale housing growth (Short Questionnaire, Q6) and there was some support across all locations. Taking into account all 4 preferences expressed, the most favoured locations were:

- the south west sector (A11-A140 outside A47),
- the south east sector (vicinity of Poringland),
- Wymondham and
- the north-east outside the NNDR.

The least popular choices were the north-west sector (A1067-NNDR) and brownfield sites within Norwich. Interestingly, when considering only the first preference of respondents most people favoured the brownfield site options. However, there was clearly some confusion in relation to brownfield sites as the question was intended to seek views on locations outside the built-up area.

If results are separated dependent on the district from which the respondent came, it is noticeable that there is a tendency for some people to prefer growth options away from their local district. However, it is also possible to provide some analysis of the preferred locations within respondent's own districts. Within their own district, South Norfolk residents gave greatest preference to options in Long Stratton, Wymondham, the south-west sector and the south-east sector and least favoured the west and south. Broadland residents favoured growth in the north sector (north of the airport) followed by the north-east outside the NNDR with the least favoured being the north-west.

In the Long Questionnaire (Q12) we asked for comments on the possible growth locations. While we did not specifically ask respondents to express preferences we have looked at positive and negative reactions and taken account of the difference between the two. This analysis suggests that the top preferences for individual locations were:

- North East Sector, inside NNDR (area 2) (24 in favour (16%); 4 against; net score = +20)
- South-West Sector, outside A47 (area 8) (20 in favour (13%); 1 against; net score = +19)
- Wymondham (27 in favour (18%); 12 against; net score = +15)

In addition a number of people suggested other growth locations. These included Diss area (4), South Sector inside the A47 (3), Loddon area (2), Aylsham area (2), South-west Sector inside A47 (2), former RAF Coltishall (outside area but put forward to meet Norwich growth needs) (2), and numerous others based on specific sites (see note above).

The Long Questionnaire then asked which overall pattern of growth respondents favoured outside the city (Q13). This put forward the option of concentration in three locations (North-east, South-west and Wymondham). This was supported by 30%, with a further 23% supporting these three locations with the addition of either a fourth location for major growth or one or more locations for medium scale growth. Consequently, 53% of respondents support a growth strategy concentrating on the North-East, South West and Wymondham either alone or with one or more additional growth locations. The locations most frequently referred to as additional to the pattern suggested were South of Norwich (8), the Long Stratton area (7), the North Sector, north of the Airport (6), and the South-east Sector in the vicinity of Poringland (6). Some 24% of responses preferred an option with a more dispersed pattern of at least 10 locations while 19% favoured a different combination of major growth options.

In commenting on the suggested locations a number of people said that further analysis of the services and infrastructure available in each area and certain constraints would be necessary. Comments by some infrastructure agencies, which also highlighted potential constraints relate to:

- Capacity of sewage treatment works and the need for pumping of waste water (Anglian Water Services – prefers locations south and east of Norwich because of closer proximity to Whitlingham waste water treatment works and the need to avoid pumping waste water through the urban area);
- Biodiversity constraints and opportunities (Norfolk Wildlife Trust);
- Impact on the trunk road network and necessary mitigation measures (Highways Agency);
- Historic landscapes in each area and the character of settlements (Norfolk Landscape Archaeology – highlighted the particular constraint in area 4 (vicinity of Poringland) because of numerous ancient monument (burial) sites and a ‘prehistoric ritual landscape’ which gives them context.);
- Assessment of the historic interest of settlements and landscape in each area (English Heritage);
- Future location of major waste disposal facilities (Norfolk Environmental Waste Services – noted a particular constraint within the area close to Longwater);
- General need for police facilities and infrastructure (Norfolk Constabulary);
- Restrictive covenants entered in respect of land west of Wymondham to prevent damage to the setting of the abbey. (National Trust);
- Educational opportunities in the light of recent government policy changes;
- Aircraft flight paths.

### **Long Stratton – Growth Option and Bypass**

In the main consultation response there was support for growth in Long Stratton to fund a bypass on the A140 (Q32 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 68%). However in the specific local survey undertaken by South Norfolk Council, residents of the Long Stratton area came out very marginally against major growth to support A140 improvements (Long Stratton survey Q1 – Against major development = 49.6%; for major development = 48.2%). Comments suggested concern that the village’s infrastructure would not support the higher level of growth proposed (see Appendix 7 for the results of this survey). When local people were asked what scale of growth they would support the majority would support fewer than 1500 dwellings (63%) and only 10% would support more than 5000 new dwellings.

## Community Development

The long questionnaire referred to the need to support community development as growth takes place. Respondents supported the provision of dedicated community workers as a means to support new communities (Q37 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 60%).

## Strategic Employment Locations

With regard to strategic employment locations, responses were split between seeking additional locations for employment development and relying on mixed use regeneration sites. (Q22 Long Questionnaire; option A = 36.6%, option B = 37.3%). Suggested locations for strategic employment development included:

- Within growth areas at Wymondham (6)
- Extension to Norwich Research Park (4)
- Alongside proposed NNDR (2)
- South-west of Norwich (2)
- North-west Sector (Drayton area) (2)

and numerous other locations.

Concern was expressed about one option – to allow freeing up of restrictions on specialist sites – if this meant that sectors identified for future growth would then have no land to accommodate the growing cluster of related specialist firms (Q22 Long Questionnaire – comments).

In relation to retail and commercial development, we offered an option for growth to take place as part of large scale housing developments. In practice this did not attract much support (Q26 Long Questionnaire – option B = 21%).

#### **4c Policies for Places Theme = City Centre**

##### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

###### Long Questionnaire

- Q3) Settlement Hierarchy
- Q4) Locations for growth around Norwich
- Q19) Promoting learning and development
- Q21) Large scale office development
- Q22) Strategic employment locations
- Q25) Town Centre Hierarchy
- Q26) Comparison shopping growth in Norwich
- Q27) New facilities and attractions
- Q33) Balance of road capacity between buses and cars
- Q39) Retail growth in Norwich city
- Q40) Provision for late night leisure

###### Short Questionnaire

- Q5) Locally specific issues
- Q7) Locations for job provision

###### Other Sources

- Have Your Say Youth Conference

##### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

The City Centre is recognised in the Issues and Options document as the core of the hierarchy for development in the area with key central services and economic functions being based there. It is also the key economic driver of the sub-region. Respondents supported the hierarchy as defined in the document with the city centre as its hub (Q3 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 59%). Respondents also supported the approach to sites in and around Norwich, giving priority to city centre development over other less accessible parts of the urban area (Q4 Long Questionnaire Yes = 71%). Young people identified the shops and restaurants of the centre as a key reason why Norwich is great for them (Have Your Say Youth Conference, Workshop 1).

Comments also recognised the potential of brownfield sites within the centre to enable that growth, although some comments also suggested that other areas should have equal priority with the city centre, if they were accessible (Q4 Long Questionnaire - comments)

## **Promoting Learning and Development**

In relation to skills and training, respondents supported the full range of options put forward to address this issue. These included promotion of learning and training establishments based in the city centre and the co-location of education and skills with businesses, many of which will be in the centre of the city. (Q19 Long Questionnaire – support all = 67%)

## **Large Scale Office Development**

For office employment growth respondents supported the need to encourage offices in the city centre but also in district centres and allocated out-of-centre sites, where these are accessible (Q21 Long Questionnaire – option C = 44%). A significant minority of comments supported a more restricted view, giving preference to the city centre for office developments (option A = 33%). Comments noted that the city centre approach fits with a sustainable transport strategy.

In relation to additional strategic employment sites, there was no explicit recognition of the role of the city centre, but the highest level of support was for an option which focused on bringing forward mixed use regeneration of sites within the city (Q22 Long Questionnaire – option B = 37%). It was suggested by as many people (37%) that additional locations would be needed.

We asked about issues that are important to each part of the area and, in respect of the city centre, most support was given to the need for respect the heritage of the city and encouraging office employment in the centre (Q5 Short Questionnaire). Comments suggested particular concerns about traffic and congestion in the centre and the need for more employment in the centre (128 comments and 47 comments respectively).

In addition when asked about provision of more jobs, 244 people identified central Norwich as a location where that should be pursued (Q7 Short Questionnaire). However, more responses were received identifying locations with good transport access (299 comments) and areas outside the city centre area (284 comments).

## **Retail Growth in Norwich**

A key issue for the city centre is the future development of its position as the leading retail centre in the East of England. In that context respondents supported the proposed hierarchy of centres for retail and leisure development, which recognises that the city centre will have a primary role in that growth (Q25 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 81%). The comments received did not criticise this aspect of the hierarchy – the only relevant comment being about Anglia Square/ Magdalen Street and whether that should be seen as part of the city centre for retail purposes (1 comment).

In terms of how the area in general should cater for growth in retail and leisure expenditure, respondents opted for promoting both further growth around the urban area in accessible locations and developing one or more centres outside the urban area to serve the proposed growth locations (Q26 Long Questionnaire – option C (combination of others) = 45%). Some people expressed concern that the centre

should not grow any further (13 comments). Respondents supported a strategy that would concentrate new retail development in the North City Centre area (Anglia Square redevelopment) (Q39 Long Questionnaire – option C = 51%), although the alternative of concentrating growth within the whole existing retail area also scored 40%. There was little support for the option of extending or enlarging the centre significantly (9%).

### **New Attractions**

We asked about the development of attractions for visitors and facilities. Responses to this question focused mainly on transport and community infrastructure issues. There were some comments suggesting additional tourist attractions (Q27 Long Questionnaire) – for example a new concert hall, a swimming pool and entertainment centre. Comments also showed support for enhanced heritage and outdoor attractions.

For leisure activities respondents expressed support for a strategy of developing a range of facilities aimed at all age groups, rather than one focused primarily on young people and the late night economy (Q40 Long Questionnaire – option B = 52%). There was more support for concentrating late night activities than there was for a dispersal strategy (Q40 Long Questionnaire – option A = 35%, option C = 13%)

### **Transport Links**

In relation to transport options, we asked about measures to give buses more priority. Respondents supported the option which would do this only if capacity can be maintained for the private car (Q33 Long Questionnaire – option A = 60%). However, this is less relevant to the city centre, where traffic management already aims to reduce the penetration of the car into the main centre.



#### **4d Policies for Places Theme = Existing Developed Areas – Suburbs and Fringe**

##### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

###### Long Questionnaire

- Q4) Using sites in and around Norwich
- Q19) Education, skills and the knowledge economy
- Q20) Small business growth
- Q27) Major new facilities or attractions
- Q33) Public transport priority measures
- Q41) Meeting housing need of Norwich
- Q42) Area-wide regeneration

###### Short Questionnaire

- Q5) Locally specific issues

##### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

Respondents agreed with the overall approach to development within Norwich and the urban area including the sequence of preferred sites from city centre to areas on the edge of the urban area where accessibility is poor. (Q4 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 71%). There were several comments supporting the priority for development of brownfield sites in the urban area both on this question and others (see section 5a above).

Some comments expressed a fear that large scale developments on the edge of the urban area could become future ghettos or undesirable areas (Q4 Long Questionnaire – 4 comments)

##### **Education, Skills and a Knowledge Economy**

In relation to skills and education and training respondents supported the range of options outlined in the document including promoting training and learning establishments, innovation/ incubator centres, encouraging co-location of education and skills training with related businesses and ensuring accessibility of such opportunities to all. (Q19 Long Questionnaire – No = 67%)

##### **Small Business Growth**

For development of small businesses the highest level of support was for making small sites available for start-up businesses in identified settlements or through conversion of rural buildings. (Q20 Long Questionnaire – option B = 44%). Many

comments suggested there was a particular focus on the references to rural buildings in this option. Several people supported a combination of options here – to include managed workspace and using a flexible approach on residential sites to include mixed use units.

### **New Facilities or Attractions**

Respondents supported a number of additional attractions or facilities. The ones most relevant to the urban area and its surroundings were

- Improved transport infrastructure (10 responses)
- Concert hall (11)
- Outdoor activity areas/ country parks (13)
- Sports facilities (8)
- Swimming pool (5)

(Q27 Long Questionnaire)

In relation to the urban area and its local environment, respondents were asked to comment on any issues that had been missed (Q5 Short Questionnaire). The following issues were raised:

- Need for more community facilities (128)
- Need to improve public transport (inc. park and ride) (113)
- Improved roads and parking (87)
- Prevent urban sprawl and loss of character of villages (77)
- General transport improvements (74)

### **Transport Links**

In relation to transport within the urban area, responses accepted the need for more bus priority measures, but sought to maintain capacity for cars (Q33 Long Questionnaire – option a = 60%). People were concerned that increase road space reserved for buses would just create more congestion without getting people out of their cars. Comments suggested improvements to strategic transport infrastructure are needed.

### **Housing**

Respondents agreed that housing need, which for practical reasons will not be able to be fully met in the city itself, should be met in the wider Norwich Policy Area. (Q41 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 73%).

### **Area-Wide Regeneration**

In relation to area-wide regeneration respondents agreed that efforts need to be focused on specific areas (Q42 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 68%). Some responses queried whether regeneration should mean denser development.

The areas suggested for such regeneration included a number of deprived inner city areas –

- North Earlham/Larkman/Marlpit
- Mile Cross

- Lakenham
  - Magdalen Street area
- (Q42 Long Questionnaire)

DRAFT

#### **4e Policies for Places Theme = Definition of Norwich Policy Area**

##### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

###### Long Questionnaire

- Q43) Definition of Norwich Policy Area

###### Short Questionnaire

- None

##### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

###### **Size and Shape of Norwich Policy Area**

Respondents saw no reason to suggest any amendments to the boundary of the Norwich Policy Area (NPA), as previously defined by Norfolk Structure Plan. (Q43 Long Questionnaire – no change = 65%).

There were minority suggestions for enlarging the NPA but these mostly involved places at some distance from the current boundary (Attleborough, Diss, and Thetford). There were also 4 people who favoured reduction in the boundary for each of Long Stratton and Wymondham. In addition 4 people felt the NPA was too large but did not suggest any particular reduction (Q43 Long Questionnaire – comments)

#### **4f Policies for Places Theme = Town Centre Hierarchy**

##### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

###### Long Questionnaire

- Q21) Office development locations
- Q25) Town Centre Hierarchy

###### Short Questionnaire

- none

##### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

Respondents gave overwhelming endorsement to the suggested hierarchy of town centres in the area (Q25 Long Questionnaire, Yes = 81%). There were a few suggestions for variations in the lower orders of centres, but with no strong contenders for change (total of 16 comments). Peoples' suggested additions included Poringland, Harford Bridge Tesco site, Stoke Holy Cross, Loddon, Long Stratton.

There were concerns that the Anglia Square/Magdalen Street area needed major regeneration in order to qualify.

There were suggestions about upgrading Acle as a centre or downgrading Aylsham and Loddon in the hierarchy (Q25 Long Questionnaire – comments)

##### **Office Development**

In relation to office development, respondents supported the option that would focus office development in the city centre, accessible district centres and allocated sites outside these centres (Q21 Long Questionnaire; option c = 44%). There was a slightly lesser degree of support for insistence that major office development should be limited to the city centre only (Q21 Long Questionnaire; option a = 33%).

## 5. Analysis of Responses by Policy Theme – Area Wide Policies

### **5a Area-wide Policy Theme = Sustainable Development**

#### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

##### Long Questionnaire

- Q1) Spatial Vision to 2026
- Q2) Spatial Planning Objectives
- Q10) Principles of Growth
- Q29) Environmental Standards of Housing Design
- Q30) Sustainable energy
- Q31) Target of 20% energy from renewable sources

##### Short Questionnaire

- Q1) Spatial Vision
- Q2) Improving the local environment
- Q3) Principles influencing the location of growth locations
- Q4) Spatial distribution of growth
- Q8) Ways to reduce the need to travel

##### Other Sources

- Have Your Say Youth Conference

#### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

The consultation demonstrated overall support for the statements of Vision and Objectives in the Issues and Options document. On the Short Questionnaire 81% of responses supported the Vision (Q1) while the Long Questionnaire (Q1) found that 49% of respondents felt the draft vision reflected a quality of life that they would like versus 25% who objected (26% of respondents had other comments).

The most comments on both questionnaires (22 or 44% on the long questionnaire and 277 or 16% on the short questionnaire) stated that the vision should not be based on acceptance of housing growth at the level proposed with some even suggesting that the level of planned growth was incompatible with high standards of environmental protection (Long Questionnaire Q2 3 comments). Others suggested the focus should be on maintaining and enhancing the sustainability of small rural settlements (Long Questionnaire Q1 19 comments and Q2 12 comments). Some concern was expressed that the Vision statement is neither locally distinctive enough nor visionary enough (Long Questionnaire Q1 17 comments) while 16 comments referred to the need to promote a range of new public transport in order to minimise the need to travel. This was echoed in the short questionnaire (Q2) in that promoting

public transport was considered the most important thing that could be done to improve the local environment.

## **Principles of Growth**

Responses to Q10 (Long Questionnaire) on strategic principles for growth indicate that 42% were comfortable with giving equal importance to all seven suggested principles (accessibility, job proximity, infrastructure and service planning and delivery, environmental impact, market delivery, timescales and resources). However 58% preferred to prioritise. The more important criteria, in the views expressed, were those concerning infrastructure and services (45% most important) and environmental impact (34% most important). Respondents who expressed a preference were clear that the more technical criteria of market delivery and the timing of development should have lower priority (38% and 41% least important respectively).

The Short Questionnaire posed a similar question asking for the most 'important tests' to help identify the best locations for growth (Q3). When taking the total of three preferences it was found that the impact on the environment, making sure the infrastructure was able to support the growth and sustainable transport availability to a range of facilities were considered the three most 'important tests'.

## **Sustainability**

In relation to sustainable methods of construction (Q29 Long Questionnaire) respondents supported both the option to match the Code for Sustainable Homes requirement for energy efficiency in new dwellings and increasing over time (41%) and to apply standards to other types of development to bring about zero carbon emissions by 2016 (29%) with 9% of people opting for a combination of the two. On the other hand there was also a significant number who said that standards should not be set ahead of national regulations (26%).

The suggestion that new development should incorporate an element of sustainable energy generation was overwhelmingly supported (Q30 Long Questionnaire; 96% in favour). There were comments; however, reminding us that viability would need to be assessed, before any particular solution could be devised. Young people also supported the greater use of renewable sources (Have Your Say Conference, workshop 2, Questionnaire responses – 73.4% support).

A specific target of 20% of energy requirements from renewable sources in new development was also supported (Q31 Long Questionnaire; 62% in favour) with 13 comments (10%) from people suggesting the target should be higher.

When asked how we can cut down peoples' need to travel (Q8 Short Questionnaire) in addition to putting houses next to jobs and facilities most respondents said we needed to encourage home working (868 comments or 24%). Others suggested improvements in public transport (21%) and supporting local shops and facilities (14%).

## **5b Area-wide Policy Theme = Housing**

### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

#### Long Questionnaire

- Q1) Spatial Vision to 2026
- Q2) Spatial Planning Objectives
- Q14) Access to affordable housing
- Q15) Gypsies and Travellers transit sites
- Q16) Gypsies and Travellers sites – in new development
- Q17) Scale of sites for gypsies and travellers
- Q18) Travelling Showpeople
- Q41) Housing need in city of Norwich
- Q44) Rural exception sites
- Q45) Affordable housing - thresholds
- Q46) Local need for affordable housing

#### Short Questionnaire

- Q4) Spatial distribution of growth
- Q5) Locally specific issues
- Q6) Locations for large scale growth

#### Other Sources

- Have Your Say Youth Conference

### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

Housing is clearly an important issue in terms of the growth proposed for the area. Responses to this issue include comments on the Vision and Objectives, the strategic principles for growth and the degree of concentration of growth. Particular concerns were shown in relation to smaller settlements and their need for growth in order to maintain sustainable services (comments on Q2/Q3 Long Questionnaire). There was also a recurring concern from some people that the targets for housing growth are too high (Q1/Q3 Long Questionnaire; Q1/Q4 in Short Questionnaire). Young people recognised the need for more affordable housing by 2026 (Have Your Say Youth Conference, Workshop 1 – what we would like to see).

#### **Location for Housing Growth**

When questioned about locations for growth most people (79%) agreed with the suggested hierarchy for managing the scale of growth (Short Questionnaire Q4). Of those who suggested alternative approaches 16% wanted more growth outside of



Norwich, across villages or in a new town, 9% were opposed to any growth at all while 7% suggested all growth should be within Norwich.

Responses to Question 5 from the Short Questionnaire highlighted the need to maintain the characteristics of locations as well as providing adequate infrastructure to support growth.

We asked for peoples top four preferences for large scale housing growth (Short Questionnaire, Q6) and there was some support across all locations. Taking into account all 4 preferences, the most favoured locations were the south west sector (A11-A140 outside A47), the south east sector (vicinity of Poringland), Wymondham and the north-east outside the NNDR. The least popular choices were brownfield sites within Norwich and the north-west sector (A1067-NNDR). Interestingly, when considering the first preference of respondents most people favoured the brownfield site options. However, there was clearly some confusion in relation to brownfield sites as the question was intended to seek views on locations outside the built-up area.

If results were separated dependent on the district from which the respondent came, it is noticeable that there is a tendency for some people to prefer growth options away from their local district. However, it is possible to provide some analysis of which are the preferred locations within respondent's own districts. Within their own district, South Norfolk residents preferred options in Long Stratton, Wymondham, the south-west sector and the south-east sector and least favoured the west and south. Broadland residents favoured growth in the north sector (north of the airport) followed by the north-east outside the NNDR with the least favoured being the north-west.

### **Affordable Housing Provision**

Responses to the questions about affordable housing supported measures to graduate the percentage contributions for smaller sites and to widen the scope for private sector alternatives to be included (Q14 Long Questionnaire).

Respondents supported the notion that, because the city of Norwich would be unlikely to be able to meet all its current needs for affordable dwellings within its boundary, that the wider Norwich Policy Area should be used to support this provision for the appropriate numbers (Q41 Long Questionnaire; 73% support).

Almost 40% of respondents felt that developer contributions for affordable housing should be sought for sites of dwellings greater than 5. (Other options included sites with 2+ dwellings – 19% and 10+ dwellings – 28%).

When discussing 'local need' with respect to affordable housing, respondents found it difficult to determine whether this should include only the particular village's residents or those from a wider group of villages (44% versus 56% respectively).

In rural areas respondents supported the option that would not allocate specific sites for affordable housing needs, but would bring such sites forward within the settlement hierarchy when need arises (Q44 Long Questionnaire; Option c = 49%). Responses also suggested reducing thresholds in villages to sites of 5 dwellings or more (Q45 Long Questionnaire; Option b = 38%) or taking a flexible approach according to

circumstances (comments on Q45 = 11%). Respondents considered that 'local need' for housing in rural areas should be identified as being within a group of villages (Q46 Long Questionnaire; option b = 56%).

Young people had a preference for living in a rural area in future by a significant majority (81% - Have Your Say Conference). Reasons given were a perceived lower cost of housing, health and the quieter pace of life, but access to the city was seen as important as well.

### **Provision for Gypsy and Travelling Showpeople**

The chapter on Housing invited comments on the specific needs of gypsies and travellers, including travelling showpeople. Transit sites are required to meet the short-stay needs of travellers on certain routes. Respondents supported provision of such sites on the main A11 and A47 routes through the area (Q15 Long Questionnaire; option A = 49%; Option D = 37% respectively) but comments included the need to consult the gypsy and traveller communities on this aspect.

There was opposition to including gypsy and traveller sites within each large new developments (Q16 Long Questionnaire; No = 69%) despite this being considered a way of integrating society and providing services for all. Comments suggested that contributions from developers could be used to provide sites outside these areas of growth.

In relation to the size gypsy and traveller sites there was more support for a larger number of small sites (Q17 Long Questionnaire; Yes = 46%; No = 38%) rather than fewer larger sites.

There were few comments about the provision of sites for travelling showpeople (Q18 Long Questionnaire – 69 in total), which is a subject on which it was considered that the specific group will need to be consulted.

**5c Area-wide Policy Theme = The Economy**

***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

Long Questionnaire

- Q19) Education and skills
- Q20) Small scale business growth
- Q21) Office Development locations
- Q22) New strategic employment locations
- Q23) Protection for employment land from other uses
- Q27) Major attractions for visitors

Short Questionnaire

- Q4) Managing growth
- Q6) Locations for large scale growth
- Q7) Locations for job provision
- Q8) Ways to reduce the need to travel

Other Sources

- Have Your Say Youth Conference

***What the responses told us about this theme***

**Jobs and Locations for Growth**

Respondents expressed support for developing new jobs in areas with good accessibility by both road and public transport (Q7 Short Questionnaire 299 comments or 5%) and also the use of brownfield sites and areas in need of regeneration (supported by answers to Q7 Short Questionnaire 168 comments and Q22 Long Questionnaire – Option B = 37%). Other comments suggest that we will need new locations in addition to brownfield sites (Q22 Long Questionnaire – Option A = 37%). Site specific locations close to Norwich for employment growth suggest the Costessey/Longwater area (153 comments), the region around Norwich airport (134 comments) with the majority of comments suggesting the Norwich city centre (244 comments) (Q7 Short Questionnaire). In rural areas the majority of respondents favoured job creation in market towns (416 comments) including Long Stratton (184 comments), Wymondham (161 comments) and Aylsham (154 comments).

Young people expressed the view that there are not enough jobs in the area (Have Your Say Conference, Workshop 2, Questionnaire responses – 71% support). Respondents gave strong support to the idea of ‘home working’, as a means to reduce the distance travelled to work (Q8 Short Questionnaire; Comments = 868).

Many consultees also supported the encouragement of small scale and local employment opportunities by a combination of:

- ensuring smaller employment sites are available, particularly to support smaller business and start-ups or, for example, through conversion of rural buildings;
- ensuring that there is adequate provision for managed workspace, "growing on " units and low cost areas for more marginal businesses;
- requiring all new larger housing developments to include employment uses and/or encouraging a flexible approach to residential units such as specific live/work units.

(Q20 Long Questionnaire; preferences spread - Option B = 44%, C = 27%, A = 26% respectively)

Comments suggested that we need to ensure that all sectors of the economy have opportunities to expand (Q20 Long Questionnaire).

There was support for encouraging offices in the city centre, in district centres and allocated out-of-centre sites, where these are accessible (Q21 Long Questionnaire – option C = 43%). Comments referred to the need to ensure that jobs are accessible to the rural population.

Responses to the question on the need to protect employment land were very mixed, but emphasised sustainable locations with good transport linkages (Q23 Long Questionnaire - comments). There was also some concern about the need to protect specific types of sites, because of their place in the local economy.

Q8 from the Short Questionnaire indicates that home working is the respondents preferred option to cutting down peoples' need to travel (868 comments).

### **Education and Skills**

There was general support for the promotion of training and learning establishments and innovation/incubator centres; encouraging the co-location of education and skills training with related businesses; and ensuring opportunities are accessible to all, taking account of the particular needs of deprived communities and disadvantaged groups (Q19 Long Questionnaire), although the overall level of response on this question was low (total = 55). However local young people appear to wish to move on elsewhere for their further/ higher education (Have Your Say Youth Conference, Introduction to Day, E = 23% likely to stay in Norwich), although they also considered UEA to be a factor making Norwich great to live in (Have Your Say, Workshop 1).

### **Major Attractions for Visitors**

Major new visitor attractions that were suggested included a new concert hall, a swimming pool and the promotion of outdoor and heritage attractions. There were 10 comments relating to the need for improved transport infrastructure.

## **5d Area-wide Policy Theme = Strategic Access and Transportation**

### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

#### Long Questionnaire

- Q32) Promotion of major growth at Long Stratton to justify bypass
- Q33) Bus priority measures
- Q34) Transport in rural areas and market towns
- Q35) Accessibility in rural areas
- Q36) Minimising impact of freight
- Q38) Rural deprivation

#### Short Questionnaire

- Q2) Improving the local environment
- Q3) Principles for choosing growth locations
- Q8) Ways to reduce the need to travel

#### Other Sources

- Have Your Say Youth Conference
- Local survey of Long Stratton Residents. (see Appendix 8)

### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

Overall the responses suggested that sustainable transport was a high priority in improving quality of life (Long Questionnaire Q1 – 16 comments). Public transport received the highest support as a measure to improve the local environment (Q2 Short Questionnaire). Accessibility and enhanced infrastructure features among the highest criteria for selection of growth locations (Q3 Short Questionnaire – criteria 1 and 3).

The Have Your Say Youth conference showed that transport is a dominant concern for young people (Have Your Say Introduction to the Day – 100% had had problems with transport; plus Lunchtime comments). The issues highlighted by young people were cost, reliability, the attitude of bus drivers, the lack of or poor level of bus service in parts of the area (see also Have Your Say, Workshop 1 report). The questionnaire responses also showed that young people use the bus a good deal, although cost is a substantial constraint (Have Your Say, workshop 2, 76% able to use bus from where they live but 56% found it too expensive).

Respondents supported more bus priority measures in the urban area, while continuing to maintain capacity for the private car (Q33 Long Questionnaire – option a = 60%)

Respondents favoured strategies in the rural areas and market towns to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use, although it was not considered to be a practical solution for all (Q34 Long Questionnaire; Option b = 62%). Comments suggested that the car should still be supported where public transport is inadequate and where walking and cycling is considered to be unsafe (Q34 Long Questionnaire - comments)

In relation to reducing the need to travel, respondents made wide ranging suggestions (Q8 Short Questionnaire). The most popular covered encouragement for working from home and ensuring co-location of shops, services, jobs and homes. There was also support for better public transport and cycling.

### **Long Stratton Bypass**

In the main consultation response, growth in Long Stratton to fund a bypass was supported (Q32 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 68%). However in the specific local survey undertaken by South Norfolk Council, residents of Long Stratton itself came out very marginally against support for major growth to improve the A140 (Long Stratton survey Q1 – Against major development = 49.6%; for major development = 48.2%). When asked about the scale of growth only a minority support levels over 1500 dwellings. (Long Stratton Survey Q2 - see Appendix 7 for the results of this survey).

### **Freight Transport**

In relation to freight transport, respondents overwhelmingly supported the option that would ensure that sites generating significant amounts of freight movements should be located at strategic points on the transport networks (road, rail, water and air). (Q36 Long Questionnaire – option a = 98%). Comments particularly reinforced the promotion of freight movement by rail and water.

### **Rural Deprivation**

To improve accessibility in the rural areas, public transport links to and between the market towns and larger villages with facilities should be improved. However, new development should be restricted unless there was good access to jobs and services (Q35 Long Questionnaire – option c = 37%; option a = 36% respectively). When considering options on how to reduce rural deprivation it was also suggested that steps should be taken to promote the multi-use of rural buildings (Long Questionnaire Q38 – 26%) and provide local facilities in these communities even when they may not be economically viable (22%).

## **5e Area-wide Policy Theme = Environmental Assets**

### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

#### Long Questionnaire

- Q1) Spatial Vision to 2026
- Q28) Protection of Landscape and biodiversity

#### Short Questionnaire

- Q2) Improving the local environment
- Q3) Principles influencing the choice of growth locations
- Q5) Locally specific issues

#### Other Sources

- Have Your Say Youth Conference

### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

Responses on environmental issues are spread over a number of areas of the consultation. In the public leaflet we asked about the things that could improve the local environment. Respondents gave significant weight to the need to avoid development in sensitive areas and to avoid any significant risk of flooding. Respondents also gave some weight to the need for sensitivity towards the historic areas of towns and villages (Q2 – Short Questionnaire).

Impact on the environment is the most important criterion for choosing locations for growth (measure of overall priorities – Q3 Short Questionnaire).

