

APPENDIX 2 – SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- **Project Brief**
- **Record of Stakeholder Consultation**
- **Greenspace Planning Policy Checklist**
- **Greenspace Management Options**

Brief to Prepare the Greater Norwich New Growth Point Area Green Infrastructure Strategy

1. Invitation to tender

- 1.1 You are invited to tender for a consultancy assignment to prepare a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Greater Norwich New Growth Point Area.
- 1.2 The main study will cover the administrative areas of Broadland and South Norfolk District Councils, Norwich City Council and the Broads Authority (for the extent of this area, refer to appendix 4).
- 1.3 At a more strategic level, the consultant will need to demonstrate regard to the relationships with existing and proposed major green infrastructure beyond the main study area; with particular regard to green infrastructure by new growth in this wider area. It should also recognise implications for Norfolk on the demand for accessible green space from neighbouring counties.
- 1.4 This will include reference to the development of a green infrastructure strategy for Thetford Growth Point which is happening concurrent with this commission.
- 1.5 The project is being commissioned by the Greater Norwich Development Partnership. This study is being coordinated by Norfolk County Council, working with its partners comprising Norwich City Council, South Norfolk District Council, Broadland District Council, The Broads Authority, Natural England and Go East.
- 1.6 It is anticipated the tender price guide would be in the region of £45,000-£60,000 (excluding VAT) for stages 1 and 2

2. Green Infrastructure Strategy Vision

- 2.1 The need to develop multi-functional accessible urban fringes is now a major policy nationally.
- 2.2 The draft East of England Plan has set out clear targets to be achieved by 2021, Greater Norwich is a key centre for development and change in the East of England. The built up area has a population of 200,000 and ambitious housing and growth targets set by the draft Regional Spatial Strategy will see this population rise to 280,000 by 2021. In October 2006 the Norwich Area was named as a New Growth Point.
- 2.3 The Greater Norwich New Growth Point Area Green Infrastructure Strategy is required to cover large scale green infrastructure at the sub-regional level to support this planned growth in the long term and to provide a framework to guide sustainable development.
- 2.4 The aim of the project is the creation of a bold vision for the growth area and to establish a strategy to provide high quality, accessible green infrastructure, within a comprehensive landscape structure, promoting ecological networks and continuity and links between habitats, to improve quality of life, to help address climate change, improve access to habitats and greenspace and community well being which complements and supports good quality housing and substantial economic growth planned for the Greater Norwich area.

3. Green Infrastructure Definition

Green infrastructure is defined as “The sub-regional network of protected sites, nature reserves, green spaces and greenway linkages which should be multi-functional and operate at all spatial scales from urban centers through to open countryside” (Town and Country Planning Association- Biodiversity by Design). The full definition of green infrastructure is attached at Appendix 1.

4. Project Description

4.1 The Green Infrastructure Strategy will comply with the East of England Plan Panel Report requirement to protect and provide networks, consisting of protected sites, nature reserves, green spaces and greenway linkages (ENV1).

4.2 This network should be multifunctional and meet a range of social, environmental and economic needs. It will operate at all spatial scales from urban areas (including business areas) to the wider countryside. It will also include connections between urban and rural settlements and between settlements and the countryside.

4.3 The strategy will have regard to provision across the four local authority areas (Norwich City, Broadland, South Norfolk, and Broads Authority) and strategic provision in the surrounding areas and the interplay of five main components of green infrastructure; physical resources and natural systems, ecological assets, landscape, historical/cultural assets and access networks/recreational facilities.

4.4 The strategy will identify current general deficiencies in green infrastructure. It will identify both present and future needs and future opportunities for the provision and maintenance of green infrastructure.

4.5 It will support ecosystems, recreational and cultural needs and provide wider environmental benefits, such as flood protection, water quality, and ameliorating impacts caused by climate change and consider the management of surface water, water quality, and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).

4.6 Consideration needs to be given to a number of important factors, namely:-

- The boundaries for Green Infrastructure provision should take account of wider pressures and opportunities, beyond the growth area, including neighbouring counties.
- The diversity of landscapes around the city and problems of landscape degradation. Five landscape character areas converge around Norwich - a level of complexity unique within the region, but also reflecting the need to preserve and enhance their characteristics and sensitively address areas of transition.
- The historic importance of heathland in the northern fringes, including habitat loss.
- Opportunities provided by river corridors (e.g. Water Cities Project), water bodies, and the proximity of the Broads.
- Norwich as a city of trees and the importance of woodlands, including their relationship to development areas.
- Demand for healthy recreational activities within and beyond the growth area from residents and visitors alike, making best use of existing and the provision of new footpaths, bridleways, cycle ways, new links and resources and conservation of water based resources.
- Aesthetics and the importance of providing and sustaining a visual sense of place.
- Historic parkland and the historic landscape setting of the city and its urban fringe.
- Biodiversity and wildlife sites and econetworks.

- Geodiversity and Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites(RIGS)

5. Policy Context

- 5.1 The East of England Plan will be the new Regional Spatial Strategy, providing strategic guidance for the region's development to the year 2021.
- 5.2 A key objective of the plan is to "improve the quality of life for the region's people by: ensuring new development fulfills the principles of sustainable communities, providing a well designed living environment adequately supported by social and green infrastructure" (source East of England Panel Report June 2006)
- 5.3 The Green Infrastructure Strategy will also take account of the full list of relevant national, regional, county and local studies listed at appendix 2.
- 5.4 The Norfolk Structure Plan (saved policies), City and District Local Plans, and the Broads Local Plan provide the current local planning policy framework. The emerging Local Development Documents, likely to include a joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, will provide the spatial planning framework for the implementation of a Green Infrastructure Strategy.
- 5.5 For policy guidance at a strategic level, refer to the County Landscape Assessment, Making Space for Wildlife and People: An Ecological Network for Norfolk and Biodiversity Planning Guidance for Norfolk and Rights of Way Improvement Plans.
- 5.6 Informing policy at a more local level, refer to the Broadland Landscape Character Assessment, South Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment, Broads Authority Landscape Character Assessment, Norwich Fringe Landscape Character Assessment, Wensum Valley Character Assessment and the Ecological Network Maps for the Greater Norwich Area.
- 5.7 The Green Infrastructure Strategy forms part of a framework of studies, which will be a key part of the evidence base for the forthcoming Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. These are:
- Green Infrastructure Strategy-Lead authority Norfolk Council
 Integrated Water Cycle Study-Lead authority Norwich City Council (Contact: Michael Burrell – MikeBurrell@norwich.gov.uk
 Flood Assessment Report-Lead authority Broadland District Council (Contact: Roger Burroughs – roger.burroughs@broadland.gov.uk).
 Norwich Growth Point Major Growth Infrastructure Study - Lead authority Broadland District Council (Contact: Roger Burroughs – roger.burroughs@broadland.gov.uk).
- 5.8 The Green Infrastructure Strategy will need to take account of and be compatible with the other two studies above.
- 5.9 In addition to the above, Open Space Audits have been commissioned by South Norfolk and Broadland District Councils. Norwich City Council is shortly to commission such a study.

6. Project Scope

The following will be essential components of the work to be undertaken in two stages.

Stage 1: Analysis and preparation of the strategy for the Greater Norwich New Growth Point Area

6.1 This stage will produce a 20 – 30 year ‘Vision’ for the green infrastructure in the Greater Norwich New Growth Point Area, which will improve the quality of life, and complement and support economic and housing growth by:

- Enhancing the locally distinctive landscape (and historic landscape) character
- Connecting and enriching biodiversity habitats, supporting Biodiversity Action Plans for the area and ecological network objectives
- Extending access and informal recreational opportunities to meet current and future demands
- Creating a network of access routes between and within new and existing communities
- Identifying formal and informal recreational opportunities to meet current and future demands

Collection of Existing Data

6.2 The Consultant will be required to pull together existing information on the following subject areas to describe the existing green infrastructure assets for the Greater Norwich Study Area.

- Physical resources and natural systems
- Ecological assets and Geodiversity
- Landscape Character
- Archaeology and historical assets
- Access networks and countryside recreational facilities
- Flood risk mapping
- Contextual planning and socio- economic data (i.e. demographic trends)

6.3 A summary of this information is shown within Appendix 3. The consultant will collect existing data by contacts through the Project Manager.

Data analysis and preparation of strategy

6.3 The Consultant will be required to present an interpretation of the constraints and opportunities at a strategic level from an analysis of information collected.

