

Greater Norwich Development Partnership

Joint Core Strategy for
Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk

Summary of issues raised:
Regulation 25 Technical Consultation
4 August 2008 – 26 September 2008

Jobs, homes, prosperity for local people



NORWICH
City Council



Norfolk County Council

Using this document

The Joint Core Strategy was the subject of a Regulation 25 technical consultation between 4 August 2008 and 26 September 2008. The responses received to this consultation are shown on the following pages as detailed below:

Content	Page numbers
Representations, their summaries and assessments, and the suggested actions for the Joint Core Strategy	2 - 170
Summary of representations, suggested actions, and actual actions taken for the Joint Core Strategy	171 - 269

Respondents to the consultations may find details of any action taken with regard to the Joint Core Strategy in response to their representations by checking the details of their representation and GNDP suggested actions in the representations summaries in pages 2 – 170, and then cross-referencing with the summaries of actual actions taken shown in pages 171 – 269.

Please note that this document comprises two separate reports which have been merged and the page numbers referred to above are those in bold text at the foot of the page

Joint Core Strategy Technical consultation Reg. 25

Public Participation Report

6. Spatial strategy

Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>6. Spatial strategy</i>				
<i>Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</i>				
7004 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Comment	Unclear about your definitions of the words 'critical' and 'essential' and how they are being used in this context. A better approach might be to highlight what you feel are essential infrastructure requirements, and then say what are the highest priorities. We certainly regard improvements to water supply and sewage disposal as essential to safeguard internationally designated sites in response to increased growth. We would also consider green infrastructure to be essential and of high priority.	Noted	Consider wording in relation to critical and essential infrastructure
6838 - Parish Fields Practice (Ms Simone Johnson) [1191]	Comment	Concerns about the levels of growth within Diss, particularly in the provision of social housing and the impact that this has when additional resources are not provided. It is essential that social resources are allocated. The Diss Practices are currently working as part of the South Norfolk health Improvement Partnership (SNhIP). This may be one forum that can help shape the infrastructure requirements for the joint core strategy.	Noted.	Ensure the need for health facilities to support growth in Diss is taken account of.
7346 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]	Comment	Yes, except that we would suggest addition of completion of the A11 dualling is added to the requirements	Noted. Completion of dualling of the A11 is referred to in the plan and is the responsibility of the Highways Agency	No change to plan
7295 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	Comment	Duplicate of Rep. 7294	Duplicate of Rep. 7294	Duplicate of Rep. 7294
7756 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	The identified critical infrastructure should be consistent with the findings of the Norwich Growth Area Infrastructure Need and Funding Study (December 2007). The study states that: "The two most significant and urgent issues to be addressed relate to clean water provision in Norwich City Centre and Gas and Electricity supply to some of the key employment growth locations in particular Broadland Business Park and the Airport."	Noted	The findings of the studies will inform the infrastructure requirements set out in the Implementation section
7550 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	The current list of essential infrastructure requirements is deficient and should make specific reference to the	The essential supporting infrastructure already refers to the 'emergency services' and, as the representation notes, is also considered under Policy 19 'Implementation and monitoring'. (SM)	No change.
7330 - North Norfolk District Council (Ms. Jill Fisher) [1570]	Comment	Support for the overall approach taken in the plan, particularly NDR and new rail halts at Broadland Business Park and Rackheath and improved rail services from Wroxham	Noted	No change to plan

Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7837 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]	Comment	<p>The Draft Core Strategy is at odds with the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>In para.13.68, the approved RSS defines the Norwich Policy Area as the urban area of Norwich, the "first ring" of villages and the market town of Wymondham. Long Stratton is not mentioned and clearly falls outside of the "first ring", yet its inclusion in the NPA and appearance in each of the 3 development options is a "given" in the Draft Strategy.</p> <p>The following questions are wrongly predicated on the assumption that the NPA is fixed. The Core Strategy is not sound in that it is incompatible with the RSS, gives no reasons why this is so and provides no opportunity to discuss the strategic issues involved.</p>	Noted	Consider soundness of any proposed strategic options in relation to the RSS.
7518 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]	Comment	Yes, particularly to NDR and water infrastructure to support growth in NE	Noted	No change to plan
6966 - Nethergate Farms [6920]	Comment	Support dispersal of settlement and services to reduce the need for rural dwellers to travel.	Noted	Take account of support for dispersal of development on choosing growth options.
7654 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Comment	<p>Accept all other options. Objective 5 and objective 12 (to positively protect and enhance Norwich's individual character and unique cultural infrastructure) are likely to have implications on the Trunk Road network as they may result in tourists and other trips to the Norwich area.</p> <p>The hierarchy has changed slightly since the one listed in the 'Issues and Options' report from November 2007. The main change is the inclusion of mixed-use developments near the top of the hierarchy. The proposed locations could have a significant impact on the Trunk Road network.</p>	Noted	Consider implications for trunk road network in further assessment of objectives
7616 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	<p>Agree with assessment of the critical infrastructure requirements. Eco-community will be designed the development to minimise both water consumption and the need to dispose of waste off-site - similar approaches should be elsewhere to reducing pressures on existing and new infrastructure.</p> <p>Northern Norwich Distributor Route is not critical to the Rackheath Eco-community, but implementation will benefit economic development in the area and will enable develop high quality public transport links</p> <p>Affordable housing is a key concern and we are currently planning on the basis of up to 40% affordable housing in the Ecocommunity. It is important that all major developments are self sufficient in the key services as far as possible. New development can also bring benefits to existing communities by providing critical mass to allow service levels to be enhanced.</p>	Note support for strategy and its implementation	No change to plan

Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7426 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517] 7106 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400] 6839 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069] 7361 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 6944 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449] 7812 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 7597 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675] 7230 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681] 7689 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691] 7455 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] 7529 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment	In agreement	Noted(RB)	No change
7710 - Poringland Parish Council (Mrs C Milton) [2038]	Comment	We accept the critical infrastructure list, however we would like added 'a cessation of traffic restriction in and around the core commercial areas of Norwich'.	The strategy promotes continuing traffic restrictions in the city centre to make road space available to promote more sustainable forms of transport with consequent opportunities to improve the pedestrian environment, increase accessibility for all and reduce carbon dioxide	No change to plan
7786 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	To include leisure facilities and that an A140 By-pass needs to be an absolute must and it to be guaranteed that it would be in place before any development as in Options 2 & 3 are even considered further. The NDR should be a complete road and needs to join the A47 to	Noted.Norfolk County Council have concluded that the NDR should not link to the A47 to the west of Norwich due to the environmental effects on the internationally protected Wensum Valley.	Consider inclusion of leisure facilities in essential infrastructure and take account of views on Long Stratton by-pass
7712 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Comment	All options will lead to increase in traffic towards Norwich via the Thickthorn and Round House Way roundabouts. The Thickthorn roundabout is particularly busy and we have doubts that it could be improved very easily to take more traffic. Any increase in traffic would also make the All through Cringleford even busier.	Noted. All new development will have to provide the necessary infrastructure, including highways and public transport improvements, to enable that development to go ahead.	Take account of the likely need for improvements to A11 as a result of development.
7664 - Ifield Estates Limited (Mr Edward Olley) [4160]	Comment	Support sustainable spatial strategy which should include employment development at Thorpe St Andrew to comply with the regional plan.	Noted	No change to plan
7260 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	Small scale developemnts should not be required to contribute to geographically distant large scale infrastructure projects such as the NDR	Noted	Consider role of small scale development in contributing to larger scale infrastructure.

Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7177 - Hopkins Homes Ltd (Mr Chris Smith) [7104]	Comment	Hopkins Homes strongly suggests that without the commitment of significant financial resources to support the creation of some of the growth options currently suggested and apparently favoured, delivery within the desired timescales will prove difficult to say the least. a significant increase in the levels of homes and jobs proposed within the rural areas of the District should be	Noted.	The strategy will have to take account of delivery issues in identifying the most appropriate locations for development.
7718 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	Support for Long Stratton bypass as critical infrastructure and designation of the Long Stratton as a 'main town' with the correct infrastructure to support it.	Noted	Take account of support for Long Stratton bypass as key infrastructure
7640 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	Welcome the Spatial Vision is welcomed as a coherent and cohesive vision for the Greater Norwich area, reinforcing the existing strengths and qualities of the area and seeking to deliver significant new housing growth in the most sustainable manner. Believe that the case for increasing growth at Hethersett is particularly strong and that Mangreen does not have infrastructure to support growth.	Noted	Take account for support for growth at Hethersett in choice of
7849 - Sport England (East Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986]	Comment	Sport England support the identification of major transport, drainage, schools and health provision as critical infrastructure, but feel that formal and informal indoor and outdoor sports facilities should also be identified, as it is only through the provision of these facilities (as well as other key cultural facilities) that it will be possible to deliver genuine sustainable communities that enhance well-being and quality of life for both new	Noted	Consider including formal and informal indoor and outdoor sports facilities in list of essential infrastructure
7312 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Comment	We applaud the prominence given to 'Climate change and sustainability' but, as detailed in our full response to 'issues and options', question how the strategy lives up to these aspirations. It is surprising, given the stated need for a modal shift away from car use, that 2 out of the 3 'Critical infrastructure requirements' are to do with upgrading the road network. The other - 'Improvements to Water Supply....' - touches on an issue which, if an environmentally responsible path was pursued, could well	Noted. Upgrading of the road network is promoted to enable improvements to public transport. The Water Cycle Study is looking in detail at water supply issues and will inform the developing plan.	No change to plan
7608 - Trafford Estate Rackheath [8291]	Comment	In the light of the East of England Plan, the JCS should secure the base from which the necessary step-change in economic and housing delivery is achieved in the short/medium term whilst identifying a sound spatial policy framework for the longer term.	Noted	No change to plan
7669 - Mr Robert Debbage [6972]	Comment	Welcome the Spatial Vision as a coherent and cohesive vision for the Greater Norwich area, reinforcing the existing strengths and qualities of the area and seeking to deliver significant new housing growth in the most sustainable manner	Noted	No change to plan

Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7249 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	Comment	.Yes, but further studies required as in Aylsham	Noted	No change to plan. Ensure water issues at Aylsham are investigated further.
7355 - Bramerton Parish Council (Mr B Ansell) [1975]	Comment	Private cars will remain the most realistic form of transport for many activities undertaken by our residents and we are concerned that the focus on public transport, walking and cycling within Norwich may lead to increased barriers to private car access to the City from villages such as Bramerton.	The focus on sustainable modes of transport, whilst still enabling access by car, continues the previous structure plan strategy which has helped to increase accessibility to the city centre of Norwich and reduced traffic flows within it. The detail of the transport interventions needed to support growth will be set out in NATS and may include further Park and Ride sites.	No change to plan
6996 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	Comment	Add dualling of the A11 to the critical infrastructure.	This scheme is already programmed to be implemented and dualling of the A11 at Elvedon is promoted under Policy 16 'Strategic access and transportation'. (SM)	No change.
7645 - Cemex [8191]	Comment	Representation promotes development in specific locations owned by CEMEX	Representation does not relate to the question or the plan. Specific sites will be allocated through subsequent development plan documents in each district.	Ensure site information is passed on to relevant officers for site allocation plans.
7614 - Yare Valley Society (Mrs Andrew J Salisbury) [1006]	Comment	Concern that major new developments around Norwich protect the natural environment and primarily concerned for the protection of the Yare Valley west of the city.	Green infrastructure, including the Yare Valley, is a key element of the plan and development could make funds available for environmental enhancements within the Yare Valley	No change to plan
7081 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805] 7338 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	Comment	Yes, apart from no link between NDR and A47 west of Norwich	Noted. The county council have concluded that the environmental effects of a road through the Wensum Valley outweigh the potential transport benefits.	No change to plan
6927 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Comment	Yes, although a Long Stratton bypass should be considered 'Critical' not 'Essential Supporting'. A lack of EERA/SoS for Transport funding before 2016 should not downgrade its regional importance as one of only two arterial routes to/from the GNDP policy area.	Noted	Take account of view of strategic importance for Long Stratton by-pass.
6919 - Norfolk Environmental Waste Services (Mr David Beadle) [4376]	Comment	NEWS/SRM submitted a representation on the Issues and Options Consultation. An essential consideration for the Core Strategy set out within the original representation is the protection of strategic waste management facilities from the encroachment of other incompatible development that might threaten the function of those facilities. As this issue does not appear to have been picked up in this [Regulation 25 technical] consultation document we would like to take the opportunity to resubmit the content of that representation again for its	Noted. Such issues will be considered through site allocation documents and Development Control policies.	No change to plan

Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6904 - Greenhouse Trust (Mr Richard Bickle) [919]	Comment	Claim that "The Norwich area has a strong track record in planning and developing projects which champion environmental sustainability". Agree that there are examples of world-class new developments such as some of the recent buildings at the UEA, the Forum includede no renewable energy and attempts to retrofit renewables technology to existing buildings (which account for the bulk of emissions associated with the built environment) have in fact in the past been resisted by City Hall and only approved against the advice of planning officers (e.g. solar tubes on our Grade 2* building). Therefore, we suspect that claims such as those made in your document are likely to ring somewhat hollow with any readers with knowledge of the issues.	Norwich City Council has been requiring energy statements for a number of years and is actively implementing the RSS policy requiring a percentage of energy from renewables in all developments. National policy has recently been amended so retrofitting of microgeneration is now permitted development except on listed buildings and in conservation areas. This national approach is now similar to the approach taken in Norwich. The emerging startegy includes renewable energy policy based on an up to date Energy Study as required by government.	No change to plan
7183 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118] 7133 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	As well as identifying the infrastructure, the timing and a Delivery Plan also needs to be considered.	An Integrated Delivery Programme already exists for the Norwich Growth Point and the JCS will be accompanied by an Implementation Schedule which will be subject to testing through the EiP process. Details of infrastructure provision/delivery will also be set out in Site Specific Policies DPDs and Area Action Plans. (SM)	No change
7105 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Comment	The benefits of modal shift will be seriously undermined by major new road infrastructure, which should in any case be unnecessary if major modal shift is achieved.	Noted. The intention of the startegy is that the new roads will enable roadspace to be freed up in the city to promote further modal shift, building on Norwich's success in recent years.	No change to plan
7572 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Support inclusion of improvements to water quality and sewage disposal as critical infrastructure. Replace references to junction improvements and NDR with "implementation of NATS".	Noted	Consider replacement of references to junction improvements and NDR
7274 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Comment	Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd do not accept that the critical infrastructure is required to be delivered before any growth occurs in the Norwich Policy area. For instance, growth along the A11 corridor, including at Wymondham should not be contingent on the Norwich Northern Distributor Route being completed.	Noted. The plan does not preclude all development without provision of all infrastructure	No change to plan
6977 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Comment	Fully support the spatial vision for the Joint Core Strategy Area and identification of Wymonham as a potential growth location and Hingham and Poringland as Key Service Centres.	Noted	No change to plan
7497 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	Comment	The Spatial Vision is welcomed as a coherent and cohesive vision for the Greater Norwich area, reinforcing the existing strengths and qualities of the area and seeking to deliver significant new housing growth in the most sustainable manner	Noted	No change to plan

Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******Council's Assessment******Action***

Decision on Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Consider including formal and informal indoor and outdoor sports facilities in list of essential infrastructure

Take account of support for dispersal of development on choosing growth options.

Take account of support for Long Stratton bypass as key infrastructure

Consider soundness of any proposed strategic options in relation to the RSS.