We asked which of all the issues identified in each area were the most important. For the City of Norwich historic character was the principle issue of concern (NB this was answered by people living throughout the area, not just those who lived in Norwich) (Q5 Short Questionnaire). Similarly for the more rural areas respondents gave priority to preserving the character of the towns and villages.

In relation to the overall Vision for the area, the responses included some environmental concerns, notably:

- the need to adapt existing urban environments
- the need to maintain woodlands and green corridors
- the need to protect local heritage
- potential negative impact of growth on tourism and countryside issues

(Q1 Long Questionnaire – comments).

Respondents overwhelmingly agreed that nationally and locally protected sites and landscapes should be protected from the impacts of growth and that additional specific areas, historic landscapes and the setting of the city should be identified and protected. (Q28 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 91%). This response also supported using the Ecological Network Map and the Norfolk Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) to guide policy development. However, some people entered a qualification that locally designated landscapes may be suitable for development if necessary to achieve wider sustainability goals (Q28 Long Questionnaire – comments).

Additional environmental assets suggested included parks, allotments, greenfields, geodiversity, and that light pollution should be avoided. Young people supported the need for more cycle paths and better recycling facilities (Have Your Say Youth Conference, Workshop 2 Questionnaire responses, 69.8% and 70.6 % respectively).

DRAFT



## **5f Area-wide Policy Theme = Community Life and Culture**

### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

#### Long Questionnaire

- Q37) Community development in growth areas
- Q38) Rural Deprivation
- Q40) Provision for late night leisure

#### Short Questionnaire

- Q1) Vision
- Q5) Locally specific issues
- Q8) Ways to reduce the need to travel

#### Other Sources

- Have Your Say Youth Conference

### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

This subject was dealt with in one chapter of the document but there are also references to communities in various other contexts in the responses.

A frequent response to the Vision for the area was that there needs to be more services and facilities especially in smaller communities in rural areas (Q1 Short Questionnaire – comments by 124 people).

We asked about locally specific issues in the different parts of the area. Community facilities, cultural and leisure opportunities were referred to in the questions about each part of the area. However, none of these scored highly as a priority for these areas, although in rural areas, 'preserving the character of towns and villages' was seen as the most important issue (Q5 Short Questionnaire). Comments relating to this question showed considerable concern for more cultural and leisure facilities in the urban area (77 comments) and the need for support for local post offices, shops and businesses in rural areas (184 comments). In the urban area respondents also supported more green open space and allotments (41 comments). In relation to the need to reduce the need to travel respondents also supported better provision of local shops and services in villages (Q8 Short Questionnaire – 497 comments)

Dedicated community workers to assist in community development in new communities was supported (Q37 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 60%). However, some comments suggested that facilities like shops, a local community centre and sports facilities should have priority and that community workers are a waste of money (12 comments)

In relation to rural deprivation we suggested a range of options that could be used. Highest support was shown for improving public transport accessibility to towns and larger villages, promoting wider multiple use of rural community buildings and providing and assisting to maintain essential facilities even when not economically viable (Q38 Long Questionnaire – option A = 28%, option d = 26%, option c = 22%). Some people commented that it was important to recognise the differences between rural and urban areas and not try to achieve equality across the whole area.

Finally we asked about leisure facilities in the city centre and there was general agreement that a range of leisure opportunities should be pursued suitable for all age groups (Q40 Long Questionnaire – option b = 52%). Comments included the need for a new concert hall/performance arts centre in the city centre (6 comments). Young people also wanted more varied leisure opportunities, but affordability was a key consideration for them (Have Your Say Youth Conference, Workshop 1 – what we wish to see)

DRAFT

## 6 Implementation and Monitoring – Responses to Consultation.

This brief section analyses responses to the last five questions on the main document, which dealt with implementation and monitoring, including aspects relating to the tariff approach.

Since the consultation the government has now announced its support for the introduction of a 'Community Infrastructure Levy' on developments. In most respects this is very similar to what the document refers to as the tariff approach. For the purposes of this report, we will therefore continue to use the term 'tariff approach'.

### **6a Policies for Implementation and Monitoring**

#### ***The Questions Relevant to this theme***

##### Long Questionnaire

- Q48) Basis for contributions to infrastructure costs
- Q49) Basis for tariff approach, if accepted
- Q50) Role of public bodies in advance funding infrastructure
- Q51) Other comments
- Q52) Management of funds

##### Other Sources

- Have Your Say Youth Conference

#### ***What the responses told us about this theme***

Respondents supported a tariff approach rather than contributions on an individual site basis (Q48 Long Questionnaire – option A = 40%, option B = 60%). There were concerns expressed that a tariff must still take account of viability of development and that it should also take account of the particular, local impact of any development.

In general there was support for the idea that a tariff should include a discount for brownfield sites (Q48b Long Questionnaire – Yes = 65%).

In the event of a tariff approach being adopted, there was general support for this being an area-wide assessment, rather than specific to one sector of the area (Q49 Long Questionnaire – option A = 58%). Similarly, respondents felt that it would be appropriate for public bodies to fund infrastructure early in the life of a development and recoup funding afterwards (Q50 Long Questionnaire – Yes = 74%).

The Youth Conference included an exercise to show the choices involved in setting a tariff and spending such income on the relevant community facilities (Have Your Say Youth Conference, Workshop 2 report). The group managed to come to consensus

and gave priority to the primary health facility, a youth centre and a contribution to public transport, with other facilities being merged to save money in order to make the development viable. This is the kind of consultation which will be necessary more widely once the structure of any tariff is being considered.

In comments on Q51 (Long Questionnaire) the main concern seemed to be viability of development and the overall level of the tariff being set with this in mind (11 comments). There were also concerns that the tariff system could distort planning judgements, in order to obtain contributions for necessary work (2 comments).

In relation managing funds derived from a tariff system, there was broad agreement that clear, transparent and audited accounts would need to be made available to developers, the community and new residents to demonstrate the links between development and provision of facilities/ infrastructure etc. (Q52 Long Questionnaire – comments). Most responses were clear that it should be locally managed, but there was some concern that this should not be by the local council.

DRAFT

## APPENDIX 1

## JOINT CORE STRATEGY ISSUES WORKSHOPS 2007

DATE	PLACE	TITLE	ORGANISATIONS IN ATTENDANCE
Tuesday 26 <sup>th</sup> June 8.00 am (with breakfast)	King's Centre, King Street, Norwich	Economy Issues	East of England Learning and Skills Council, Norfolk Tourism, Princes Trust, Federation of Small Businesses, Norwich Chamber of Trade and Industry, NEETU, YMCA training, Job Centre Plus, Archant Ltd, Jarrold and Sons, Broadland District Council (Economic Development), Bidwells, Roche Retail, Norfolk County Council (Economic Development) South Norfolk Council (Economic Development), UEA, Easton College, Citygate, Visit Norwich Ltd, Martin Smith Partnership.
Tuesday 26 <sup>th</sup> June 6 p.m.	Assembly Rooms, Theatre Street, Norwich (Kent and Sexton Rooms)	Community Life Issues	Norfolk PCT, Norwich Methodist Church, Age Concern Norwich, NELM Development Trust. Norfolk County Council Children's Services, Broadland District Council (LSP), Norfolk Constabulary, Norfolk Association of P and TC, South Norfolk Health Improvement Project, YMCA Norfolk, Norwich City Council (Community Development).
Monday 2 <sup>nd</sup> July 2.30 p.m.	Assembly Rooms, Norwich (Pierce and Sexton Rooms)	City Centre/ Regeneration Issues	The Garage, Waterfront, City Centre Management Partnership, Norfolk Constabulary, Jarrold and Sons, NSAC, Norfolk Action and Alcohol Team, Broadland Older People's Partnership, Great Hospital Trust, Visit Norwich Ltd, Mancroft Advice Project, Marks and Spencer, Norwich City Council (Economic Development), Bidwells, Roche
Monday 2 <sup>nd</sup>	Pinebanks,	Rest of	Bidwells, TA Millards, Arnolds, UEA, RICS, NTAG, Arnolds, Bracon

July 6 p.m.	Thorpe St Andrew	Norwich Policy Area + Growth Issues	Ash Parish Council, Costessey Parish Council, Easton Parish Council, Hethersett Parish Council, Little Melton Parish Council, Poringland Parish Council, Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council, Tasburgh Parish Council, Wymondham Town Council, South Norfolk Older People's Forum, Building Partnerships, Cringleford Parish Council, East Carlton with Ketteringham Parish Council, Framingham Earl Parish Council
Wednesday 4 <sup>th</sup> July 10.30 am.	UEA Sports Park, Norwich	Environment Workshop	Broads Society, Costessey Society, Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership, Norfolk Gardens Trust, UEA Tyndall Centre, Norwich 21, Norwich River Heritage Group, Reepham Society, Norfolk County Council Climate Change Group, City Council (Community Development), Bidwells, Norwich City Council (Landscape), Hethersett Society, Enertrag, Environment Agency, Wymondham Development Partnership, Norfolk Sports Alliance, Wymondham Community Partnership.
Wednesday 4 <sup>th</sup> July 2.30 p.m	UEA Sports Park, Norwich	Culture and Leisure Issues	Creative Arts East, Norfolk Rural Community Council, Norfolk Ramblers Association, Norfolk and Norwich Festival Ltd, Sport England (Eastern), Visit Norwich Ltd, South Norfolk Council (Sport and Leisure), UEA Sportspark, Norwich City Council (Sport Development), Open Youth Venue, Norfolk Tourism, RSPB, Broads Authority, The Forum Trust, Licensing Forum, Norfolk County Football Association, Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Service, Norwich Sports Council, NNREC, Wymondham Community Partnership
Thursday 5 <sup>th</sup> July 2.30 p.m.	Assembly Rooms, Theatre Street, Norwich (Kent and Sexton	Transport Issues	East Anglian Cycling Club, Highways Agency, Passenger Transport Group, Norfolk and Norwich Transport Action Group, Norwich Door to Door, Norwich Airport Ltd, Rail Passenger Council, Sustrans, Taverham Parish Council, Konnect Buses, Norfolk County Council (Transport Strategy), Living Streets, Norwich Cycling Campaign,

	Rooms)		Broads Authority, Ambassador Travel, UEA Estates and Buildings, Norfolk Fire Service, Norfolk Hackney Trade Association, Rail Future, South Norfolk Older People's Forum, TA Millards
Thursday 5 <sup>th</sup> July 7p.m.	UEA Sports Park, Norwich	Rural Issues Workshop	Buxton with Lammas Parish Council, Hainford Parish Council, Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council, Reepham Parish Council, South Walsham Parish Council, Stratton Strawless Parish Council, Upton with Fishley Parish Council, Broadland Council (Local Strategic Partnership), Greater Norwich Housing Partnership, Bunwell Parish Council, Chedgrave Parish Council, Denton Parish Council, Hingham Parish Council, Loddon Parish Council, Saxlingham Nethergate Parish Council, Talconeston Parish Council, Woodbastwick Parish Council, Rackheath Parish Council, Harford Parish Council, South Norfolk Parish Council, Bidwells, Brown and Co
Friday 6 <sup>th</sup> July 10.30 a.m.	Pinebanks, Thorpe St Andrew	Housing Issues	Broadland Housing Association, Circle Anglia, Cofton Ltd, Cotman Housing Association, Hopkins Homes, House Builders Federation, Lovell, Norfolk Rural Community Council, Pegasus Planning Group, Persimmon, Savills, Pedders Way Housing Association, Saffron Housing Trust, Norfolk Homes Ltd, RPS Planning Consultancy, South Norfolk Flood Defence, Greater Norwich Housing Partnership, TA Millards, YMCA, Shelter, City wide tenants board, Showmans Guild of Great Britain, May Gurney, Broadland District Council (Housing), Brown and co, Wherry Residents Association

**APPENDIX 2****Joint Core Strategy 'Issues & Options' - stakeholder meetings and presentations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Audience</b>	<b>Type of event</b>
31 Jan 07	Children's Services	Meeting
7 Feb 07	LSP co-ordinators	Meeting
28 Feb 07	PCT	Meeting
28 Mar 07	Children's Services	Meeting
18 Apr 07	Highway's Agency	Meeting
9 May 07	LSP co-ordinators	Meeting
16 May 07	HBF	Meeting
16 May 07	RICS	Meeting
28 June 07	PCT	Meeting
11 July 07	Minerals and Waste	Meeting
16 July 07	Post- 16 Education	Meeting
25 July 07	Joint LSP	Workshop
22 August 07	GO-East	Meeting
7 Sept 07	RICS	Seminar
10 Oct 07	CPRE and the Broads Authority	Meeting
Oct 08	Greater Norwich pre-consultation preparation	Secondary Heads in Greater Norwich
06 Nov 07	Major stakeholders	Launch Event
8 Nov 07	Highways Agency	Meeting
22 – 23 Nov 07	General public	Exhibition
28 Nov 07	Primary Care Trust	Planners briefing
06 Dec 07	Norwich Property Forum	Presentation
03 – 14 Dec 07 (weekdays)	General public	Exhibition



<b>Date</b>	<b>Audience</b>	<b>Type of event</b>
14 Dec 07	Greater Norwich Homelessness Prevention Strategy Group	Briefing
20 Dec 07	City Centre Management Partnership	Briefing
03 – 05 Jan 08	General public	Exhibition
10 - 11 Jan 08	General public	Exhibition
13 Jan 08	General public	Exhibition (Mobile)
14 Jan 08	General public	Exhibition (Mobile)
16 Jan 08	General public	Exhibition
17 Jan 08	PCT Dr Rogriduez & Clive Rennie	Planning briefing
17 Jan 08	General public and combined with hard to reach group event	Exhibition
14 Jan 08	LDF Working Party (all member)	Workshop
18 Jan 08	CoNP Strategic Board and Delivery Board	Workshop
21 Jan 08	General public and combined with hard to reach group event	Exhibition
21 Jan 08	General public	Exhibition (Mobile)
22 Jan 08	General public	Exhibition (Mobile)
24 Jan 08	General public and combined with hard to reach group event	Exhibition
30 Jan 08	Joint LSP meeting	Workshop
07 Feb 08 tbc	Young people	Youth Conference

## APPENDIX 3

## EXHIBITION ATTENDANCE FIGURES

Exhibition	Date	male under 18	male 18-24	male 25-34	male 35-44	male 45-54	male 55-64	male 65-74	male over 75	
Loddon Hollies	08/01/2007	1	1	0	0	3	8	15	3	
Forum	22/11/2007	5	1		1		3			
Forum	23/11/2007	1	1	4	3	1	7	5	1	
Weston Longville	27/11/2007	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	1	
Hethersett	28/11/2007	2	0	3	2	9	18	20	6	
Aylsham	28/11/2007	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	5	
Wymondham market stall	30/11/2007	5	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
Reepham	30/11/2007	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	1	
Diss Corn Hall	01/12/2007	3	0	1	1	1	3	12	3	
Poringland	04/12/2007	1	0	0	3	4	17	26	11	
Bedford Street	04/12/2007	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	
Bedford Street	05/12/2007	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	
Harleston Market	05/12/2007	0	0	5	5	5	5	0	0	
Horstead	05/12/2007	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	2	
Bedford Street	06/12/2007	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	
Bedford Street	07/12/2007	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	
Wymondham Central Hall	08/12/2007	2	3	0	6	6	22	13	4	
Bedford Street	10/12/2007	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	
Bedford Street	11/12/2007	0	0	1	1	2	1			
Private Sector Forum	11/12/2007									
Bedford Street	14/12/2007	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	
Bedford Street	31/12/2007	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	

GNDP Joint Core Strategy - Issues & Options Consultation Interim Report

Forum	03/01/2008	0	0	1	5	7	8	7	0	
Forum	04/01/2008	0	0	14	3	4	5	2	0	
Forum	05/01/2008	0	0	4	3	17	21	6	0	
Diss Market	05/01/2008	0	0	5	5	5	5	2	0	
Mulbarton Village Hall	07/01/2008	0	1	2	0	5	11	10	2	
Costessey	09/01/2008	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	
South Walsham	09/01/2008	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	
Hingham	11/01/2008	1	0	1	1	1	4	3	5	
Costessey High school	11/01/2008	15								
Older Peoples Forum	14/01/2008							5		
Wymondham College	24/01/2008	16								
Business Forum SN	01/02/2008					8				
Have your say Youth Conference	06/02/2008	30								
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>84</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>729</b>

Exhibition	Date	Female under 18	Female 18-24	Female 25-34	Female 35-44	Female 45-54	Female 55-64	Female 65-74	Female over 75	unknown
Loddon Hollies	08/01/2007	2	0	0	1	3	11	12	4	
Forum	22/11/2007		1	1		4	2	1		
Forum	23/11/2007	1	2	2	2	1	3	5	1	
Weston Longville	27/11/2007	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	0	
Hethersett	28/11/2007	0	0	1	1	7	14	11	8	
Aylsham	28/11/2007	1	0	0	2	3	13	11	8	
Wymondham market stall	30/11/2007		9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
Reepham	30/11/2007	0	0	2	3	1	5	3	2	
Diss Corn Hall	01/12/2007	2	0	1	1	3	6	7	3	
Poringland	04/12/2007	3	1	1	2	9	28	12	4	
Bedford Street	04/12/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Bedford Street	05/12/2007	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	

GNDP Joint Core Strategy - Issues & Options Consultation Interim Report

Harleston Market	05/12/2007	0	5	5	5	5	1	0		
Horstead	05/12/2007	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	1	
Bedford Street	06/12/2007	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Bedford Street	07/12/2007	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wymondham Central Hall	08/12/2007	1	1	2	2	7	15	10	3	
Bedford Street	10/12/2007	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Bedford Street	11/12/2007									
Private Sector Forum	11/12/2007									120
Bedford Street	14/12/2007	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		
Bedford Street	31/12/2007	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	
Forum	03/01/2008	1	1	1	1	4	4	6	0	
Forum	04/01/2008	0	0	11	1	4	13	1	6	
Forum	05/01/2008	0	0	1	2	30	5	4	0	
Diss Market	05/01/2008	0	0	5	5	5	3	0	0	
Mulbarton Village Hall	07/01/2008	2	0	1	1	5	8	7	1	
Costessey	09/01/2008	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	2	
South Walsham	09/01/2008	0	1	0	2	1	3	1	1	
Hingham	11/01/2008	2	0	1	1	1	4	5	2	
Costessey High school	11/01/2008	15								
Older Peoples Forum	14/01/2008							5		
Wymondham College	24/01/2008	16								
Business Forum SN	01/02/2008					2				
Have Your Say Youth Conference	06/02/2008	30								
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>78</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>647</b>
<b>Total male &amp; female</b>										<b>1376 + 120</b>

GNDP Joint Core Strategy - Issues & Options Consultation Interim Report

Supermarket	Date	male under 18	male 18-24	male 25-34	male 35-44	male 45-54	male 55-64	male 65-74	male over 75
Wymondham Waitrose	12/01/2008	0	6	10	10	10	10	10	10
Eaton Waitrose	13/01/2008	0	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Bowthorpe Roys	14/01/2008	1	0	0	3	1	4	2	2
Costessey Sainsbury	15/01/2008	0	2	2	2	3	0	4	2
Drayton Budgens	16/01/2008	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	1
Old Catton Somerfield	17/01/2008	0	0	0	1	8	5	8	3
Hellesdon Asda	18/01/2008	0	0	0	1	5	6	4	2
Sprowston Tesco	19/01/2008	0	0	1	0	5	5	9	1
Thorpe St Andrew	20/01/2008	1	1	6	6	4	4	5	1
Riverside Morrisons	21/01/2008	0	0	2	3	4	2	2	0
Norwich Earlham Somerfield	22/01/2008	0	3	1	3	5	3	0	0
Harford Tesco	23/01/2008	1	1	2	2	5	8	12	2
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>29</b>

DRAFT

GNDP Joint Core Strategy - Issues & Options Consultation Interim Report

Supermarket	Date	Female under 18	Female 18-24	Female 25-34	Female 35-44	Female 45-54	Female 55-64	Female 65-74	Female over 75
Wymondham Waitrose	12/01/2008	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	3
Eaton Waitrose	13/01/2008	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Bowthorpe Roys	14/01/2008	0	0	0	1	3	2	1	0
Costessey Sainsbury	15/01/2008	0	0	0	3	2	2	4	1
Drayton Budgens	16/01/2008	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	0
Old Catton Somerfield	17/01/2008	0	1	1	0	7	3	0	0
Hellesdon Asda	18/01/2008	0	0	0	2	1	8	1	0
Sprowston Tesco	19/01/2008	0	0	1	2	10	5	3	2
Thorpe St Andrew	20/01/2008	1	4	1	3	10	5	5	1
Riverside Morrisons	21/01/2008	0	0	1	0	3	1	2	0
Norwich Earlham Somerfield	22/01/2008	0	0	3	4	7	2	1	0
Harford Tesco	23/01/2008	0	0	4	0	4	8	7	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>12</b>

Overall total male & female = 544 attending supermarket roadshows  
 =1372 + 120 = 1492 attending exhibitions

**GRAND TOTAL ATTENDANCE =2036**

## APPENDIX 4

### ANALYSIS OF OUTCOMES OF 'HAVE YOUR SAY' YOUTH CONFERENCE 7<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2008.

#### Aims and Structure

The "Have Your Say" conference was organised to help young people participate with the Greater Norwich Development Partnership's (GNDP) consultation on the Issues and Options document for the Joint Core Strategy. The event sought to inform young people on the significant growth planned for the GNDP area and on the process that the local councils would go through in deciding where the new development should be located. Young people were also asked what factors they felt needed to be taken into account when such decisions were made. The format for the day was prepared through a working party that included young people. Participants were drawn from High Schools in the GNDP area.'

The schools in attendance:

- Wymondham High School
- Reepham High School
- Wymondham College
- Hellesdon High School
- The Hewett School
- Aylsham High School
- City Of Norwich School

Approximately 60 students attended

#### Introduction to the Day

Rob and Chrissie from Radio Broadland welcomed the students, described what the GNDP is and what the partnership does and explained the purpose of the day. (See appendix 1) Next they asked the students a series of questions, and their responses were captured on video.

Results are as follows:

<b>Questions – morning session</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>% YES</b>
<b>A.</b> Have you ever had problems with transport?	52	0	100%
<b>B.</b> Do you like shopping?	46	6	89%
<b>C.</b> Do you shop on the internet?	40	12	77%
<b>D.</b> Do you use local shops?	49	3	94%
<b>E.</b> When you leave education will you stay in the Norwich area?	12	40	23%
<b>F.</b> Do you know how to have your say on future plans for the growth of the Norwich area?	8	44	15%
<b>G.</b> Do you know how many houses and jobs are being	5	47	10%

planned?			
<b>H.</b> Do you think you will be able to afford your own home	3	49	6%
<b>I.</b> Would you like to live in the City centre?	10	42	19%
<b>J.</b> Would you prefer to live in the rural area?	42	10	81%
<b>K.</b> Do you think man is responsible for contributing to global warming?	49	3	94%
<b>L.</b> Do you and your family regularly recycle?	48	4	92%
<b>M.</b> Would you like to work for yourself?	49	3	94%
<b>N.</b> Do you think money is more important than quality of life?	6	46	12%
<b>P.</b> Do you like living in Norfolk?	46	6	89%

**At the end of the day**, questions were revisited and there was a shift in voting in some areas:

<b>Questions - afternoon session</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>% YES</b>
<b>A.</b> Have you ever had problems with transport?	52	0	100% (no change)
<b>F.</b> Do you now know how to have your say on future plans for the area?	50	2	96% (up from 15%)
<b>G.</b> Do you know how many jobs and houses are planned for the area?	36	16	69% (up from 10%)
For any job you would like to do, do you think there will be training locally?	13	39	25% (not asked in morning)
<b>I.</b> Would you like to live in the City centre?	7	45	13% (down from 19%)
<b>E.</b> When you leave education will you stay in the Norwich area?	8	44	15% (down from 23%)

#### **Transport - Issues highlighted**

Cost

Reliability

Grumpy bus drivers

Not regular/ frequent enough

No services in rural areas

Poor condition of buses

Bus stops but no buses in some parts of South Norfolk

#### **Staying in the Norwich area after education – Issues highlighted**



Too expensive 3  
Desire to explore  
Disagreeable weather conditions  
Lack of job opportunities  
Poor public transport  
Prefer to live abroad / Scotland / Finland  
Settle where they go to University

**For those who would want to live in rural areas – Reasons given**

Lower cost of housing  
Healthier  
Can visit City anytime – best of both worlds  
Quieter pace of life

The rest of the morning the students attended a workshop of their choice:

**WORKSHOPS**

**Workshop 1. (Greater) Norwich Sucks / (Greater) Norwich is Great**

Facilitators: Tim Bacon (Norwich CC), Ruth Bullard (Blyth Jex School), Marion Catlin (Norwich CC)

This Workshop involved 15 students from three schools. The group worked in groups of five to identify the things they thought were great/not great about the Norwich area. The cumulative suggestions from the three groups were then voted upon to obtain a consensus across the workshop. The commonly shared views were as follows:

Norwich sucks because of:

- Poor transport/rude bus drivers
- Anglia Square
- St Stephens
- Westlegate tower
- Litter/gum
- Over-priced leisure facilities

Norwich is great because of:

- Shops/restaurants
- UEA/education
- Clean (somewhat contradictory re above litter/gum comments)
- Airport
- New buildings
- History/culture

The three groups also produced a quick presentation on what they would like to see Norwich like in 2026. Some themes coming from this included:

- Local produce/organic food
- Affordable housing
- Varied and affordable leisure (not just city centre focused)
- High tech jobs
- Jobs close to home
- Improved housing/new build
- Green spaces/clean
- Bright colours/interesting architecture (specifically Mexican for Anglia square)

**Workshop 2. Hard Choices and Saying it Better**

Facilitators: Tim Horspole and Kelly Farrow (Broadland DC), Simon Marjoram and Kim Woodhouse (South Norfolk DC)

Originally planned for two workshops but they were amalgamated to make the session viable as they both needed a minimum number to be meaningful.

### ***Hard Choices***

This exercise required young people to consider what services and facilities are essential when planning a new community. Based on a fictitious planning application the participants had to agree what community facilities should be included in a major housing development. A role was given to each participant; their views had to reflect what they thought a person with their role would say. The exercise involved trimming £1,890,000 from a costed list of facilities and services.

### **The Outcome**

After much debate the group managed to come to a consensus. They all agreed that the Primary Health facility, the youth centre and the contribution to public transport should stay. Savings were made by merging the place of worship with the older people's day centre (saving £500,000); amending the nature of the play areas and merging them with other open space (saving £200,000); merge the supported housing scheme in with the affordable housing; merge the skills centre and the library and accept a smaller scale police station.

### ***Saying it better***

This exercise aimed to take the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) Joint Core Strategy Issues and Options consultation questionnaire and redesign it with young people, making it more appropriate and meaningful for seeking their views on the future growth plans for the area.

### **Familiarity**

Firstly we established whether the young people had seen the questionnaires which had been delivered to every household in South Norfolk, Broadland and Norwich City areas. None had seen it.

### **User friendly**

We asked the young people to read the leaflet section by section giving each a 'thumbs up' or 'thumbs down' for understanding, being able to answer the questions and whether the issues were of interest and relevance to them.

Generally they felt the questions posed were too complicated. The language used was too technical. Sections identified to be of relevance and interest were: Environment, Jobs, Getting About, and Growth Locations - particularly as to how this might affect their schools.

### **Design**

The students looked critically at the design, colours and pictures. They thought the design was unhelpful and suggested that questions should always come after the informative text, rather than having to keep turning the questionnaire over to find the relevant text that the question was asking about.

### **Questions**

The students discussed what the issues were for them and their friends within each of the topics and designed questions that would ask their peers whether they agreed or not. They discussed the issue of 'closed questions' versus 'open questions' and decided that closed questions should be asked to ensure clarity. The next stage of the preparation of the Joint Core Strategy will be the 'Preferred Options' which will be

in Autumn 2008 - young people will be consulted again at this time. The workshop concluded with the students that wanted further input into the design of the questionnaire leaving their contact details for receipt and agreement on the final version. A copy of the questionnaire can be found at the end of this report.

**Production post conference**

The first draft of the Young People’s questionnaire was produced by South Norfolk Council Planning Policy Team and e-mailed to the participating young people for comments. The final version was printed during the February half term and 100 copies for each school were sent to the schools participating in the conference. They were also sent to schools located in the suggested growth locations – Blyth Jex, Long Stratton, Costessey High, Framingham Earl High and Hethersett High.

***Responses received***

A total of 646 questionnaire responses were received. An analysis of the results will be undertaken by GNDP planning group in due course.

School	Responses received
Aylsham High School	100
Blyth-Jex High School	0
City of Norwich School (CNS)	51
Costessey High School	101
Framingham Earl High School	0
Hellesdon High School	62
Hethersett High School	0
Hewett	0
Long Stratton High School	95
Reepham High School	51
Wymondham College	77
Wymondham High School	109
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>646</b>

**Gender**

Male 312 (48.3%)  
 Female 326 (50.5%)  
 Not disclosed 8

**Age**

Age	Total Responses
11	47 (7.3%)
12	132 (20.6%)
13	177 (27.4%)
14	143 (22.1%)
15	65 (10.1%)
16	49 (7.7%)
17	26 (4.0%)

**Ethnicity**

Ethnic Origin	Total
---------------	-------

White	612 (75.7%)
Mixed	14 (2.2%)
Asian or Asian British	4 (0.6%)
Black or Black British	3 (0.5%)
Chinese	1 (0.2%)
Other	5 (0.8%)

	<b>Statement</b>	<b>Total Agreed</b>
<b>Environment</b>	There should be more cycle paths	451 (69.8%)
	There should be more recycling facilities	456 (70.6%)
	We should encourage greater use of renewable energy (e.g. wind)	340 (73.4%)
<b>Jobs</b>	There are not enough jobs in your area for young people	464 (71.8%)
	You would be able to do your chosen career in Norwich	295 (45.8%)
	You would want to work in the Norwich area	288 (44.6%)
<b>Getting About</b>	You are able to get a bus from where you live	495 (76.6%)
	The buses go to/from Norwich	482 (74.8%)
	I can get a bus to/ from school	335 (51.9%)
	I can use a public bus daily	384 (59.4%)
	I use a public bus at least once each week	161 (24.9%)
	I use a public bus mainly at weekends	317 (49.1%)
	Public transport is too expensive for young people	362 (56.0%)
<b>Your School</b>	My school should not get any bigger	301 (46.7%)
	It would be better to build new schools rather than expanding the existing ones	265 (39.5%)
	My school could expand further to have more pupils	233 (36.1%)

A total of 148 students indicated that they wished to be kept informed about the growth options and take part in future consultations about this subject.

### **Workshop 3. Dragons' Den**

This workshop was run by Norfolk Network and two students from the UEA. Students were given a product and tasked with convincing the 'dragons' that they should invest in their company. It was a fun and informative exercise that gave young people an insight into business planning, marketing, sales, production and profit margins. As well as being an insightful experience, the purpose was to encourage students to become enterprising individuals.

Student feedback:

"Today has really opened my eyes into what it takes to run a business – I now want to gain the necessary skills by taking business studies in the sixth form."

"It was good to have the support and to talk to the UEA students."

"It was great to work in a team and my confidence has gone through the roof, now that I've survived the dragons and an audience".

"It's given me confidence in my own ideas and how to communicate them."

"It was really valuable to hear the experience of the entrepreneurs who were judging us and to have their constructive feedback."

### During lunch

There was a suggestions board for students to leave their comments about the city.