- Analyse data above and through discussions with stakeholders, provide a broad assessment of the current extent and condition of the green infrastructure network, identify current and future gaps in the green infrastructure network and sensitive areas/ potential conflict between uses.
- Make Specific recommendations to identify needs and opportunities for future green infrastructure.
- Enhance locally distinctive landscapes.
- Connect and enrich biodiversity (including supporting BAP targets) and geodiversity
- Extend formal and informal public access.
- Provide for missing green transport links to make the countryside more accessible for non-motorised forms of transport
- Bring these recommendations together to identify a multi-functional green space network to meet the needs of the well being for a growing population and ameliorate the effects of climate change.

- Identify criteria to evaluate the benefit derived from such green infrastructure provision.
- As part of the development of an Action Plan for the Strategy consider how this infrastructure could be provided.
- Enhance opportunities for landscape and water based recreational provision.
- Enhance the conservation and appreciation of the historic environment and historic landscape character.

Stage 2: Action Plan

- 6.5 The action plan will need to consider the practical implications of providing the green infrastructure proposed. This may include for example, Section 106 agreements, public and private sector partnership arrangements, and making use of national and European funding. The long term maintenance and improvement of these facilities are to be considered when formulating the strategy.
- 6.6 The Commissioning of Stage 2 will be dependant on the consultant's performance during stage 1. A detailed brief will be developed for Stage 2 within the scope of the works for Stage 1
- 6.7. Consultants are asked to prepare a detailed methodology for Stage 1 and an outline methodology for the Stage 2 Action Plan with detailed rates and an indication of consultant hours to be spent on the relevant stages.
- 6.8 The Action Plan will focus spending by using the Stage 1 Green Infrastructure Strategy framework to:
- 6.9 Using the Greater Norwich New Growth Point Green Infrastructure framework, produce a prioritised, phased and costed list of projects for new green infrastructure including a business plan with an estimate of related budget costs (capital and revenue) and recommendations for sources of funding, delivery, governance, long-term maintenance and also identifying priority investment projects within the following timescales:-

Short to medium 1-3 years, Medium term 4-8 years and long term 9-15 years

7. Programme for Delivery of the Green Infrastructure Strategy

Key Milestones Programme

Agree brief for stage 1	03-January 2007
Advertise for expressions of interest for tenders for stage 1(selective tendering)	10-January 2007
Receive expressions of interest with pre-tender questionnaire	09 February 2007
Shortlist of consultants to be agreed and brief sent	14 February2007
Tenders from short listed consultants to be received by	27 February 2007
Short listed Consultants to be interviewed	08 March 2007
Appoint consultant	12 March 2007
First Stakeholder Workshop	Early May 2007
Draft Report stage 1 (including an evaluation of consultant's performance)	08-June 2007
Second Stakeholder workshop	Mid June 2007

Final Report stage 1	29-June 2007
Commission Action Plan(stage 2) (Subject to previous performance evaluation)	02-July 2007
Draft Action Plan	03-August 2007
Final Action Plan	31-August 2007
Green Infrastructure Strategy Stages 1 and 2 to be signed off by the Client Commissioning Group	31-August-2007

8. Project Output

- 8.1 An A4 written technical report that sets out the agreed strategy and business plan complete with an appropriately scaled series of coloured maps folded to A4 format. Provide 24 bound copies, plus 24 copies of an electronic version on CD-Rom.
- 8.2 An A4 technical summary of this report to be designed and print ready available on CD-Rom, incorporating indicative maps only (as a guide – less than 30 pages).
- 8.3 Provide appropriate maps that can be used to support the application of green infrastructure provision in Greater Norwich as part of the development planning process.
- 8.4 Where maps are produced, provide the appropriate source data and legend files to enable future enhancement of the maps.
- 8.5 GIS layers should have appropriate attributes and be supplied in either MapInfo Tab file or ESRI shape line format.
- 8.6 Maps and data will include the base line data from Stage One of the study and the identified green infrastructure proposals from stage Two.
- 8.7 Produce an A4 monochrome non-technical information pack outlining the Green Infrastructure Strategy to provide a background for the stakeholders to identify strategic visions and ideas to be included in the action plan.
- 8.8 A four page A4/A5 colour, non-technical leaflet will be designed and finalised to promote the strategy using key images from the study, to be supplied electronically in a print-ready format.

9. Project Management Structure

- 9.1 The Client Commissioning Group will oversee the commissioning and delivery of the Green Infrastructure Strategy for Greater Norwich.
- 9.2 The lead authority for this project will be Norfolk County Council. The Project Manager and first point of contact will be Gerald den Hoed.
- 9.3 Client Commissioning Group Membership
 - Norfolk County Council-Phil Bennett Lloyd (Project Lead)
 - Norwich City Council-George Ishmael
 - South Norfolk District Council-Richard Cooper
 - Broadland District Council-John Walchester
 - Natural England- Graham King
 - Broads Authority-Gillian Morgan

9.4 Members of the Client Commissioning Group will support the framework, approach and scope of the Green Infrastructure Strategy as outlined and meet fortnightly during January and February 2007, thereafter monthly.

9.5 Progress reports to be provided by the Consultant to the Project Manager for circulation to the Client Commissioning Group and to the Directors Group for reporting to Go East at agreed milestones.

10. Project Management Contact Details

The project management arrangements will be as follows:

Project Director-Phil Bennett Lloyd-Environment Manager
Tel. 01603 222754
E mail. philip.bennett-lloyd@norfolk.gov.uk

Project Manager-Gerald den Hoed-Landscape Architect
Tel. 01603 222767
E mail. gerald.den-hoed@norfolk.gov.uk

11. Consultant Meetings

11.1 The number of meetings required between the Consultant and the Client Commissioning Group will be set out after the methodology has been agreed for the project.

11.2 As a minimum, the consultant should expect to meet with the Client Commissioning Group at the following intervals:

Meetings to be attended

- At inception to agree detailed brief following appointment
- At two stakeholder workshops
- After the two stakeholder workshops to discuss the issues raised
- At/After the presentation of the Draft report.
- At monthly progress meetings, which may be either tied in with the above meeting or additional meetings.
- All the above is subject to agreement with the Client Commissioning Group.

Consultant administrative role

- Provide monthly progress reports and distribute to Project Manager for distribution to Client Commissioning Group.
- Provide written updates at key points during the contract and distribute to Project Manager.
- Work to an agreed programme of work for developing the outputs required from each work phase to meet the key milestones programme.
- Facilitate two stakeholder workshops with stakeholders as agreed with Client Commissioning Group.
- Produce an information pack outlining the Green Infrastructure Strategy to provide a background for the stakeholders to identify strategic visions and ideas to be included in the action plan.
- Produce a record and analysis of the two stakeholder workshops and feedback this information to the Project Manager for distribution to the Client Commissioning Group.
- The consultant's role is to provide input as to the content of the two stakeholder workshops and to provide sufficient information to the Project Manager, enabling two

stakeholder workshops to be arranged, with an indication of cost to be included within the consultant's tender subject to approval by the Client Commissioning Group.

Norfolk County Council administrative role

- To cover administrative arrangements associated with the two stakeholder workshops, including, arranging venues, sending out invitations, note taking and arranging feedback to stakeholders with costs of this to be borne by the Client Commissioning Group
- The Project Administrative Support Officer will arrange for minutes to be taken and distributed prior to each progress meeting.
- The Project Administrative Officer will distribute agenda prior to each progress meeting with the Project Manager and Client Commissioning Group setting out agenda items.

GREATER NORWICH GROWTH POINT AREA GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY

Stakeholder Technical Workshop

Held on Thursday 24th May 2007 at The Assembly House, Norwich

PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP

To brief stakeholders on the scope and content of the Green Infrastructure Strategy, and to obtain technical views on the preliminary mapping of key green infrastructure resources and opportunities with the key organisations who will be primarily responsible for green infrastructure provision within the Greater Norwich Area.

FORMAT OF THE WORKSHOP

Philip Bennett-Lloyd (Norfolk CC) welcomed everyone to the workshop. Philip outlined the workshop programme and set out the general background to the project, and then introduced the client commissioning group and the lead project consultants – Chris Blandford Associates (CBA).

Dominic Watkins (CBA Director) provided an overview of the study process – defining what green infrastructure is and the aims and scope of the Strategy. Dominic explained that the work started in late March 2007 and was being undertaken in two stages - Stage 1 comprised the analysis and preparation of a draft strategy report, with Stage 2 comprising preparation of an action plan to guide delivery of the strategy.