Consider inclusion of leisure facilities in essential infrastructure and take account of views on Long Stratton by-pass

No change to plan. Ensure water issues at Aylsham are investigated further.

Consider role of small scale development in contributing to larger scale infrastructure.

Ensure site information is passed on to relevant officers for site allocation plans.

Ensure the need for health facilities to support growth in Diss is taken account of.

Take account of view of strategic importance for Long Stratton by-pass.

The strategy will have to take account of delivery issues in identifying the most appropriate locations for development.

The findings of the studies will inform the infrastructure requirements set out in the Implementation section

Consider wording in relation to critical and essential infrastructure

Take account for support for growth at Hethersett in choice of options.

Take account of the likely need for improvements to A11 as a result of development.

Consider implications for trunk road network in further assessment of objectives

Consider replacement of references to junction improvements and NDR

Q2. CITY CENTRE - Are you aware of any major issues that would prevent delivery of this proposed policy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7. Policy for places				
Q2. CITY CENTRE - Are you aware of any major issues that would prevent delivery of this proposed policy?				
6997 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	Comment	Over willingness of city council to accept objections to policy objectives may be a problem e.g. to development of St Andrews Hall as a concert venue. (MB)	Noted. A concert hall study has been undertaken as part of the evidence base for the JCS. This has recommended the city centre could support a medium scale mixed use facility designed for conferences and concerts. This should be city centre based and use an existing building.	Amend policy to cover the findings of the concert hall study
7711 - Poringland Parish Council (Mrs C Milton) [2038]	Comment	Development of city centre requires improved and affordable public transport. Until this is done, restrictions on car use should be stopped. The city must serve the hinterland not just itself. (MB)	Noted. Transport policies promote a shift way from car use to more sustainable modes of transport including bus rapid transit and park and ride to benefit all. Part of this policy approach includes restricting car use to reduce congestion and free up road space for improved public	No change to policies (MB)
7427 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517] 6840 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Capacity of sewers and other water infrastructure in city centre is a critical constraint on growth [RB]	Agree. Not seen as a barrier to redevelopment of previously developed land but has been a key factor in selection of locations for major new areas for growth in the Norwich Policy area. Also acknowledge that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has confirmed that more detailed assessment of flood risk at the site specific level will be needed for parts of the city centre , but can be undertaken in relation to site specific allocations Development plan Documents or Area Action Plans[RB]	No amendment to policy needed
7551 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	Relatively high crime rate in city centre affects focus as a destination. Reword policy to state "the main focus of city centre development should be to make Norwich a safe place to develop retail, leisure , office and culture activity". (MB)	Accepted (MB)	Amend policy to add focus on safety (MB)
7665 - Ifield Estates Limited (Mr Edward Olley) [4160]	Comment	Support townscape and public transport improvements in city centre to improve links to business parks amongst other locations.	Support noted	No change to plan
7573 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] 7092 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	Comment	Various environmental qualities raised in order to ensure satisfactory quality of places including City Centre [RB]	Agreed - but referred to in draft policy [RB]	No change [RB]
7655 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624] 7598 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675] 7231 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681] 7530 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223] 7617 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	Major issue highlighted relates to improved public transport and related matters [RB]	Agree this is critical . Mentioned in policy in terms of access to city centre from areas of major growth. Overall strategy fro growth places great emphasis on improved public transport [RB]	no amendment needed to policy [RB]
7646 - Cemex [8191]	Comment	Promore CEMEX site for employment development	Subsequent Site allocation plan will alloacte sites.	No change to plan

Q2. CITY CENTRE - Are you aware of any major issues that would prevent delivery of this proposed policy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7347 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]	Comment	Over willingness of city council to accept objections to policy objectives may be a problem (MB)	Noted. (MB)	None (MB)
6915 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	Comment	Support policy as it contains all the vital elements to maintain Norwich in its role as the regional centre. It is expected that a Core Strategy should contain a policy to introduce a strategy for the town centre as it is the role of the Core Strategy is to set out the scale of development envisaged with a subsequent AAP to focus on how the strategy will be delivered.	Support noted. Implementation will be through a combination of the site allocation plan, an area action plan for the Northern City centre and a Masterplan for the St Stephens area. Further SPDs may be required.	No change to plan
6905 - Greenhouse Trust (Mr Richard Bickle) [919] 7082 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805] 7719 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022] 7757 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	Limitations of capacity may restrict the amount of housing which can be accommodated in the city centre . The potential saturation of the market for apartments and need for more family housing may further limit the potential. Others say more housing should be provided in the city as a whole, and that the need to accommodate other central areas uses needs to be taken into account	The concern is noted - the Completion of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment should provide a definitive view on this issue	No change at present
7713 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Comment	Oppose further development at Cringleford.	This representation does not relate to this policy. Consider views expressed in relation to growth options.	No change to plan.
7313 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Comment	Some city centre sites such as Anglia Square now being developed at lower densities than previously envisaged due to market downturn. Fear this place pressure for greater infill on green spaces to meet housing targets.	Appropriate locations will be protected from development through being allocated as green spaces in the Site Allocation Plan. (MB)	Allocate green spaces in other DPDs (MB)
7005 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934] 7339 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 7107 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400] 7275 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425] 7362 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 7813 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 7456 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] 7261 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	No Specific barriers raised - though other issues touched upon in some cases	Noted	No change needed

Decision on Q2. CITY CENTRE - Are you aware of any major issues that would prevent delivery of this proposed policy?