Summary of the feedback:

- Cheaper buses (multiple comments)
- More buses
- Cheaper public transport
- More regular recycling bin collections
- Free bus passes for under 18s in full-time education
- Trains in rural areas i.e. Reepham to Causton
- Sustainable houses
- Harleston needs speed bumps on School lane (multiple comments)
- More activities for younger people and at lower prices
- Fair prices for farmers

### After lunch

Students were free to visit a variety of stations in a business exhibition format.

Stations were as follows:

- **The Map Game** – students experimented with where to put housing and how much, roads, transport, recreation grounds. Lead by Tim Horspole (Broadland DC) and Kim Woodhouse (South Norfolk DC)
- **NVS** – Steve Smith from Norfolk and Norwich Voluntary Services attended to promote volunteering opportunities across the county.
- **Connexions** – attended to promote their careers advice and lifestyle advisory services
- **Waste/recycling** – Helen Lambert (Norwich CC) attended to answer any questions that the students had regarding waste and recycling.
- **Transport** - Josie Barnett & Chris Limbach (Norfolk CC) attended to answer queries on transport issues.
- **Wymondham Environmental Club** – attended to promote environmental issues i.e. lobbying for a ban on plastic bags.
- **SNYA** – Steve Thomas (South Norfolk DC) and young people from South Norfolk Youth Action attended to promote SNYA. SNYA were also actively involved in the preparation and delivery of the youth conference.
- **Councillors** - Two district and one county councillor attended to answer any questions from the students and encourage them to actively engage with the Joint Core Strategy. The councillors in attendance were Cllr Bremner (Norwich CC), Cllr Carswell (Broadland DC) and Cllr How (Norfolk CC). Robert Hobbs (Norwich CC planning policy officer) was on hand to assist with any planning policy issues.

The day was closed by Ruth Bullard (Blyth Jex School) - this included questions detailed at beginning of report.

**Key points from the feedback forms:**

Those students who filled in a feedback form1:

- 88% felt they knew more about the process for planning growth and development in Greater Norwich at the end of the day
- 68% wanted to be contacted in the future to be involved with further consultation events

DRAFT

## APPENDIX 5

### YOUNG PEOPLES' QUESTIONNAIRE

Help us to plan the future – we need to know what you think

This survey is asking your views about the future plans for the growth of Norwich and the surrounding areas. Please fill in the questionnaire by ticking the boxes that apply to you. Everything you tell us will be treated in confidence. A chance to win £30 in a prize draw of completed entries will take place at the end of March. Please return your questionnaire to your school office by FRIDAY 7<sup>th</sup> MAR. 08

#### ABOUT YOU

Gender: Male  Female   
 Your Age: 11  12  13  14  15  16  17   
 Your Name .....

YOUR SCHOOL/ COLLEGE: \_\_\_\_\_ YEAR: \_\_\_\_\_

ETHNIC BACKGROUND: What is your ethnic group? Choose ONE section from A to F, to indicate your ethnic group.

- A. WHITE  B. MIXED  C. ASIAN OR ASIAN BRITISH   
 D. BLACK OR BLACK BRITISH  E. CHINESE   
 F. OTHER (WRITE IN)  .....

#### INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION: Over the next 20 years, the Norwich area is set to grow to meet the targets set by Government for new houses and jobs and this is your opportunity to say how you think things should change. We need to find space for over 25,000 new homes. We will also need more and better jobs, schools, transport, medical and leisure facilities for everyone. Below are some questions drafted by young people at the Have your say Youth Conference. These are the issues they think will affect young people in the future. What do you think?

#### 2- ENVIRONMENT

Our environment is precious, and we should treat it with respect. Any new things being built should have minimum impact on climate change. Tick the box only if you agree

- A. There should be more cycle paths? .....   
 B. There should be more recycling facilities .....   
 C. We should encourage greater use of renewable energy? E.g. wind turbines



#### 3- JOBS

Tick the box only if you agree

- D. There are not enough jobs in your area for young people?   
 E. You would be able to do your chosen career in Norwich?   
 F. You would want to work in the Norwich area? .....



**Help us to plan the future – we need to know what you think**

**4: GETTING ABOUT**



Tick the box only if you agree

- F. You are able to get a bus from where you live? .....
- G. The buses go to / from Norwich? .....
- H. I can get a bus to / from school? .....
- I. I can use a public bus daily? .....
- J. I use a public bus at least once each week? .....
- K. I use a public bus mainly at weekends? .....
- L. Public transport is too expensive for young people? .....



**5: YOUR SCHOOL**



Tick the box only if you agree

- M. My school should not get any bigger? .....
- N. It would be better to build new schools rather than expanding the existing ones? .....
- O. My school could expand further to have more pupils? .....

**THANK YOU FOR FILLING IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

If you would like to be kept informed about how the growth plans for the Norwich area are going and would like to take part in future questionnaires about this subject, please fill in your details below and we will add you to our database.

Name .....

Address .....

.....

Postcode .....

Email .....

This questionnaire is part of the Joint Core Strategy Issues & Options consultation by the Greater Norwich Development Partnership of Broadland, Norwich City, South Norfolk and Norfolk County Councils.



## APPENDIX 6

### Issues & Options Summary Leaflet - Results Analysis

The following table provides a breakdown of the number of summary leaflet responses made in hard copy format and the number supplied electronically:

Document	Hard copy representations	Electronic representations	Total responses
Summary Leaflet	6,640 (89.7%)	764 (10.3%)	<b>7,404</b>

The table below shows how many of the total number of responses were submitted by individuals in each of the three authority areas:

Document	Broadland responses	Norwich responses	South Norfolk responses	Other	Total responses
Summary leaflet	3313	1591	2070	77	<b>7,404</b>

The results below are set out by question in the Issues & Options Summary Leaflet:

#### Q1. Do you agree with the draft vision for the area?


<b>Yes</b>	6,017	81%
<b>No</b>	1,387	19%

#### If no, what would you change?

The scale of growth proposed is too high and there is fear about immigration. There should be no change in the area.	277
Roads need improving and it should be easier for car use.	180
Sceptical about the vision/ consultation/ decision making process	136
Public transport (including P&R and rail) walking and cycling needs improving. More areas should be pedestrianised	131
There should be no urban sprawl, loss of the countryside or building on Greenfield land. Development should go on brownfield sites or reuse existing derelict and empty buildings in Norwich	129

There is a need for more services and facilities, especially in rural areas e.g. schools, healthcare, shops, leisure, employment	124
There is a need for more growth in villages and market towns to maintain their viability and vitality and to support existing services	109
Norwich should not be the focus for growth	81
There should be a greater emphasis on preserving the character of villages and market town. Within these areas there should be no large scale growth.	63
Infrastructure is insufficient. Improvements are needed before any growth is undertaken	63
Unitary issues (for and against)	54
There is a need for more affordable housing to meet local need	48
New homes should go near existing public transport	33
We should restrict the loss of open space and countryside and should try to enhance it along with promoting green infrastructure, wildlife and biodiversity.	32
There should be no further road building (including no NNDR)	17
The promotion of renewable energy and the protection of the environment should be top priorities	14
There is the need for a new settlement (possibly an eco town)	14
There should be more focus on art and culture	9
Good design should be a priority along with reducing densities	8
More detail is required	6
Other issues	143


**Q2. From the list of things we could do to improve the local environment, please choose the one you feel is the most important  
Have we missed anything?**



Better affordable transport, car parking and improved roads and public transport	476
Eco-friendly/ carbon neutral housing, better recycling facilities	282
Better planned infrastructure (inc. social) BEFORE development	252
No more high density housing and better designed housing	194
Landscape / ecology	187
No more building anywhere	154
Safer cycling and walking/ reduce need to travel	126
Avoid greenfields	99
Water/ flood	94
More affordable housing	58
Other	599

**Q3. From the list please choose the three most important 'tests' to help us identify the best locations for new communities**

1. People should have access by walking, cycling and public transport to a good range of facilities.
2. Homes should be close to a good range of jobs.
3. Existing and new infrastructure must support the planned levels of growth.
4. Impact on the environment should be minimised, including open space, wildlife, water and flood risk.
5. Making sure houses are built in time and give people a choice of where to live.
6. Deciding how growth might happen in the very long-term (after 2026)
7. High quality agricultural land and mineral resources must be avoided where possible.



**Q4. Is the way we propose to manage the growth the best way?**

<b>Yes</b>	5682	79%
<b>No</b>	1530	21%

**If no, what would you change?**

More growth should be outside of Norwich, across villages or a new town	1175
No to growth	617
All growth should be in Norwich	523
Transport and infrastructure should be in place before development	515
Don't know - not enough information provided - too vague	65
Other factors e.g. environmental impact, flooding, protection of wildlife & heritage	41
Affordable homes for locals, ban 2nd homes, buy to rent	27
Use more brownfield developments, empty buildings, regeneration	25
Unitary issues	23
No more flats, build more quality houses, lower densities	19
No growth in villages around Norwich - no to urban sprawl	19

Sustainability issues, locations & building materials	10
Other	186

**Q5. All of the issues specific to your area are important, but which are the most important and have we missed any?**

**Central Norwich**


1. Allow room to expand city centre shopping
2. Regenerate and encourage office employment in the centre
3. Respect the history of Norwich
4. Expand cultural and leisure facilities

**Urban Norwich and surrounding areas**

5. Effect of growth on the suburbs and villages
6. Allow space for new facilities
7. Keep growth close to Norwich
8. Improvements to transport

**More rural areas**

9. Housing for local needs
10. Supporting agriculture/ employment opportunities
11. Preserving the character of towns and villages
12. Protecting the natural environment
13. Overcoming rural isolation
14. Encouraging and maintaining services
15. Availability of public transport



**Missed issues for central Norwich**

There is no need for shopping areas to expand	132
-----------------------------------------------	-----

General concern about transport (congestion, access, traffic)	128
Improve public transport (inc. P&R)	120
Improve roads, parking (inc. NNDR)	116
More cultural/leisure/tourism facilities	77
Develop brownfield sites/ use empty buildings	77
Keep traffic out of the city centre/ more pedestrian areas	59
More housing (general)	58
More green/ open spaces	55
Preserve the character of Norwich	51
More employment (office, manufacturing) within the centre	47
More community facilities (education, health, youth)	38
Improve cycling/ walking	35
Reduce crime/ improve community safety/ address litter problems	28
More affordable housing to meet the needs of local people	22
Have employment centres elsewhere	20
More independent shops	16
More shopping malls	11
Good design/ appropriate densities	11
Other	164

### Missed issues for urban Norwich and the surrounding area

More community facilities (education, health, youth)	128
Improve public transport (inc. P&R)	113
Improve roads, parking (inc. NNDR current proposal or linked Southern bypass)	87
Prevent urban sprawl/ not to lose the character of each other/ merging of villages	77
General transport improvements/ problems	74
Opposed to large scale growth/ any growth/ happy with area as it is	51
Improved provision of local shops	47


Improve cycling, walking	46
More green/ open spaces/ links to countryside/allotments	41
Ensure that there is adequate infrastructure/ enhance infrastructure (inc. drainage/water/utilities)	37
Provide more employment opportunities in these areas	35
More leisure/ cultural facilities	30
More affordable housing to meet the needs of local people	29
Better design/ appropriate densities	28
Protect the natural environment	22
Issues relating to unitary	21
Reduce crime/ improve community safety/ address litter problems	19
Not to have a NNDR/ new roads	12
More renewable energy schemes/ reduce carbon emissions	6
Do not build on floodplains	6
Others	96

### Missed issues for the rural area

Infrastructure, better roads, sewerage	273
More support for local businesses, post offices, shops and industries	184
No growth, leave rural area as it is/ protect the character of villages	156
Better public transport	130
Ban second homes/ provide homes for local people/ more affordable houses	99
Free parking and more parking	8
Other	319

**Q6. We need to find at least three new sites outside of Norwich for large-scale growth. Each site will need to provide 5,000 to 10,000 new homes with additional facilities. From the list below, please indicate your first, second, third and fourth preferred locations.**

1. North sector (north of airport)
2. North East sector (inside the NNDR)
3. North East sector (outside the NNDR, vicinity of Rackheath)
4. South East sector (vicinity of Poringland)
5. South sector (A11-A140 outside A47)
6. Long Stratton
7. Wymondham
8. South West sector (A11-B1108 outside A47)
9. West sector (River Yare to River Wensum)
10. North West sector (A1067-NNDR)
11. Brownfield sites in Norwich




Site No.	Order of preference (based on respondents' 'First Preference' only)	Order of preference, based on total responses per site
1	2	6
2	8	8
3	7	4
4	5	2
5	10	5
6	3	9
7	4	3
8	6	1
9	9	7
10	11	10
11	1	11




Further analysis of these results was undertaken in order to ascertain whether there is any correlation between respondents' preferred locations and the location of their home address (e.g. are there any patterns indicating that residents from South Norfolk generally tend to prefer sites in Broadland or Norwich, rather than their own district, and vice-versa?)

The chart below sets out the percentage of 'First Preference' votes from individuals residing in each of the three districts for each of the 11 locations:



NB Locations 1, 2, 3 and 10 are in Broadland. Locations 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are in South Norfolk.

These results indicate that, while there is some evidence of respondents from Broadland and South Norfolk giving first preference to locations in the other district, the overall pattern is broadly similar with the top 5 locations all being the same (albeit in a different order of preference).



The chart above performs a similar analysis, but for 'First Preference' sites and 'Second Preference' sites combined:

Similarly, there does appear to be some evidence to suggest that votes were made with a 'Not In My Back Yard' philosophy; the top 4 locations for Broadland residents are all in South Norfolk and 3 of the top 4 locations for South Norfolk residents are in Broadland.

It is of course possible to see which Broadland locations are preferred by Broadland residents and the same for South Norfolk.

One of the constraints of this analysis is that it pre-supposes that, if there is an element of 'Not In My Back Yard' thinking amongst respondents, then their reflex reaction will be to choose their preferred site in another district, rather than one which may be some distance away from their place of residence but which still falls within the same district.

**Q7. Are there particular locations where we should be providing for more jobs...**

**Close to Norwich?**

<b>Yes</b>	3,235	49%
<b>No</b>	3,308	51%

**If 'Yes', where?**

Locations with good road/public transport access/ near main radials/A47southern bypass/Norwich Northern Distributor Road/ring road/ P&R sites	299
Other places outside area/ Don't know/ Irrelevant comments	284
Norwich city centre/ central Norwich/ Anglia Square	244
Disused emp. land/buildings, brownfield sites, regeneration areas; areas of social deprivation, job need, high unemployment; create niche employment	168
Costessey/ Longwater area	153
New or existing industrial estates/ small industrial estates/ business parks/ employment areas	143
Mainly Norwich Airport/ some RAF Coltishall/ some other airfields	134
Rural Area Market Towns	129
Western Norwich/ NRP/ UEA/ New Costessey/ Colney/ Earlham/ Larkman est.	120
Southern Norwich/ Lakenham/ Trowse/ Eaton/ Cringleford/ Harford Bridge	108
Close to where people live/ new housing development areas	107
Northern Norwich/ Catton/ Hellesdon/ Mile Cross	102
Eastern Norwich/ Thorpe St Andrew/ Sprowston	100
Anywhere in Norwich	93
Norwich fringes/ within a mile of Norwich/ just outside Norwich	84
Areas to south/ south east/ south west of Norwich	77
In and around the proposed housing growth areas	77
Wymondham	69
Broadland Business Park/ Thorpe Business Park	66
Hethersett/ Thickthorn area	64
Long Stratton	55
Drayton/ Taverham/ Thorpe Marriott area	55
Areas to north/ north east/ north west of Norwich	47
Poringland	44
Anywhere in the rural area	43
Rackheath/ Salhouse area	42
Horsham St Faiths (inc. growth area)	35
Norwich - within Southern Bypass	35
New settlement/ new village/ Mangreen growth area	33

Norwich - within Northern Distributor Road	31
Norwich - within the Ring Road	28
None	27
Areas to east of Norwich	25
Areas to west of Norwich	19
Small developments/ small industries/ craft workshops/ small units/ light industry/ tourism and leisure developments/ retail estates	19

### In rural areas?

<b>Yes</b>	2,836	45%
<b>No</b>	3,472	55%

### If 'Yes', where?

Market towns	416
Other settlements outside area/ don't know	365
Anywhere with good roads and public transport/ close to rail lines/ near the main radial roads/ near NNDR and southern bypass/ close to P&R sites	201
Long Stratton	184
Large villages	171
Wymondham	161
Aylsham	154
Close to where people live/ new housing development/ areas with good services and facilities	122
Anywhere in the rural area	121
Disused employment land/ disused buildings/ aid agriculture/ aid local businesses/ areas of high unemployment, jobs needed, lack of choice	120
Diss	102
Areas to south/ south east/ south west of Norwich	94
Loddon	85
Acle	80
Rural small developments/ small industries/ craft workshops/ small units/ light industry/ tourism and leisure developments/ meet local needs/ shops etc.	68
Existing industrial estates/ small industrial estates/ business parks	61
Harleston	60
Within 10-12 miles of Norwich/ in and around the proposed growth areas	60
Reepham	53

Areas to north/ north east/ north west of Norwich	49
RAF Coltishall, plus other airfields	41
Areas to east of Norwich	37
Small villages	37
Hethersett/ Thickthorn area	29
Norwich and/or fringes	29
Hingham	27
Poringland	22
Areas to west of Norwich	21
Costessey/ Longwater area	20
Buxton/ Coltishall/ Hainford/ Horstead/ Stratton Strawless areas	19
Brundall/ Blofield/ Lingwood area	17
Wroxham/ Hoveton area	17
Rackheath/ Salhouse areas	14
None	13
Encourage home working/ teleworking	13
No greenfield devt/ not in countryside	11
Broadland Business Park	9
Broads area	9
Drayton/ Taverham/ Thorpe Marriott areas	8
A new settlement/ new villages	7
Horsham St. Faiths	5
Waveney Valley locations	4
Spixworth	2
Cantley/ Reedham areas	2

**Q8. We can reduce the need to travel by putting houses next to jobs and facilities or enabling better communications. Are there any ways to cut down peoples' need to travel?**

<b>Yes</b>	3,579	55%
<b>No</b>	2,982	45%

**If 'Yes', please specify:**

Encourage home working	868
Improve public transport	755
Support local shops and services (incl culture and leisure)	497
Better cycling facilities	215
No solution / response doesn't answer question	166
Homes, jobs and services together	161
Encourage car sharing schemes	86
Car use / travel is inevitable	83
Park and Ride	81
Stop allowing out of town development	62
Open more train stations	58
Bring back need to go to local school / housing should be near schools	51
Focus development in market towns and surrounding areas	49
Provide more school buses	38
NDR	31
Mobile facilities / improved delivery services (e.g. internet shopping)	30
Focus development in Norwich	27
Encourage flexible working	25
Make employers provide transport to work for their employees	20
Local affordable housing	15
Other	541

**Monitoring information and representativeness of respondents**

Respondents to the summary leaflet were asked to provide details on their gender, age, ethnic background and whether or not they have a disability. The aim of securing this information is to ensure that the GNDP is reaching all groups within the community and is not excluding any particular sector of the community from having their say.

The details below set out the monitoring information relating to respondents who completed the Issues and Options summary leaflet, against the latest population estimates across the three districts, for each of the monitoring categories mentioned above.

N.B. Where figures are shown in green, they indicate that a particular group has been well represented, and where figures are shown in red, they indicate that a particular group has been under-represented.

**a) Gender of respondents**

	% respondents	% of the Broadland, Norwich & South Norfolk popn*
<b>Male</b>	56%	49%
<b>Female</b>	44%	51%

\* Norfolk County Council Mid-2006 estimates

**b) Number of respondents with a disability**

863

**c) Age range of respondents**

Age group	Total	% respondents	% of Broadland, Norwich & S. Norfolk popn*
Under 18	325	7.36	19.38
18-24	163	3.69	9.65
25-34	370	8.38	12.45
35-44	616	13.95	14.41
45-54	717	16.23	12.75
55-64	961	21.76	12.94
65-74	721	16.32	9.24
Over 75	544	12.31	9.13

\* Norfolk County Council Mid-2006 estimates

**d) Ethnic origin**

Ethnic origin	No. respondents	% respondents	% of Broadland, Norwich & S. Norfolk popn*
White British	6777	95.67	93.52
White Other	177	2.5	2.31
White Irish	51	0.72	0.58
Any other ethnic group	19	0.07	0.22
Mixed - White & Asian	12	0.04	0.11
Mixed Other	10	0.17	0.27
Chinese	8	0.14	0.25
Asian or Asian British - Indian	6	0.08	0.66
Black or Black British - African	6	0.01	0.19
Mixed - White & Black African	3	0.03	0.14
Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi	2	0.03	0.22
Asian or Asian British - Other	2	0.08	0.16
Black or Black British - Caribbean	4	0.06	0.36
Mixed - White & Black Caribbean	5	0.01	0.08
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	1	0.11	0.49
Black or Black British - Other	1	0.27	0.49
Other	306		

\*ONS table EE1: Estimated resident population by ethnic group and sex, mid-2005 (experimental statistics)

Due to the relatively small sample size in relation to the total population of the three districts (7,404 completed summary leaflets = 2.01% of the total population for the three districts, based on mid-2006 estimates), it would be unwise to make changes to the main data-set based on these comparisons (e.g. weighting the answers from the under-45s to balance out the overall result).

However, this analysis will help to target under-represented groups during the next stages of consultation on the Joint Core Strategy. It also highlights those groups that have been particularly well-represented during this consultation stage: the 55-64 and 65-74 age groups. Whilst it is important not to lessen our efforts in engaging with these groups during the next stages of consultation, it



may be worth reviewing resource allocation to ensure that engaging under-represented groups becomes a key objective.

DRAFT

## APPENDIX 7

### ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES ON FULL QUESTIONNAIRE

#### Q1 Spatial Vision

*Q1 Does the draft spatial vision to 2026 reflect the quality of life that you would like to have from the area?*

Support = 93 (49%); Object = 47 (25%); Other Comments = 50 (26%)

Summary of Comments:

- The vision should not be based on acceptance of housing growth at the level proposed (22)
- Focus on maintaining and enhancing the sustainability of small rural settlements (19)
- The vision should be more creative and locally distinctive (17)
- Need to promote a range of new public transport measures and minimise the need to travel (16)
- The Vision needs to maintain woodlands/ green corridors/ heritage and character/ attractive countryside/ geodiversity (14)
- The vision fails to recognise the opportunity for smaller scale urban extensions which can be developed earlier (11)
- The Vision fails to recognise specific locations where growth will be focused. (10)
- Current transport infrastructure is inadequate and improvements must be made before new development (10)
- Major growth should be within or close to the Norwich urban area (the NPA) (9)
- Fuller emphasis should be placed on the role of market towns, including outside the NPA (9)
- Concern about urban sprawl outside the built up area and merging of settlements. (8)
- Concern that jobs will not match the growth in people (7)
- Concern about the capacity of local services to cope with growth (6)
- The Vision should refer to urban environments needing to adapt to address sustainability (4)
- Need to ensure that deprivation and inequality are tackled (2)
- The Vision is too long – needs to be more concise (1)

#### Q2 Spatial Planning Objectives

*Q2 Are these the right objectives for getting to where we want to be by 2026?*

Support = 87 (49%); Object = 41 (23%); Other Comments = 50 (28%)

Summary of comments:

- Should make sure development is still allowed in smaller settlements to support and sustain their services and rural economies (12)

- Fair to expect new development to contribute to new infrastructure of all types where the need is clearly set out, but this mechanism should not be used to address the shortfall/deficit in existing infrastructure investment (8)
- Concern that some objectives are incompatible with each other – no basis is given for resolution of such conflict. (5)
- Need to be more people-based, rather than focussing only on ‘hard’ physical infrastructure (3)
- Concern that the level of planned growth is incompatible with high standards of environmental protection, will contribute more to climate change, and not be sustainable (3)
- Need to be stronger on moving towards zero-carbon development, though concern about moving ahead of legislation and building regulations with arbitrary local renewable energy generation/energy efficiency targets (3)
- Clarify that objectives are not in any order of priority (2)
- need to be more specific about using growth to design out deprivation (2)
- regenerate existing communities and economies both urban and rural (2)
- reduce inequalities (1)
- (Obj 1) – this is not for Core Strategy, but should have been decided by the Statement of Community Involvement.
- (Obj 3) should refer to protecting existing sports fields (1)
- (Obj 4) focus on using land more sustainably to meet need for genuinely affordable housing (5)
- (Obj 4) smaller settlements need to be more sustainable to reduce commuting (10)
- (Obj 4) the city is the most sustainable location for both housing and jobs. (2)
- (Obj 5) should focus on revitalising rural economy (2)
- (Obj 5) should focus on supporting local businesses and local economic development (2)
- (Obj 6) should focus on ensuring access rather than necessarily providing additional facilities (2)
- (Obj 8) should recognise that some environmental assets are going to be destroyed and aim at most sustainable balance (2)
- (Obj 9) this is too weak – should be more positive to achieve zero carbon development as early as possible (3)
- (Obj 9) fails to mention flooding (2)
- (Obj 10) should be about managing travel demand rather than increasing road space (3).
- (Obj 10) should include reference to green infrastructure and allotments (2)
- (Obj 12) should specifically apply to all communities and market towns, not just Norwich (3)
- (Obj 12) should refer to sustainable tourism and the potential of the Broads (2)

### **Q3 Spatial Hierarchy**

*Q3 Do you agree with the hierarchy for growth and development*

Yes: 113 (59%); No: 44 (23%); General comments: 33 (17%)

#### Summary of Comments:

- More growth should be in villages in order to maintain the sustainability of their services (11)
- Propose alternative of a New Town on larger scale (9)
- Avoid fossilising villages, with reduced services and weakened communities – implies second-class citizens (7)
- Each level of hierarchy should have some appropriate growth (7)
- Preference should be given on basis of infrastructure already available (5)
- Market Towns and Key Service Centre should be combined (4)
- Role of specified location should be raised in hierarchy (3)
- Development in villages will create problems and put pressure on services (2)
- Greater emphasis on market towns and secondary rural settlements (2)
- Role of specified location should be reduced (1)

### **Q4 Locations for Growth in and around Norwich**

*Q4 Do you agree with the approach to sites in and around Norwich?*

Yes = 108 (71%); No = 34 (22%); Other Comments = 11 (7%)

#### Summary of Comments:

- Support priority to use of brownfield and derelict sites (8)
- Site specific comments (6)
- The most accessible locations should be favoured for growth (5)
- Too much growth is centralised in Norwich (4)
- Need to consider capacity of specific areas (4)
- The NPA is too large and villages will lose their individuality (4)
- Concern that large scale growth on fringe of City could become ghettos (4)
- Consider a range of small/ medium scale developments that can ensure continued delivery before the larger sites come forward (3)
- Landscape and other environmental factors must be considered (3)
- Concern that large scale growth on fringe of City could become ghettos (4)
- Growth villages and towns will lose their individuality (3)
- Should recognise that other factors must be considered beyond accessibility (3)
- Does not define what 'good accessibility' means (2)
- Whole approach depends on land being deliverable (2)
- Growth dependent upon NNDR should be ruled out (1)
- Resist continued high rise building (1)
- Low impact development favoured (1)
- Sequential approach is too simplistic (1)

- Should be green belt around Norwich with development spread further out (1)
- Areas liable to flood should be excluded from consideration (1)
- Concern about growth in Key Service Centres, as these are only 4<sup>th</sup> in hierarchy. (1)
- Focus on areas within urban area which have poor accessibility at present (1)

### **Q5 Definition of Market Towns**

*Q5 Do you agree with the definition of market towns?*

Yes = 104 (70%); No = 34 (23%); Other Comments = 10 (7%)

Summary of Comments:

- Alternative locations should be defined as market towns (11)
- Market town development should be well designed and sympathetic to their character (8)
- Ensure that growth takes place consistent with accessibility, jobs and services (7)
- Specific places should not be included (6)
- Refer to role of market town in relation to surrounding population (2)
- Some market towns already damaged severely (2)
- Need to balance growth with employment as well (2)
- Combine definition with Key Service Centres (1)

Suggested for inclusion – Hingham, Long Stratton, Acle, Reepham, Wroxham/Hoveton, Coltishall (RAF base), Poringland, Little Melton, Beccles, Bungay, Attleborough, Dereham

Suggested for deletion (or to KSC) – Loddon, Aylsham, Wymondham

### **Q6 Key Service Centres**

*Q6: Is this the right way to define key service centres?*

Yes = 83 (62%); No = 28 (21%); Other Comments 22 (17%)

Summary of Comments:

- Definition of Key Service Centre against market towns seems confused (12)
- These centres need better public transport (11)
- Ensure services can expand to satisfy growth criteria (4)
- Need flexible approach (3)
- Some large villages only have a school – this should be sufficient (2)
- Need to encourage small service businesses in KSC's (2)
- Need to consider potential growth in order to improve services (1)
- Suggested additional services to be included in definition
  - Sport and leisure facilities (7)
  - Post office (5)

- Road transport infrastructure (as distinct from public transport) (4)
- Pub / restaurant (3)
- Community centre (3)
- General store (2)
- Doctor (2)
- Youth group (2)
- Church (2)
- Rail availability (1)
- Bank (1)
- Bus stop with shelter (1)
- Various additional environmental and care facilities.

Suggested for inclusion as KSC – Poringland, Blofield, Hempnall, Little Melton, Long Stratton, Wroxham/Hoveton.

**Q7 Secondary rural settlement definition**

*Q7 This is a list of suggested services to help define a ‘secondary rural settlement’? Please say whether the services are essential, desirable or not actually necessary to have in places like this.*

<b>List of services</b>	<b>Essential = 131 responses*</b>	<b>Desirable = 114 responses*</b>	<b>Not necessary = 96 responses*</b>
a. Village Hall / Community meeting place	58	12	4
b. Church / Religious place of worship	26	28	4
c. Public House	23	39	11
d. Pre-School / child care	26	25	6
e. Primary School	46	26	1
f. Secondary School	7	23	31
g. Public Transport (bus, rail etc.) Journey to work service	63	21	2
h. Public Transport (bus, rail etc.) Day time service	44	11	2
i. Public Transport (bus, rail etc.) Evening service	25	23	5
j. Cycle/pedestrian access	38	23	3
k. Library	7	15	30
l. Post Office or bank	39	24	9

m. Convenience store, food shop or farm shop,	55	16	1
n. Newsagent	13	31	5
o. Employment and job opportunities	21	34	2
p. Medical Services (doctor, dentist, residential care home)	30	24	9
q. Indoor recreation facilities	14	31	22
r. Outdoor recreation facilities	22	29	9
s. Mobile / visiting services	19	27	6
t. Garage	14	28	25
u. Social groups e.g. sports, scouts, toddlers etc.	25	21	6
v. Size of population	12	18	6

\* All multiple answers included.

#### Summary of Other Comments:

- Desirable for key facilities to be present but not necessarily within village boundary. (3)
- Facilities need to be provided/ improved to accommodate growth. (2)
- Concerned the rural character of these places will be destroyed (2)
- Does not matter what facilities they have – it should relate to ability to accommodate growth (1)
- Disagree with definition - the ability to accommodate modest growth without ruining the character of the settlement is priority. (1)

### Q8 Groupings of rural settlements

Q8: *Could a group of secondary rural settlements collectively form a key services centre?*

Yes = 39 (38%); No = 19 (19%); Other Comments = 44 (43%)

#### Summary of Comments:

- Only where they are adjacent/close together e.g. can walk/cycle (9)
- Will destroy identities/character of rural settlements, leave villages alone (7)
- Dependent on services and their co-ordination (opening hours/public transport) (7)
- Will generate excessive mileage/pollution to access services between settlements (6)
- More information needed about other matters (2)
- Rural settlements too dispersed – except possibly in NPA. (1)
- This would create new towns by stealth (2)

Examples suggested – Barford/ Barnham Broom/ Carleton Forehoe etc; Bramerton/ Rockland/ Surlingham; Broome/ Ditchingham; Cantley/ Reedham/ Halvergate; Chedgrave/ Loddon; Dickleburgh/ Scole; Ellingham/ Kirkby Cane; Geldeston/ Gillingham; Hingham area; Horsham/ Newton St Faiths; Mulbarton/ Swainsthorpe/ Swardeston; Rackheath/ Salhouse.