An overview of the preliminary green infrastructure opportunity mapping was provided:

Theme 1. Physical Resources & Natural Systems - Overview

Bill Wadsworth (CBA) explained that this theme comprised the following resources:

- * Geology, Soils, Landform and Hydrology/Flood Risk
- * Biodiversity

Bill presented the current Ecological Network mapping studies for the Greater Norwich Area proposed by the Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership comprising core areas, linkages and enhancement zones, highlighting the potential linkages between this and the other themes.

Theme 2. Human Land Uses, Systems & Activities - Overview

Keith Rowe (ADAS) explained that this theme comprised the following resources:

- * Heritage and Culture
- * Accessible Greenspace
- * Leisure, Recreation and Tourism Destinations
- * Access and Movement
- * Social, Economic and Health issues
- * Existing Development Allocations, Initiatives and Proposals

Keith presented the concept behind the proposed Sustainable Movement Network. He explained the anticipated network hierarchy, highlighting the potential linkages between this and the other themes. The hierarchy comprises (i) doorstep and neighbourhood connectors in urban areas, (ii) countryside

connectors between urban areas and the surrounding countryside, and (iii) green ways/blue ways providing primary access routes connecting the Greater Norwich Area with surrounding areas.

Theme 3. Environmental Character & Land Use Change - Overview

Dominic Watkins explained that this theme provided an understanding of the context for the future planning and management of biodiversity and human land uses/activities. The theme comprised the following resources:

- * Countryside Character
- * Norwich Urban Character

Dominic emphasised the importance of ensuring that green infrastructure and growth is planned, designed and managed in ways that promote locally distinctive characteristics and qualities that contribute to the Greater Norwich Area's character and sense of place.

BREAKOUT DISCUSSION GROUPS

The workshop participants were divided into four groups to review and discuss the preliminary mapping of key green infrastructure resources. Each group was asked to consider the following discussion points:

- Are there any other sources of information (documents/mapping data) that can be used to inform the analysis of the GI resources (i.e. to help define the quantity/extent, quality/condition and/or accessibility of the resource)?
- What are the present management/enhancement needs and predicted future deficiencies/gaps in provision (by reference to policy requirements/targets/standards)?
- What are the generic opportunities to address management/enhancement needs and predicted future deficiencies/gaps in provision?
- What are the site-specific opportunities to address management/enhancement needs and predicted future deficiencies/gaps in provision?
- What are the potential constraints to protection/enhancement of the resource (e.g. sensitive areas, potential user/use conflicts, etc)?

Theme 1. Physical Resources & Natural Systems - Discussion Group Comments

Facilitator

Bill Wadsworth (CBA)

Participants

Scott Perkin (Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership)
Chris Strachan (Environment Agency)
Nick Vass-Bowen (Breckland District Council)
Hamish Melville (Broadland District Council)
Robin Goolden (Wensum Valley Trust)
John Hiskett (Norfolk Wildlife Trust)
Steve Jones (RSPB)
Heidi Thompson (Norfolk County Council)
Helen Ward (Natural England)

Stuart Rickards (Environment Agency)
Ben McLean (Norfolk County Council)
Gerry Barnes (Norfolk County Council)

Additional information sources

- Catchment Flood Management Plans
- Locally designated series: woodlands
- Farm woodlands maps
- Quarry sites with planning history or formal land use

Management and enhancement needs and deficiencies/gaps in provision.

- Enhancement of the urban fabric (significant retrofitting; green roofs)
- River Corridors / Valleys within Norwich (restoration and day lighting of streams in culverts; new wetland – possibly south east of Norwich)
- Floodplain and river valley sides restoration (support grazing)
- Key areas - River valleys; Marriott's Way; Mousehold Heath; Horsford
- Wensum valley – cross valley pedestrian links and for Costessey and Ringland areas
- Upfront provision of GI
- Central Government funding before development.
- Landscape Framework e.g. Milton Keynes – appropriate assessment / international legislation lever for movement.

Opportunities

- “Greening Norfolk” – large scale habitat creation;
- River Valleys
- Fragmentation and extent;
- Resilience to change;
- Wensum valley – crossing at Costessey
- Econet report – recreation of full extent of Mousehold Heath;
- Area west of Norwich – Acle, Yare, heath/wood pasture areas
- Large scale vision for habitat creation (Orchards; Hedges; Community woodlands; Field margins)
- Grasslands included as a component of woodland creation / management with opportunities for large-scale creation of a mosaic of habitats.
- Large new wetlands;
- Bringing the Broads into the City
- Work with Health Trust for large woodland / orchards next to the hospital – health walks
- Local community needs: allotments; orchards; firewood
- Wensum Valley Way (Nar Valley Way; Wherryman's Way; Marriott's Way) – linkages with Fakenham, West Norfolk and North Norfolk Coast.
- Linkages with The Brecks and Thetford Forest for continuity.

Constraints/issues

- Funding (Stage II) – more than existing resources (e.g. agri-environment and S106 agreements).
- Floodplain grazing – availability of herds (key constraint for all grassland types)
- Cannot expect existing resources to absorb projected growth / pressure;
- Pressure from canoeing community to open up currently non-navigable reaches of river;
- Extension of navigable reaches of rivers – plus associated management requirements;
- Potential pressure to open up Waveney / Wensum banksides to public access;

- Policy mechanisms can be difficult to negotiate (Joint Strategy for Greater Norwich may ameliorate this to some extent).
- Long term management (Trust funds).

Theme 2. Human Land Uses, Systems & Activities - Discussion Group Comments

Facilitators

Keith Rowe (ADAS)
Jean Churchward (ADAS)

Participants

Mike Knights (Norfolk County Council)
Paul Hoey (Norfolk County Council)
Steven Smith (EEDA)
Roger Woods (Forestry Commission)
Noam Bergman (Tyndall Centre)
Nick Sanderson (Broads Authority)
George Ishmael (Norwich City Council)
Matt Davies (Norwich Fringe Project)
Susan Flack (Broadland District Council)
Peter Barber (Norfolk County Council)
Richard Cooper (South Norfolk District Council)
Nigel Bringham (Sustrans)
David Gurney (Norfolk Landscape Archaeology)
Bob Cronk (Norwich City Council)
Michael Hand (Norfolk County Council)
Wendy Pontin (Norfolk County Council)
Richard Doleman (Norfolk County Council)

Additional information sources

- Community woodlands – Forestry Commission
- Permissive routes – e.g. under Countryside Stewardship
- Boudica’s Way, Tas Valley Way & Kett’s country Walk to be added to map. Also Bure Valley Way as Green Way rather than countryside connector.
- Catton Hall Park to be added to map
- Strumpshaw Fen to be added as greenspace & tourist destination.
- Thetford visitor surveys show Thetford Forest attracting many visitors from Greater Norwich Area and similar effect applies to Coast
- Cultural heritage (sites of local & regional importance; historic churches; Scheduled Monuments in south Norfolk missing from map; show concentrations of historic buildings/clusters of buildings)
- Parish Plans – input from Rural Community Council or Districts
- Accessible Greenspace (capture linear areas e.g. old railways now footpaths/cycleways etc; river corridors e.g. Wensum and missing National Trust land)
- Criteria for ‘destination’ e.g. visitor numbers, costs, frequency of visit, type of visit – link to sustainable movement network – primary/secondary/local
- EEDA Sport England Report – shows the stock of recreational sports grounds
- Check conservation areas
- Three districts are producing play strategy – safe areas etc which could be useful.

Management/enhancement needs

- Importance of Marriott's Way, Yare Valley Walk and River walks as green space as well as access routes.
- Importance of maintaining existing RoW network
- Need improved information on existing and proposed ROW network
- Differentiate local use/ wider use community access/ functional use
- Ensure that local needs – e.g. a walk, playing football, picnic etc. are captured
- Links to shops & post offices etc as part of development of local network
- Opportunities to use historic routes (e.g. trackways) to link sites
- Ensure historic environment is factored in (intellectual & physical access)
- TAS valley key resource – Boudica's Way; historic sites, accessible
- Pick up safety /improvements in safe areas from district action plans
- Consider areas for healthy initiatives.