Amend policy to cover the findings of the concert hall study (MB)

Allocate green spaces in other DPDs (MB)

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

7363 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	Sewerage / surface water. Evidence of over capacity currently especially in Wymondham evidence by flooding	Noted	Consider surface water issues through the plan
--	---------	--	-------	--

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7498 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	Comment	Option 1 or 2 is strongly preferred over Option 3 as they contain more growth at Easton / Costessey. Costessey has an excellent level of shops, services and employment sites, and is very well connected to the centre of Norwich through frequent bus services and a park-and-ride site. It is therefore suitable to accommodate a minimum of 2000 new dwellings in the years to 2026.	Support for growth at Easton / Costessey using existing infrastructure noted	Consider support for growth at Easton Costessey in choice of options.
7677 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	Comment	NDR and implementation of findings of Water Cycle Study will be important in relation to development of Royal Norfolk Golf VClub site.	Noted. Any development to the north of Norwich will have to ensure sewerage is not taken through city centre sewers.	No change to plan.
7514 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]	Comment	Housing allocations in Aylsham should not be restricted by the water cycle study findings as Anglian water have made it clear that they will provide water infrastructure for new development. Soundness of plan called into question by not having revised SA to accompany Technical Consultation document.	Noted. The Water Cycle Study identifies areas where there is existing headroom at sewerage treatment works so no improvement would be required.	Ensure Water Cycle Study continues to inform emerging plan.
7340 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	Comment	We are unable to answer any more questions as the questions are asked of the areas and providers where developments are likely to take place	Noted	No change to plan
7276 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Comment	A commercial led mixed use development scheme at East Wymondham (Browick Road) can be delivered within existing infrastructure capacity.	Noted. Such site specific issues will be considered through subsequent DPDs.	No change to plan.
7855 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	Comment	Concern that there is no mention of increased leisure facilities for use by all age groups, including youth activities. The provision of sports grounds and pitches together with community halls and the attraction of leisure businesses (eg Cinemas) is considered a vital infrastructure requirement to support communities.	Leisure facilities to serve new developments are required through the plan. These are likely to be provided on site, but off site provision involving improvements to existing facilities can sometimes be more suitable.	No change to plan
7303 - Eastern Storage Equipment [8283]	Comment	The Northumberland Street/Waterworks Road Industrial Estate should not be retained as a largely commercial/industrial estate. The market signals in recent years have been clear: given the increasingly residential nature of the area, the Estate is no longer an appropriate location for industrial and commercial employment buildings. Such operations are much better sited away from residential areas and close to arterial roads and the trunk road network. The Joint Core Strategy and emerging Site Allocations DPDs should therefore take the chance to identify more suitable sites for industrial/commercial development and allow the conversion of the Estate to residential use (perhaps also with some B1 office development), thus making best use of brownfield land which is well-related to the city centre with excellent public transport links and the adjacent primary/first school.	Noted. This plan will identify strategic employment sites. Any change of use of specific smaller scale sites such as this should be considered through subsequent DPDs.	No change to plan. Ensure issue of use of Northumberland Street industrial area is considered through the Norwich Site Allocation Plan.
7690 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Comment	We assume that the North East Sector Sprowston/Rackheath growth area would include fields 11-14 and 18-20, as on attached map, south of a line along Beeston Lane	This plan is strategic. Detailed site allocations in the NE will be considered through the Area Action Plan.	No change to plan

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7707 - Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement [8170]	Comment	Land at Cringleford can accommodate a high quality business park and housing, thereby creating a distinctive gateway on the strategically significant approach to the centre of Norwich along the A11 corridor. The delivery of the growth agenda must incorporate a mixture of large scale and small/medium scale development locations, dispersed around the Norwich area in suitable/sustainable locations. Our clients own land in the Yare Valley off Keswick Road/The Loke and in the vicinity of Cringleford Wood/Gurney Lane. These areas could form part of the wider green infrastructure anticipated in Policy 4, brought forward as part of the wider Newmarket Road Gateway.	It is probable that it will be necessary for development to proceed in a number of locations to achieve the necessary delivery rates.	Consider option for housing and employment growth at
7599 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]	Comment	Option 1 is the most viable in terms of the findings of the underpinning studies. Option 2 & 3 are likely to result in even more development coming to South Norfolk as it will be difficult, in planning terms, to limit development to Wymondham. It is also highly unlikely that the levels of development proposed for Long Stratton will fund a by-pass for the necessary growth in schools and other infrastructure.	Noted	The amount of investment required in different options will be a key issue for members in choosing the growth option.
7647 - Cemex [8191]	Comment	Support option 1 as it can make use of the significant existing infrastructure and services in the SW area, in accordance with PPS1.	Noted	Take account of existing infrastructure and services in making choice of options.
6802 - Roger Heap [5766]	Comment	Focus all development in one new town with its own services and facilities	Noted. A single new town would be highly unlikely to achieve the level of growth required in the plan period and to meet short term need. This is because of the long time period taken to establish the necessary infrastructure for such a large scale development.	No change to plan
7574 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	It should be made clear that extensive new green infrastructure is needed in relation to development between Wymondham and the bypass in addition to that between Hethersett and Wymondham. We assume that this is intended with references to Tiffey valley but it should be made more explicit.	Noted. This issue has been considered through the Green Infrastructure Study will be dealt with in more detail in subsequent DPDs.	No change to plan
6945 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	Care should be taken to ensure that there are links to existing infrastructure, housing, and employment sites rather than requiring entirely new infrastructure.	Noted.	No change to plan
7042 - Horsham & Newton St Faith Parish Council (Mr Michael Haslam) [7652]	Comment	The additional infrastructure required to implement a new business park north of the airport comprises a new access road and junction with A 140 and then the usual on-site infrastructure of roads, foul and surface water sewers, water, gas, electricity and telecommunications.	Noted	No change to plan
7531 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment	The critical infrastructure requirements have been correctly identified.	Noted	No action