### Q9 Limited Development Elsewhere in rural area

*Q9 This approach is consistent with government policy. Is there any reason why we should have a departure from this?*

Yes (i.e. amend approach) = 30 (27%); No = 50 (44%); General comments only = 33 (29%)

Summary of Comments:

- Limited development should be provided for in rural areas (40);
- Development should be based on local community wishes;
- Need to consider the sustainability of individual settlements;
- Need to consider the social consequences of not providing for new housing as distinct from sustainability issues;
- Need to allocate land for housing in these settlements;
- Allow for conversions of commercial agricultural buildings.

### Q10 - Growth Principles

*Q10 – Are these principles equally important? (principles are accessibility; job proximity; infrastructure and service planning; environmental impact; market delivery; timescales; resources). If not, what principle do you think is the most important? Which is least important?*

Yes = 54 (42%); No = 76 (58%)

	<b>Principle</b>	<b>Most important</b>	<b>Least important</b>
1	Accessibility	17	10
2	Job proximity principle	9	17
3	Infrastructure and Service Planning and Delivery	34	4
4	Environmental Impact	26	2
5	Market Delivery	6	29
6	Timescales	3	31
7	Resources	5	6

While the majority express a preference for ranking these principles, any assessment of their comparative importance should not lose site of the 42% of responses that weight them equally. This doesn't affect the order of preference but it does moderate the differences between them.



Among those who expressed a preference ‘infrastructure/service planning & delivery’ and ‘environmental impact’ were the most important, while ‘market delivery’ and ‘timescales’ were least important.

Summary of Comments:

- Weighting system should be devised (6)
- Evidence required to assess these criteria (3)
- Principles should be tested through Sustainability Appraisal criteria (1)
- Principles flawed as they presuppose growth concentration in NPA (1)
- Do not fix weighting system as principles could change over time (1)
- Additional principles suggested – historic environment; housing affordability, tackling deprivation, green infrastructure promotion, effect on setting of city, protection of quality of life.

**Q11 Delivering growth options**

*Q11 Which option for the overall approach to growth in the Norwich policy area do you prefer? Please explain how your approach would enable us to deliver the necessary housing and jobs in a sustainable way.*

Preferred Option	Responses	%
A – dispersed growth in large number of areas	54	30.9%
B – medium concentrations of growth	33	18.9%
C – Large scale urban extension/ new settlement	<b>61</b>	<b>34.9%</b>
Other Pattern	21	12.0%
Comment re growth	6	3.4%

NB some multiple choices – if two options, both counted (mix of all three is one of the ‘Other’ patterns)

There were a wide range of comments and some directly opposing views about what scale of growth is likely to be sustainable. Most concern was expressed about the ability of growth to deliver the infrastructure needed.

Summary of Comments:

- Larger developments enable a full community to be built up together with the facilities and resources required. (15)
- The best result may be a mixture of all three kinds of growth (10)
- Smaller scale more likely to sustain the maintenance of character and encompass environmental concerns (6)

- Larger scale of development will rob the area of its character and social cohesion (5)
- In villages an injection of good new development with a social housing element will enhance & reinvigorate villages and their services (4)
- The principle of new, large settlements would minimise the damage to existing settlements. (4)
- Prefer all growth to be concentrated in the existing urban area of Norwich (3)
- New development areas can be added to existing neighbourhoods to create a scale of demand for new services required there (3)
- Further evidence needed about the impact of dispersed growth – studies to date have focused on large scale options. (2)
- Efficient transport for public use is essential and suggests Option C (2)
- No more development until the government can provide for those already here (2)
- Small piecemeal developments unlikely to be as sustainable as would be desirable and is not realistic (2)
- Options B and C present a frightful vision of urban consolidation and high rise. (1)
- New settlements should be considered but it is very difficult to persuade an employer to locate to a place without an existing employment base ( 1)
- Concentrated development is more limiting to opportunities for micro-generation of energy and on-site waste management (1)
- Spread development widely – beyond NPA. (1)
- Option B is not too large to create major problems but large enough to supply public transport facilities (1)
- Option C – experience suggests cost per completed dwelling lower due to nearby infrastructure. (1)

**Q12 Potential Locations for Growth**

*Q12a – Do you have any comments on the possible broad locations for major growth highlighted in appendix 4?*

*Q12b – Are there any other broad locations that should be investigated for major growth?*

**Q 12a – Comments on Appendix 4 Growth Locations Summarised**

<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>In Favour</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Net Score</b>	<b>% in favour</b>
1. North Sector (Airport)	8	2	+6	5.3%
2 NE (inside NNDR line)	<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>+20</b>	<b>15.9%</b>
3a NE (outside NNDR line)	8	7	+1	5.2%
3b East (Outside NNDR)	9	5	+4	6.0%
4. SE (Poringland)	13	6	+7	8.6%
5. South (west of A140)	12	3	+9	7.9%
6. Long Stratton (with bypass)	14	7	+7	9.3%
7. Wymondham (extension)	<b>27</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>+15</b>	<b>17.9%</b>
8. SW (Hethersett)	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>+19</b>	<b>13.2%</b>
9. West (R Yare to R Wensum)	7	3	+4	4.6%
10. NW (Drayton /A1067 Corridor)	5	2	+3	3.3%
11. Inner City - brownfield	4	0	+4	2.6%

*NB Multiple choices allowed – options not mutually exclusive*

*There are several caveats about this analysis.*

- *It does not count generic comments – i.e. ones that count against (or in favour) of nearly all sites.*
- *Major agents have submitted support for several growth areas on behalf of different owners within those areas – i.e. they are double/ multiple counted – but these do not provide comparative data to actually answer the question of which area is preferable.*
- *Location 11 was not identified in appendix 4 – options assume it takes first priority but some people identified it in their choices.*

### **Q12b Other Locations Suggested**

*(NB site specific responses not included)*

Diss area (4)

Area South of city, within Southern Bypass (3)

Tasburgh area (3)

Loddon area (2)

Aylsham area (2)

Former RAF Coltishall (2) (NB outside area)

Harleston area (2)

South-west sector (inside A47 bypass) (2)

Reepham area (1)

Wroxham area (1)

Extension east of Broadland Business Park (1)

Summary of Comments:

- Agree with all suggested analysis areas (6)
- Object to the question which is biased towards large scale growth. Need for a range of site sizes in a balanced approach (3)
- All developments should be based on rail or bus routes (2)
- Options should not assume that NNDR will be built – growth must be able to cope without it. (2)
- A more sophisticated analysis of the educational demands and opportunities is needed in relation to government policies – should not be splitting 6<sup>th</sup> Forms from secondary schools for example. (2)
- Flood plains should be prohibited for development (1)
- Areas should be assessed for location of the nearest sewage treatment works to reduce the energy demand for pumping (1)
- Impact on trunk road network will need mitigation to varying degrees (1)
- Further evidence needed to reach judgment – factors of population growth, air flight paths etc. (1)
- Before Preferred Options stage there needs to be an assessment of biodiversity constraints and opportunities for all options (1)
- Issues listed are simplistic and ignore the impact on existing green areas, which will be under heavy pressure, especially the river valleys. (1)
- The historic interest and character of settlements and landscape should be assessed before choosing between them. (1)

- All growth areas should have identified green corridors to separate them. (1)
- Cheap land owned by government does not make a location suitable (1)
- Overall suggests lack of coordination between the locations and transport planning to reduce the need to travel (1)
- (Location 1) This area should be investigated further, as expansion of the Airport is key to Norfolk's economic growth. (1)
- (Location 2) Option offers opportunity for speedy integration because of good facilities available (2)
- (Location 2) The location includes tree belts which are important to the setting of the city. (2)
- (Location 2) This location is not dependent on NNDR. (1)
- (Location 2) This location has an existing foodstore which could form the basis of a district centre in accordance with the Retail Study. (1)
- (Location 3a) Would benefit from existing settlements which are suitable for growth and have an employment base and rail station. (1)
- (Location 3a) Area is too close to the Broads (1)
- (Location 3a) This urban extension does not need to be dependent on the NNDR (1)
- (Location 4) There are advantages of a new settlement here, which could develop a new employment base for an existing dormitory town (3)
- (Location 4) This area has a number of scheduled ancient monuments and growth would disrupt a prehistoric landscape. (1)
- (Location 4) Conclusions re road access are contested – this route is less congested than others from the south and has excellent access to A47 and good public transport (1)
- (Location 5) Local infrastructure is adequate to support growth. (3)
- (Location 5) Area should be extended more widely for a single growth area of 15-16,000 homes with use of the Norwich – Cambridge axis (1)
- (Location 5) This location has an existing foodstore which could form the basis of a district centre in accordance with the Retail Study. (1)
- (Location 6) Support for growth if it enables a bypass to be built (4) (NB see Q 32 and Appendix 7)
- (Location 6) This is a small town and would be unable to withstand the influx of major growth – not enough services and the town's heart would be destroyed.(2)
- (Location 7) Whilst expansion is not challenged in principle, the area to the west of Wymondham in the Liffey valley should be excluded as the setting of Wymondham Abbey and other historic estates. (3)
- (Location 7) Care necessary because this is a historic market town with special character (2)
- (Location 7) Wymondham seems a logical choice as it has good infrastructure and has already accepted change. (2)
- (Location 7) Growth here must be kept separate from Hethersett to north-east (2)

- (Location 7) This is a small town and would be unable to withstand the influx of major growth – not enough services and the town's heart would be destroyed. (1)
- (Location 7) Concern that Wymondham is outside NATS area – will it obtain major transport improvements to match its growth. (1)
- (Location 8) For this area it is relatively easy to upgrade public transport (1)
- (Location 8) Growth here needs to be large scale in order to enable new high school development (1)
- (Location 9) Moderate increase in size of Easton could enhance its character (1)
- (Location 9) Areas close to Longwater are protected for a future MRDF (Waste Strategy) Specific recognition should be given to that and its effects on locations nearby.(1)
- (Location 9) growth can be linked to the expansion of Easton College (1)
- (Location 9) This corridor gives a good opportunity for a high quality public transport link to the city centre (1)
- (Location 10 ) Needs to be large enough to enable a district centre and secondary school. (1)

**Q13 Options for Growth**

Q13a Which option for growth outside the city (detailed above) do you prefer?

Q13b Please specify which locations you prefer (if answering b, c or d)

**Q13a**

<b>Option</b>	<b>Summary Description</b>	<b>Preferred</b>	<b>% preferences</b>
A	Concentration on NE, SW sectors and Wymondham	40	29.6%
B	As A but with fourth location	11	8.1%
C	As A but with two additional areas of medium size growth	20	14.8%
D	Different combination of major growth options	26	19.3%
E	Dispersal to at least 10 locations	33	24.4%
None		5	3.7%

NB Multiple choices not allowed – options are intended to be mutually exclusive

In some cases, where the respondent specified Option B or C but then suggested a locational choice(s) within the area defined in Option A, the answer was amended to Option A since no additional location was being suggested..

**Q13b**

<b>Other Location Preferred</b>	<b>Mentions under B</b>	<b>Mentions under C</b>	<b>Mentions under D</b>
Long Stratton area (sector 6)	3	3	1
South of Norwich (5)	2	1	5
Coltishall Airfield	1	0	0
North of Airport (1)	1	3	2
West Sector (9)	1	0	1
North West sector (10)	1	1	2
Aylsham area	0	2	0
Brundall/Blofield area	0	1	0
South East Sector (4)	0	2	4

Diss area	0	2	1
Loddon	0	1	0
Organic growth of towns	0	0	1
Urban area (11)	0	0	1
Only areas within NNDR and SBP	0	0	2
Areas along NNDR	0	0	1
Urban extensions smaller than scale suggested	0	0	2
Periphery of city where served by bus routes	0	0	1
Between Wymondham and Long Stratton	0	0	1
One New Town of 20,000+	0	0	2
Market town growth	0	0	1

**Q14 Access to a Decent Home**

*Q14 Which of these approaches do you support? Are there any other actions you would suggest?*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Support</b>
A	Commercial contributions to affordable housing as well as residential	20%
B	Reduce lower threshold of site contributing below 15	24%
C	Graduate percentage contribution for smaller sites	40%
D	Encourage wider private sector alternatives	50%

**Summary of Suggested Additional Measures:**

- Support more exceptions sites (4)
- Seek the level of affordable housing set out in RSS (4)
- Separate areas for affordable housing (2)
- Use Community Infrastructure Levy (2)
- Provide environmentally friendly housing that is cheap to run (2)



- Intervene in market (2)
- Ensure affordable housing is well integrated (2)
- Specific need for specialist housing for elderly people (2)
- Set targets for different types of housing in accordance with PPS3 (1)
- Reduce empty homes (1)

### Q15 Gypsies and Travellers – Transit Sites

*Are there any particular highway corridors where we should focus our search for transit sites to best meet the needs of the community?*

<b>Corridor</b>	<b>Response</b>
A11	49.4%
A 140 (south)	24.7%
A140 (north)	20.0%
A47	36.5%
Other A roads	17.6%
Elsewhere	4.7%

Additional comments included a number of people stating that the Gypsy and Traveller community would be best placed to answer this question

### Q16 Gypsies and Travellers – sites in large new developments

*Q16 In the longer term should an element of long stay sites for gypsies and travellers be included in each large new development?*

Yes = 26.2%; No = 68.9%; Other Comments = 4.9%

Other comments included

- Do not include in growth option but require s106 contribution from developers to facilitate site elsewhere.
- Consult gypsy and traveller community about their preferences.

### Q17 Gypsies and Travellers -size of sites

*Q17 Should a larger number of small sites (up to 15 pitches) be developed rather than fewer large sites in each new development?*

Yes = 45.5%; No = 37.6%; Other Comments = 16.9%

### Q18 Travelling Showpeople

*Q18 What provision should be made for travelling show people? Please specify.*

Summary of answers

- Not enough knowledge to comment
- No provision
- In a location linked to showgrounds
- Ensure provision of basic facilities is available
- Permanent winter quarters should be provided, not travelling sites.
- On suitable farmland by agreement with owners
- In locations close to larger settlements
- Refer to guidance in Circular 1/2006

**Q19 (Education and Skills) (Long Questionnaire)**

*Q19 Are there any of these options that you would not support and if so why not?*

Yes (i.e. options not supported) = 0; No = 37 (67%); Other = 18 (33%)

Summary of other comments

- Improve education system / teaching – not at present a suitable basis for lifelong learning (3)
- Needs of the majority should come before the deprived or disadvantaged (2)
- City College not mentioned (1)
- Only support initiatives that have evidence of past success. (1)
- Opportunities must be available to all but not by coercion (1)
- Accessibility is usually assessed by officials who have little experience of being deprived: people with genuine needs miss out. (1)

**Q20 Small Business Growth**

*Q20 Which option do you think is most likely to support small business growth?*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>%</b>
A (employment within housing areas)	47	26.4%
B (making small sites available for start-ups)	<b>80</b>	<b>44.0%</b>
C (managed workspace and units in low cost areas)	49	26.9%
Other Suggestions	3	1.6%
Opposed to the options	2	1.1%

*NB Not mutually exclusive – therefore multiple answers recorded*

Summary of Comments:

- Unwise to move back to traditional land use zoning – concentrate on mixed use in local centres on principal roads – not throughout a settlement. (3)
- Ensure there is a mix of opportunities for all sectors of the economy (3)
- The theory of housing linked with employment requires social/ economic restructuring beyond the scope of JCS (1)
- The crucial business of seed-corn subsidy for start-up workshops and industrial skill development is completely ignored (1)
- Small scale growth will only support small scale jobs. (1)
- (A) – Option would also contribute to greater sustainability by reducing the need to travel (1)
- (A) – this would result in business not being in the best locations within a settlement (1)
- (A) – Option should pursue flexible design to enable any dwelling to be used for a period of home-working (1)
- (A) – space could be designed near houses for use by home workers (1)
- (B) – secondary rural settlements need protection from overdevelopment of this sort (or housing) (1)
- (B) Provide lower business rates/ rents for start-ups (1)
- (C) Each size of business needs its own solution (1)

### Q21 Large Scale Office Development

Q21 Which option do you feel would have most positive impact on office development in the area?

<b>Option</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>%</b>
A – City Centre	38	33.0%
B – City Centre + out-of-centre	21	18.3%
C – CC + district centres + allocated sites	<b>50</b>	<b>43.5%</b>
Other	6	5.2%

#### Summary of Comments:

- Disperse small office development as part of mixed use sites (3)
- Requires careful consideration of the character of available sites (1)
- There are different demands needing different locations. (1)
- Consider carefully what constitutes ‘major’ office development in the context of the proposed scale of growth (1)
- Modern office technology does not require ‘intensive co-location’ – smaller rural developments supported (1)
- Major disadvantage of market towns is their lack of a concentration of office jobs to provide career prospects (1)

- (A) – this option supports development of a strong public transport infrastructure and reduction of car use (2)
- (C) – need to accept decentralisation but restrict its geographic spread. (1)

## Q22 Strategic Locations for Employment Growth

Q22 Which option do you prefer? If a new location is needed where should it be and what role should it play?

<b>Option</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Support</b>
A	Additional locations needed	49 (36.6%)
B	Concentrate on mixed use Regeneration sites	50 (37.3%)
C	Remove restrictions at existing specialist sites	28 (20.9%)
Other		7 (5.2%)

### Locations Identified:

- Within growth area of Wymondham (6)
- Norwich Research Park/ Cringleford extension (4)
- New location some distance from Norwich (2)
- Alongside proposed NNDR (2)
- Within growth area 8 (Hethersett/ Little Melton area) (2)
- Within NW sector (Drayton area) (2)
- Sites close to the Airport (1)
- Extension to Broadland Business Park (1)
- Enlarge existing Longwater site (1)
- In vicinity of A47/ A140 junction (1)
- Alongside trunk roads generally (1)
- Opportunities at park-and-ride sites (1)
- Site specific comments (4)

### Other Comments:

- The absence of an Employment Sites review means not able to judge whether the options provide enough land (2)
- Unlikely to be sufficient land in the regeneration areas – hence need to identify strategic sites as well. (1)
- Welcome the differentiation by employment type. (1)
- Employment should be identified within each growth allocation (1)
- (B) – doubtful whether either North City Centre or Deal Ground/ Utilities sites have much potential (1)
- (C) - lift restrictions on other sites, but retain those relating to the Airport, as there are sufficient needs for specialist development there (1)
- (C) - this would have potentially negative effects on beneficial sectoral clusters (1)

**Q23 Protection of Employment Sites**

*Q23 We will need to adopt policies to protect employment land from other uses. What priority factors should be taken into account?*

Good transport linkage	13
Sustainable locations close to residential areas	12
Distinction of the type of employment provided and density on the site	10
Prevent retail and leisure growth on employment land	8
Established need for retail and leisure uses allowed	7
Agricultural employment and related sectors	4
Ecologically friendly and low environmental impact	5
Retention of locally owned businesses	5
Absence of contamination or other factors making site unsuitable for housing use	3
How realistic is such protection of employment land? (+ comments about not being realistic)	3
Deprivation and needs of local community	2
Importance of supporting manufacturing sectors	2
Potential for public sector involvement to release site constraints	2
Access to rail or water	1
Availability of other suitable land in area	1
Low flood risk	1
Impact on traffic congestion	1
Security of site and incidence of crime	1
Need for businesses to be in an area	1
National and international status of firms concerned	1
High value employment	1

## Q24 Employment in Rural Areas

Q24 Which option do you prefer?

Option A = 85 (68.5%); Option B = 26 (21%) Other = 13 (10.5%)

Other Comments :

- Support employment growth in or near villages (6)
- Encourage employment anywhere (3)
- Support smaller sites and conversions of rural buildings for employment uses (2)
- Support employment growth in market towns (2)
- Allocations should be in sustainable locations (1)
- Provide employment opportunities for local people (1)

## Q25 Town Centre Hierarchy

Q25 Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy of centres?

Yes = 93 (81%); No = 18 (16%); Other comments = 4 (3%)

Summary of Comments

- Concern re villages and settlements at the bottom of the hierarchy – flexibility needed here (3)
- Objection to significant development in Level 3 or 4 centres (2)
- Put new town centre within large new developments (2)
- Hierarchy should be based on Sustainability Appraisal rather than pre-defined. (1)
- Objection to proposed status of Acle (enhance to level 2), Aylsham (reduce to level 3); Loddon (reduce to level 3).
- Need to add Poringland, Stoke Holy Cross, Long Stratton and Harford Bridge as level 3.
- Support for Magdalen Street/ Anglia Square but needs to be improved (1)
- Magdalen Street/ Anglia Square should be part of city centre (1).
- Concern (Highways Agency) that Acle should not be raised, since it would have an impact on A47 trunk road traffic issues.

## Q26 (Comparison Shopping Growth in Norwich) (Long Questionnaire)

Q26 Which option do you prefer? (a = significant growth in an accessible urban location; b = one or more new town centres related to growth; c = both a and b)

Option a = 31 (34%); Option b = 19 (21%); Option c = 41 (45%)

Summary of Comments

- There is no need for anymore growth or a new town centre (13)
- There will be a need for new centres in new developments (not large shops but like a high street) (3)

- There should be more encouragement and support for smaller independent retailers and local shops (3)
- The market towns (such as Diss/ Wymondham) should have more retail growth both convenience and comparison (2)
- Some types of retail need to locate outside the central core (1)
- Growth in retail must be aligned to figures for housing and employment (1)
- The plan contradicts itself as it suggests that the centre will be an intensive office-based employment area (1).

### **Q27 Visitor Attractions**

*Q27 Are there any major new facilities or attractions that should be promoted in the Joint Core Strategy? If so what might they be?*

Yes = 56 (84%); None = 11 (16%)

Summary of Facilities Suggested:

- Outdoor activity areas/ country parks (13)
- Concert Hall (11)
- Improved transport infrastructure (10)
- Sports facilities (8)
- Swimming pool (5)
- General leisure and tourism (5)
- Promotion of local heritage (4)
- Entertainment space (3)
- Social infrastructure (3)
- Shopping (2)
- Food based attractions (2)

### **Q28 Protection of Landscape and Biodiversity**

*Q28 Do you agree with this suggested approach? If you think there is an alternative approach please specify.*

Yes = 106 (91%) No = 11 (9%)

Suggestions and Omissions:

- Locally protected landscapes and nature sites may be suitable for development to achieve wider sustainability goals (14)
- Need to prevent urban sprawl through landscape policies / green belt around city + Wymondham and protect rural nature of county (7)
- Need for policy for historic environment based on Conservation Area Appraisals and other evidence and for historic landscapes (3)
- Reduce scale of growth and protect all greenfield sites. (3)
- Need to protect environment against light pollution (2)
- Development should create improved landscapes and enhance biodiversity (2)
- Need for Appropriate Assessment of plan and developments (2)
- Greater emphasis on geodiversity required to comply with government policy (2)

- Greater weight to preservation of agricultural land and ecological value of brownfield sites needed (2)
- Water resources and surface water management need more discussion (2)
- Need for policy to protect valleys and parks as green lungs (2)

### **Q29 Sustainable Construction**

*Q29 Which approach do you think the Strategy should adopt?*

Option 1 (match Housing Corporation and increase over time) = 60 (41%)  
Option 2 (match a lower Code for Sustainable Homes level and increase over time) = 3 (2%)  
Option 3 (zero carbon for many types of buildings before 2016) = 43 (29%)  
Option 4 (No standards ahead of national regulations) = 38 (26%)

Several people opted for a combination of options 1 and 3 (9%)

### **Q30 Renewable Energy**

*Q30 Should all types of development, including businesses and housing, be required to incorporate an element of sustainable energy, where feasible?*  
Yes=130 (96%); No=5 (3.5%); Other Comment = 1 (0.5%)

Some comments expressing caution that this does not affect development viability, but overwhelmingly this proposal is supported.

### **Q31 - Renewables Target**

Yes= 80 (62%); No= 48 (37%); Other Comment = 1 (1%)

Summary of Comments

- The target should be higher (13)
- Viability of development must not be compromised by such a policy (10)
- Should seek to limit use of energy by transport policy (especially NNDR)
- No evidence to support this target
- The only way to reduce non-renewable energy use is to limit development.

### **Q32 Long Stratton Bypass**

*Q32 Should the Joint Core Strategy promote major mixed use growth at Long Stratton to improve that section of the A140?*

## **Summary of Responses**



Yes	83	68%
No	33	27%
Other	6	5%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>122</i>	<i>100%</i>

NB see Appendix 7 for survey of local people in Long Stratton.

Other Comments:

- The improvement should be funded regardless of growth option
- Growth in Long Stratton not sustainable and road improvement will lead to increased need to travel.

**Q33 Norwich Area Transport Strategy**

*Q33 Which option do you prefer? (a = promote bus priority but maintain capacity for cars; b = promote improved public transport with reduced road space for cars)*

Option a = 89 (60%); Option b = 49 (33%); Other = 10 (7%).

The clear majority supported option a, the reasons being

- Although supporting the promotion of public transport the reality would be that the car will still remain in important means of travel
- There will be increased congestion if we take road capacity away from cars
- Even if road space is given over to buses people will not use them

Those that supported option b did so because

- They could not see how the travel demands of growth could be accommodated other than by an improved public transport system
- Some cautioned that care was needed to ensure strategically important routes were protected.

Comments in the Other Category

- Growth is not feasible without the NDR
- Improvements to strategic transport infrastructure is needed
- Park and ride should be further developed as an alternative
- Promotion of a 500 space expansion of the existing Thickthorn park and ride site and bus improvements to Hethersett Lane to provide access for the existing and proposed Norwich Research Park, The Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital and the University of East Anglia

**Q34 Transport in Rural Areas**

*Q34 Which option do you prefer? (Option a = accept reliance on travel by car; Option b = develop strategies that allow greater use of walking, cycling or public transport.)*

### Summary of Responses

Option a	48	33.6%
Option b	88	61.5%
Other	7	4.9%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>143</i>	<i>100%</i>

*NB Accompanying note by Norfolk and Norwich Transport Action Group.*

#### Reasons for Support of Option A:

- Existing PT provision is viewed as being inadequate to meet peoples' needs in rural areas
- Walking and cycling in rural areas and to/within larger settlements is also viewed as being unsafe – e.g. A140 in Long Stratton
- Discriminating against those who cannot walk, cycle, etc?

#### Other Comments:

- Need to recognise need for private car in more rural areas and for disability groups everywhere (14)
- Walking, cycling and public transport access need to be improved before limiting access by car (4)
- Efficient use of private car should be encouraged (2)
- Rapid transit system proposed to encourage PT use (1)
- Emphasise the development of footpaths, cycling and public transport to make the use of private cars and other vehicles less attractive (1)
- Quiet lanes should be more widely promoted (1)

### Q35 Access to Services in Rural Areas

*Q35 Which option do you prefer (Option a = strengthen transport links to market towns; Option b = encourage local service delivery; Option c = restrict new development unless good access to jobs and services can be demonstrated.)*

### Summary of Responses

Option a	53	36.6%
Option b	31	21.4%
Option c	54	37.2%
Other	7	4.8%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>145</i>	<i>100%</i>

#### Summary of more detailed comments:

- Strengthen links between market towns as well as with their hinterland, including public transport (6)
- Opportunities should be taken to improve sustainability of smaller settlements by not refusing jobs and services (2)
- 'Good access' should include road access as well as public transport. (2)
- More jobs should be moved to rural areas (1)

**Q36 Freight Transport**

*Q36 Which option do you prefer? (Option a = planning that sites which will attract significant freight movements are well located to the strategic transport networks; Option b = No restriction on the location of major freight generators)*

**Summary of Responses**

Option a)	121	98%
Option b)	3	2%
Other	0	0%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>124</i>	<i>100%</i>

Comments reinforced the need to plan for freight movement by rail and water. Two respondents supported the provision of a rail freight terminal, one suggesting north-east of Norwich and the other a site close to the A11 at Wymondham.

**Q37 Community Engagement and Cohesive Communities**

*Q37 Is providing dedicated community workers the best way to support new communities? If no, then please provide details of how you feel this can be done.*

Yes = 52 (60%)    No = 35 (40%)

Supporting comments

- Community workers are needed early on until the community can support itself (3)
- They can provide the necessary leadership (1)
- Culture and art need to be built into the process of developing communities (1)

Comments on Alternatives

- Providing facilities such as shops, schools, a community centre & sports facilities is sufficient. There is no need to waste money on community workers (12)
- Communities generate themselves as people go about their daily business and make contacts (9)
- More use can be made of the voluntary sector – e.g. youth clubs, church groups, drama groups, sports clubs etc. (7)
- Help promote resident committees, networks and local neighbourhood management (3)
- There needs to be respect and consultation in local areas (3)

**Q38 Rural Deprivation**

*Q38 Which option do you prefer? (Option a = improve public transport and accessibility to towns and larger villages where facilities already exist; option b*

= allow 'significant' residential development in isolated rural areas to provide support for existing or new facilities; option c = provide/ maintain/ improve local facilities for the community even when they may not be economically viable; option d = promote the multi-use of rural buildings, giving a variety of uses for the community and making them more economically viable; option e = Do nothing.)

### Summary of Responses

Option a	45	28.0%
Option b	19	11.8%
Option c	35	21.7%
Option d	41	25.5%
Option e	10	6.2%
Other	11	6.8%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>161</i>	<i>100%</i>

#### Summary of Comments:

- People who live in rural areas do so because there are so few services and facilities. Providing services in all areas leads to suburbanisation of the countryside (4)
- Need to increase rural population to support and retain existing rural services and facilities (2)
- Also important to retain rural services and facilities to support tourism in rural areas, e.g. Broads area (1)
- Need to recognise the need for different approaches in rural and urban areas (1)
- Option b was felt not to be viable due to the lag time associated with infrastructure improvements (1)
- Needs of young people should be prioritised (1)
- Churches and chapels suggested as being able to provide facilities in rural areas (1)

#### Q39 Retail growth in Norwich city

Q39 Which option is most appropriate to accommodate the retail growth in the city centre?

<b>Option</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Support</b>
A	Concentrate around existing retail area	45 (40%)
B	Expand the retail centre	10 (9%)
C	Develop additional capacity in North City Centre area	58 (51%)

#### Summary of other comments:

- Already sufficient retail capacity in city centre (7)

- Development must retain character of Norwich (4)
- Improve public transport and promote car free development (3)
- Focus retail growth on new locations – i.e. growth areas (2)
- Take action on vacant shops (2)
- Encourage more residential development (2)
- Need for a range of city centre functions beyond retailing (1)

#### **Q40 Provision for late night leisure**

*Q40 Which option(s) do you prefer? Are there other options that could be included?*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Support</b>
A	Expansion of area but retain concentration in area	37 (35%)
B	Control expansion to ensure a range of activities for all age groups	56 (52%)
C	Dispersal of late night leisure activities around central area	14 (13%)

Other Options Suggested:

- Concert Hall/ performing arts centre (6)
- Dispersal would lead to more difficulties for police and more disruption for local residents (3)
- Better evening transport (3)
- Restrict number of outlets that have late licences. (3)

#### **Q41 Provision of affordable housing in Norwich**

*Q41 Do you agree that housing need which could best be met in the city of Norwich, but for practical reasons cannot be, should be met in the Norwich Policy Area?*

Yes = 84 (73%); No = 25 (22%); Other = 6 (5%)

Summary of Comments:

- Allow housing need to be met in surrounding area outside Norwich in smaller developments (3)
- This question suggests its own answer – too inflexible (2)
- Larger settlements in the NPA should be favoured for this (2)
- Seems a non-starter to transfer needs to another area (1)
- Diversity is necessary if people's needs are to be met in a way which can fit into the area (1)
- Should be met as part of New Town outside Norwich (1)
- Should not include land in Breckland (1)
- Yes but only when empty homes have been occupied first (1)

- Impact on Great Yarmouth housing market need to be assessed first (1)

**Q42 Regeneration in the Urban Area**

*Q42 Should we focus our efforts on area-wide improvements in any part of the existing built-up area?*

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	<b>53</b>	<b>67.9%</b>
No	16	20.5%
Other	9	11.5%

Areas Suggested for Regeneration:

- North Earlham, Larkman, Marlpit (6)
- Mile Cross (5)
- Lakenham (3)
- Magdalen Street area (2)
- Heartsease (2)
- West of urban area (2)
- Plus a number of other areas suggested by one individual only.