Deficiencies/gaps in provision

- RoW network good in e.g. the south of the Greater Norwich Area but poor in some parts
- Cycle routes in S Norfolk are mainly on rural roads.
- Inadequate bridleways provision
- Cycling provision in Norwich poor in north and northeast.
- Lack of links to northern Broads from Norwich.
- Some links between trains/buses/cycling but not sufficient
- Limited access for boat launch sites in and close to Norwich.
- Poor links to access sites e.g. cycle/foot access to Whitlingham Country Park
- Lack of large areas of accessible green space on north and north east of Norwich

Opportunities

- Scope for negotiating cycle access on footpaths where inadequate cycle provision, including in rural areas
- Provision/identification of more access points for launching boats/canoes in Norwich e.g. at meeting of Yare and Wensum
- Link to Caistor St Edmund Roman town by water
- Foot/cycle access to Whitlingham Park
- Continue Yare Valley Walk to Bawburgh and beyond
- Create link between Yare and Wensum
- Develop walk along Wensum, and create links with Marriott's Way
- Improve links from Norwich to northern Broads and rivers
- Create radial links on north and north eastern Norwich for walking & cycling
- Create better links across city and rivers
- Improve facilities for cycle links and cycle provision (e.g. hire) at railway stations
- Investigate improvement for cycle carrying on buses (e.g. on Broadshopper – used to have cycle trailer attached, but needed improvement/refinement)
- Cultural trails e.g. linking historic churches or windmills
- Investigate potential for rail halt between Norwich and Diss at Long Stratton area
- Scope for new cycle/walking links as part of new development
- Northern distributor road (need to build opportunities either side of NDR; area to N & NE Norwich (airport etc) for Greenspace)
- Maximising opportunities linking greenspace with big development areas – northern research area; Broadland industrial area; airport etc
- Scope for new access areas as part of the development e.g. Country Park on north side of Norwich; community woodland areas.

Constraints/issues

- Potential conflict between biodiversity and access e.g. more water access.
- Engineering/ cost equation of providing access across rivers and roads.
- Need to consider visitor capacity as well as size of accessible green space e.g. Whitlingham Country Park and Bure Marshes similar size but latter far less capacity because access limited to footpaths to hides.
- Socio-economic data as evidence base – reality check
- Clear about outcomes – benefits to people and wildlife (use Planning for Real to test plans)

Theme 3. Environmental Character & Land Use Change - Discussion Group Comments

Facilitators

Dominic Watkins (CBA)
Flora Wehl (CBA)

Participants

Judith Cantell (Norfolk County Council)
Gerry Barnes (Norfolk County Council)
Mike Burrell (Norwich City Council)
Phil Morris (Norfolk County Council)
Alan Gomm (South Norfolk District Council)
John Walchester (Broadland District Council)
Mary McHugh (Norwich City Council)
John Jones (Norfolk County Council)
Ken Hamilton (Norfolk Landscape Archaeology)

Additional information sources

- Norwich Urban Archaeological Database
- Urban Valuation Study for Norwich (part of the Norwich Fringe Project)
- Norwich City Centre Spatial Strategy
- Norwich Historic Public Open Space (Volunteer Project completed in 1999)
- Norfolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Study

Management/enhancement needs

- A significant increase in homes is forecasted for the Norwich urban area, with up to 36,000 new homes expected in the next twenty years, 20,000 of which are intended for greenfield sites.
- Planning for a delivering housing growth offers opportunities to create places where people want to live, work and visit.
- New developments need to develop a shared vision to create ‘good’ places for people to live and invest in; i.e. creating new developments that:
 - * Respect and enhance the area’s context to reinforce locally distinctive identity e.g. understand an area using characterisation techniques and an analysis of local distinctiveness to help ensure development reinforces and enhances local character and identity.
 - * Analyse and understand what contributes positively to existing local identity and use the analysis to inform future development.
 - * Are multi-functional and provide opportunities for food, water and energy production and sustainable healthy living.

- * Plan strategically for public space – it can reinforce the character of a place and contribute to local distinctiveness i.e. creating good quality and robust streets, square, parks and open spaces.
- * Adopt policies and tools to deliver high-quality places i.e. work in partnerships and proactively use the planning system to promote a shared vision and set new standards.
- * Are integrated into wider regional, sub-regional and local open space frameworks including green grids, and open and green space strategies as required by PG17.
- The following green space management needs and principles were considered important in relation to projected housing growth:
 - * Type of green space provision i.e. function, facilities,
 - * Quantity of green space provision i.e. creating distinctive places a variety of experiences.
 - * Level and amount of green space provision i.e. setting standards for new developments.
 - * Strategic accessibility/connectivity.

Deficiencies/gaps in provision

- Urban character study needed for the whole of Norwich.
- A Streetscape Improvement Plan for Norwich
- An overall strategy for Norwich to provide multi-functional open spaces that connect to the surrounding landscape / countryside.
- Variety of scale and type of public open space i.e. recognise that different age groups have different needs and use green space in different ways.

Opportunities

- Promote new urbanism / smart growth development projects to create more attractive, efficient and liveable communities i.e. encourage carbon neutral, clustered, mixed-use, multi-nodal neighbourhoods.
- Support innovative and inspirational pilot projects that promote a green identity, such as carbon, waste and water neutral developments.
- Green wedges into the city of Norwich are seen as very important and have the potential to be strengthened and enhanced i.e. enhance Norwich's image as a visually green city with wooded hinterland and river valleys.
- Improve the quality and connectivity of existing green space within and around Norwich.
- Enhance and create new links between nodes and greenspaces to improve access to surrounding countryside and provide 'seamless connections' for communities i.e. green corridors.
- Integration of green infrastructure alongside a development, to provide a range of social, economic and environmental benefits e.g. children's play areas, attractive walking and cycle routes, flood storage areas, biodiversity, air quality improvement, shelter from the wind, and space to grow food.
- Strengthen and encourage growth in existing communities i.e. locate development in areas with existing infrastructure.
- Increase the quantity and quality of country parks in and around Norwich.
- Restoration of heathland between the Broads protected wetland area and adjacent agricultural land i.e. provide an effective buffer zone.
- Increase the number of trees in general within Norwich, strengthening its identity as 'city of trees' and a 'city in an orchard, or an orchard in a city'.
- Strengthen and enhance 'wooded gateways' into Norwich, especially the west and south western entrances to the city e.g. Newmarket Road.
- Link areas of forest north of Norwich with new woodland and plantation forest, respective of the existing environmental character.
- Waterways / river valleys are major assets within the Greater Norwich Area that have the potential to provide and enhance multi-functional green infrastructure e.g. 'bring the Broads into the city of Norwich'.

- Promote the Waveney Valley Project and associated enhancements to the landscape, wildlife habitats and countryside amenities i.e. steer recreational pressures away from the Broads and provide an alternative.
- Extend the navigable extent of the Bure River north to Coltishall / Horstead.
- Innovative and sustainable projects that could provide useful precedents for the Greater Norwich Area include:
 - * Great Fen Project – Cambridgeshire, UK (involves the restoration over 3,700 hectares of fenland from arable land between Huntingdon and Peterborough)
 - * Sustainable Drainage Systems and public recreation in Holland (integration of recreation and stormwater management techniques within urban environments)
 - * The Copenhagen ‘Finger Plan’ (encourages urbanisation to develop in slender fingers from the city core, allowing green wedges of undeveloped land in between – the Plan continues to provide the basis of present urban planning of the city).
 - * ‘Zero car zones’ in Rotterdam, the Netherlands.
 - * Allotment Strategy, Edinburgh
 - * Urban extensions to Amsterdam, the Islands of IJburg, the Netherlands
 - * Ely town regeneration partnership (including the Jubilee gardens project).

Constraints/issues

- Although the urban edge to Norwich is somewhat contained by the River Yare, the northern sprawl to Norwich is less defined.
- Ensuring that new developments are not isolated i.e. consider how they will connect into existing networks and how they will contribute physically, socially and economically.
- Abrupt edge between the Broads wetland and adjacent agricultural land – need for a buffer zone.
- Identifying and understanding strategic gaps and associated needs in provision of green space and green space connectivity.

PLENARY SESSION

The individual discussion groups were then brought back together for a plenary session. Each group’s facilitator presented an overview of the key discussion points raised by the participants.

Concluding remarks from the audience included:

- There are many potential opportunities for upfront funding that can be used to deliver the strategy. These should be explored to inform the Action Plan in Stage 2 of the study.
- The Norwich Growth Point Infrastructure Study, being undertaken by EDAW, is looking specifically at funding mechanisms.
- The Green Infrastructure Strategy should promote the enhancement of biodiversity in existing urban areas as well as new developments - for example ‘green roofs’.

NEXT STEPS

Philip Bennett-Lloyd thanked everyone for attending the workshop and providing useful comments on the initial mapping work, which would be considered by the consultants.

Dominic Watkins explained that the consultant team is currently developing the draft Stage 1 analysis and strategy report for the end of June, and that there was a further opportunity to input to the strategy and action plan preparation process at a second workshop to be held on 13 July 2007 (details of this workshop to be confirmed by Norfolk County Council in due course).

