

GEOFF LYON

MAIN MATTER 3B

Dear Sir,

Thank you for agreeing to accept my further representations ahead of the Session to discuss Matter 3B on 17 November 2010. As you may be aware I was not previously included in the circulation list or offered the opportunity to provide further comment.

I refer you to my representations made on 28 August 2010 (ID: 11930 & 11931).

Since making those representations, I understand that the GNDDP have accepted concerns relating to the late inclusion of the Strategic Allocation of the "Growth Triangle" and have now deleted the proposed Focus Changes FC8 and FC9 from the Joint Core Strategy (JCS).

On the basis that the JCS submission no longer includes proposed Focus Changes FC8 and FC9, I would make the following observations:

1. If the Inspector accepts the justification for the size of the allocations in the JCS, it is critical, in my view, that delivery of the key objectives of the Core Strategy are not put at unnecessary risk through piece-meal development across the "Growth Triangle" area. As such, in order to deliver the stated benefits of a larger site it would be prudent for a Master-plan to be agreed across the complete "Growth Triangle" area so as to properly establish which areas are most suitable for development, which areas need to be protected and to ensure a co-ordinated delivery of necessary infrastructure to support such development;
2. On the basis of the above, it is imperative that land owners within the "Growth Triangle" work closely together to deliver growth, which could not only be mutually beneficial to those with a financial interest in the land but will also assist in the timely delivery of the key objectives of the Core Strategy. The benefits of working closely together are therefore not insignificant and the output of greater co-ordination may help to increase the confidence of local people that this is indeed a project which people in Norwich can be truly proud in terms of the places and spaces that will be created and is a development which integrates successfully with its surroundings.
3. The GNDDP have still yet to consider the implications of failing to provide for a "Plan B" and I see no evidence that contingencies

MAIN MATTER 3B

are in place should funding for major infrastructure fail to materialise. The recent statement issued from the GNDP Policy Group meeting held on 23 September 2010 demonstrates a declining confidence in their own submitted JCS document and the statement suggests that the document will be subject to a timely review. I am sure I am not alone in questioning the purpose of pursuing the current submitted JCS if it is considered highly probable that it will no longer be fit for purpose so soon after its potential adoption date.

4. Finally I must place on public record my displeasure at the general way in which the GNDP have conducted the process of producing the Joint Core Strategy. In particular, the public consultation exercise has been a resounding failure demonstrated by the lack of engagement by ordinary members of the public who will be most affected by the proposals put forward by the GNDP. The decision to hold meetings behind closed doors has rightly angered many whilst the unnecessary complexity involved in submitting representations may have only served to disenfranchise residents at a time when the views of local people should be forming the backbone of strategic policies to shape our places and spaces of the future. I do sincerely hope that lessons will be learned by those responsible, particularly ahead of any "timely reviews" of the JCS.

END