Other Comments

- Question how ‘densification’ was necessarily part this process and no need for high rise development in the city.

**Q43 Definition of Norwich Policy Area (NPA)**

*Q43 Do you see any reason to amend the NPA? If you answered yes, please elaborate.*

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes (i.e. change)	30	28.8%
No	<b>68</b>	<b>65.4%</b>
Other	6	5.8%

Changes proposed

<b>Enlarge NPA</b>		<b>Reduce NPA</b>	
<b>Suggested additions</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Suggested Reductions</b>	<b>No</b>

Attleborough	4	Long Stratton	4
Thetford	2	Wymondham	4
Diss	3	Areas outside the Southern Bypass	3
Loddon area	1	Too large generally	4
Beccles	1		
Lowestoft	1		
Yarmouth	1		
Bracon Ash area	1		
Add to South of NPA	1		
Dereham	2		
Add to West of NPA	1		
North Walsham	1		
TOTAL	19	TOTAL	15

Summary of Other Comments:

- Use journey time as yardstick for definition (1)
- Further development at Wymondham not sustainable – too distant from town centre and has deficit of open space – exclude W. (1)
- JCS should be about creating a new pattern of settlement – hence total review (1)

**Q44 Rural Exception Sites (Housing)**

*Q44 Which option do you prefer? (Option A = allocate sites in all villages where need is identified; Option B = Allocate sites only in villages with a defined range of services; Option C = not allocated sites, but encourage them to be brought forward where needed.)*

Option A = 21.4%    B = 29.8%    C = 48.9%

Additional comments:

- need to allocate sites in accordance with the settlement hierarchy;
- bringing sites forward as they're needed will stop people holding on to them;
- should avoid very small villages;
- allocate near facilities to stop villages dying;
- allow people to be close to relatives/friends to stop rural deprivation;
- ensure sites avoid important spaces/ecological sites etc.

#### **Q45 Affordable Housing in rural Areas – Thresholds**

*Q45 Which option do you prefer? (Option A = reduce threshold to sites of 2+ dwellings; Option b = sites of 5+ dwellings; Option C = sites of 10+ dwellings)*  
Option A = 18.5%; B = 37.9%; C = 28.2%

In addition 11% proposed a flexible approach or a graduated threshold.  
Others proposed thresholds of 1, 15, 20 and 50 dwellings.

#### **Q46 Local Need for Housing in rural areas**

*Q46 Which option do you prefer? (Option A = within a particular village; Option B = a wider definition of a group of villages)*  
Option a = 44.2% B = 55.8%

Additional comments:

- a cascade approach should also be applied to the affordable housing element of all rural allocations;
- sites within a cluster of villages may be closer to range of facilities than those on the edge or a larger 'sustainable' settlement.

#### **Q47 The Rural Economy**

*Q47 Which option do you prefer? And if option C, within what distance? (Option A = locations within or adjacent to existing settlements; Option B = within 1 km of a settlement; Option C = a different higher figure)*

Option A = 28 (26.2%) B = 42 (39.3%) C = 37 (34.9%)

For those selecting option C, the distances suggested were:

- 1km – 2km (10)
- 2km – 3km (10)
- 3km – 5km (6)
- 10 km (1)

Other comments:

- Depends on business type (12)
- Distance best left to market forces (2)
- Should allow encouragement for tourism (2)
- Should be close to settlements (1)
- Provide footways/ cycle paths to businesses (1)

#### **Q48 Funding Infrastructure**

*Q48 Which approach do you favour? Do you think there should be a discount built into a tariff (if adopted) for brownfield or contaminated sites? (Option A = Contributions solely on a site by site basis; Option B = Contributions (tariff basis) towards overall infrastructure needs supplemented by site-by-site contribution where appropriate)*



Option A = 48 (40%) B = 72 (60%)

#### Summary of Comments

- A blanket tariff approach does not reflect costs of the specific scheme and there will be increased costs for managing the fund resulting in some sites not benefiting as much as they should. (7)
- Either option must take account of viability (2)
- Some aspects of green infrastructure strategy could not be implemented unless all developers contribute (2)
- Two tier system is too complex (1)
- Site-by-site funding can still allow pooling of funds in some circumstances (1)
- All developers benefit from publicly provided infrastructure and therefore should contribute (1)
- Collecting solely on a site-by-site basis does not gain enough money to do anything useful with. (1)
- Contributions should be reduced if developments are of higher quality (1)
- Tariff needs to be fully consulted on with development industry (1)
- Need to set out effectively what achievements are expected from a tariff. (1)

(Q48b) Yes (discount for brownfield sites) = 65%; No = 35%

#### **Q49 Area Basis for Tariff Funding**

*Q49 If a tariff approach is adopted, do you think it should be based on a) area-wide assessment or b) a specific sector?*

Option a = 51 (58%) B = 37 (42%)

#### Additional comments

- The area should not include smaller villages and settlements outside the main growth area (1)
- The tariff should apply to all consents but with ability to take account of types of location and development. (1)

#### **Q50 Funding – Investment Period**

*Q50 If a tariff is adopted, would it be appropriate for public bodies to fund infrastructure early in the life of a development and recoup it via the tariff as development progresses?*

Yes = 71 (74%) No = 25 (26%)

#### Summary of Comments

- It should be the responsibility of the developer to pay for the infrastructure before development starts (6)
- Public bodies should not take such a risk, as they could be left in debt if development does not proceed (4)

- It would depend on the type of infrastructure or the area (2)
- There should be staged payments so that the developer contributed at the start of the process (1)
- It would be an important mechanism to kick-start investment for early provision of benefits (1)
- Existing facilities could otherwise be swamped by development before any improvements are made (1)
- For the scale of growth proposed, it is necessary, not just appropriate (1)

### **Q51 Other Comments on Tariff**

*Q51 Are there any other comments you wish to make on this issue?*

#### Summary of Comments

- The level of tariff must avoid undermining viability of development – could mean a scaled approach is necessary (11)
- The cost of contributions will be passed onto the buyer. Local people on local salaries cannot afford this. (3)
- Developer contributions can only come from one pot. Contributions for one thing may impinge upon money for another (3)
- Danger that planning permissions are granted just in order to get the tariff contribution (2)
- Contributions should not be used for schemes already proposed before any development is planned (2)
- Communities need to see a link from development to needs being met – hence not all the contributions should go to central pot. (2)
- Adequate funding must be reserved for environmental, health and leisure activities (1)
- A single growth option would be easier to administer (1)
- The basis for funding through the tariff must be clear from the outset (1)

### **Q52 Management of Funds**

*Q52 Do you have any views on how funds derived from a tariff, if adopted, would best be managed?*

#### Summary of Comments

- Clear, transparent and audited accounts would need to be made available to developers, the community and new residents to demonstrate the links between development and provision of facilities/ infrastructure (29)
- Joint management by an independent, non profitable body/ organisation made up of people with no vested interest (5)
- Management by the local Council within which area the scheme falls (4)
- Management by the GNDP or other principle authority (3)
- Finds must be ring-fenced to the appropriate scheme (3)
- Consult locally before money is spent (3)

- Minimum costs for administration and maximise benefit of infrastructure (1)
  - Management by a private company, in order to avoid expensive bureaucracy (1)
- 

DRAFT

## APPENDIX 8

### LOCAL SURVEY OF LONG STRATTION RESIDENTS

#### **Consultation on the possibility of achieving a bypass for Long Stratton by agreeing to additional housing and commercial development**

South Norfolk Council recently undertook a survey in the Long Stratton area to obtain resident's views on how a bypass could be provided. They sent out 3,200 questionnaires and received an excellent response with 1,182 replies, being a response rate of nearly 37%.

The first question was:

***Should the Joint Core Strategy promote major mixed-use growth at Long Stratton to improve that section of the A140? (This implies a mixture of housing and commercial uses)***

The response was:

<b>View</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>In favour</b> of major development	570	48.2%
<b>Against</b> major development	586	49.6%
<b>No view</b> expressed	26	2.2%

The second question was:

***What level of housing growth do you think would be appropriate in Long Stratton over the next twenty years?***

The response, which allowed people to have more than one choice, was:

<b>No. of dwellings</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>%</b>
Large scale (5,000-10,000 dwellings)	123	10.5%
Medium scale (1,500-5,000 dwellings)	311	26.4%
Under 1,500 dwellings	379	32.2%
No dwellings	177	15.1%
Another number	186	15.8%

273 of the replies to the survey also added comments, of which 115 made positive comments in support of a bypass. Another 74 respondents aired concern over the village's infrastructure and wanted changes before any more development took place.

The survey has not provided a clear view with the responses split almost evenly for and against major development. In relation to the size of possible development the views suggest no more than 5,000 dwellings.

(South Norfolk Council Summary)

DRAFT

Joint Core Strategy options consultation

**confidential and for internal purposes only**

<b>Document Circulation and History</b>	
Prepared by:	
Inspected and Approved by:	
Date of issue:	

<b>Version</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Changes</b>
1	Draft	25/6/08	Paul Rao	Working draft for planning group
2	Draft	26/6/08	Phil Morris	As above
3	Draft	27/6/08	Richard Doleman	As above
4	Draft	1/7/08	Roger Burroughs	As above
5				
6	Draft	2/7/08	Ruth Carey	Reformatting and amended vision
7	Draft	3/7/08	Roger Burroughs	Further modifications
8	Draft	8/7/8	David Willis	Further modifications
9	Draft	9/7/08	Paul Rao	Further modifications for Directors sign-off

### **IMPORTANT NOTE – development of this document**

*In 2007 and early 2008 the GNDP undertook a considerable amount of work to develop a core strategy for the districts of Broadland Norwich and South Norfolk, except for the area under the jurisdiction of the Broads Authority. This led to a major consultation exercise from November 2007 to February, 2008, looking at 'issues and options'. The document which formed the focus of this work, and the summary leaflet, looked at possible approaches to a wide range of topics including different ways of accommodating the level of new development necessary to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan. This included looking at alternative locations where large scale development might be located in the area close to Norwich.*

*The intention was that this should lead to the publication of a 'preferred options' document in late summer/ autumn 2008. However, in June, 2008, new regulations governing the plan making process came into effect, removing the preferred options stage. Instead, the new regulations require authorities to consult 'specific' and 'general' bodies (as defined in regulations) on what the 'content' of the strategy should be. The regulations also require authorities to consider whether residents and businesses should be included at that stage. The next stage prescribed by the new regulations is the publication of a draft plan for full consultation and submission to the Government Office for the East of England, along with any representations made, for consideration at an independent examination.*

*A considerable amount of work, including public consultation on issues and options has already been undertaken. Therefore the GNDP intends to use the present stage to seek guidance from the 'specific' and 'general' bodies on whether our current approach is one they support. We are also asking whether different options for accommodating major growth in the Norwich area could be made to work in practical terms, given our objectives of meeting development needs as sustainably as possible, ensuring that the necessary infrastructure is provided in tandem with the development, and that high quality can be built into new development. Because a large scale public consultation exercise was undertaken only a few months ago, the GNDP has taken the view that there would be limited value in consulting individuals again at this stage, and that this would be better undertaken when the draft plan is prepared.*

*The work done at the 'issues and options' stage has been important in the development of this document. In particular the results of the earlier consultation exercise have now been collated, sustainability appraisal of the issues and options has been augmented by further work on the growth options under consideration, and further evidence gathering has been done.*

*This document is the result of that work and is therefore a position statement, rather than the 'preferred options' document, or a draft plan. The GNDP hopes it will help the 'specific' and 'general' bodies to give a more helpful and focused response, leading to the publication of a draft plan on which full public consultation will take place before submission for consideration at a Public Examination. This report is publicly available for inspection, as are the report of the consultation exercise at the issues and options stage, the draft sustainability appraisal report, and the evidence studies completed to date. A leaflet explaining the new process, where we are, and the next steps is being circulated to all households and businesses in the area covered by the joint core strategy.*

# Contents

	Chapter	Page no.
1	Executive summary	
2	Foreword	
3	Introduction	
4	Delivering the Joint Core Strategy	
5	Spatial portrait	
6	Spatial-vision	
	• Spatial vision	
	• Spatial objectives	
7	Spatial strategy	
8	Policies for places	
	• Settlement hierarchy	
	• Norwich Policy Area	
	• Norwich City centre	
	• Remainder of the Norwich Area including fringe parishes	
	• Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area	
	• Development in towns, villages and the countryside	
	• The Broads	
	• Hierarchy of centres	
9	Area-wide policies (policies about topics)	
	a) Reducing environmental Impact	
	b) Housing delivery	
	c) The economy	
	d) Strategic Access and Transportation	
	e) Environmental assets	
	f) Communities and culture	
10	Implementation and monitoring	
	Table 1 Developer contributions	
	Table 2 Nature of infrastructure likely to be funded through a CIL	
	Appendices	
1	Option 1 Key	
	Dependencies and major growth locations	
2	Option 2 Key	
	Dependencies and major growth locations	
3	Option 3 Key	
	Dependencies and major growth locations	
4	Definition of the Norwich Policy Area (Parish list and plan)	



# 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 For the past year the three councils of Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk have been working together with Norfolk County Council as the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) to develop long term plans for housing growth in the area.
- 1.2 This report sets out proposals for potential inclusion in a plan – called the ‘Joint Core Strategy’ – that will guide future housing growth in Norwich and the surrounding area. This is motivated by a need to contribute to national house building targets in a sustainable way.
- 1.3 The target for growth is to identify sites for at least 47,500 new homes in the area between 2001 and 2026. Significant progress has already been made, with 7,500 homes already built, and planning permission granted for a further 14,700. This means that locations for a further 25,400 home still have to be identified. This report sets out in detail the proposals for doing this, alongside a full appraisal of the infrastructure developments that will be needed to support the new homes.

## Background

- 1.4 In November 2007, Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk district councils, together with Norfolk County Council, carried out a 12 week ‘issues and options’ consultation among residents.
- 1.5 In addition, a number of Evidence Studies have been undertaken and these determine the major infrastructure and sustainability needs facing the area over the planned growth period.
- 1.6 A number of proposals for growth are detailed in this document. These have been drawn up after reviewing all the responses to the consultation and the results of the Evidence Studies. The Partnership believes these represent viable solutions for the area to meet its 2026 growth targets, as well as ensuring the infrastructure is in place to accommodate development beyond this.
- 1.7 These proposals are explained in detail throughout this document. The Partnership invites all organisations being consulted to examine these and respond.

## Vision

- 1.8 This document includes the vision for the area. The overarching aim is to build sustainable communities across three districts. The key elements to this include:
  - The opportunity to play an active part in community life and be involved in decision making
  - Healthier and safer places and a high quality environment
  - Access to suitable housing, jobs, facilities and services
  - Opportunities for people to learn at all stages of life
  - The right infrastructure so people can travel using varied forms of transport.

1.9 A big part of achieving this will be about getting the location for new growth locations right.

**Proposed new housing locations**

1.10 To deliver the planned housing growth a mixture of small scale development dispersed around the area and large scale development concentrated in particular locations is proposed.

**Sites identified for small scale development**

300 new homes: - Diss - Harleston	100-200 new homes: - Acle - Reepham - Wroxham	Around 100 new homes: - Hingham - Loddon	20-50 new homes: - Blofield - Brundall - Hethersett* - Long Stratton*
-----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

\* unless chosen as a major growth location as shown below.

1.11 The Partnership is currently examining three potential options for large scale development. Each of these options offers the potential for 24,000 new homes, which will be supported by a range of new infrastructure investments, including employment sites, new schools, transport links and health services.

**1.12 Potential options for major development**

Location	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Norwich	4,000 new homes	4,000 new homes	4,000 new homes
Broadland	2,000 new homes	2,000 new homes	3,000 new homes
South Norfolk	2,000 new homes	2,000 new homes	2,000 new homes
Sprowston and Rackheath area	6,000 new homes	6,000 new homes	6,000 new homes
Hethersett and Little Melton area	4,000 new homes	4,000 new homes	No development
Mangreen, Swardeston, Mulbarton, and Swainsthorpe area	No development	No development	4,500 new homes
Wymondham	4,000 new homes	2,000 new homes	2,000 new homes
Costessey and Easton area	2,000 new homes	2,000 new homes	1,000 new homes
Long Stratton	No development	2,000 new homes	1,500 new homes

1.13 This document contains further detail on the options, and what the main objectives are.

### **3 Introduction**

- 3.1 This document follows the 12 week consultation undertaken by the Councils in winter 2007 / 2008 on the major planning 'issues' facing Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk.
- 3.2 Through this earlier consultation, the three councils tested a number of options for their policies and proposals. Under new Regulations the process of plan making has changed and we need to ask again about the content of the strategy. This document is based on earlier work (available separately – see Appendix X) involving consultation, sustainability appraisal, and evidence gathering and we are seeking views on emerging policy and options for major growth.
- 3.3 The districts of Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk are a diverse mixture of the city of Norwich, Market Towns, villages and countryside. The challenge ahead is to ensure that future development is managed to protect and enhance the local and global environment and people's quality of life while still meeting the needs of current and future generations, ensuring a sustainable future.
- 3.4 To plan for this growth, Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk Council are working together with Norfolk County Council to prepare a new plan. This plan - the Joint Core Strategy will be the main component of future planning strategies for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. It will set out the long-term vision and objectives for area including broad policies for steering and shaping development. It identifies broad locations for new housing and employment growth and changes to transport infrastructure, as well as defining areas where development should be limited.
- 3.5 In October 2006 the Norwich area was awarded Growth Point status. This means that the three district councils, together with their partners, can bid to Government for additional funding to support the growth and regeneration of the area.
- 3.6 The results of this present engagement exercise will help us shape the final Joint Core Strategy document that we submit to Government in the spring of 2009. The policies and proposals of the final document, which will cover the period up to 2026, will affect everyone that lives, works in or visits the area.

#### **How you can make your comments**

- 3.7 Your comments on this document are welcomed and these can be sent to us either online or by completing the comments forms.

#### **How we reached this stage**

- 3.8 In November 2007 the councils began a 12 week 'Issues and Options' consultation with stakeholders and the wider community for the Joint Core Strategy document. All householders were delivered a leaflet with a brief questionnaire, asking them about the key issues. The Partnership formally consulted with statutory bodies and developers and landowners. Council officers have given a number of presentations to interested groups and held static and travelling exhibitions. A report on the findings of the Issues and Options consultation has been produced. These documents can be


viewed at the District Council Offices, County Hall or on-line at [www.eastspace.net/gndp](http://www.eastspace.net/gndp).

<b>Stages in developing the Joint Core Strategy</b> (assumes no significant additional evaluation or modelling – add 6 months if required)	
Consultation on 'content ' of the plan	August – September 2008
Publish and consult on draft plan	April-May 2009 or September-October 2009 (depending on additional work required)
Submission to secretary of state	Summer 2009 or Winter 2009
Public examination	January-March 2010 or August – October 2010
Adoption	March – June 2010 or October-December 2010

DRAFT

## 4 Developing the joint core strategy

- 4.1 Through the work of the Local Strategic Partnerships the aspirations of local people and needs have already been identified in Sustainable Community Strategies, which create a long-term, sustainable vision for area and set the agenda for priorities in the local area agreement<sup>1</sup>.
- 4.2 The Joint Core Strategy will be the key component in delivering the spatial elements of the Sustainable Community Strategies. The integration of the Community Strategies and the Local Development Framework is an important part of the new planning system and they should share the same vision and, where possible, the same priorities and objectives.
- 4.3 The Joint Core Strategy forms part of the Local Development Framework. A Local Development Framework is a 'folder' of local development documents that outlines how planning will be managed in your area. It guides future development and use of land in Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk up to 2026. These documents will eventually replace old-style Local Plans and will be used to assess all planning applications. The Local Development Framework will also allocate sites for new developments.



<sup>1</sup> **Local Area Agreement (LAA)** : A three year 'contract' between a local area (represented by the local authority and other partners through the local strategic partnership) and central Government to deliver particular priorities as set out in its sustainable community strategy

- 4.4 The Joint Core Strategy has to meet the requirements of the Government's East of England Plan (EEP). This is the Regional Spatial Strategy which sets out the planning matters that need to be dealt with in more detail at a local level. It also specifies the number of new homes and jobs that must be provided in the area up to 2026. The Strategy considers these growth targets up to 2026 to help the Norwich area prepare for this unprecedented high level of growth and change. It identifies the supporting infrastructure needed to support growth and shows how this infrastructure will be funded.
- 4.5 The EEP is already being reviewed and is due to be completed by 2011. It will take account of updated household forecasts and look ahead to 2031. It will result in upward pressure on housing targets but at this stage cannot be assessed with certainty.
- 4.6 European and national legislation also requires local planning authorities to undertake a "sustainability appraisal" of the Joint Core Strategy, and an "appropriate assessment" in those cases where there is a risk of an impact on sites of international conservation importance.
- 4.7 As well as complying with national and regional policy it is important that local development frameworks are prepared on the basis of sound evidence. This joint core strategy has been prepared using an extensive evidence base.
- 4.8 You can keep up-to-date with progress on the Joint Core Strategy and other growth and development issues by reading our newsletter or on the GNDP's website [www.eastspace.net/gndp](http://www.eastspace.net/gndp) .

## 5. Spatial portrait

### 5.1 People and communities

- There are very extensive levels of multiple deprivation in Norwich (2<sup>nd</sup> most deprived in the region/62<sup>nd</sup> nationally) and significant pockets of rural deprivation.
- With the notable exception of rural deprivation, generally, Broadland and South Norfolk are relatively affluent.
- There is a generally good level of health, well-being and community safety across the area as a whole. The city has more limiting long-term illness, and also high crime levels associated with the regionally-important concentration of evening and night time attractions (like clubs and bars).
- Relatively large Gypsy and Traveller communities in the area.
- Relatively higher proportion of people with no qualifications across the area, with Norwich having lowest district proportion of school leavers with grades A\*-C GCSEs.

### 5.2 Natural environment, landscape and biodiversity

- The Norwich area has a strong track record in planning and delivering projects that champion environmental sustainability
- The Broads extend from the eastern edge of Greater Norwich along the River Wensum into the heart of the city. Whitlingham Country Park is on the eastern edge of Norwich. The river is an attractive natural feature with significant brownfield regeneration along both of its banks in Norwich and further major schemes planned. Riverside regeneration offers an opportunity to complete a connected riverside walk from the river's gateway to the Broads into the city centre.
- The area's landscape is very diverse, including heathland, ancient grassland, wetland, farmland, marshland, and reedbeds that all provide the habitats for a wide variety of birds, animal and plant life.
- Defined landscape character areas converge on Norwich: a level of complexity unique within the East of England region. These are:
  - the fens and marshes of the Broads;
  - In the west and north of the area - rolling landscapes of varied geology including woodland, heath and former parkland estates;
  - an extensive open clay plateau incised by rivers in the south; and
  - a more intimate landscape of small fields and hedgerows in the east.
- There are internationally important wildlife sites across the area: Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPA), Ramsar sites and nationally important Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and local wildlife sites across the area.

### 5.3 Heritage and built environment

- Outstanding heritage resource in Norwich as a 'contemporary medieval city'
- Distinctive and characteristic historic buildings, towns and villages in Broadland and South Norfolk (including historic landmark buildings such as Wymondham Abbey and Blickling Hall).
- Flooding is a key risk for parts of the area, especially parts of central Norwich, and areas close to the Broads and major rivers. The impact of climate change makes lower-lying areas even more vulnerable to flooding.

## 5.4 Key external linkages

### International :

Principal local connections are via Norwich International Airport, Eastport (Great Yarmouth) and Haven Gateway (Felixstowe and Harwich)

### National/Regional:

North (North Norfolk)	East (Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft)	South (Suffolk and beyond)	South West	West	Broads Authority
<p>Bittern Line provides rail link.</p> <p>Coast and countryside are key attractors.</p> <p>Net in-commuting to JCS area</p> <p>Wroxham (Hoveton) cross-border settlement with growth planned at Hoveton in recognition of wide range of services.</p>	<p>Closest KCDCs (both with significant regeneration needs)</p> <p>A47 and Wherry Line provide key strategic access (of particular strategic significance for GY and L)</p> <p>Eastport will provide access to Europe</p> <p>Net in-commuting to JCS area</p>	<p>A140 road and rail road and rail corridor provides key strategic access to London and Ipswich. A140 almost entirely single carriageway and subject to range of speed restrictions particularly in Suffolk. Ongoing issues of journey reliability and duration on rail line.</p> <p>A146/A12 important for rural south east of JCS area</p>	<p>A11 road and rail corridor, provides key strategic access to London, Cambridge and south midlands (and rest of UK ). A11 dualling incomplete.</p> <p>No Government commitment to EastWest Rail proposal.</p> <p>Significant growth in the A11 corridor including 4,000 dwellings at Attleborough and 6,000 at Thetford.</p>	<p>A47 provides key road access to midlands and north. Mostly single carriageway in Norfolk. Suffers from congestion and safety issues.</p> <p>Net in-commuting from Breckland (Dereham area)</p> <p>Net in-migration from East Midlands</p>	<p>Broads Authority area extends into north, centre and south of JCS area.</p> <p>Most “Broads villages” are actually within JCS area</p>



		<p>Border towns of Diss and Harleston in South Norfolk (and Beccles and Bungay in Waveney).</p> <p>Net in-migration from London, SE and rest of EofE regions</p>	<p>Strategic employment also at Snetterton.</p> <p>Brecks are important visitor attractor with further potential</p> <p>Net in-commuting from Breckland</p> <p>Stansted Airport has major growth planned. If this should be delayed further growth pressures are likely at Norwich international Airport</p>		
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

## 6 Spatial vision

- 6.1 The Joint Core Strategy will set out a spatial planning vision for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk for the lifetime of the plan – to 2026. Building sustainable communities in the three districts will be the central theme and the main focus for the vision.
- 6.2 The Sustainable Community Strategies for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk and the County Strategic Partnership lead the communities' own local aspirations. These give the context for this Joint Core Strategy.
- 6.3 The main common themes of the Sustainable Community Strategies are:
- for people to play an active part in community life and to be involved in decision making
  - to have healthier and safer places and a high quality environment that is protected and respected for everyone's enjoyment
  - to have access to suitable housing, jobs, facilities and services for all whatever their needs.
  - to provide opportunities for people to learn at all stages of life
  - to develop the right infrastructure so that people can travel using varied forms of transport.
- 6.4 The spatial vision acknowledges significant changes to the area in order to meet the ambitious targets for new homes and jobs set out in the regional plan. This vision describes what sort of area we are aiming for in the future and shows how the spatial planning elements of the Sustainable Community Strategies can be achieved..
- 6.5 **The spatial vision:**

By 2026 the extended communities of Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk will be strong, cohesive and forward looking. Between 2006 and 2026, 40,000 new homes (of which over 35,000 in the Norwich Policy Area) will have been provided and about 25,000 new jobs will have been created. Good progress will have been made in delivering safe, healthy, prosperous, sustainable and inclusive communities throughout the three districts. This will have involved development of well designed, good quality homes that meet people's needs and aspirations in attractive and sustainable places. People will have good access to good quality jobs and essential services.

### **Climate change and sustainability**

- Regeneration, development and growth will have created sustainable places and revitalised areas of deprivation, while minimising the use of global resources and mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change.
- Zero carbon development will be the standard to be achieved through advances and innovation in the design, construction and management of sustainable communities and new buildings which improve energy efficiency and use renewable energy.
- A network of green links will connect existing open space and wildlife habitats within urban areas and to the countryside.

### **Communities, deprivation and regeneration (people, deprivation, skills, health, culture, participation and civic life)**

- People will enjoy healthy, safe and fulfilling lifestyles, have equitable access to high standards of health and social care and can make informed choices about their own health.
- There will be excellent opportunities for lifelong learning and personal development and people will have high expectations for their own educational achievement to meet their needs, to contribute to the life of their communities, and to the economy
- The area will be renowned for its culture, creativity and spirituality.
- The area will provide high quality cultural and leisure opportunities that improve people's well-being.
- There will be excellent public open space, sport and recreational facilities and community centres. Improved access to and from the countryside will ensure everyone can take part in community and cultural activities.
- More visitors will be attracted to the area by enhancing links between the wider Norwich area and places of natural beauty such as the Broads, the Brecks and the coast.

### **Living, working and getting around (transportation, access housing, jobs)**

- Business investment in the area will support and create a sustainable, diverse, thriving economy accessible and appropriate to the needs of all the community and where the social and environmental performance of the economy is improved.
- Investment at strategic and other employment locations will have helped create a stronger economy (including Norwich city centre; Norwich Research Park, Hethel Engineering Centre, and other areas for jobs growth including Thorpe St Andrew, Longwater, Colney, Cringleford, Norwich Airport and the Wymondham/A11 corridor). Growing the local economies in main towns and key service centres will have revitalised the rural economy.
- The road network will be maintained and improved to and across the area. Rural isolation will be reduced by improving transport networks and encouraging new communication and information technologies. However, people will need to use their cars less as jobs, shops, schools and recreational facilities will be in areas accessible by public transport, cycling and pedestrian routes.
- High quality public open space, sport and recreational facilities and community centres to ensure people can be active and enjoy community activities.

### **Locations for major new communities**

- Will help deliver strategic levels of growth in the Norwich Policy Area.
- Each one will be a distinctive high quality sustainable community with a vibrant and attractive district centre and a network of local centres serving existing neighbouring communities and new residents alike providing shops, health, education and community services easily accessible by foot, bicycle and public transport.

### **The urban area of Norwich**

- Will be a greener city, in appearance and environmental performance. It will be a stronger social, economic and cultural centre with a focus for jobs, shopping, leisure and other activities.
- Norwich city centre will build on its importance for key economic sectors including financial and general insurance services, retailing and creative and media industries. It will continue to be a UK “top-10” retail centre.
- As a contemporary medieval city Norwich will treasure and promote its rich historic, cultural and architectural heritage, encouraging the design of new iconic buildings built to an exceptional design quality.
- Norwich will continue to be the cultural capital of East Anglia and local people and visitors will have access to theatres, art galleries, museums and buildings of architectural and historical interest. The cultural economy will stimulate regeneration, increase tourism and encourage an active and cohesive community.
- Norwich will maintain and promote its rich heritage of historic and contemporary buildings as well as parks, wildlife sites, woodland and heathland.
- Sustainable transport options will include a network of safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle links and public transport services to provide easy access to the city centre, business parks and further afield, reducing the need for car use.