GREATER NORWICH GROWTH POINT AREA GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY

2nd Stakeholder Technical Workshop

Held on 13th July 2007 at The Assembly House, Norwich

PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP

To provide an opportunity for the key stakeholders to discuss the draft Strategy with the consultant team, and to identify and discuss project proposals for inclusion in the Action Plan.

PARTICIPANTS

Organisation	Name	Job Title
Norfolk County Council	Gerald den Hoed	Landscape Architect Client Commissioning Group
Norfolk County Council	Richard Graham	Service Development Officer
Norfolk County Council	Nicola Atton	Green Infrastructure Support Officer
Norfolk County Council	Phil Morris	Principal Planner
Norfolk County Council	Judith Cantell	Senior Landscape Architect
Norfolk County Council	Michael Hand	Economic Strategist
Norfolk County Council	John Jones	Rural Environment Manager
Norfolk County Council	Mike Knights	Heritage and Landscape Manager
Norfolk County Council	Mari Martin	Head of Arts
Norfolk County Council	Tim Vines	AONB Manager
Norfolk County Council	John Brigham	Assistant Minerals & Waste Planning Officer
Norfolk County Council	Chris Jones	Technical Assistant – Public Rights of Way
Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership	Scott Perkin	Biodiversity Coordinator
Norfolk Landscape Archaeology	David Gurney	Principal Archaeologist
Norfolk Wildlife trust	Reg Land	Conservation Manager
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	John Hiskett	Senior Conservation Officer
RSPB	Hannah Watson	Conservation Officer
Natural England	Graham King	Senior Specialist Client Commissioning Group
Norwich City Council	George Ishmael	Landscape Planning & Strategy Officer Client Commissioning Group
Norwich City Council	Mike Burrell	Senior Planner (Policy)
Norwich City Council	Sharon Quantrell	Economic Development Officer (Policy & Projects)
Norwich City Council	Mary McHugh	Principal Landscape Architect
Breckland District Council	Natalie Beal	Planning Policy Officer – Thetford Growth Point
Broads Authority	Gillian Morgan	Director of Planning & Development Client Commissioning Group
Broads Authority	Nick Sanderson	Head Countryside Ranger

Broadland District Council	John Walchester	Senior Planning Officer Client Commissioning Group
Broadland District Council	Barbara Hornbrook	Conservation Manager
Broadland District Council	Susan Flack	Broadland Life Coordinator
South Norfolk Council	Richard Cooper	Senior Planning Officer Client Commissioning Group
Sustrans	Nigel Brigham	East of England Director
CPRE Norfolk	James Frost	Branch Director
Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research	Noam Bergman	Senior Research Associate
Barton Willmore	Edward Hanson	Senior Planner
Barton Willmore	Lee Newlyn	Senior Planning Partner

FORMAT OF THE WORKSHOP

Gerald den Hoed (Norfolk CC) welcomed everyone to the workshop. Gerald outlined the workshop programme and purpose.

Dominic Watkins (CBA Director) provided an overview of the Draft Strategy Report. Dominic outlined the following aspects of the Strategy:

- Definition of green infrastructure
- Strategy Aims
- Strategy Objectives
- The resources that constitute green infrastructure in the Greater Norwich Area
- Strategy Principles
- The Ecological Network proposals
- The Sustainable Movement Network proposals
- The Vision for green infrastructure
- The spatial priorities for investment within the proposed Green Infrastructure Network

Dominic also provided an overview of the scope and purpose of the Action Plan in relation to implementing the Strategy. He explained how the Action Plan would need to guide green infrastructure investment and project delivery and link to the Strategy's vision and principles. Priorities for investment would be identified on the basis of needs and opportunities identified by the technical work, taking into account available sources of funding and stakeholder and community aspirations.

BREAKOUT DISCUSSION GROUPS

Purpose of the Exercise

This provided an opportunity for stakeholders to help identify project proposals for inclusion in the Green Infrastructure Strategy's Action Plan. The Action Plan will provide a prioritised, phased and costed list of strategic green infrastructure projects to be put forward for funding and delivery by the Government, local authorities, developers and landowners.

Project Selection Criteria

It was explained that the criteria for selecting green infrastructure projects are based on identifying the level of multi-functional public and environmental benefits that would be potentially delivered (see the Proforma below for details).

The criteria are designed to give priority to multi-functional projects that are located within the ‘Sub-Regional Green Infrastructure Corridors’ and ‘Local Green Infrastructure Corridors’ identified on the proposed network maps. These Corridors are broad locations within the Greater Norwich Area where targeting investment in green infrastructure is considered to most likely to deliver multiple environmental, social and economic benefits.

However, it was emphasised that other projects of a more local nature, both within and beyond these Corridors, should also be considered where significant benefits across a wide range of green infrastructure functions can be demonstrated. Projects that are intended to deliver only limited or single benefits should not be discounted, as these may be crucial in achieving specific aims and objectives for green infrastructure and can help support more multi-functional projects.

The Green Infrastructure Project Selection Project Proforma

Using the proforma, the groups were invited to propose future projects that they considered would best meet the selection criteria. The general locations of the proposed projects were recorded on maps.

It was emphasised that the project proposals included in the Action Plan would be indicative; in most cases, feasibility studies would be required to examine in detail issues of project design, land ownership considerations and sources of funding.

Green Infrastructure Project Outline	
Project Name	
Map Ref	
Project Aims	
Priority for Implementation	Short to medium (1-3 years)? Medium term (4-8 years)? Longer term (9-15 years)?
Lead Delivery Agency	
Delivery Mechanism/ Funding Sources	Public? Private? Combination of public and private? Other?
Estimated Funding Costs	<£100k? £100k - £500k? £500k - £1m? £1m - £2m? >£2m? Other?

Project Selection Criteria

Contribution to Delivery of the Green Infrastructure Network (Figure 7.1)	
Does the proposed project lie within or immediately adjacent to a Sub-Regional Green Infrastructure Corridor?	
Does the proposed project lie within or immediately adjacent to a Local Green Infrastructure Corridor?	
Contribution to Delivery of the Sustainable Movement Network (Figures 6.1/6.2)	
Would the proposed project deliver a significant element of the Primary Movement Network?	
Would the proposed project deliver a significant element of the Secondary Movement Network?	
Contribution to Delivery of the Ecological Network (Figures 5.1/5.2)	
Would the proposed project contribute to safeguarding the Ecological Network's Core Areas of high wildlife value?	
Would the proposed project deliver a significant element of the Ecological Network's Habitat Enhancement and Creation Areas?	
Would the proposed project deliver a significant element of the Ecological Network's Wetland Habitat Enhancement and Creation Areas?	
Would the proposed project deliver a significant element of the Ecological Network's Corridors?	
Contribution to Delivery of the Green Infrastructure Core Principles	
Would the proposed project help safeguard and protect valuable green infrastructure?	
Would the proposed project help integrate green infrastructure into development schemes and existing developments?	
Would the proposed project help secure new and enhanced green infrastructure before development proceeds where there is a clear need for provision?	
Would the proposed project help enhance green infrastructure where of low quality, in decline or requires investment to realise its potential to meet future demands?	
Would the proposed project help mitigate potential adverse effects of development, new land uses and climate change?	
Would the proposed project help create new green infrastructure where there is an identified deficit, or growth is planned and additional provision or compensatory measures are needed?	
Contribution to Delivery of Green Infrastructure Thematic Principles	
<i>Sense of Place</i> - would the proposed project protect and reinforce the distinctive historic and natural qualities that make the Greater Norwich Area special, and help manage the effects of development to sustain the character of the Area?	
<i>Sustainable Access and Movement</i> – would the proposed project facilitate walking and cycling and improve public transport links?	
<i>Making Space for Wildlife</i> - would the proposed project help improve the condition, extent and connectivity of wildlife habitats, reverse the effects of habitat fragmentation and create conditions to allow habitats and species to adapt to the effects of climate change?	
<i>Heritage Enhancement</i> - would the proposed project enhance the management, presentation, accessibility and interpretation of the historic environment and the cultural heritage?	
<i>Sub-Regional Connectivity</i> – would the proposed project help connect the green infrastructure network in the Greater Norwich Area with networks in neighbouring areas at the sub-regional and local scales?	
<i>Respecting Environmental Capacities</i> – does the proposed project take into account the capacity of natural processes, systems and resources in responding to the challenges of adapting to and mitigating the effects of climate change?	