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6998 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	Comment	A11 dualling and improvements to broadband connections in the Queens Hills and Longwater areas. There may be a need for a new telephone exchange closer to any more development in this area.	Noted. The A11 dualling is referred to in the plan. Consider issue of broadband connections.	Consider issue of broadband connections.
7618 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	Propose development at Rackheath integrated with existing settlement, and the established industrial areas, to create a community of around 5000 dwellings with a full range of services and facilities. This is being planned in accordance with the government's Eco-towns objectives and standards as set out in the DCLG Eco-towns progress report of July 2008.	Noted. Any development with ecotown status will have to be built to the highest standards required by central government. Such a development could provide an important local and national exemplar.	Take account of ecotown proposal in considering choice of options
7814 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	aside from the primary care facilities that are implied in the 3 options, NHS Norfolk would need to consider what additional capacity will be required for community services (ie district nursing, health visiting, midwifery, physio etc) as well as secondary care capacity (including acute and mental health care).	Noted. Such facilities would be best located in district centres in new settlements.	No change to plan
7758 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	Hethersett area does not have the social infrastructure to accommodate 4,000 new homes. The village has a limited number of services within walking distance, and the allocation of houses here would encourage car based travel. Development within this area would also be contrary to current planning policies which seek to prevent the coalescence of Wymondham and Norwich respectively.	Any new development would have to provide the infrastructure and services to support it. Green infrastructure would have to be provided and could form a strategic gap to prevent coalescence.	Take account of views on limited services in Hethersett to accommodate growth.
7342 - Tasburgh Parish Council (Mrs Julie King) [7053]	Comment	Oppose growth at Long Stratton. If LS is chosen for growth there must be a by-pass and other highway and cycling improvements on A140 and additional services in LS i.e. Heath Centre, Leisure Centre, Village Hall, Schools. Support growth at Aylsham and opposed to further	Noted. Any new development would have to provide the services and infrastructure to support that development.	Take account of services regarded as necessary to support any growth at Long Stratton.

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7152 - Norwich Consolidated Charities (Mr S. A. Franklin) [1325] 7161 - Taylor Wimpey (Mr Colum Fitzsimons) [7258] 7609 - Trafford Estate Rackheath [8291]	Comment	<p>Welcome focus on existing suburbs and immediate urban/rural fringe as " a key to the successful development of the area" and on a variety of scales of growth sites in the area. The achievement of the necessary housing delivery rates in the short/medium term will arise if the spatial strategy promotes an approach which incorporates a range of urban extensions, both in terms of scale and distribution.</p> <p>A strategic employment proposal on Newmarket Road, combined with some further housing, would represent an appropriate response to the strategic location of this general area, adjoining the interchange between the A11 and the A47. The employment aspect of the Norwich Gateway proposal would be well related to the new housing presently being developed off Round House Way. The smaller housing component of the Norwich Gateway scheme would be well related both to the existing/proposed employment areas in Cringleford/Colney and linked to the City Centre by a well-established public transport link from the Thickthorn park and ride site along Newmarket Road.</p>	Note support for a variety if scales of growth in the area, including gateway developments.	Consider potential of smaller urban fringe areas in helping to achieve overall growth targets.
7207 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	<p>Bus service, roads, cycle paths, rail stops, Sewage and drainage, Hi-speed internet - inadequate at present.</p>	Any new development will be required to provide the services necessary to enable that development to go ahead. This is covered in the implementation section of	No change to plan
7326 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Comment	<p>West': Costessey & Easton, Options 1 & 2: 2000 homes. Option 3: 1000 homes. 35. This option appears unsuitable for development being both part of the Bypass Landscape Protection Zone and the Yare Valley. Present policy clearly and place-specifically precludes development here and we would question why it has been considered as an option. Other areas in the North and West of the area at present form part of the 'green wedge'. Woodland immediately to the north of the Dereham Road and the A47 to the West with its attendant protection zone would appear to act as further barriers to development. The protection zone has, for the last 15 years, served the role as defined by the Structure Plan Panel of preserving 'those attributes of the City's natural setting which contribute to its environmental quality'. It is important that this laudable aim is not overridden.</p>	Noted. Any new development permitted as a result of this strategy would have to provide green infrastructure to serve that development. If any sites chosen for allocation through subsequent DPDs are in the previous Structure Plan landscape protection zone, this would have to be considered in the masterplanning of such development.	No change to plan.
6898 - M. Falcon Property Solutions (Mr Michael Falcon) [7186]	Comment	<p>There is an opportunity for a new parkway railway station, at Mangreen, as a catalyst for economic growth and to serve housing.</p>	Noted.	Investigate further with Network Rail if such a station would be acceptable and practicable on the London mainline.
6801 - Mrs H Williamson [6288]	Comment	<p>Opposed to further growth in Hethersett due to problems stemming from recent development and need to protect green space around village.</p>	Noted	Take account of opposition to growth in Hethersett