### **The rural area**

- The main towns, key service centres and service villages will be focal points for communities to have better access to quality jobs, healthcare and education facilities and shops.
- The rural area will retain its distinctive Norfolk character and will continue to be working and tranquil, recognising the Broads, and other locally and nationally important habitats

### **Main Towns**

The four main towns of Aylsham, Diss, Harleston and Wymondham will

- provide for a safe and healthy quality of life
- retain attractive historical centres as a focus for their continued success serving their rural catchments.
- enjoy greater economic prosperity with new opportunities for business
- Accommodate new housing growth that will be limited in Aylsham, moderate in Diss and Harleston, (i.e. some 300 new homes each) and large scale in Wymondham (2000-4000 dwellings depending on the chosen growth option). This will be developed in a sustainable manner complementing each town’s form and function, and incorporating good sustainable transport links to existing town centres, local employment locations and good recreation, leisure and community facilities.
- be enhanced by activities arising from “Cittaslow” (i.e. “slow town”) status in Diss and Aylsham

### **Key Service Centres**

The ten Key Service Centres of Acle, Blofield, Brundall, Hethersett, Hingham, Loddon/Chedrave, Long Stratton, Poringland/Framingham Earl, Reepham and Wroxham will

- Remain attractive places with a range of enhanced shops, services, community facilities and job opportunities to meet local and surrounding area needs
- Accommodate job growth to meet those local needs and balanced with the needs of proposed housing growth
- Accommodate small to moderate levels of new housing (between 20 and 200 dwellings) in accordance with the capacities of local services, community facilities and utilities provision
- Form limited but strong employment and tourism-related links with the Norfolk Broads (i.e. at Acle, Brundall, Loddon/Chedgrave and Wroxham)
- Have enhanced transport links to Norwich and the main towns.

### **Service Villages and Other Villages**

Service Villages or Other Villages will maintain and enhance rural life by providing additional flexibility in the provision of sustainable housing and other small scale development, consistent with their form and character.

Service villages will

- Continue to provide limited local services with easy access
- Have enhanced small scale local employment and service opportunities
- Provide for limited new growth of about 10-20 dwellings each

Other Villages will

- Be the locations for infill or small scale developments including limited new housing

## 6.6 Spatial planning objectives:

### **Objective 1**

**To involve as many people as possible in new planning policy.**

All sections of the community will be actively encouraged to express their own vision of the future, through this strategy, further plans and planning applications. There will be a particular focus on involving people who have not previously had a say in planning. As many people as possible should play a part in the ambitious long-term plans for growth in the wider Norwich area. This will help make planning more inclusive, and give confidence that the benefits of growth are felt more equally across existing and new communities in and around Norwich.

### **Objective 2**

**To be a place where people feel safe in their communities.**

This will be promoted by working with partners and the public in Norwich and the rural areas to promote community safety, a stronger sense of belonging and pride in peoples' surroundings, to reduce crime and the fear of crime. Better community facilities, better road safety and design of new developments will help to reduce crime.

### **Objective 3**

**To encourage the development of healthy and active lifestyles**

Within Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk the availability and accessibility of open space, the countryside, sports and recreational facilities will be improved. People will also be offered the best opportunities to make healthy travel choices as part of their

daily lives. By working with the Norfolk Primary Care Trust and Norfolk County Council, medical and social facilities will be properly planned for new developments, which will be accessible to all.

#### **Objective 4**

##### **To allocate enough land for housing, and affordable housing, in the most sustainable settlements**

The amount and type of new housing will be provided in line with the targets set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and to meet the needs identified by the Greater Norwich Sub Regional Housing Assessments. Most new homes will be built in the Norwich Policy Area (35,000 out of 40,000, 2006-2026). Smaller sustainable settlements will accommodate smaller-scale growth. So people have alternatives to using cars, new housing, employment and services will be planned so they are grouped together wherever possible. The settlement hierarchy defines the towns and villages with a good range of jobs, services and facilities. Appropriate densities will make sure land is used efficiently and the need for accessible and affordable housing will also be met.

#### **Objective 5**

##### **To promote economic growth and diversity and provide a wide range of jobs within Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk**

Existing employment sites will be safeguarded and enough land for employment development will be allocated in line with the Regional Spatial Strategy. This is to meet the needs of inward investment, new businesses and existing businesses wishing to expand or relocate. Norwich city centre will continue to exert a powerful economic influence over the wider area. Its growth will be further encouraged, so that the centre remains one of the best in the country for retail and employment. Within the Norwich Policy Area, Thorpe St Andrew, Longwater, Colney, Cringleford, Norwich Airport and Wymondham/A11 corridor will also be the focus of further jobs growth. Supporting economic growth in the market towns and revitalising the rural economy are also priorities. Mixed-use development, live/work units and diversification schemes will be encouraged to reduce the need for local people to commute long distances to work.

#### **Objective 6**

##### **To make sure people have ready access to services**

Norwich city centre is currently the highest-ranking retail centre in the East of England with people visiting it from a very wide area. The diversity and vitality of the city centre will be maintained and enhanced. The surrounding market towns and service centres will continue to play a key service role. Innovative approaches will be taken to support rural service provision. Wherever new homes or jobs are to be developed, existing supporting services must either already be adequate or should be provided at the right stage of a new development. This will ensure existing and future residents and workers will have access to the services they need.

#### **Objective 7**

##### **To allow people to develop to their full potential by providing educational facilities to support the needs of a growing population**

Within Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk there is a need to improve, expand and provide for new schools to serve an increasing population and higher educational aspirations. Enough pre-school, primary, secondary and further education facilities

are needed so children and young people can do as well as they are able. It is essential to provide an environment and the facilities to improve the skills of the workforce so the developing economy of the Norwich area and its wider catchment can be supported.

#### **Objective 8**

##### **To protect, manage and enhance the natural, built and historic environment, including key landscapes, natural resources and areas of natural habitat or nature conservation value**

The area is a special place and everyone should be proud of where they live, work, study or visit. Norwich has a remarkable historic centre with some fine architectural examples. There are also extensive areas of open space, historic parks, wildlife sites and wooded ridges in the city. The surrounding market towns and villages are very attractive with each having its own identity. People living in the area have access to open countryside, wildlife sites and the special qualities of the Broads. It is a priority to improve these special qualities even more so that everyone can enjoy them. The use of previously developed land will be prioritised to minimise the loss of agricultural land and the countryside. Development must provide environmental gains through green infrastructure. Biodiversity, locally distinctive landscapes will be protected and enhanced. Linkages between habitats will be promoted, helping to enable adaptation to climate change and sustainable access to the countryside will be promoted.

#### **Objective 9**

##### **To minimise the contributors to climate change and address its impact**

Climate change and sustainability are a key priority. Throughout Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, high standards of design will be promoted to reduce greenhouse gases. To make best use of appropriate renewable energy sources and to improve energy efficiency, zero carbon developments will be investigated. Water efficiency will be a priority in both new and existing development. Domestic and commercial waste will be minimised by encouraging waste reduction, reuse, recycling, composting and safe energy recovery.

#### **Objective 10**

##### **To enhance infrastructure provision to meet the needs of existing and future populations**

Greater use of sustainable modes of transport will be encouraged by better public transport, footways and cycle paths. People will also need to use cars less by making services, jobs, shops, schools and recreational facilities closer and easier to reach by walking, cycling and by public transport. The strategic road network is also essential, especially for the health of the economy. The road network will be maintained and improved access within Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, and to and from Norwich will be improved. More than 90% of the area is rural and rural isolation can be reduced by encouraging newer communication and information technologies.

#### **Objective 11**

##### **To reduce the need to travel**

Preference will be given to locations where services, employment, shops, schools and recreation are accessible by walking, cycling and public transport to reduce the need to travel especially by private car.

## **Objective 12**

### **To positively protect and enhance Norwich's individual character and unique cultural infrastructure**

Promoting culture in Norwich will help to develop the economy, stimulate further regeneration, increase sustainable tourism and promote community involvement. Norwich is already recognised as the cultural capital of East Anglia and we will help sustain this infrastructure so local people and visitors have access to a variety of facilities such as theatres, art galleries, museums and buildings of architectural and historic interest. Adequate public open space, sport and recreational facilities, community centres and access to the countryside is needed locally to make sure everyone in Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk can take part in community activities. More visitors will be encouraged to the area by protecting the very qualities that make the area attractive. Gateways between the wider Norwich area and the Broads, the Brecks and the coast will be enhanced in a way that does not harm their special character.

DRAFT



## 7. Spatial strategy

### Key Dependencies

- 7.1 The Strategy is dependent on significant investment in supporting infrastructure. New development will contribute to this. However, the provision of infrastructure, beyond that normally provided as part of the development, will need the active cooperation of and investment by other agencies. These include utility companies, health care providers, central and local government, Highways Agency, and rail undertakings. Without this support the plan's ability to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan will be reduced.
- 7.2 Critical infrastructure dependencies for growth are:
- NNDR and the implementation of NATS
  - Investment in junction improvements on the A47
  - Improvements to water supply and sewage disposal

Essential supporting infrastructure such as the Long Stratton bypass, green infrastructure, schools, emergency services and health care will also be required.

Local infrastructure including affordable housing will be provided as part of development

## 8. Policies for places

### Suggested policy for the growth strategy

#### Policy 1 Settlement hierarchy

New development in the area will be focused on:

- The urban area of Norwich, including the urban fringe parishes of Colney, Costessey, Cringleford, Trowse, Thorpe St. Andrew, Sprowston, Old Catton, Hellesdon, Drayton and Taverham
- Major mixed-use developments in specified locations within the Norwich Policy Area
- Main towns
- Key service centres
- Service villages
- Other villages

The scale of development will decrease at each level of this hierarchy.

#### Reasoned Justification

- 8.1 The East of England Plan focuses growth on Norwich as a Key Centre for Development and Change with lower levels of growth in other towns and key service centres.. In a rural area it is also appropriate to identify smaller villages for local needs growth.

#### Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area

The focus for major growth and development is in the Norwich Policy Area. The strategy for accommodating this growth in the NPA is:

Employment development at strategic locations will include:

- Significant expansion of office provision in the City Centre
- Significant expansion of health, higher education and, in particular, science park activity at UEA/NRP
- A new business park associated with the Airport and focussed on airport related uses
- An extension to Broadland Business Park
- Consolidation of activity at Longwater
- Expansion of activity at Hethel relating to automotive and high tech engineering
- New employment development to serve major growth locations.

Housing need will be provided by the allocation of sufficient land to deliver at least 36,000 dwellings in the NPA in the period 2006-2026.

- 10,000 dwellings comprising an existing commitment plus an additional 4,000 dwellings within the Norwich City Council area
- 10,500 dwellings in the Broadland NPA comprising existing commitment plus at least an additional 2,000 dwellings on small and medium sites in sustainable

locations in the urban area, urban extensions and larger villages, and 6,000 dwellings in a large new community detailed below

- 18,560 dwellings in South Norfolk NPA comprising existing commitment plus an additional 2,000 dwellings on small and medium sites in sustainable locations in the urban area, urban extensions and larger villages, and 12,000 dwellings in larger developments detailed below

*(NB the precise distribution of growth depends on the spatial options selected – see below)*

Transport infrastructure will include:

- The Northern Distributor Road
- Long Stratton Bypass
- Bus rapid transit
- New rail halts at Broadland Business Park and Rackheath (innovative new services will be investigated on the Wymondham - Norwich - Wroxham axis, potentially extending to Coltishall)
- Junction improvements on the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass.

### **Supporting text**

- 8.2 Norwich is identified by the East of England Plan as the Key Centre for Development and Change to accommodate the greatest amount on new development in the area. This will involve focusing development within the established urban area (including the urban fringe parishes in Broadland and South Norfolk) and will also necessitate major greenfield development within the Norwich Policy Area. Numerous brownfield sites have been developed in recent years and some further opportunities remain. In the short term, a significant proportion of development will be focused on brownfield sites, but in the longer term there will be fewer available.

## **Policy 3 Norwich City Centre**

Within the City Centre the main focus will be on retail, leisure, office, and cultural development. There will also be opportunities for some housing and educational development. Its role as a regional centre will be promoted by:

- enhancing the historic city, including its built and environmental assets and its distinctive “contemporary medieval” character through innovative, sustainable design;
- strengthening the city’s role as a visitor destination of international importance, with additional tourist facilities and leisure development in accordance with the retail study;
- enhancing its retail function, providing for a substantial expansion of comparison retail floorspace of varied types and size of unit to provide a range of premises to 2021. This will be achieved through intensification of uses in the primary retail area and if necessary through its expansion; other shopping areas will be strengthened to provide for retail diversity, with a particular focus on enhancing the character of specialist retailing areas;

- expanding its function as an employment centre, including provision of high quality office premises and a diversity of uses across the area, including media, creative, finance, insurance and information communication industries.

Where housing development is permitted, densities should generally be high, but some family housing should also be provided to achieve a social mix. Housing should be provided as part of mixed use development where appropriate, particularly in areas A, B and C. A minimum of 2,750 dwellings will be provided in the city centre.

To support these roles, improvements will be made to:

- the public realm;
- open spaces, green linkages and connections between open spaces, linking to the river corridor and the open countryside;
- walking and cycling provision (with particular regard to visitors);
- sustainable transport access to and within the city centre in accordance with the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy. This will promote Norwich as a gateway and enable a bus rapid transit system to link the new communities, with the city centre as the hub.

The Northern City Centre will be developed in accordance with its Area Action Plan.

### **Reasoned Justification**

- 8.3 Norwich is a regional centre and transport node. The Strategy promotes further major retail, leisure, office, culture and tourism related development in line with regional policy. It continues the previous policy of promoting mixed use development, but with a greater emphasis on commercial uses rather than housing because regional policy places a greater priority on employment uses in the city centre. Evidence shows that at least 100,000 m<sup>2</sup> of new offices will be required in the city centre up to 2021. Recent market trends support such an approach, showing a revival in demand for high quality offices, but with little demand for older, poorer quality offices and pressure in some cases for conversion to housing.
- 8.4 Regional policy and research have also identified that a substantial amount of space is required for other service related uses, such as leisure and tourism. Although the emphasis on housing has been reduced compared with earlier policy, it is important that some housing is provided to meet need and to continue the city centre's success in creating a vital and vibrant community.

### **Policy 4 The remainder of the Norwich urban area, including the fringe parishes**

Throughout the suburban area opportunities will be sought

- to identify and regenerate “tired” suburbs
- to improve townscape and retain the best of local character
- to improve the “gateways” to Norwich by seeking co-ordinated environmental and townscape improvements on all major routes from the urban edge to the City Centre

- for small and medium scale redevelopments to increase densities, where a design and access statement demonstrates that an improvement to townscape will result, and particularly around district centres and on public transport routes,
- to retain and improve local jobs, including through the retention of existing employment allocations and by ensuring that small scale opportunities are genuinely available to all levels of the market
- to retain and improve local services,

Green infrastructure and links between currently fragmented habitats and to the rural fringe will be protected, maintained and enhanced. This will include:

- the protection of the landscape setting of the urban area
- tree planting to reinforce and re-establish the historic “orchard in a city, city in an orchard” .....
- the re-establishment of heathland habitats in the north and north east to link through to Mousehold.
- The completion of a riverside and river valley walks extending out into the surrounding countryside
- A new water based country park at Bawburgh and improved links from the city center and areas north of the river Yare to the existing country park at Whitlingham
- The establishment of a comprehensive cycle and walking network

Reduction of the impact of traffic on residential areas will be facilitated by the construction of the NDR and will include:

- Adoption of a hierarchy of routes as set out in NATS
- The establishment of “homezones” where appropriate
- Area wide traffic restraint, restrictions on through traffic and reduced speeds
- Comprehensive walking and cycling links

Significant enhancement of public transport will include:

- a bus rapid transit network on routes linking the City Centre and railway station to the Airport, Bowthorpe/Costessey/Longwater, Cringleford/NRP, Sprowston , Thorpe St Andrew business parks and strategic growth locations.
- Improvements to infrastructure on other key routes of the Public Transport Network.

Norwich will be promoted as a “learning city” and the expansion of existing further and higher education opportunities will be encouraged.

The following areas are identified as priorities for regeneration requiring area-wide co-ordination and community based approaches:

- Northern City Centre – physical and social regeneration, including significant redevelopment opportunities in accordance with an Area Action Plan.
- Northern wedge (North City Centre to Mile Cross and New Catton) – emphasis on improvement to the urban fabric in southern parts of the area and social regeneration in the north.
- Western Norwich – emphasis on social regeneration

- East Norwich (City Centre to Deal Ground/Utilities) – major physical regeneration opportunities, enhanced green linkages from City Centre to Broads.

### Reasoned Justification

- 8.5 The existing suburbs and immediate urban /rural fringe are a key to the successful development of the area. They are home to a significant number of people, businesses and environmental assets, and provide the links between the city centre and the surrounding area. There are a range of opportunities for redevelopment, regeneration and enhancement. The range of issues warrants a comprehensive and dedicated strategy.

### Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area

All major growth locations will be masterplanned using accredited design methodology to achieve the highest possible standards of design and to:

- deliver healthy, sustainable communities and locally distinctive design
- achieve a high level of self containment while integrating well with neighbouring communities
- be designed around walking and cycling for local journeys and public transport for longer journeys
- include SUDS, on site or nearby energy generation, for example CHPC, and water saving technologies
- include new primary schools, local retail and other services, small scale employment opportunities and primary healthcare facilities
- ensure high quality telecommunications and adequate energy supply and sewerage infrastructure

*The Issues and Options consultation invited comments on specific locations for major growth. Although there was no significantly different public preference between places, a number of places for larger scale growth have been considered for further investigation. One combination of places is supported by evidence studies and early work on sustainability, while the two others are based on responses to the earlier consultation exercise (including a separate consultation on the support for a bypass for Long Stratton) and have been developed to add a Long Stratton bypass, and seeking to make fuller use of the A140 corridor. Differences in performance, sustainability and synergies of infrastructure provision require further evaluation.*

*The Greater Norwich Development Partnership has not yet decided how major growth can best be provided in the NPA. The broad locations for this major growth and the number of new homes in each place are summarised in the table below. Appendices 1, 2 and 3 describe these options in more detail.*

Location	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Norwich	4,000	4,000	4,000
Broadland smaller sites	2,000	2,000	3,000
South Norfolk smaller sites	2,000	2,000	2,000
North East (Sprowston/Rackheath area)	6,000	6,000	6,000
South West (Hetherset/Little Melton area)	4,000	4,000	
South (Mangreen / Swardeston/Mulbarton /Swainthorpe area)			4,500
Wymondham	4,000	2,000	2,000
West (Costessey/Easton area)	2,000	2,000	1,000
Long Stratton		2,000	1,500
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24,000</b>	<b>24,000</b>	<b>24,000</b>

### Reasoned justification

- 8.6 The East of England plan requires that most of the growth within the plan will be located in the NPA, and in particular served by greatly enhanced public transport walking and cycling. It will not be possible, however, to accommodate all of the Norwich policy area growth within the urban area and therefore other locations in the NPA are identified for major mixed use growth.

### Policy 6 Main Towns

Subject to specific servicing constraints these towns will accommodate additional housing, expanded town centre uses, additional employment and additional requirements as follows:

	Approximate housing provision	Town centre uses	Employment	Additional Requirements
Aylsham	No housing allocation because sewage treatment	Limited expansion adjacent to the town centre.	Expansion based on existing employment areas	Development must take account of Cittaslow ["slow town"] status

	works is at capacity.			
Diss	300	Significant expansion adjacent to town centre	Employment growth to meet the needs of town and large rural catchment	Development must take account of Cittaslow ["slow town"] status.  Mixed-use redevelopment of redundant factory land at Park Road to be promoted by an area action plan.  Improved water supply needed
Harleston	300	Modest expansion to serve local catchment adjacent to town centre	Additional employment growth based on existing employment areas.	Improved water supply needed
Wymondham	See 'locations for major change and development in the NPA'			

### Reasoned justification

- 8.7 The East of England Plan proposes that market and other towns should also accommodate significant levels of growth. They should have the potential to increase their social and economic sustainability through measures to support their regeneration and improve their accessibility, especially by public transport. Four main towns have been identified, Aylsham, Diss, Harleston and Wymondham
- 8.8 **Aylsham** has the fourth highest level of shops and services outside Norwich, available employment land and spare capacity at all of its schools. As a main town, it would be expected to accommodate new housing. However the sewage treatment works is already at capacity so no allocation for additional housing is proposed, although infill development within the existing town will still be acceptable.
- 8.9 Jobs growth will be encouraged in line with the needs of the town and its catchment on existing allocated areas. The town also has the potential for limited new shopping floor space up to 2016, which will require the suitable expansion of the town centre. The existing commitment to a new supermarket can accommodate forecast need for



convenience shopping. Quality of life will be enhanced by community measures to further the town's "Cittaslow" or "slow town" status.

- 8.10 **Diss** is an attractive market town with the largest number of shops and services outside Norwich. It serves a large rural catchment covering parts of South Norfolk and northern Suffolk and has the development potential for significant new shopping floor space up to 2016. This will be accommodated on the existing retail land allocation adjacent to the town centre.
- 8.11 With an attractive historical town centre that includes parkland and a notable lake, plus sizeable employment areas well located next to the railway station with good bus and rail links, the town could sustain the further development of about 300 dwellings up to 2026. The town centre will be enhanced by the implementation of an area action plan to encourage the mixed use redevelopment of redundant factory land along Park Road, while the town's general quality of life will be enhanced by the encouragement of community measures to further its "Cittaslow" or "slow town" status. Job growth will be encouraged to serve the needs of this growth and the town's catchment.
- 8.12 New local high school places and a new water supply will need to be provided for this level of housing growth.
- 8.13 **Harleston** has a good range of speciality shops and services serving a relatively local catchment, with a high proportion of people able to access the centre on foot. The moderate potential for new shopping floor space by 2016 will require suitable allocations in the town. The town's shops and expanding industrial estate provide for a range of job opportunities which will be encouraged to develop in balance new housing. Harleston has spare capacity in local schools. New allocations will be made to accommodate about 300 dwellings up to 2026.
- 8.14 A new water supply will be needed to provide for this level of housing growth.
- 8.15 **Wymondham** is the largest market town in the area, but loses retail trade to Norwich due to its relatively close proximity and good bus and rail links. Its historical centre, weekly market and shopping and service centre role will be enhanced by the identified moderate potential to expand its shopping floor space by 2016. The town has local job opportunities on several large employment areas and a good provision of accessible shops and services will sustain significant housing growth.

## Policy 7 Key Service Centres

Land will be allocated for a modest scale of residential development as indicated below (subject to any specific servicing constraints), established retail and service areas will be protected, and local employment opportunities will be promoted.

Acle: 100 to 200 dwellings

Blofield: 20 to 50 dwellings

Brundall: 20 to 50 dwellings

Hethersett: 20 to 50 (unless a major growth location)

Hingham: 100 dwellings

Loddon/ Chedgave: 100 dwellings

Long Stratton: 20 to 50 (unless a major growth location) Poringland/ Framingham Earl: (no further allocation due to existing commitments) Reepham: 100 to 200 dwellings Wroxham: 100 to 200 dwellings
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Reasoned justification

- 8.16 There are 10 settlements defined as key service centres where at least a small amount of growth can be expected. The locations selected as key service centres have a range of facilities enabling them to meet local needs as well as the needs of residents of surrounding areas. Typically these are a primary school, a secondary school either within the settlement or easily accessible by public transport, a range of shops and services( including convenience shopping, but more limited in scope than those in the main towns), a village hall, primary health care, and a library. They also have public transport services for non-journey to work and leisure purposes.
- 8.17 **Acle** has a small range of shops and services serving everyday needs. It has good bus and rail links, is an access point to the Norfolk Broads and can provide for limited job growth. Infrastructure and environmental constraints limit its potential to accommodate new housing development. However, because no allocations can be made at Aylsham, an allocation of between 100-200 dwellings is proposed.
- 8.18 **Blofield** is a large village with a reasonable range of facilities, but limited shopping and employment. It is surrounded by high quality agricultural land. **Blofield Heath** is a detached settlement to the north. It has its own limited range of facilities. There are more sustainable options for accommodating new housing developments in the Norwich policy area; consequently only modest housing growth of approximately 20 – 50 dwellings is proposed.
- 8.19 **Brundall** has a limited range of dispersed shops and services and is a major centre for boatyards. It has grown as a consequence of its proximity to Norwich, but has a deficient provision of recreational facilities that needs to be rectified. Brundall is surrounded by high quality of agricultural land. It is important to prevent coalescence with the neighbouring large village of Blofield. Although Brundall has two railway stations, there are more sustainable options for accommodating new housing developments in the Norwich policy area; consequently modest housing growth of about 20 – 50 dwellings is proposed.
- 8.20 **Hethersett** has a small range of shops but a good range of services serving everyday needs. It has good bus links to Norwich and Wymondham but limited local employment provisions due to its proximity of Norwich. A modest housing growth of 20-50 dwellings is proposed, unless it forms part of a major growth location which would require an investigation of existing sewer capacity and technological modifications to Whitlingham Sewage Treatment Works.
- 8.21 **Hingham** is one of the smaller rural centres with a range of basic shops and services serving everyday needs, in an attractive and historical centre located around a large green. There is a local employment area, although this is now fully committed.
- 8.22 In view of Hingham's small size, relatively limited range of local shops and services, and the need to overcome high school capacity constraints, a growth of

approximately 100 dwellings is proposed, supported by the encouragement of additional local jobs including consideration of the need to extend the industrial estate.

- 8.23 **Loddon** has an attractive historical centre providing a range of shops and services with bus links to Norwich and nearby towns. The adjoining village of **Chedgrave** shares those shops and services in addition to having its own. A range of local industrial, business, retail and tourism job opportunities will be encouraged in line with the needs of housing growth. New development of some 100 dwellings is proposed to 2026, subject to the overcoming of the shortfall in capacity at the high school, although environmental constraints and areas at risk of flood will be significant factors at the site specific stage.
- 8.24 **Long Stratton** has a good range of local shops and services, a range of employment opportunities and reasonable bus links to Norwich. Growth is constrained by traffic conditions in the town and a bypass is proposed. Consequently only a modest housing growth of 20-50 dwellings is proposed unless the village forms part of a major growth location.
- 8.25 **Poringland** has a dispersed provision of local shops and services. As it has significant housing commitments not built, no new allocations are proposed. It also has limited local job opportunities, so a new local employment area is proposed.
- 8.26 **Reepham** has a range of shops and services, local job opportunities and available employment land. However, its schools are both virtually at capacity and limited capacity at the sewage treatment works also restricts development potential. However, in view of limited capacity at Aylsham, some 100 – 200 new homes are proposed to 2026, with the encouragement of appropriate local job growth. This will require measures to improve local school capacities.
- 8.27 **Wroxham** forms a gateway to the Broads and is adjacent the larger service centre of Hoveton, across the River Bure in North Norfolk District. While Wroxham's services are limited, its links to Hoveton as a local employment, service and major Broads tourism centre could support the development of some 100 to 200 dwellings by 2026. This is well within utilities capacity limitations taking into account the proposed new housing allocations for some 150 dwellings in North Norfolk District Council's Local Development Framework. Investment may be needed to improve effluent quality, and development must provide improved community facilities.

## Policy 8 Service Villages

Each service village identified below will be expected to accommodate 10 to 20 new dwellings as well as small scale employment or service development appropriate to the needs of the village and its immediate surroundings. Local shops and services will also be protected.

Brooke, Burston (and Shimpling), Buxton, Cawston, Coltishall (and Horstead), Dickleburgh, Ditchingham, Ellingham/Kirby Cane(Kirby Row), Great and Little Plumstead\*, Great Witchingham (Lenwade), Horsford\*, Horsham and Newton St Faith\*, Lingwood (and Burlingham), Marsham, Mulbarton\*, Newton Flotman\*,

Pulham Market/Pulham St. Mary, Reedham, Rockland St. Mary, Salhouse\*, Scole, South Walsham, Spixworth\*,. Stoke Holy Cross\*, Tasburgh\*, Tharston\*, Thurlton/Norton Subcourse, Trowse with Newton\*, Rackheath\*

(\*within Norwich Policy Area)

### **Reasoned Justification**

8.28 The services considered to be the most essential to support small scale growth are a:

- village hall;
- journey to work bus service (to Norwich and/or a Key Service Centre)
- primary school;
- food shop.

8.29 Thirty Service Villages (including 12 in the Norwich Policy Area) have been identified with these services. These places will provide an additional total of some 300-600 new homes throughout the plan area to provide for limited housing growth to meet a range of local needs including affordable housing.

8.30 They might also be expected to accommodate small scale local employment opportunities to provide for the diversification of the local economy (including agriculture and tourism), and local services.

## **Policy 9 Other Villages**

The other villages identified below will have defined development boundaries but will only accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings and small scale business or services.

Alburgh, Alington/Yelverton, Ashby St. Mary/Thurton, Aslacton, Barford, Barnham Broom, Bawburgh\*, Bracon Ash\*, Bressingham, Broome, Bunwell, Cantley, Carleton Rode, Earsham, Ellingham/Kirby Row, Forncett St. Peter, Foulsham, Freethorpe, Frettenham, Gillingham, Hainford, Hempnall, Hevingham, Little Melton, Morley, Roydon, Saxlingham Nethergate, Seething (and Mundham), Shelton with Hardwick, Spooner Row\*, Surlingham\*, Tacolneston (inc. Forncett End), Thurton, Tivetshall St. Margaret, Tivetshall St. Peter, Wicklewood, Winfarthing, Woodton, Wreningham. Easton\*

(\* within Norwich Policy Area)

### **Reasoned Justification**

8.31 The area contains a large number of villages that have few or no local services, and would not provide a sustainable location for significant new development. Such places are very reliant on the services of larger centres for their everyday needs, and new development would not necessarily help to retain or attract services due to the ever increasing population thresholds required to support them. While significant expansion would be unsustainable, some of these places with basic essential services would be capable of accommodating very limited infill development without affecting the form and character of the villages. Housing to provide for local needs may be suitable.

8.32 The 41 defined “Other Villages” have a village hall and a primary school. These provide a minimal level of essential services that reduces the need for car trips. These villages will be defined by a village development limit.

## Policy 10 The Countryside

In the countryside (including parishes not identified in one of the above categories), affordable housing for which a specific local need can be shown will be permitted as an exception to general policy. Farm diversification, home working, small scale commercial enterprises where a rural location can be justified, including limited and leisure and tourism facilities to maintain and enhance the rural economy will also be acceptable. Other development, including the appropriate replacement of existing buildings, will be permitted in the countryside where it can clearly be demonstrated to further the objectives of this core strategy.

### Reasoned Justification

8.33 Much of the area is agricultural land forming an attractive backdrop to the existing settlements and the Norfolk Broads. This area contains many attractive built and natural features including areas of notable landscape character, geological and biodiversity interest. These need to be protected and enhanced, while providing for the rural economy and accessibility to services to be maintained and enhanced.

8.34 Development in the countryside could include:

- housing for which a specific local need can be shown as an exception to general policy,
- small scale local employment and service provision such as through farm diversification
- small scale commercial enterprises where a rural location can be justified,
- and limited leisure and tourism facilities to maintain and enhance the rural economy.

8.35 Other development in the countryside might include extensions or conversions to or the replacement of dwellings and employment premises, and home working. In the case of more significant proposals, these will be considered in the light of their contribution to meeting the overall objectives of the core strategy.

## Policy 11 The Broads

In areas adjacent to the Broads Authority Area, particular regard will be applied to maintaining and enhancing the economy, environmental quality and setting of the Broads.

## Reasoned Justification

- 8.36 The Broads is an area of acknowledged landscape and biodiversity value. The Broads Authority Area is outside the area of this Core Strategy. In areas within sight of the Broads, particular regard will be applied to the visual impact of new development.

### Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres

The development of new retailing, services, offices and other town centre uses as defined by government guidance will be encouraged at a scale appropriate to the form and functions of the following hierarchy of defined centres.