<i>Healthy Lifestyles</i> – would the proposed project provide accessible green infrastructure in and around areas close to where people live and work to promote healthy lifestyles and opportunities for active and passive recreation?	
<i>Employment Benefits</i> – would the proposed project create new employment opportunities through the production of goods and provision of services related to green infrastructure (such as maintenance of green infrastructure and sustainable low-carbon energy generation using biofuels)?	
<i>Social and Community Benefits</i> – would the proposed project provide a strong focus for community engagement in green infrastructure provision, and facilitate social inclusion and lifelong learning opportunities leading to greater public awareness of and respect for the environment?	

NEXT STEPS

Gerald den Hoed thanked everyone for attending the workshop and providing useful suggestions and comments, which would be considered by the consultants.

Dominic Watkins explained that the consultant team is currently developing the draft Action Plan for the beginning of August. The completed project proposal forms received at and subsequent to the workshop from participants would be used to directly inform the Action Plan.

The information received from this workshop was used to inform, where relevant, the Schedule of Potential Green Infrastructure Projects set out in Annex C.

GREATER NORWICH GROWTH POINT AREA GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY

Community Workshop

Held on 12th July 2007 at The Assembly House, Norwich

PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP

To provide an opportunity for community groups to be briefed on the project, discuss the draft Strategy with the consultant team, and to identify and discuss project proposals for inclusion in the Action Plan.

PARTICIPANTS

Organisation	Name	Job Title
Norfolk County Council	Phil Bennett-Lloyd	Environment Manager (Partnership & Policy) Client Commissioning Group
Norfolk County Council	Gerald den Hoed	Landscape Architect Client Commissioning Group
Norfolk County Council	Richard Graham	Service Development Officer
Norfolk County Council	Nicola Atton	Green Infrastructure Support Officer
Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Group	Robert Parkinson	
Brecks Countryside Project	Abigail Stancliffe-Vaughan	Community and Biodiversity Project Officer
The Yare Valley Society	Andrew Salisbury	Acting Chair
The Yare Valley Society	John Elbro	
Broads Local Access Forum	Peter Medhurst	
Broads Local Access Forum	Raymond Walpole	
Norfolk Rural Community Council	Geoffrey Leigh	External Relations Manager
Wymondham Community Partnership & Wymondham Nature Group	Ann Roberts	Chair
Association of Town & Parish Councils	Steven Ford	
Association of Town & Parish Councils	David Gudgeon	
Broads Authority	Lesley Marsden	Landscape Architect
The Norwich Society	Alec Hartley	
Norwich Heritage Economic and Regeneration Trust	Anthony Moore	Research and Development Coordinator
Norfolk Geodiversity Society	Jenny Gladstone	
Norfolk & Suffolk Boating Association & Royal Yachting Association	Mike Evans	
Norfolk Older People's Partnership	Lyn Holt	
Natural England	Graham King	Senior Specialist Client Commissioning Group
Norwich City Council	George Ishmael	Landscape Planning & Strategy Officer Client Commissioning Group

Central Norwich Citizens Forum	Jim Durrant	Planning Committee Chair
Norfolk Anglers Conservation Association	Chris Oakley	General Manager
Norfolk Local Access Forum	Don Saunders	
Norfolk Local Access Forum	George Saunders	
Broads Authority	Gillian Morgan	Director of Planning & Development Client Commissioning Group
Norwich Rivers Heritage Group	Gill Ward	
Broadland District Council	John Walchester	Senior Planning Officer Client Commissioning Group
Norwich Open Spaces Group	Liz Orna	
BTCV	Marya Parker	Operations Manager, East of England (North)
South Norfolk Council	Richard Cooper	Senior Planning Officer Client Commissioning Group
Thorpe St Andrew	Peter Rope	Tree Warden
Broods Local Access Forum	Ray Warpole	
Yare Valley Society	Andrew Salisbury	
Norwich City Council	Jennifer Ley	Councillor

FORMAT OF THE WORKSHOP

Philip Bennett-Lloyd (Norfolk CC) welcomed everyone to the workshop. Philip outlined the workshop programme and set out the general background to the project, and then introduced the client commissioning group and the lead project consultants – Chris Blandford Associates (CBA).

Dominic Watkins (CBA Director) provided an overview of the study process – defining what green infrastructure is and the aims and scope of the Strategy. Dominic explained that the work started in late March 2007 and was being undertaken in two stages - Stage 1 comprised the analysis and preparation of a Draft Strategy Report, with Stage 2 comprising preparation of an Action Plan to guide delivery of the Strategy.

Dominic provided an overview of the Draft Strategy Report, outlining the following aspects of the Strategy:

- Definition of green infrastructure
- Strategy Aims
- Strategy Objectives
- The resources that constitute green infrastructure in the Greater Norwich Area
- Strategy Principles
- The Ecological Network proposals
- The Sustainable Movement Network proposals
- The Vision for green infrastructure
- The spatial priorities for investment within the proposed Green Infrastructure Network

Dominic also provided an overview of the scope and purpose of the Action Plan in relation to implementing the Strategy. He explained how the Action Plan would need to guide green infrastructure investment and project delivery and link to the Strategy's vision and principles. Priorities for investment would be identified on the basis of needs and opportunities identified by the technical work, taking into account available sources of funding and stakeholder and community aspirations.

BREAKOUT DISCUSSION GROUPS

Purpose of the Exercise

This provided an opportunity for community groups to help identify project proposals for inclusion in the Green Infrastructure Strategy's Action Plan. The Action Plan will provide a prioritised, phased and costed list of strategic green infrastructure projects to be put forward for funding and delivery by the Government, local authorities, developers and landowners.

Project Selection Criteria

It was explained that the criteria for selecting green infrastructure projects are based on identifying the level of multi-functional public and environmental benefits that would be potentially delivered (see the Proforma below for details).

The criteria are designed to give priority to multi-functional projects that are located within the 'Sub-Regional Green Infrastructure Corridors' and 'Local Green Infrastructure Corridors' identified on the proposed network maps. These Corridors are broad locations within the Greater Norwich Area where targeting investment in green infrastructure is considered to most likely to deliver multiple environmental, social and economic benefits.

However, it was emphasised that other projects of a more local nature, both within and beyond these Corridors, should also be considered where significant benefits across a wide range of green infrastructure functions can be demonstrated. Projects that are intended to deliver only limited or single benefits should not be discounted, as these may be crucial in achieving specific aims and objectives for green infrastructure and can help support more multi-functional projects.

The Green Infrastructure Project Selection Project Proforma

Using the proforma, the groups were invited to propose future projects that they considered would best meet the selection criteria. The general locations of the proposed projects were recorded on maps.

It was emphasised that the project proposals included in the Action Plan would be indicative; in most cases, feasibility studies would be required to examine in detail issues of project design, land ownership considerations and sources of funding.

Green Infrastructure Project Outline	
Project Name	
Map Ref	
Project Aims	
Priority for Implementation	Short to medium (1-3 years)? Medium term (4-8 years)? Longer term (9-15 years)?
Lead Delivery Agency	

Delivery Mechanism/ Funding Sources	Public? Private? Combination of public and private? Other?
Estimated Funding Costs	<£100k? £100k - £500k? £500k - £1m? £1m - £2m? >£2m? Other?

Project Selection Criteria

Contribution to Delivery of the Green Infrastructure Network (Figure 7.1)	
Does the proposed project lie within or immediately adjacent to a Sub-Regional Green Infrastructure Corridor?	
Does the proposed project lie within or immediately adjacent to a Local Green Infrastructure Corridor?	
Contribution to Delivery of the Sustainable Movement Network (Figures 6.1/6.2)	
Would the proposed project deliver a significant element of the Primary Movement Network?	
Would the proposed project deliver a significant element of the Secondary Movement Network?	
Contribution to Delivery of the Ecological Network (Figures 5.1/5.2)	
Would the proposed project contribute to safeguarding the Ecological Network's Core Areas of high wildlife value?	
Would the proposed project deliver a significant element of the Ecological Network's Habitat Enhancement and Creation Areas?	
Would the proposed project deliver a significant element of the Ecological Network's Wetland Habitat Enhancement and Creation Areas?	
Would the proposed project deliver a significant element of the Ecological Network's Corridors?	
Contribution to Delivery of the Green Infrastructure Core Principles	
Would the proposed project help safeguard and protect valuable green infrastructure?	
Would the proposed project help integrate green infrastructure into development schemes and existing developments?	
Would the proposed project help secure new and enhanced green infrastructure before development proceeds where there is a clear need for provision?	
Would the proposed project help enhance green infrastructure where of low quality, in decline or requires investment to realise its potential to meet future demands?	
Would the proposed project help mitigate potential adverse effects of development, new land uses and climate change?	
Would the proposed project help create new green infrastructure where there is an identified deficit, or growth is planned and additional provision or compensatory measures are needed?	
Contribution to Delivery of Green Infrastructure Thematic Principles	
<i>Sense of Place</i> - would the proposed project protect and reinforce the distinctive historic and natural qualities that make the Greater Norwich Area special, and help manage the effects of development to sustain the character of the Area?	
<i>Sustainable Access and Movement</i> – would the proposed project facilitate walking and cycling and improve public transport links?	