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7296 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	Comment	<p>The impact of 4,000 homes at Wymondham, 4,000 at Hethersett and 2,000 at Costessey/Easton may require additional electrical network upgrades to ensure continuity of supply to these locations and wider locations such as Attleborough and Dereham which are dependent on supply from the Trowse supergrid station.</p> <p>Question 4:</p> <p>Constraints on delivery could include energy (principally electricity supplies) and road capacity on the A11 and A47, especially at Longwater and Thickthorn. The capacity of rail to serve expanded communities at Wymondham and beyond is questioned.</p>	Noted. Road and energy capacity will be considered through this plan, taking account of likley growth in the A11 corridor in breckland.	No change to plan
7510 - Alex and Peter Valori / Faircloth and Baker [7209]	Comment	<p>Based on experience in Stevenage where no development has resulted fro an attempt to focus all development in one area, propose a startegy based on a focus on multiple locations around the urban fringe, with very limited development beyond the A47.</p> <p>This should be supported by an inner eastern relief road between the A47 and the Wroxham Road in advance of the NOR to support development in the NE.</p>	Noted. The emerging strategy recongrnises that locating all development in one area would be unlikely to lead to delivery of growth within timescales.	Take account of the view that multiple urban fringe sites should be promoted though the startegy
7316 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Comment	Technical Consultation should be more specific on locations for growth with more detailed mapping.	This is a strategic plan which idetifies broad areas appropraite for grwoth, without identifying specific sites to be alloacted for growth. This will be done through subsequent DPDs.	No change to plan
7656 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Comment	Highways Agency agrees with the statement that the differences between the options need further evaluation.	Noted	Ensure highways implications of the choice of options is considered further.
7321 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Comment	Much of this area is currently protected under ENV2 which provides for green wedges and forbids 'inappropriate development' which 'would be detrimental to the rural character of the area'. It is precisely that character and the separate identity of the villages which would, of course, be lost with these proposals and which local residents have shown such desire to protect. There are natural environment protection sites in the area and the main road network is at or near capacity.	Any development will have to provide green infrastructure, protect and enhance natural sites and provide transport infrastructure to support its growth.	Take account of constraints in Little Melton and Hethersett area.

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7661 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Comment	<p>Option 1 correctly identifies a key dependency of this Option as being significant highway improvements at the following locations on the A47 Trunk Road network. However, no indication is given as to the nature, scale, feasibility or cost of the improvements required, and whether or not their effectiveness to deal with the forecast traffic flows has been modelled. More evidence is required on this issue.</p> <p>The Highways Agency's view is that major residential development in the Longwater area is inherently less sustainable than the other locations proposed. Although there is an employment area at Longwater, there are no proposals to enlarge it (the phrase used in Policy 2 is only 'consolidation of activity') and this could lead to a larger proportion of out-commuting from a residential area here.</p>	Noted. It is accepted that further work is required in detailing works required around the A47 by-pass to support	Ensure further work is undertaken concerning transport improvements required to support
7532 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment	<p>There is no indication as to whether the site(s) being considered lie to the north or the south of the A47: if they are to the south (eg at Easton), the question of how local movements between the new residential area and the existing employment (and retail) area can be encouraged to use non-car modes of travel should be investigated and if necessary suitable infrastructure to facilitate this</p> <p>While we welcome the fact that the option identifies a strategic employment site at Colney, the option is unclear about the scale of residential development which could take place at Colney Lane and which would benefit from the education and employment opportunities available at this location and the high quality public transport links which the strategy would promote. Our investment strategy for Colney Lane is intended to maximise these benefits and could complement the proposed</p>	Noted	No change to plan
7006 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Comment	Significant infrastructure - following the findings of the Norwich Water Cycle Strategy, additional facilities for the treatment and disposal of sewage and the identification of new points for water abstraction; waste disposal; inter-connected networks of green infrastructure meeting the ANGst standards; sustainable transport options	Noted. The studies and standards referred to all form part of the evidence base and are helping in the development of the plan	No change
6920 - Norfolk Environmental Waste Services (Mr David Beadle) [4376]	Comment	Strategic Waste Management Facilities	Noted	No change to plan
7838 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]	Comment	None	Noted	No change to plan
7452 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] 7651 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Comment	Hempnall Parish Council strongly objects to all three options. The amount of housing development is incompatible with maintaining a rural hinterland to Norwich, something which Hempnall Parish Council considers to be extremely valuable to the county as a whole.	The amount of housing development must be met to meet the requirements of the regional plan. This plan prioritises the use of brownfield land to reduce greenfield land use, but brownfield site development opportunities will reduce in the next twenty years. Green infrastructure will play a key role in ensuring new development does not have a negative influence on the rural hinterland.	No change to plan