- 1) Norwich city centre
- 2) The town and large district centres of:  
Aylsham, Diss, Harleston and Wymondham, and within the Norwich urban area, at Anglia Square and Magdalen Street.
- 3)
  - a) The existing large village and district centres of:  
Acle, Hethersett, Hingham, Loddon, Long Stratton, Poringland and Reepham, and within the Norwich urban area at Aylsham Road, Drayton Road, Bowthorpe, Dereham Road, Eaton Centre, Earlham House, Larkman centre, Plumstead Road, Old Catton , Dussindale (Thorpe St Andrew), Coltishall
  - b) New district centres/ high streets to be established at:
    - the proposed major growth locations within the Norwich Policy Area
    - and at Blue Boar Lane, Sprowston and Hall Road, Norwich

Policies will be introduced within all categories of centre as well as service villages and established or committed district centres to enhance the environment and economy of the centre and to protect the centre by controlling proposals which would result in the loss of commercial premises or local services.

## Reasoned Justification

- 8.37 Government policy promotes vital and viable town centres to provide a range of easily accessible shops and services in an attractive and safe environment. A positive approach to the development of centres will promote local economic growth, investment in regeneration, social inclusion, widen consumer choice and be accessible by a range of forms of transport.
- 8.38 The Greater Norwich area is dominated by Norwich city centre, which is a strong office, retail and leisure destination and the highest ranked retail centre in the region. There are approximately 1100 shops covering 229,000 m<sup>2</sup> of floorspace in the city centre.

- 8.39 This is supplemented by the large district centre at Anglia Square and some eleven other district centres within the Norwich urban area that meet the daily needs of their local resident populations. There are also several free-standing large food stores situated around the Norwich fringe and retail warehouse parks at Costessey, Blackberry Court (Sweet Briar Road), and Salhouse Road, Sprowston.
- 8.40 The surrounding area is served by a network of vibrant market towns. The largest centres are Aylsham, Diss, Harleston and Wymondham. These are traditional market towns which each contain some 70-140 shops and services, totalling some 5,000-16,000 m<sup>2</sup> net. They provide for a wide range of food and non-food shopping requirements, plus cultural and tourism facilities, and serve significant rural catchments. They are broadly comparable in size and function with the large district centre of Anglia Square/ Magdalen Street in Norwich.
- 8.41 A further range of smaller towns and larger villages provide for a more limited choice of goods and services from broadly 15-30 premises each totalling some 1000-2500 m<sup>2</sup> net. These places serve relatively local catchments, and some contain fewer shops and services than might be expected, due to their proximity to Norwich or other large centres just outside the Greater Norwich area. These are equivalent to “district centres” in the Norwich urban area.
- 8.42 There is a need for limited extra convenience goods floor space in the smaller centres but a major requirement for new comparison goods floor space in the city centre.

## 9 Area-wide policies

### Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact

To address climate change and promote sustainability, all development will be energy efficient and minimise carbon dioxide emissions, therefore

- a) all new housing should match the current Housing Corporation requirements under the Code for Sustainable Homes (to be upgraded over time).
- b) non-housing development will also be subject to energy efficiency and sustainability standards to be upgraded over time, and a proportion of the predicted energy use from each development and will incorporate an element of on-site renewable energy generation.

All development will

- Make efficient use of land, with the density of development varying according to the type of area and following the preferred sequence of development locations for major growth and assessing development against all of the community's needs in an appropriate phased manner.
- Contribute to conserving scarce resources, protecting sites that are important for biodiversity, landscape character and protecting mineral and other natural resources, which have been identified through the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework.
- Make sustainable use of resources, providing for recycling of materials (including rainwater), water management, sustainable drainage, and use of locally sourced materials wherever possible and ensuring the quality of natural resources is retained.
- Be designed to a high standard to respect and enhance the distinctiveness and character of townscape, including the distinctive 'contemporary mediaeval city' character of central Norwich and the particular character of each of the market towns, key service centres, villages and the distinctive character of historic and cultural features and of natural landscapes (including the areas adjoining the Broads and other river valleys).
- Minimise the need to travel and give priority to modes of travel in accordance with the Norwich Area Transportation Study hierarchy of different types of transport.
- Be adapted to a changed climate and located to minimise flood risk, mitigating any flood risk through design.

#### Supporting text

- 9.1 Sustainable neighbourhoods are a key element of the Vision for this strategy to 2026. This fulfils government policy emphases, which have been reiterated in numerous national policy statements and guidance and also in the Regional Spatial Strategy. Most recently the new Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 – Planning and Climate Change, provides important advice for all developments to minimise emissions and respond to the effects of climate change. It will be important in the Norwich area to ensure that development fulfils this emphasis and meets the challenge of climate change. This will require a local energy study to inform an Energy Plan, set local energy standards for new development and facilitate the creation of local decentralised energy networks.



- 9.2 This requires an overarching policy approach, which affects the planning for all settlements, large and small and the major growth areas planned in this strategy. It also finds expression in several of the generic policies for strategic subjects in section of this Preferred Options report.
- 9.3 Sustainable neighbourhoods means that those communities will enjoy the facilities, the high quality movement opportunities, the job opportunities and the recreational and leisure opportunities that should be part of the quality of life for everyone. It also requires that construction methods and the transport system enables sustainable use of resources, minimising the emission of carbon dioxide and thus the impact on climate change.

## Housing – meeting the needs of present and future communities

### Policy 14 Housing delivery

Provision will be made for at least 40,000 new homes between 2006 and 2026, of which 36,000 will be within the Norwich Policy Area.

Housing will be distributed in accordance with the Strategic Growth Options and Settlement Hierarchy.

#### *Housing Mix*

Proposals for housing will be expected to contribute to the mix of housing required to meet the needs of the area, as set out in the most up to date study of housing need and/or Housing Market Assessment.

#### *Affordable Housing*

A proportion of affordable housing, including an appropriate tenure-mix, will be required in accordance with the most up-to-date needs assessment for the plan area, on sites of 5 or more dwellings (or 0.2 hectare or more).

In negotiating the proportion and tenure of affordable housing account will be taken of site characteristics and the economic viability of provision. Where viability is an issue financial support will be sought via public subsidy, such as Housing Corporation grant. Affordable housing provision will be on-site unless it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible.

In appropriate settlements sites that would not normally be released for housing will be considered for schemes that specifically meet an identified local need for affordable homes. Such schemes must ensure that the properties are made available 'in perpetuity' for this purpose.

#### *Gypsies and Travellers*

Provision will be made for 58 permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches between 2006 and 2011, these will be provided on the following basis: Broadland 15, Norwich 15 and South Norfolk 28. Individual sites will contain no more than 12 pitches.

Provision will be sought in locations that provide good access to the main routes used by Gypsies and Travellers, such the A11, A47, A140 and A143/A1066. Sites should

also be capable of being serviced with basic utilities and avoid environmentally sensitive areas and areas at risk from flooding. Where possible sites will be located within a reasonable distance of facilities and supporting services.

Provision for further permanent sites Gypsies and Travellers, as well as transit sites and sites for Travelling Showpeople, will be made if the need is identified.

### Reasoned justification:

#### *Housing Provision*

9.4 The Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England sets out the new dwelling requirement for both the whole of the Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Area, as well as the requirement for the Norwich Policy Area. In order to meet the obligation set out in PPS 3 to have a 15-year housing land supply at the point of adoption, provision is also made to meet the supply for the period 2021-2026. The calculations for the amount of housing for which land remains to be allocated is set out the table below. The extent to which delivery of housing is meeting these requirements will be monitored using housing trajectories for the three-district area and the NPA.

Area/District	RSS 2001-2021	Built 2001-2006	PP/Allocated	Built +Current Commitment	Allocation required to 2021	Extra 2021 to 2026	Allocation required to 2026	Total New Homes 2006 to 2026
NPA	33,000	6,236	12,528	18,764	14,236	8,921	23,157	35,685
Rural	4,500	1,210	2,128	3,338	1,162	1,097	2,259	4,387
<b>Total</b>	<b>37,500</b>	<b>7,446</b>	<b>14,656</b>	<b>22,102</b>	<b>15,398</b>	<b>10,018</b>	<b>25,416</b>	<b>40,072</b>
Norwich		3,486	5,987	9,473			4,000	9,987
SN (NPA)		1,639	6,263	7,902			12,000	18,263
SN (Rural)		640		640			1,130	1,130
Broadland (NPA)		1,111	2,406	3,517			8,000	10,406
Broadland (Rural)		570		570			1,130	1,130
<b>Total</b>		<b>7,446</b>	<b>14,656</b>	<b>22,102</b>	<b>15,398</b>	<b>10,018</b>	<b>26,260</b>	<b>40,916</b>

Over/under  
RSS 844 844

Numbers from Core  
Strategy Option 1

The proposed level of housing development for particular locations is set out in the Settlement Hierarchy and Strategic Growth Locations.

#### *Housing Mix & Affordable Housing*

9.5 Government and local authorities are keen to ensure that housing provision meets the need of the community, both existing and future. As well as providing housing developments of different scales across a range of settlements, this also means including an appropriate mix of sizes, types and tenures of homes within these

developments. This will meet the needs of a range of households of different sizes, ages and incomes. Provision will also be made for specialist housing where appropriate, this could include, supported housing, care facilities and retirement communities.

- 9.6 The mix of house types and tenures will be based on the most up-to-date evidence at the time applications are made. The findings of the most recent housing needs assessment for the three districts indicates that 43% of overall housing need can only be met by affordable housing. Affordable housing is defined as 'housing provided for rent, sale or shared equity at prices permanently below the current market rate, which people in housing need are able to afford'. In order to make realistic inroads into the identified need and meet the RSS target of 35% of all housing completions being affordable, 40% affordable housing will be sought on all qualifying sites. PPS3 sets a national indicative threshold of 15 units above which an element of affordable housing is required. However, in order to provide affordable housing across a wide range of sites and maximise the amount provided a contribution will be sought on all sites of 5 units or more.
- 9.7 In some instances providing 40% affordable housing on-site will not be viable, particularly without public subsidy. In such circumstances a financial contribution, such as a grant from the Housing Corporation, will be sought. Where developers, as a last resort, seek the affordable housing contribution off-site, this would need to be as equivalent provision on an suitable alternative site or a financial contribution equal to the land value plus the average Housing Corporation grant for the type of housing proposed. In circumstances where viability is a concern and either a reduced percentage or off-site provision is proposed, applicants will need to demonstrate this via an 'open book' approach.
- 9.8 In addition to providing a proportion of affordable homes on the majority of market housing sites, provision will also be made for affordable homes to meet a demonstrated local need on sites that would not otherwise be released for housing. These 'exceptions' sites may be allocated through Site Specific Policies or could come forward when a specific need is demonstrated in a particular settlement or group of settlements. Exceptions site allocations will be considered in settlements classified in the hierarchy as Other Villages or above, whilst applications arising from specific local needs assessments will also be considered in these settlements and in other locations if appropriate.

#### *Gypsies and Travellers*

- 9.9 The Government requires that local authorities make provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites to meet the identified needs for the area. This is order to reduce the problems associated with unauthorised sites and tackle a number of the problems faced by these communities, particularly relating to low educational achievement and poor health. An early review of the RSS covering Gypsy and Traveller needs has identified an initial requirement for permanent pitches up to 2011. Typically a pitch is a space for two, or possibly more vans, to accommodate a family; two vans allows one for travelling and another left on site. For periods a pitch may be empty, whilst at other times e.g. family events, there may be more than two vans.
- 9.10 In order to best meet the needs of these communities sites will ideally be located in and around Norwich and in locations which facilitate access to local services and

which follow the patterns of movement of the community, such as the broad corridors around the A11, A47, A140 and A143/A1066.

9.11 Transit sites for Gypsies and Travellers and sites for Travelling Showpeople will be identified as the need for such sites becomes known.

## Policy 15 The economy

The local economy will be developed in a sustainable way:

- To facilitate the job growth potential of the local economy and deliver the RSS target (35,000 additional jobs 2001-21)
- To increase the proportion of higher value, knowledge economy jobs while ensuring that opportunities are available for the development of all sectors of the economy and workforce

Sufficient employment land will be allocated in locations consistent with the Spatial Hierarchy policy to meet identified need and provide for choice. In particular:

- The needs of small and start-up businesses will be addressed through the allocation of new smaller scale employment sites and the retention of a range of existing smaller scale employment sites across the area and by requiring the provision of small scale business opportunities in all significant residential and commercial developments. Flexible building design and innovative approaches will be sought in new and existing residential developments to encourage local working and business opportunities.
- Larger scale needs will be addressed through the allocation of sufficient land to provide a choice and range of sites. DPDs and investment strategies will ensure that a readily available supply of land is maintained throughout the JCS period
- Investment strategies will focus on overcoming constraints to key sites

Opportunities for innovation, skills and training will be expanded through:

- Facilitating the expansion of, and access to, further and higher education provision
- Support for the establishment of a retail academy
- Encouraging links between training/education provision and relevant business concentrations including co-location where appropriate
- Support for enterprise hubs at NRP, EPIC, and Hethel, and at other accessible locations in the area

Tourism, leisure, and cultural industries will be promoted. This will be assisted by:

- the general emphasis of the Joint Core Strategy on achieving high quality design and environmental enhancement
- implementation of the Green Infrastructure Strategy
- encouragement for appropriate development including sustainable tourism initiatives

The rural areas the economy and diversification will also be supported by

- A preference for the re-use of appropriate redundant agricultural buildings for commercial uses, including holiday homes to support the tourism industry (affordable housing may be an acceptable alternative use).
- Promotion of farmers markets, and farm shops in villages

## Reasoned justification:

- 9.12 Achieving the full economic potential of the area is dependent on improved connectivity, including the implementation of the priorities set out in the sustainable transport policy and maintaining and enhancing the environment and quality of life in the area.
- 9.13 Enhancing the knowledge economy and promoting innovation will be important across all sectors and parts of the area. However, the expansion of activity at the Norwich Research Park, a refocus on employment and education in and around the City Centre, building on the early success of the Hethel Engineering Centre [and new opportunities for airport related businesses?] will play a particularly important role.
- 9.14 It will be particularly important to ensure that a range and choice of small scale employment sites are allocated and retained, including sites suitable for low value workshop type uses.
- 9.15 Tourism, leisure, and cultural industries are recognised as crucial sectors in the local economy that are also fundamental to local quality of life and the attraction and retention of other businesses and staff.

## Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation

Enhance the transportation system to promote sustainable economic development, reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices and minimise the need to use the private car. We will do this by promoting;

- improvements to A11 and A47
- enhancement of rail services to London and Cambridge
- enhanced and innovative use of the local rail network
- the Norwich Northern Distributor Route to aid strategic access, significantly improve quality of life, environmental conditions, and provide capacity for public transport improvements
- A140 Long Stratton Bypass
- development, close to essential services that encourage walking and cycling as the primary means of travel.
- Provision of IT links and promotion of home working.
- the regional significance of Norwich International Airport for both leisure and business travel to destinations across the UK and beyond.

and reduce social exclusion, rural deprivation and isolation and enhance accessibility to jobs and services by;

- Continuing to improve public transport accessibility to and between Main Towns and Key Service Centres
- Promotion of local service delivery
- Continuing to recognise that in the most rural areas the private car will remain an important means of travel.
- Only promoting significant growth in Key Service Centres where there are realistic travel choices

## Reasoned Justification

9.16 Transportation and access issues for the JCS are improved strategic links to the region and beyond and access to jobs and services across the area.

9.17 Good strategic access reduces the perceived isolation of Norfolk. Improvements help stimulate and enhance the local economy by making the area more attractive for inward investment so crucial to maintaining the balance between housing and job growth. Improvements in strategic infrastructure such as the rail network and trunk roads are generally very expensive. In some instances the core strategy may be able to deliver improvements, but it is often the case that improvements to infrastructure providing longer distance strategic links have to be delivered by outside agencies such as Network Rail and the Highways Agency. The Plan needs to ensure that it promotes these improvements by providing a context for them to occur and ensuring their importance is recognised.

9.18 Identified strategic improvements are:

- A11 yet to be dualled at Elvedon, although programmed for 2012
- A47 improvements planned, however significant stretches remain single carriageway
- Rail link to London is slow at about 2 hours and the journey reliability needs to be improved
- A140 Long Stratton Bypass is identified in the Local Transport Plan however not prioritised for RFA
- NNDR identified in RSS and in RFA and is a major scheme in the Local Transport Plan as a strategic element of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy providing transport infrastructure to unlock growth and improving surface access to Norwich Airport.
- The only regionally significant airports are Stansted and Norwich. Norwich International Airport provides access to a wide range of international destinations via Schiphol and has domestic flights to locations including Scotland, the North West and the south west.

9.19 The levels of growth the core strategy will require that the consequent need to travel is managed. Ensuring that all residents have good access to local jobs and services, preferably by either walking or cycling will reduce the need to travel and promote more health lifestyles. For longer trips and In rural areas where there are fewer local services and employment opportunities, public transport will be promoted. To meet the RSS, climate change and objectives of the Joint Core Strategy public transport will be promoted a head of car based improvements, particularly in the urban areas. To meet the diversity of travel need, there has to be new and innovative ways of providing public transport:

- High Quality rapid bus services and around the city
- Maximisation of the local rail network to serve exiting communities locations for large scale growth.
- Promotion and wider use of existing community transport schemes
- Greater use of non-scheduled services such as flexi bus and dial a ride services.

9.20 In rural areas there will remain a reliance on the private car, but the impacts on the Norwich urban area can be minimised by promotion of the already extensive network of Park and Ride sites.

## Policy 17 Environmental assets

The environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained and enhanced and the benefits for residents and visitors improved. Development proposals should avoid harming areas of environmental importance.

Outside areas protected through international or national designations, the strategy will [seek to] direct development to areas where

- It does not harm existing environmental assets of acknowledged regional or local importance, or where harm is unavoidable, it would provide for appropriate mitigation or replacement with the objective of achieving a long-term maintenance or enhancement of the status quo.
- It would provide opportunities to enhance the area's existing landscape, townscape, ecological, and historic character, including securing their long term future.
- It would contribute to providing green infrastructure compatible with the green infrastructure strategy. This will include areas of open space, wildlife resources and links between them as an integral part of the development, and connecting to the wider green infrastructure network
- It would help to make provision for the long-term maintenance of the green infrastructure network

### Reasoned Justification

9.21 Outside Norwich the area retains a largely rural character and high environmental quality. Small towns and numerous villages are spread through attractive countryside, which also provides the setting for the city of Norwich. River valleys and other green areas extend into and adjoin more built-up areas, creating a close relationship between urban and rural. Particular features include the Broads Area, of national park status, and areas of international nature conservation importance. More generally, there is a variety of landscape types which gives a distinctive character to individual parts of the area; and wildlife habitats of national or local importance are found in the urban area as well as the countryside. As well as these semi-natural aspects, there is also a strong historic influence. There is a rich concentration of historic assets, dominated by the mediaeval city of Norwich and its hinterland of market towns, but also including historic buildings, halls and parklands in the surrounding countryside. Ancient monuments and archaeological remains add a further layer to this historic character. Together, the semi-natural and built assets create an environmental quality that is enjoyed by both residents and visitors.

9.22 The area has a wealth of environmental assets ranging from international and national status, to those of local importance. In accordance with national and regional policy, it is important that these are safeguarded and enhanced for the benefit of current and future generations. These assets include biodiversity (wildlife

and habitats), built heritage (including buildings, conservation areas, parks and parklands), ancient monuments and archaeology, geodiversity (geological features), and landscape character; as well as more general aspects such as the countryside and rural character, and the setting of Norwich, towns and villages, and the Broads.

9.23 A Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy has been produced on behalf of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership. This proposes a multi-functional network of green-spaces and green-links, having regard to factors such as existing and potential open spaces, natural and semi-natural areas, ecological networks, landscape, geodiversity and accessibility. The relevant spatial elements will be taken forward, as appropriate, through the Local Development Frameworks of the constituent Authorities. The key features of the proposed Green Infrastructure network are shown indicatively on the key diagram

## Policy 18 Communities and culture

All development will be expected to maintain or enhance the quality of life and well being of communities.

In order to deliver thriving communities, tackle social deprivation and to meet the diverse needs across the Joint Core Strategy area, a spatial planning/multi-agency approach will be required to ensure the following themes and infrastructure requirements are addressed in a holistic way.

### **Health**

Adequate and accessible health facilities provided across the Joint Core Strategy area.

Promotion of healthier lifestyles through improved walking & cycling facilities and greater access to green space and the countryside

### **Crime**

Well designed, safe and accessible spaces where crime and fear of crime are minimised.

Underlying factors that can lead to crime and anti-social behaviour tackled.

### **Education**

Essential to ensure that there is sufficient provision and access to schools and adult learning opportunities for existing and future populations

### **Culture**

Protection of existing cultural assets and support for development of new or improved facilities. Continued enrichment of cultural heritage through use of innovative design and art in public realm

### **Leisure**

Existing facilities protected and enhanced. All development expected to provide for new or improved leisure provision that could include built facilities and/or access to green space, country parks and the wider countryside.

### **Community cohesion**



It is essential that every effort be made to promote the integration and cohesion within and between new and existing communities. The early engagement of existing communities in the design process will help create a development that reflects local aspirations which can act as focus/hub for community interaction. This will be particularly important in the major growth locations.

It will be particularly important to consider the above aspects in relation to proposals elsewhere in this document for housing, employment and accessibility and in addition the Implementation chapter.

## **Reasoned Justification**

9.24 Whilst planning can make specific allocations for development sites it is vital that the softer supporting infrastructure is provided to add the dimension joining liveability and practicality to the theoretical allocations. This is achieved through agencies working together, e.g. health agencies responsible for health prevention working with authorities providing open space to ensure opportunities for exercise are locally available. The Preferred Option as presented is explicit in the aspects that need to accompany new development, and the way in which it functions. Developers should be aware of these expectations at the earliest opportunity so as they can plan for facilities in their schemes. In part the policy is a list of expectations that will be enacted through other agencies spending programmes, or LSP work, or LAA documents. Again public agencies need to plan in advance and programme the support services for when the new population begins to be established. Part of the implementation will be through legal agreements or CIL accompanying planning applications for the new development.

## 10. Implementation and Monitoring

### Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring

All development in the plan area will be accompanied by appropriate infrastructure provided in tandem with the development, with arrangement for its subsequent maintenance. Provision will be achieved through:

- Active use, where necessary, by the local planning authorities and County Council of their legal powers to bring about the strategically significant development, including compulsory purchase, proposed in the plan in the manner envisaged.
- Coordination with the investment programmes of other public bodies and utility providers
- Taking full advantage of mainstream Government funding streams
- Innovative approaches to capital investment based on forecast future revenue streams
- Contributions from all market residential and commercial development in the plan area through a Community Infrastructure Levy and, for site specific requirements, Planning Obligations. In all cases appropriate allowance will be made for infrastructure directly provided on site as part of the development.
- In the case of community or social development, a reduced contribution, taking account of the social value of the development concerned.

The resulting funds will be gathered, managed and spent in a transparent way by the authorities forming the Greater Norwich Development Partnership ( or their successor [s]) by means of a published Integrated Development Programme for the plan area. The level of any charge made under the community infrastructure levy will be reviewed periodically through the publication of a supplementary planning document and updated between reviews by reference to relevant cost indices.

Future maintenance of infrastructure provided on the site or built or improved as part of the development will be achieved either through adoption by a public body with appropriate maintenance payments or other secure arrangements such as the establishment of a local infrastructure management body. This will apply to all infrastructure, including, where applicable.

- SUDS
- Local and renewable energy generation
- Green infrastructure and the implementation of green infrastructure strategies, including habitat creation/ pedestrian and cycle links/recreation facilities/ Parks/ trees, hedgerows, woodland/landscaping
- Community and recreation facilities [education facilities, community halls, health facilities, libraries, social services facilities, allotments etc]
- Water conservation measures
- Improved public transport facilities
- Other appropriate transport infrastructure
- Emergency services including crime prevention
- Waste management/ recycling/composting facilities
- Street furniture

- Public art
- Utilities
- Affordable or supported housing

The quality of new developments will be assured through the careful scrutiny of Design and Access statements for all appropriate developments and a requirement for their implementation. Strategic Growth Locations require an accredited design process giving local people an opportunity to shape development and which guarantees implementation of the whole scheme. The developer[s] of major Strategic Growth Locations will also be required to enter into an ongoing commitment to support community development throughout the period until the development is built and first occupied.

**N. B. This policy and the following supporting text is drafted on the assumption that the government introduces a Community Infrastructure Levy along the lines indicated in earlier published consultation papers. It will need amendment should the proposals be abandoned or substantially changed, and if necessary following the review of local government structures in Norfolk.**

## Reasoned Justification

### Implementation

- 10.1 Implementation of the policies in this plan will depend on the co-ordinated activities of a number of agencies. As the plan is developed each individual policy will indicate the main agencies responsible for implementation, the stage of the plan at which implementation is sought (unless it is a policy applicable throughout the plan's lifetime) and the principal mechanism(s) for implementation.
- 10.2 It is essential that necessary infrastructure is provided in tandem with new development. The precise timing will be a matter of judgement in each case, but the underlying principle will be to avoid placing an undue strain on existing services and to ensure that residents of new developments do not form patterns of behaviour which ultimately threaten the viability of new services as a result of their late arrival.
- 10.3 Implementation of the plan will entail considerable expenditure. Developer contributions will be sought through a combination of a community infrastructure levy (CIL) and contributions through Section 106 obligations (or any successors to these mechanisms). Table 2 shows the items of infrastructure expected, at this stage, to be covered by each of these elements.
- 10.4 The scope for a CIL charge will be subject to more detailed investigation. It will apply to both residential and commercial development, to fully embrace the Government's latest thinking. This might be done by treating, a specified area of commercial floor space or land as equivalent to one dwelling and the CIL set at a value reflecting the ratio of land values for the use in question, as defined in the current Town & Country Planning Use Classes Order, to the value for residential land in the same area. The CIL could also take account of any specific conditions applied to dwellings falling within use Class C3 which may affect the value of the land in question. For sui generis uses, falling outside a recognised Use Class, an independent valuation would be required. The key infrastructure required to accommodate the broad scale of development proposed in the Norwich policy area was estimated by EDAW. Further

work is being undertaken to refine and cost the infrastructure needed over the whole plan area and in light of options for the distribution of development . From the work done to date by EDAW, the cost of the infrastructure required is likely to exceed probable revenue from a CIL, and current mainstream funding, and therefore the upper limit of CIL is likely to be determined by viability rather than the cost of the necessary infrastructure. Part of the ongoing research is to assess viability to enable the CIL to be set at a realistic level. Table Z. Z. indicates the broad categories of infrastructure investigated by EDAW.

- 10.5 An accredited design process is required for Strategic Growth Locations and it is expected that specific infrastructure requirements will arise as a result. These will be provided by the developers as an integral part of the development and the cost (other than for utilities) will be discounted from the CIL that would otherwise be payable.
- 10.6 For social or community development, a reduction taking account of the social or community value of the development would need to be made. For example a primary care facility would not be expected to contribute the element of the CIL for health infrastructure, or a school that for education infrastructure, but both would be expected to contribute to transport etc. Affordable housing will be exempt where it is provided without public subsidy by a developer through S106 obligations as part of a mixed market and affordable tenure scheme or where it forms part of a rural exceptions scheme to meet the needs of local people already likely to be living in an area. On sites consisting entirely of affordable housing provided by a housing association, the CIL payable will be calculated on 60% of the dwellings only, to enable housing associations to compete for sites on an equal footing with the private developers.
- 10.7 The local planning authorities, in consultation with stakeholders, will from time to time review the infrastructure needs of the development proposed in this Core Strategy and development values in the locality to ensure that the level of CIL achieves an appropriate contribution, but does not threaten the viability of development. This will be achieved through the preparation and review of a supplementary planning document. Between these reviews, the CIL sought will be adjusted in line with the BERR output price index for public works: all public works.
- 10.8 Subject to the outcome of the continuing research into scope for a CIL, it is expected that the CIL will be charged at a uniform rate across the plan area, and will not differentiate between previously developed land and greenfield sites
- 10.9 A developer may challenge the level of CIL via an open book appraisal if the developer believes it will render a particular development unviable. Where this can be demonstrated and the price paid for a site took account of known or reasonably predictable site costs, the CIL charged on the particular site will be reduced to a level which permits the prevailing rates of developer profit for the land use in question.
- 10.10 Where HCA funding is not available fro affordable housing and it can be demonstrated that the developer costs will rise as a consequence and threaten the viability of a scheme, the CIL charge will need to be varied or the amount of affordable housing adjusted. The EDAW study suggested that only about half the reduction in CIL per sale house would be available where no public funding is available on a typical mixed private/affordable housing scheme.

- 10.11 The strategic infrastructure to be funded by the CIL will be set out in detail in an Integrated Development Plan which will be published by the Greater Norwich Development Partnership and subject to consultation with stakeholders and formal agreement by partner organisations. This would set out in detail the infrastructure, of all kinds, expected to be provided in the coming period (for example the next five years in detail and the following five in outline), priorities, its anticipated cost, sources of funding, agencies responsible, and the expected timing of implementation.
- 10.12 Detailed spending decisions on strategic infrastructure will be made by a group set up by the Greater Norwich Development Partnership and reporting to member organisations, which will make public its terms of reference so that the propriety of spending decisions is apparent.
- 10.13 This spending programme will be used as a mechanism to forward fund infrastructure where necessary to ensure timely provision.
- 10.14 The Greater Norwich Development Partnership will co-operate with utility providers to ensure that their asset management plans take full account of the infrastructure needed to accommodate the development proposed in this plan. It will also seek to maximise the contribution from other mainstream public sector funding streams.
- 10.15 The Greater Norwich Development Partnership will seek innovative ways to fund capital investment of necessary infrastructure, for example borrowing against forecast increases in local taxation revenue resulting from new development, and the relaxation of ring fencing regulations where this can be achieved in a way compatible with the necessary transparency in accounting for the use of public funds.
- 10.16 For those elements of infrastructure funded through obligations under S106, there will be a general de minimis threshold of 5 dwellings (or 500sq m of commercial floorspace) below which contributions will not be sought. However, all local access, safety or local amenity related, or operational matters will be subject to a S106 obligation irrespective of the scale of the development.
- 10.17 The overall quality of development is critical to its acceptability to the Greater Norwich Development Partnership and to the people of the area. All relevant developments will need to be accompanied by a rigorous Design and Access Statement and proposals for its implementation. The developer[s] of major strategic growth areas will also be required to participate in an accredited participatory design process to determine the form of the development and guarantee its development in full, and to enter into an ongoing commitment to support community development throughout the build period, up to the point where the development is first occupied, to bring about a genuinely sustainable community. This will include fostering the growth of community and voluntary organisations which are critical in genuine community development. In these developments, or others critical to the achievement of the plan's objectives, where it proves necessary, the Councils will be prepared to intervene using legal powers available to them.
- 10.18 All developers will be expected to guarantee[either through adoption by a public body with appropriate maintenance payments or for example by the establishment of a local infrastructure management body] the long term maintenance of physical and

social infrastructure provided on the site or built or improved elsewhere as part of the development.

## **Monitoring**

10.19 The Joint Core Strategy includes a monitoring framework to ensure the policies are still relevant, that we are moving in the right direction and making progress in achieving the objectives of the plan.

- Are the objectives still relevant?
- Are the policies achieving the outcomes that they were designed for?
- Are the policies delivering sustainable development?
- Are our targets being achieved?