<i>Making Space for Wildlife</i> - would the proposed project help improve the condition, extent and connectivity of wildlife habitats, reverse the effects of habitat fragmentation and create conditions to allow habitats and species to adapt to the effects of climate change?	
<i>Heritage Enhancement</i> - would the proposed project enhance the management, presentation, accessibility and interpretation of the historic environment and the cultural heritage?	
<i>Sub-Regional Connectivity</i> – would the proposed project help connect the green infrastructure network in the Greater Norwich Area with networks in neighbouring areas at the sub-regional and local scales?	
<i>Respecting Environmental Capacities</i> – does the proposed project take into account the capacity of natural processes, systems and resources in responding to the challenges of adapting to and mitigating the effects of climate change?	
<i>Healthy Lifestyles</i> – would the proposed project provide accessible green infrastructure in and around areas close to where people live and work to promote healthy lifestyles and opportunities for active and passive recreation?	
<i>Employment Benefits</i> – would the proposed project create new employment opportunities through the production of goods and provision of services related to green infrastructure (such as maintenance of green infrastructure and sustainable low-carbon energy generation using biofuels)?	
<i>Social and Community Benefits</i> – would the proposed project provide a strong focus for community engagement in green infrastructure provision, and facilitate social inclusion and lifelong learning opportunities leading to greater public awareness of and respect for the environment?	

NEXT STEPS

Philip Bennett-Lloyd thanked everyone for attending the workshop and providing useful suggestions and comments, which would be considered by the consultants.

Dominic Watkins explained that the consultant team is currently developing the draft Action Plan for the beginning of August. The completed project proposal forms received at and subsequent to the workshop from participants would be used to directly inform the Action Plan.

The information received from this workshop was used to inform, where relevant, the Schedule of Potential Green Infrastructure Projects set out in Annex C.

GREENSPACE PLANNING POLICY CHECKLIST

The following checklist is based on the technical toolkits provided by a report for the Hertfordshire Countryside Management Service, Watling Chase Community Forest and the Countryside Agency on approaches to creating and managing greenspace through the planning system²⁴, updated as appropriate.

Local Development Frameworks

Relevant greenspace matters for possible inclusion in the Local Development Frameworks include:

- General greenspace policy and explanatory text with cross reference to the GI Strategy
- Greenspace requirements and standards
- Creation of greenspace
- Arrangements for management and maintenance of greenspace
- Commuted payments / financial endowments for maintenance
- Use / type of greenspace
- Timescale / phasing relative to development
- Identify general extent of greenspaces on proposals map
- Cross reference to relevant supplementary planning documents

LDF Greenspace Policy

Relevant matters for possible inclusion in a general LDF greenspace policy include:

- Requirement for greenspace to be provided in connection with residential development
- Reference to quantitative and qualitative standards of provision
- Requirement for development proposals to include appropriate arrangements for the management and maintenance of greenspace provided in connection with a development
- Requirement for a commuted payment for maintenance costs where the responsibility for the management and maintenance of greenspace will be transferred to the local authority
- Requirement for a financial contribution to be made towards greenspace provision off site, where it cannot be provided on site
- Reference to the possible need for a planning agreement / obligation relating to the provision, management and maintenance of greenspace
- Cross reference to more detailed appendix or supplementary planning document as appropriate

Relevant matters for possible inclusion in the explanatory text to the policy include:

- Explanation and expansion of policy requirements set out above.
- Justification for the requirement for greenspace to be provided in connection with residential development.
- Outline of the standards of provision to be made.
- Cross reference to detailed greenspace standards in SPD or appendix
- Explanation of the requirement for development proposals to include appropriate arrangements for the management and maintenance of greenspace provided in connection with a development.

²⁴ Community Greenspace and New Development – creation through the planning system and lessons for the future (prepared by Vincent and Gorbing/LDA for the Hertfordshire Countryside Management Service, Watling Chase Community Forest and the Countryside Agency, Final Report, undated)

- Explanation of the requirement for a commuted payment for maintenance costs where the responsibility for the management and maintenance of greenspace will be transferred to the local authority (amount not to be specified at this stage)
- Reference to the period of time that the commuted payment will be expected to cover (usually 10 to 20 years) and the justification for this period
- Explanation of the requirement for a financial contribution to be made towards greenspace provision off site, where it cannot be provided on site.
- Reference to the possible need for a planning agreement / obligation relating to the provision, management and maintenance of greenspace
- Reference to the expected public rights of access to greenspace – formal public open space / permissive public access in perpetuity
- Cross reference to more detailed appendix or SPD

Greenspace Supplementary Planning Document

Relevant matters for possible inclusion in a supplementary planning document include:

- Explanation and expansion of policy requirements (if necessary, depending on level of detail in explanatory text)
- Details of the greenspace standards
- Reference to requirement for development proposals to include appropriate arrangements for the management and maintenance of greenspace provided in connection with a development, including interim arrangements until permanent arrangements put in place.
- Outline of alternative options for the management and maintenance of greenspace, e.g. local authority, charitable trust, developer / management company
- Outline of requirement for a commuted payment for maintenance costs where the responsibility for the management and maintenance of the greenspace is to be transferred to the local authority or for financial / building endowment where a charitable trust is to be established.
- Possibly include details of the methodology used to calculate commuted payment / endowment and the length of the period that this is expected to cover.
- Expected public ‘rights’ of access to greenspace and the requirement for it to be kept in perpetuity (if permissive greenspace) and need for plan defining areas.
- Need for access to be satisfactory and adequate for size of greenspace and activities that are likely to take place.
- Outline of design considerations and criteria
- Requirement for the submission of a landscaping scheme and the level of detail expected.
- Requirement for the submission of a landscape management plan / scheme.
- Requirement for the submission of a landscape master plan / landscape framework plan
- Timing and phasing of landscaping works and provision of greenspace.
- Outline of information and level of detail to be submitted with planning applications.
- Reference to the possible need for a S106 agreement relating to the provision, management and maintenance of greenspace.
- Outline of content of S106 agreement
- Requirement for a planning brief / development brief for larger sites.

GREENSPACE MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Introduction

There are a number of options that may be relevant for the delivery and future management of greenspace in the Greater Norwich Area. The main options are management by:

- Local Authorities
- Existing or new Charitable Trusts
- Management Companies
- Partnerships
- Other Organisations

The following overview of current key greenspace management options is based on a review of approaches to creating and managing greenspace provided by a report for the Hertfordshire Countryside Management Service, Watling Chase Community Forest and the Countryside Agency²⁵.

Local Authority Option

The key features of this option are

- The traditional approach to ownership and management of greenspace.
- Land owned by Local Authority (may be transferred by developer)
- Land managed and maintained by Local Authority, usually in conjunction with other public open spaces
- Developer usually required to pay a commuted sum towards maintenance for a specific period (say 10 to 20 years)
- Commuted payment is usually calculated using a standard formula (total cost by number of years, including an allowance for inflation/interest).
- After specified period management and maintenance funded out of general Council Tax funds

Best practice case study examples of this approach include:

- Proposed Great Ashby District Park, Stevenage
- Napsbury Park, London Colney
- Trinity Mead, Bridgetown, Stratford-Upon Avon

The main advantages of this approach are summarised below:

- Relatively straight forward.
- Ownership issues are relatively simple.
- Tried and tested approach.
- Maintenance can usually be carried out by teams already in the area.
- Possible economies of scale for maintenance costs, when maintenance combined with other greenspaces
- Land likely to be designated public open space with full rights of public access
- May be the cheapest and simplest option from the developers point of view

²⁵ Community Greenspace and New Development – creation through the planning system and lessons for the future (prepared by Vincent and Gorbing/LDA for the Hertfordshire Countryside Management Service, Watling Chase Community Forest and the Countryside Agency, Final Report, undated)

- There is no obligation on residents to provide financial contributions or provide commitment for management.

The main disadvantages of this approach are summarised below:

- Risk of insufficient funding being provided for maintaining adequate standards of maintenance.
- Once commuted sum has been spent, maintenance standards may fall.
- Money may go into a central fund rather than being set aside for maintenance of one specific project.
- Competition for funding with other council services could affect ability to maintain satisfactory standards of maintenance
- Possibly less scope for imaginative design and maintenance of a particular greenspace as less focused due to competition for attention and resources from other spaces.
- Maintenance may be carried out to the local authority's average standard, rather than taking into account site-specific maintenance requirements.
- Possibly low levels of community involvement and sense of ownership.

Other comments on this approach include:

- A comprehensive management plan should be produced by the designers involving the eventual managers (i.e. local authority).
- It is important that adequate funding is available for maintenance.
- Commuted payments should be ring fenced to ensure that they are used for the intended purpose and are not diverted to other purposes.
- Plans should be made for continued good management once the commuted sum has been used.

Existing or New Charitable Trust Option

The key features of this option are

- Trust usually have long lease on the land (say 125 to 150 years)
- Freehold may be held by developer, local authority or the Trust
- Land managed and maintained by the Trust, which has charitable status.
- Developer usually required to pay for establishing the Trust and to provide a financial endowment / building and property endowment for long term maintenance (period of lease)
- Management and maintenance funded by return on investments, property rental, grant aid etc.
- Funding may also be provided by annual charge on householders within development.
- A board of trustees is elected, who supervise the management of the greenspace

Best practice case study examples of this approach include:

- Shenley Park, Shenley (Shenley Park Trust)
- Highfield Park, St Albans (Highfield Park Trust)
- Ellenbrook Park, Hatfield
- Elsea Park, Bourne, Lincolnshire

The main advantages of this approach are summarised below:

- Option possibly with greatest scope for community involvement and ownership
- Possibly the best option for ensuring high standards of maintenance in the long run

- Land may be designated public open space with full rights of public access
- Possibly option with greatest scope for imaginative and creative design and management as Trust would have more focus.
- As Trusts are likely to be based 'on site' they are possibly more in touch with users of the greenspace and can respond more quickly to issues and incidents.
- Rates relief on property used for charitable purposes.
- Charities have privileged tax position.
- Local Authority capital finance rules do not apply, so trusts have greater flexibility of expenditure.
- Potential for a wide range of trustees.
- Generally predictable / guaranteed income (however see below).

The main disadvantages of this approach are summarised below:

- Complex arrangements to set up
- Costly to set up and provide endowment
- May not be perceived as a proper 'public park' by local authority, which could give rise to on going difficulties (e.g lack of by-laws, additional cost due to lack of economies of scale, rivalry, lack of coordination etc)
- May be the mostly costly option from the developers point of view
- May be difficulties recruiting suitable trustees
- May be funding shortfall if investments do not provide adequate returns.
- Lump sums or fixed contributions may devalue over time, creating a funding shortfall.
- The trust must operate within charity and company law.
- It can be difficult to reverse the trusts status in the event of difficulties/failures.
- It can be difficult to find and retain suitable trustees from within the community.
- Securing funding, grants etc. can dominate the trust's work.
- Failure of the trust may have financial implications for trustees.

Other comments on this approach include:

- Trusts are particularly effective where they are directly associated with a residential development.
- A shortage of interest, skills, or expertise in the local community may cause difficulties.
- Trusts usually are governed by Articles of Association, which set out the requirements for membership, meetings, voting, powers and duties of trustees etc, and Memorandum of Association, which sets out the objectives and powers of the trust.

Management Company Option

The key features of this option are

- Land ownership is often retained by developer / landowner or may be transferred to a management company
- Land managed and maintained by management company
- Management and maintenance initially funded by developer and / or covenanted contributions from householders. (Developer usually funds initial maintenance).
- Long term management and maintenance costs usually funded by covenanted contributions from householders

Best practice case study examples of this approach include:

- Napsbury Park, London Colney (Crest Nicholson)

- North Hamilton, Leicester

The main advantages of this approach are summarised below:

- Management/ maintenance is usually to a high standard.
- Financial endowment not required
- Possibly the simplest option from a Local Authorities point of view (no ongoing costs or responsibilities, and get benefit of greenspace)

The main disadvantages of this approach are summarised below:

- Least scope for community involvement and ownership.
- Annual fees can be expensive for residents.
- Management of greenspaces may be at a national rather than local level
- Land may be permissive greenspace rather than public open space.
- Legal agreement required to ensure full rights of public access in perpetuity.
- Dependent on long term view of developer / management company.
- May be less advantage in maintaining to a high standard once all properties sold (unless legal agreement sets out specification for expected levels of maintenance)
- What happens if the developer / management company fail to maintain the greenspace to a satisfactory standard or they go out of business? (legal agreement could possibly require a bond so that if there is a default the local authority can take over responsibility).
- Where there is no direct representation, there can be a lack of community involvement in management.

There are a number of types of management companies, including:

- Residents' Management Company – where residents run a company to manage the greenspace, with residents in a development owning a share in the company and paying annual service charge.
- Management Company employed by landowner – where the landowner (or developer) retains ownership of the greenspace, but where responsibility for management is passed to a Management Company.
- Management Company owning land – where ownership is passed to a Management Company and who are responsible for management of the greenspace. The company may be a not-for-profit company working across the country (e.g the Greenbelt Group). Funding may be provided by an initial capital sum from a developer and an annual charge on properties.
- Where there is no direct representation, there can be a lack of community involvement in management.

Partnership Option

The key features of this option are

- A partnership of interested parties who have come together to jointly manage an area.
- Potential members of partnerships include local authorities, residents groups, wildlife trusts, landscape maintenance charities and groups of individuals with a common interest.
- A management committee oversees the management of the greenspace.

The main advantages of this approach are summarised below:

- A range of different interest groups can be represented on the management committee.

- The responsibilities on individuals may be less onerous than those of a trustee in a charitable trust. There may therefore be more volunteers from the local community.
- Ownership of the land can be retained by the local authority, which reduces the risks and complications in the event of financial or other difficulties.
- Local people may not have to contribute financially to the upkeep of an area.
- There is a wider range of management/ maintenance possibilities than if management is retained by the local authority.

The main disadvantages of this approach are summarised below:

- As ultimate responsibility does not fall onto one organisation, there may be a lack of motivation, and standards may slip.
- The relatively informal arrangement means that the partnership could disintegrate if difficulties arise.
- Disagreements between the parties (particularly over finance) may cause problems.
- Community representatives may lack the necessary management skills, and may follow an individual agenda.

There are a number of types of partnerships. Some examples are:

- Partnership Forums – where a local authority retains ownership of and management responsibilities for the land, but enters into partnership agreements with community and voluntary sector organisations to deliver projects and activities and to agree common approaches and priorities.
- Service Agreements – where a local authority retains ownership of the land, but contracts management services to community and voluntary organisations, with the aim of delivering wider community and social benefits.

Other Organisations Options

Voluntary and Public / Private Sector Agreements

Other organisations such as the Woodland Trust, or local Wildlife Trusts may enter into an agreement with a local authority, developer or landowner to manage greenspaces where they are of particular conservation importance.

Community Interest Companies'

The Government introduced 'Community Interest Companies' (CICs) in 2005, a new type of not-for-profit limited company designed for social enterprises that want to use their profits and assets for public and community benefit. CICs must register at Companies House, and will not be eligible for charitable status (or the associated tax exemptions). They must show, through the "Community Interest Test", that they are committed to public/community benefit. An independent regulator will be appointed to oversee delivery of their community commitment. The management of greenspace may fulfill the requirements of the Community Interest Test, and CICs could be a workable alternative to the management mechanisms listed above. The CIC approach offers the following benefits:

- Enables profits and assets to work for community benefit with the relative freedom of the non-charitable company form to identify and adapt to circumstances, but with a clear assurance of not-for-profit distribution status.
- Members of the board of a charity may only be paid where the constitution contains such a power and it can be considered to be in the best interests of the charity. It means that, in general, the founder of a social enterprise who wishes to be paid cannot be on the board

and must give up strategic control of the organisation to a volunteer board, which is often unacceptable.

- The definition of community interest that will apply to CICs will be wider than the public interest test for charity.
- CICs will be specifically identified with social enterprise. Some organisations may feel that consequently this is a more suitable than charitable status



www.cba.uk.net

London Office

*Swan Court 9 Tanner Street London SE1 3LE
Tel: 0207 089 6480 Fax: 0207 089 9260 Email: mail@cba.uk.net*

South East Office

*The Old Crown High Street Blackboys Uckfield East Sussex TN22 5JR
Tel: 01825 891071 Fax: 01825 891075 Email: mail@cba.uk.net*

Chris Blandford Associates is the trading name of Chris Blandford Associates Ltd
Registered in England No 3741865. Registered Office: 29 High Street, Crawley, West Sussex RH10 1BQ