10.20 A key component of the Local Development Frameworks of the local planning authorities is the production of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR), which must be submitted each year to the Secretary of State. The AMR is envisaged as a regular check, and opportunity to adjust policies as appropriate and offers the opportunity to revise the programme of Plan preparation, (the Local Development Scheme) in the light of circumstances. The Greater Norwich Development Partnership will publish regular monitoring reports, and use the outcomes to inform reviews of the integrated development programme, the need for review of this joint core strategy, and in making judgments about the conformity of other Development Plan Documents with this joint core strategy.

## **Performance Indicators**

10.21 A number of 'Performance Indicators' have been developed to help judge the success or otherwise of the policies and objectives. Some of these indicators are Core output indicators, which the Government require us to collect. The other 'local' indicators are equally important and have been developed to address matters relevant to this area. Many of the indicators derive from the Sustainability Appraisal, as sustainability must be at the heart of the plan.

## **Contextual Indicators**

10.22 These are intended to illustrate the nature of the environment within which the plan's proposals are set and the changes to that environment. A Local Area Agreement has been established in Norfolk and a set of 35 indicators prioritised reflecting the key local concerns relating to the area's well being.

10.23 The set of indicators should be short, readily available to collect, robust, relevant and together should measure the plan's performance.

The following table identifies several initial core output indicators and local indicators. Together these need to provide an assessment of whether the strategy is moving towards its objectives and whether the policies are achieving what they set out to do.

We will also need to set ourselves appropriate targets against which movement towards or away from policy objectives can be measured over time. Targets need to be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound (Local Development Framework Monitoring: A Good Practice Guide)

**Table 1**

<b>Developer contributions</b>	
<p>Matters to be covered by Obligations under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non financial operational or technical matters relating to the development or use of land</li> <li>• The provision of affordable housing as part of a mixed tenure development, or, exceptionally on a different site or a financial contribution in lieu of provision</li> <li>• Other site specific matters relating solely to the development such as immediate access works, on site archaeological investigation, children’s play facilities, protection or enhancement of on site bio- or geo- diversity features</li> <li>• Land transfer for facilities required on a particular site eg for a school.</li> <li>• Specific off site works made necessary by a development, e.g. specific cycle and footways, public transport enhancement.</li> </ul>
<p>Matters to be covered by contributions through a Community Infrastructure Levy</p>	<p>Wider strategic and local transport infrastructure (including public transport enhancement, walking and cycling and related feasibility and design work) other than the immediate access to a site*</p> <p>Educational infrastructure including school provision and improvements and lifelong learning facilities*</p> <p>Green infrastructure including bio- and geo- diversity*</p> <p>Social infrastructure including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Community facilities including libraries*</li> <li>○ Childcare and early years facilities *</li> <li>○ Health and social care facilities*</li> <li>○ Community safety facilities including emergency services*</li> <li>○ Recreational facilities apart from children’s play facilities*</li> <li>○ Community development facilities *</li> </ul>
<p>Strategic matters funded through Asset Management Plans governed by a regulator and not eligible for S106 contributions (or, subject to further clarification by the Government,) a CIL, but where standard charges are made to developers [NB specific contributions may be negotiated for more local infrastructure improvements, and for certain works developers may have the work undertaken by any suitably registered utility provider, not necessarily the incumbent one]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity- Grid Sub stations</li> <li>• Gas- high/intermediate pressure mains</li> <li>• Water- new abstraction points and treatment works</li> <li>• Waste water- new or upgrade works to sewage treatment works</li> </ul>

## Table 2

### **Nature of Infrastructure Likely To Be Funded Through a CIL**

The growth infrastructure investigated in the study by EDAW covering the Norwich policy Area fell into the following categories. Further work is being undertaken to quantify the investment likely to be needed over the whole plan area and taking into account the local effects arising from the distribution of development proposed in this document. The work undertaken by EDAW is set out in full in their study which is a one of the background documents to this preferred options document.

- Early years facilities
- Primary schools
- Secondary schools
- Primary health care facilities
- Dentistry facilities
- Indoor and outdoor sports facilities
- Green infrastructure including informal recreation facilities
- Community facilities
- Library facilities
- Crime prevention facilities including police facilities
- Fire and ambulance facilities
- Improved pedestrian facilities
- Improved cycling facilities
- Improved public transport ( bus and rail) facilities
- Public transport interchange facilities
- Review of potential for LRT as a public transport mode
- “ Soft measures” such as travel awareness campaigns and improved information
- Review of parking facilities in Norwich and review of capacities at park and ride sites
- Local and strategic improvements to the road network including junction improvements and the Norwich Northern Distributor Road
- Resolution of infrastructure limitations which inhibit the development of strategic employment sites (primarily access and utilities)
- Investment in labour force the skills and development particularly aimed at potential growth sectors
- Inward investment strategy
- Utility services including electricity, gas, water, and sewerage



## APPENDIX 1

### Option 1

#### **Major growth at Wymondham and Hethersett on the A11 corridor and to the North East of Norwich inside and outside the Northern Distributor Road**

##### **Key Dependencies**

To implement the option significant highway improvements are required at the Longwater (A1074), Watton Road (B1108) and Thickthorn (A11) junctions on the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass) together with provision of the NDR which will also improve Postwick junction.

The primary public transport route from the south west will be along Newmarket road. In addition bus priority measures are needed along Hethersett lane crossing the A47 and linking with the NRP, Hospital and University, supported by expansion of the existing Thickthorn Park and Ride site with improved access from A11 northbound. The growth in the north east will require the promotion of at least one bus priority route into the city centre which may be Gurney Road / Salhouse Road.

There will need to be improvements to the walking and cycling networks and more localised road and bus priority improvements, but these will depend on the form of development in the growth areas and the continued work on the Norwich Area Transport Strategy.

New secondary schools are needed to serve the new communities in the north east, south west and Wymondham. The educational requirements of the remaining growth will be met by enhancing existing facilities. New primary schools would be provided within the housing developments.

Additional infrastructure will need to be provided to overcome the constraint on electricity supply to the Longwater area.

##### **Description of major growth locations**

###### **North East Sector (Sprowston / Rackheath area)**

This location will deliver an urban extension extending either side of the NDR. Delivery is dependent on the implementation of the NDR. The structure of the local geography suggests that this new community will take the form of a series of inter-related new villages or quarters and will include:

- at least 6,000 dwellings (rising to a total of at least 10,000 dwellings after 2026)
- a district centre based around an accessible “high street” and including a new library, education and health facilities. The development will also require new local centres.
- a new secondary school with an initial phase to open within the first 5 years. To facilitate early provision the early phases of development will concentrate on family housing.

- Retention of existing important greenspaces and significant levels of heathland re-creation to provide stepping stones to link Mousehold Heath to the surrounding countryside. Historic parkland will be conserved.
- bus rapid transit to the city centre possibly via Salhouse Road and Gurney Road and a choice of safe and direct cycle routes to the centre.
- safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes, and orbital bus services, to Broadland Business Park, Rackheath employment area, Airport employment areas
- a new rail halt at Rackheath
- permeability and community integration across the NNDR and with existing communities.

### **South West Sector (Hethersett/Little Melton area)**

This location will deliver a new country town providing

- at least 4,000 dwellings (rising to a total of at least 7,000 dwellings after 2026)
- a town centre based around an accessible “high street” designed to serve the new community and the immediate locality and not to draw trade from a wider area. The town centre will include retail, service and employment provision, a new library, healthcare and education facilities. The development will also require new local centres and be complemented by enhanced facilities in the existing villages.
- a new secondary school with an initial phase to open within the first five years (possibly delivered through the relocation and expansion of Hethersett High School)
- a new small scale business park closely integrated with the town
- extensive levels of green infrastructure to create a “Ketts Country” pastoral landscape of grass, wood, hedgerow and wetland habitat. This will include a new country park and significant landscape buffers to provide a setting for the town and to maintain important strategic gaps and the settings of Norwich and Wymondham
- SUDS – the underlying geology suggests this will also provide wetland habitat
- bus rapid transit to the city centre possibly via Newmarket Road
- safe and direct cycle routes and local bus services to NRP, Wymondham and Longwater

### **Wymondham**

This location will deliver expansion of the urban area to include

- at least 4,000 dwellings (rising to a total of at least 5,000 after 2026) located predominantly to the south and east of the town to ensure best access to the town centre and railway station and to maintain the strategic gap to the north and northeast
- expansion of the town centre of a quality that will retain and enhance the distinctive character of the existing historic centre
- a new secondary school with an initial phase to open within the first 5 years. To facilitate early provision the early phases of development will concentrate on family housing
- extensive levels of green infrastructure to create a “Ketts Country” pastoral landscape of grass, wood, hedgerow and wetland habitat. This will also strengthen the importance and role of the Tiffey valley, the landscape setting of the town and strategic gaps, particularly towards Hethersett
- bus rapid transit to the city centre and exploiting any opportunities to maximise the use of rail connections

- safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes to key locations in and around Wymondham including the town centre, the railway station and Gateway 11, and enhanced longer distance cycle access to Hethel, Hethersett and NRP

### **West**

This location is dependent on capacity expansion of the A47 Longwater junction and will provide

- around 2,000 dwellings at Costessey and Easton
- a new local centre at Easton
- secondary school provision will be provided by a combination of schools in the area at Costessey, Earlham and new provision at SW growth location. Additional opportunities may be also provided at Easton College
- Green Infrastructure to provide enhanced public access to the Yare valley including Bawburgh lakes
- bus rapid transit to the City Centre via Dereham Road
- bus and cycle links NRP and to secondary schools (including SW growth location)
- safe and direct cycle and pedestrian access to Longwater employment and retail area and the Bowthorpe employment area

(NB additional dwellings total to 24,000 i.e. 1,000 more than required to provide for contingency and flexibility. Further contingency and flexibility will be provided by efforts to encourage further brownfield opportunities and bringing forward larger sites more quickly. The strategy also identifies 8,000 dwellings (4.4 years supply) in large new communities for the post 2026 period).



## APPENDIX 2

### Option 2

#### **Major growth at Hethersett and to the North East of Norwich inside and outside the Northern Distributor Road and moderate growth at Wymondham and Long Stratton**

#### **Key Dependencies**

To implement the option significant highway improvements are required at the Longwater (A1074), Watton Road (B1108) and Thickthorn (A11) junctions on the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass) together with provision of the NDR which will also improve Postwick junction. Completion of a bypass is a prerequisite for the scale of growth identified in Long Stratton.

The primary public transport route from the south west will be along Newmarket road. In addition bus priority measures are needed along Hethersett lane crossing the A47 and linking with the NRP, Hospital and University, supported by expansion of the existing Thickthorn Park and Ride site with improved access from A11 northbound. The growth in the north east will require the promotion of at least one bus priority route into the city centre which may be Gurney Road / Salhouse Road.

There will need to be improvements to the walking and cycling networks and more localised road and bus priority improvements, but these will depend on the form of development in the growth areas and the continued work on the Norwich Area Transport Strategy.

New secondary schools are needed to serve the new communities in the north east and, south west. The scale of growth in the other locations means the secondary provision will need to be met by enhancing existing facilities in Long Stratton and off-site expansion in Wymondham. New primary schools would be provided within the housing developments.

Additional infrastructure will need to be provided to overcome the constraint on electricity supply to the Longwater area.

#### **Description of major growth locations**

##### **North East Sector (Sprowston / Rackheath area)**

This location will deliver an urban extension extending either side of the NDR. Delivery is dependent on the implementation of the NDR. The structure of the local geography suggests that this new community will take the form of a series of inter-related new villages or quarters and will include:

- at least 6,000 dwellings (rising to a total of at least 10,000 dwellings after 2026)
- a district centre based around an accessible “high street” and including a new library, education and health facilities. The development will also require new local centres.
- a new secondary school with an initial phase to open within the first 5 years. To facilitate early provision the early phases of development will concentrate on family housing.

- Retention of existing important greenspaces and significant levels of heathland re-creation to provide stepping stones to link Mousehold Heath to the surrounding countryside. Historic parkland will be conserved.
- bus rapid transit to the city centre possibly via Salhouse Road and Gurney Road and a choice of safe and direct cycle routes to the centre.
- safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes, and orbital bus services, to Broadland Business Park, Rackheath employment area, Airport employment areas
- a new rail halt at Rackheath
- Permeability and community integration across the NNDR and with existing communities.

### **South West Sector (Hethersett/Little Melton area)**

This location will deliver a new country town providing

- at least 4,000 dwellings (rising to a total of at least 7,000 dwellings after 2026)
- a town centre based around an accessible “high street” designed to serve the new community and the immediate locality and not to draw trade from a wider area. The town centre will include retail, service and employment provision, a new library, healthcare and education facilities. The development will also require new local centres and be complemented by enhanced facilities in the existing villages.
- a new secondary school with an initial phase to open within the first five years (possibly delivered through the relocation and expansion of Hethersett High School)
- a new small scale business park closely integrated with the town
- extensive levels of green infrastructure to create a “Ketts Country” pastoral landscape of grass, wood, hedgerow and wetland habitat. This will include a new country park and significant landscape buffers to provide a setting for the town and to maintain important strategic gaps and the settings of Norwich and Wymondham
- SUDS – the underlying geology suggests this will also provide wetland habitat
- bus rapid transit to the city centre possibly via Newmarket Road
- safe and direct cycle routes and local bus services to NRP, Wymondham and Longwater

### **Wymondham**

This location will deliver expansion of the urban area to include

- 2,000 dwellings located in a number of sites around the town whilst maintaining the strategic gap to the north and northeast
- expansion of the town centre of a quality that will retain and enhance the distinctive character of the existing historic centre
- expanded secondary school provision, possibly through a free-standing sixth form centre
- extensive levels of green infrastructure to create a “Ketts Country” pastoral landscape of grass, wood, hedgerow and wetland habitat. This will also strengthen the importance and role of the Tiffey valley, the landscape setting of the town and strategic gaps, particularly towards Hethersett
- enhanced bus services to the city centre and exploiting any opportunities to maximise the use of rail connections
- safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes to key locations in and around Wymondham including the town centre, the railway station and Gateway 11, and enhanced longer distance cycle access to Hethel, Hethersett and NRP

## **West**

This location is dependent on capacity expansion of the A47 Longwater junction and will provide:

- around 2,000 dwellings at Costessey and Easton
- a new local centre at Easton
- secondary school provision will be provided by a combination of schools in the area at Costessey, Earlham and new provision at SW growth location. Additional opportunities may be also provided at Easton College
- Green Infrastructure to provide enhanced public access to the Yare valley including Bawburgh lakes
- bus rapid transit to the City Centre via Dereham Road
- bus and cycle links NRP and to secondary schools (including SW growth location)
- safe and direct cycle and pedestrian access to Longwater employment and retail area and the Bowthorpe employment area

## **Long Stratton**

This location is dependent on the Long Stratton bypass and will provide:

- around 2,000 dwellings
- enhanced facilities and access to the town centre
- secondary school provision will be provided by the expansion of the existing school
- investment in strategic green Infrastructure corridor
- public transport improvements including priority at the A140/A47 junction and an enhanced route to the City Centre
- safe and direct cycle and pedestrian access to the town centre and employment
- additional local employment opportunities.

(NB additional dwellings total to 24,000 i.e. 1,000 more than required to provide for contingency and flexibility. Further contingency and flexibility will be provided by efforts to encourage further brownfield opportunities and bringing forward larger sites more quickly. The strategy also identifies 7,000 dwellings (almost 4 years supply) in large new communities for the post 2026 period).







## APPENDIX 3

### Option 3

#### **Major growth to the North East of Norwich inside and outside the Northern Distributor Road and to the south of Norwich in the Swainsthorpe, Mulbarton and Swardeston area and moderate growth at Wymondham and Long Stratton**

#### **Key Dependencies**

To implement the option significant highway improvements are required at the Longwater (A1074), and Thickthorn (A11) and Harford (A140) junctions on the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass together with provision of the NDR which will also improve Postwick junction. Completion of a bypass is a prerequisite for the scale of growth identified in Long Stratton.

To facilitate the necessary public transport access from the south will need to be bus priority improvements on the approach to the A140/A47 Harford junction and B1113. Within the Norwich Southern Bypass, further bus priority will need to be introduced along the A140 Ipswich Road. Growth at Wymondham is likely to require expansion of the existing Thickthorn Park and Ride site with improved access from A11 northbound. The growth in the north east will require the promotion of at least one bus priority route into the city centre which may be Gurney Road / Salhouse Road.

There will need to be improvements to the walking and cycling networks and more localised road and bus priority improvements, but these will depend on the form of development in the growth areas and the continued work on the Norwich Area Transport Strategy.

A new secondary school is needed to serve the new community in the north east. The form and location secondary provision for growth in the south is yet to be determined. The scale of growth in the other locations means the secondary provision will need to be met by enhancing existing facilities in Long Stratton and off-site expansion in Wymondham. New primary schools would be provided within the housing developments.

Additional infrastructure will need to be provided to overcome the constraint on electricity supply to the Longwater area.

#### **Description of major growth locations**

##### **North East Sector (Sprowston / Rackheath area)**

This location will deliver an urban extension extending either side of the NDR. Delivery is dependent on the implementation of the NDR. The structure of the local geography suggests that this new community will take the form of a series of inter-related new villages or quarters and will include:

- at least 6,000 dwellings (rising to a total of at least 10,000 dwellings after 2026)
- a district centre based around an accessible “high street” and including a new library, education and health facilities. The development will also require new local centres.
- a new secondary school with an initial phase to open within the first 5 years. To facilitate early provision the early phases of development will concentrate on family housing.

- Retention of existing important greenspaces and significant levels of heathland re-creation to provide stepping stones to link Mousehold Heath to the surrounding countryside. Historic parkland will be conserved.
- bus rapid transit to the city centre possibly via Salhouse Road and Gurney Road and a choice of safe and direct cycle routes to the centre.
- safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes, and orbital bus services, to Broadland Business Park, Rackheath employment area, Airport employment areas
- a new rail halt at Rackheath
- permeability and community integration across the NNDR and with existing communities.

### **South Sector (Mangreen / Swardeston / Mulbarton / Swainsthorpe area)**

This location will deliver a new 'country town' providing

- 4,500 dwellings (with the potential to expand after 2026)
- a town centre based around an accessible "high street" designed to serve the new community and the immediate locality and not to draw trade from a wider area. The town centre will include retail, service and employment provision, a new library, healthcare and education facilities. The development will also require new local centres and be complemented by enhanced facilities in the existing villages.
- new strategic business park of about 50 hectares to the north of the area to ensure access to the A140 and A47.
- a new secondary school with an initial phase to open within the first five years to serve new and existing communities
- enhanced levels of green infrastructure
- bus rapid transit to the city centre possibly via Ipswich Road
- safe and direct cycle routes to the city centre, the NRP
- traffic will be managed to reduce impacts on the network of small roads to the south and west of the area.

### **Wymondham**

This location will deliver expansion of the urban area to include:

- 2,000 dwellings located in a number of sites around the town whilst maintaining the strategic gap to the north and northeast
- expansion of the town centre of a quality that will retain and enhance the distinctive character of the existing historic centre
- expanded secondary school provision, possibly through a free-standing sixth form centre
- extensive levels of green infrastructure to create a "Ketts Country" pastoral landscape of grass, wood, hedgerow and wetland habitat. This will also strengthen the importance and role of the Tiffey valley, the landscape setting of the town and strategic gaps, particularly towards Hetherset
- enhanced bus services to the city centre and exploiting any opportunities to maximise the use of rail connections
- safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes to key locations in and around Wymondham including the town centre, the railway station and Gateway 11, and enhanced longer distance cycle access to Hethel, Hetherset and NRP

## **West**

This location is dependent on capacity expansion of the A47 Longwater junction and will provide:

- around 1,000 dwellings at Costessey and Easton
- enhanced local services at Easton
- secondary school provision will be provided by a combination of schools in the area at Costessey, Hethersett and Earlham. Additional opportunities may be also provided at Easton College
- Green Infrastructure to provide enhanced public access to the Yare valley including Bawburgh lakes
- bus rapid transit to the City Centre via Dereham Road
- bus and cycle links NRP and to secondary schools
- safe and direct cycle and pedestrian access to Longwater employment and retail area and the Bowthorpe employment area

## **Long Stratton**

This location is dependent on the Long Stratton bypass and will provide:

- around 1,500 dwellings
- enhanced facilities and access to the town centre
- secondary school provision will be provided by the expansion of the existing school
- investment in strategic green Infrastructure corridor
- public transport improvements including priority at the A140/A47 junction and an enhanced route to the City Centre
- safe and direct cycle and pedestrian access to the town centre and employment
- additional local employment opportunities.

(NB additional dwellings total to 24,000 i.e. 1,000 more than required to provide for contingency and flexibility. Further contingency and flexibility will be provided by efforts to encourage further brownfield opportunities and bringing forward larger sites more quickly. The strategy also identifies 4,000 dwellings (just over 2 years supply) in large new communities for the post 2026 period).



## **APPENDIX 4**

### **Definition of the Norwich Policy Area**

The Norwich Policy Area is the same as in the Norfolk Structure Plan (1999) with the addition of the parish of Salhouse. This has been added to allow coherent development around Rackheath and not to encourage large scale development of Salhouse village.

DRAFT

## Joint Core Strategy options consultation leaflet

<b>DOCUMENT HISTORY</b>			
Version	Date	Purpose	Author
Draft a	7 July 2008	Draft leaflet for comment	Mark Fuller, Linstock
Draft b	9 July 2008	Revision following Planning Sub-Group comments	Mark Fuller, Linstock

<b>Approvals</b>			
Name	Organisation	Role	Date

# Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk

Jobs, homes and prosperity for local people

DRAFT

## The Greater Norwich Development Partnership

### Your councils working together for the future of your area

Over the next 20 years, Norwich and, the areas that surround it, face the prospect of considerable growth, with new houses and jobs needed to meet the aspirations of a rising population. This growth will need to be carefully managed, with planning guidelines drawn up for the whole area.

To make this happen Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk Council have joined together with Norfolk County Council to form the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) to develop a shared vision for the future of our local area. This will become a 'Joint Core Strategy' (JCS) – a document that will set out the area's growth plans, guiding planning and development for the years to come.

At the end of 2007 and the start of this year the four councils carried out a full public consultation to ask local people for their views on how the area could develop in the future. All households were delivered a leaflet with a brief questionnaire, asking them about the issues that meant the most to them. The feedback we gained from this consultation, together with the detailed research we have done into the area's future needs, helped us draft a plan for where new homes could be located around the area, as well as three potential options for large scale developments.

A full report, detailing each of the options in depth is now being considered by a range of technical experts, service providers, and community groups. This report, along with a full list of the organisations being consulted, is now available for public inspection.

We want to make sure that all local people are kept fully informed of the work that is being done, so have produced this leaflet to summarise the plans currently under consideration.

Later this year elected councillors from each of the GNDP partner authorities will be coming together to examine these options, and the results of the current consultation. They will then decide on a single plan to guide future development in the area. This will be submitted for full public consultation where all local people will be invited to have their say.

We hope you find the information in this leaflet useful and look forward to your input as our work progresses.



### **Making a contribution to national housing growth**

- The Government has set out ambitious plans to increase the supply of housing across the UK, with the target of three million new homes by 2020.
- The Government's 'East of England Plan' has set Norwich and its surrounding areas stretching goals to contribute to this.
- To support this, the area has been awarded 'Growth Point Status'. This means that the councils can come together to bid for additional funding for new infrastructure and regeneration.
- Thanks to this the area has already been awarded £12.1 million to support growth over the next two years.

DRAFT

## **What we are working to achieve**

### **Spatial Vision for Norwich, Broadland, and South Norfolk**

By 2026 the extended communities of Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk will be strong, cohesive and forward looking. Between 2001 and 2026, 47,500 new homes will have been provided and at least 35,000 new jobs will have been created. Good progress will have been made in delivering safe, healthy, prosperous, sustainable and inclusive communities throughout the three districts. This will have involved development of well designed, good quality homes that meet people's needs and aspirations in attractive and sustainable places.

#### Local People will be able to:

- Live in a distinctive place, whether part of the historic city, suburbs or fringe parishes, a market town, village or countryside, where the spaces between Norwich, towns, villages and the rural environment are protected.
- Trust that the special character of the countryside, natural, built and historic environment will be valued, protected, managed and enhanced, with people proud of where they live, work, study or visit.
- Live a more environmentally friendly way of life in communities which have efficiently managed water, energy, and waste resources.
- Have access to a wider variety of services and facilities, better health and high value, fulfilling jobs based on enhanced education and skills, increased prosperity and reduced deprivation in urban and rural areas.
- Enjoy high quality surroundings in high standard homes, with support and care if needed, at a price they can afford.
- Know that existing and new developments will create communities which are sustainable, foster pride and a sense of belonging.

### **Evidence studies**

Planning for future growth and new development means anticipating issues and being fully aware of the area's needs. We want to make sure our vision and objectives are right for Norwich and its key surrounding areas, so over the past year we've been doing extensive research into how development might impact on a series of important factors. The result of this is a series of 'evidence studies' which give a comprehensive picture of the area, setting out in detail all the issues that need to be considered in the Joint Core Strategy.

Studies have been produced looking at:

- Flood risk
- Economic growth
- Water supply
- Retail needs
- Infrastructure requirements
- Housing needs
- Recreational facilities

In addition, we have carried out a major 'Sustainability Appraisal' to ensure that the plans being drawn up take account of all the long term impacts.

We will be carrying out further studies as part of the work on developing the strategy.

## The local options for new homes

Government house building targets and our own appraisal of the area’s future needs mean that we have a clear idea about the numbers of new homes our plans need to accommodate.

### **We need to identify sites for at least 47,500 new homes between 2001 and 2026.**

We have already gone a long way to meeting these objectives, with 7,500 new homes already built since 2001 and planning permission granted for a further 14,700.

This means that the strategy we are currently drawing up needs to identify locations for at least 25,400 more new homes.

We are currently looking at ways to meet this challenge, identifying where new homes could be built around the area.

The first of these are areas for small scale development:

### **The number of new homes that could be appropriate**

300 new homes: - Diss - Harleston	100-200 new homes: - Acle - Reepham - Wroxham	Around 100 new homes: - Hingham - Loddon	20-50 new homes: - Blofield - Brundall - Hethersett* - Long Stratton*
-----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

\* unless chosen as a major growth location as shown below.

A number of other villages could accommodate a smaller scale of development depending on housing need and local services.

Alongside these relatively small scale developments, the research we have carried out and the views expressed in the ‘issues and options’ consultation last winter have helped us devise three different options for major growth. Each of these options offers the potential for 24,000 new homes, which will be supported by a range of new infrastructure investments, including new schools, transport links and health services.

### Potential options for major development

<b>Location</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
Norwich	4,000 new homes	4,000 new homes	4,000 new homes
Broadland	2,000 new homes	2,000 new homes	3,000 new homes
South Norfolk	2,000 new homes	2,000 new homes	2,000 new homes
Sprowston and Rackheath area	6,000 new homes	6,000 new homes	6,000 new homes
Hethersett and Little Melton area	4,000 new homes	4,000 new homes	No significant development
Mangreen, Swardeston, Mulbarton, and Swainsthorpe area	No significant development	No significant development	4,500 new homes
Wymondham	4,000 new homes	2,000 new homes	2,000 new homes
Costessey and Easton area	2,000 new homes	2,000 new homes	1,000 new homes
Long Stratton	No significant development	2,000 new homes	1,500 new homes

## What will happen next?

Following the current consultation, your elected councillors will be taking a decision on the shape of a strategy to be pursued further. They will examine each of the three options for major growth and decide which elements will be incorporated into the final Joint Core Strategy. The results of this decision will then be presented in a full public consultation next spring. All local people will be given the opportunity to give their views, helping us arrive at a vision for the future of the area we all share.

The joint core strategy which arises from this will be presented to the Government for approval next year, with the final plan expected to be adopted in 2010.

**The work being done now will help make sure that local people and their families have new homes, jobs and prosperity for years to come.**

DRAFT

.....**Back cover**.....

For more information on the Joint Core Strategy, and the rest of the work your councils are doing through the Greater Norwich Development Partnership, please visit:

[www.eastspace.net/gndp/](http://www.eastspace.net/gndp/)

Or contact:

**Greater Norwich Development Partnership**  
C/O Broadland District Council  
Thorpe Lodge  
1 Yarmouth Road  
Norwich  
NR7 0DU

DRAFT

## Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Joint Core Strategy

### Draft questions for Regulation 25 Consultation

<b>Spatial strategy</b>
<p>The joint core strategy is dependent on certain important infrastructure being delivered as explained in para x.xx, page xx.</p>
<p><b>Question 1</b> Have we identified the right key dependencies?</p>
<b>City Centre</b>
<p>The city centre fulfils many functions and the strategy will influence the emphasis for the future. Para x.xx, page xx gives the proposed policy which says that the main focus of city centre development should be retail, leisure, office and culture.</p>
<p><b>Question 2</b> Are you aware of any major deliverability issues relating to this proposed policy?</p>
<b>Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area</b>
<p>The consultation document suggests 3 options for the distribution of major housing and jobs growth.</p>
<p><b>For option 1 (see Appendix 1)</b></p>
<p><b>Question 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?</li><li>b) What are the constraints to delivery?</li><li>c) What opportunities does this option present?</li><li>d) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies and could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?</li></ul>
<p><b>For option 2 (see Appendix 2)</b></p>
<p><b>Question 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?</li><li>b) What are the constraints to delivery?</li><li>c) What opportunities does this option present?</li><li>d) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies and</li></ul>



could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

**For option 3** (see Appendix 3)

**Question 4**

- a) What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?
- b) What are the constraints to delivery?
- c) What opportunities does this option present?
- d) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies and could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

**Main Towns**

Para x.xx, page xx explains what main towns are and the part they play in the strategy. The proposed main towns are Wymondham, Aylsham, Diss and Harleston.

**Question 5**

- a) What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?
- b) What opportunities can growth bring?
- c) What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?
- d) How could growth in main towns link with your longer term investment strategies?

**Key Service centres**

Para x.xx, page xx explains what key service centres are and the part they play in the strategy. The proposed key service centres are given in para x.xx.

**Question 6**

- a) What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?
- b) What opportunities can growth bring?
- c) What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?
- d) How could growth in key service centres link with your longer term investment strategies?

**Service villages**

Para x.xx, page xx explains what service villages are and the part they play in the strategy. The proposed service villages are given in para x.xx.

**Question 7**

- a) What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?
- b) What opportunities can growth bring?
- c) What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?
- d) How could growth in service villages link with your longer term investment strategies?

**Other Places**

Paras x.xx to x.xx explain the strategy for the smallest communities, the open countryside and the Broads.

**Question 8**

Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?

**Area Wide Policies**

Policies that apply across the whole joint core strategy area such as housing, culture and leisure and transport are given in Paras x.xx to x.xx found on pages xx to xx

**Question 9**

Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

**Implementation**

We need to be able to show that the joint core strategy can be put into practice and the implementation section Para x.xx, page describes how we will go about this.

**Question 10**

Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? If not, how should we change our approach?

## Joint Core Strategy Regulation 25 Consultation

### **Consultee Categories**

Agents & Developers & Housebuilders  
Arts & Culture Groups  
Black Minority Ethnic Groups & Equal Opps Groups  
Business & Commerce  
Community Groups  
Crime & Safety Groups  
Education & Youth Groups  
Environment & Heritage Groups  
Faith Groups  
Health & Social Care Groups  
Housing Associations  
LSP Chairs & Co-ordinators  
Landowners (large)  
Local Government  
National & Regional Government  
Neighbouring Authorities  
Neighbouring Parish Councils  
Parish Councils (Broadland)  
Parish Councils (South Norfolk)  
Sports & Recreation  
Statutory Consultees  
Tourism  
Transport  
Utilities  
Young People