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7083 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	Comment	None, but those identified should be in place before any major development	Major infrastructure will be provided to accompany development, co-ordinated through an implementation plan with this strategy.	NO change to plan
7552 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	All development will require an increase in Police resources. Norfolk Constabulary objects to the current details of significant infrastructure requirements. The scale of development envisaged in the specified areas will have a	The requirement for this level of growth is set out in the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy. The JCS seeks to identify the appropriate locations for the growth, taking account of the increased infrastructure required to support the different growth options.	Engage police further through JCS to identify best use of existing resources and further infrastructure needs.
7134 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	All the major growth locations identified will involve significant investment in infrastructure. The Core Strategy should seek to maximise the amount of development to the North East in order to support that infrastructure and utilise the capacity created and should plan ahead for up to 10,000 dwellings to 2031. The Core Strategy should clarify the intentions regarding growth within the NNDR and at Rackheath. We consider that there is scope for a mixed use urban extension of at least 6,000 homes within the area bounded by Wroxham Road, the proposed NNDR and A47 at Postwick over the longer term.	It is probable that it will be necessary for development to proceed in the north east simultaneously in a number of locations to achieve the necessary delivery rates. It is also likely that the ultimate form of development will consist of a number of "villages" or "neighbourhoods" each with their own local facilities. However there are certain elements of high level infrastructure which will need to be shared, for example a high school and major public transport infrastructure and therefore some coordination between the different elements of the major development	Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed
7428 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	Provision of green infrastructure forming a coherent scheme across the JCS area should be considered at an early stage. Whilst open/ green spaces can be created within development adequate links and corridors may require more strategic planning. An assumption has been made within stage 2 of the WCS that all sewer networks are at capacity and therefore costs and timings will need to be factored into any future growth. Within Norwich City Centre, flood risk is likely to be the greatest environmental constraint. As discussed above, a level 2a SFRA would help to assess the varying risk across the City Centre and plan around it. We would also support an interdisciplinary approach, for example allocating green spaces to areas unsuitable for built development due to high flood risk. Such an approach may help reduce flood risk overall by securing or even improving the provision of floodplain within Norwich.	Noted. The findings of the WCS and Green Infrastructure Study will play a key role in the masterplanning of new communities. The Level 2 SFRA for the city centre will be done and will inform Norwich's site allocation DPD.	No change to plan. Ensure Level 2 SFRA done for Norwich site allocation DPD.
7612 - Yare Valley Society (Mrs Andrew J Salisbury) [1006]	Comment	Concern that Hethersett/Little Melton (Options 1 and 2) would create pressures for changes to the links with the City, threatening the environment and the Yare valley in particular.	Noted. Any new development would have to provide the infrastructure to support that development, including improvements to green infrastructure such as the Yare Valley.	Take account of potential threats to the Yare Valley in the choice of options.
7228 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232]	Comment	Need for Northern Distributor Road and employment sites providing a variety of different scales of employment opportunity.	Noted. The NDR is a key element in all options. The chosen option will need to provide a wide variety of employment sites. Strategic sites will be identified through this plan and smaller sites in subsequent DPDs.	No change to plan

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7318 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Comment	Wymondham itself is, of course, an historic market town with its own unique heritage and identity. Development even on the scale proposed in options 2 and 3 would do much to erode the character of the town of which its residents have shown a strong desire to protect. A recent consultation exercise by Wymondham Town Council found that resisting further major development was a key priority of those that took part. It was also widely felt that improvement to services and infrastructure should come ahead of any development and that protection of the natural environment was of prime importance.	Noted. Any new development will have to provide the services and infrastructure to enable that development to go ahead, including green infrastructure.	Take account of views on growth in Wymondham and the need for any growth to be supported by infrastructural improvements and landscape protection.
7348 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]	Comment	A11 dualling and improvements to broadband in Queens Hills and Longwater areas. There may be a need for a new telephone exchange closer to any more development in this area.	A11 dualling referred to in plan.	Consider broadband services in Costessey area.
7117 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	Comment	Need for NDR and rail halt on Sheringham railway line.	Noted.	Further investigate the potential for a rail halt on the Sheringham line to serve any future growth.
7720 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	This option would be dependant on the linking up of the NNDR and the A47. The infrastructure required for this option would make it by far the most expensive.	The County Council have fully considered the issue of linking the NDR to the A47 via the Wensum Valley and concluded that it is not viable due to the environmental sensitivity of the valley.	No change to plan.
6841 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report. It would appear that option 1 is the most readily deliverable option taking into account water and wastewater infrastructure requirements, but this should be validated by the Water Cycle Study before final selection	Note support for option 1 from Anglian Water, dependent on further findings from Water Cycle Study	Take account of water infrastructure issues as required by RSS when choosing options.
7457 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	Additional roads/ transport provision to enable access to the new development from existing major roads. Current minor roads not suitable for large increase in traffic. consideration should be given to some form of restriction for direct access for traffic and the potential increase in the volume of traffic through existing villages.	Noted. Any new development will have to provide such links to major roads and any improvements required to the main roads to serve the development. Minor road restrictions will be considered at the more detailed planning	No change to plan.
7250 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	Comment	Should include Trowse	Noted.	Consider including Trowse in option 1.
7787 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	For Leisure facilities and for street lighting.. More dwellings in Hethersett and Wymondham could mean more traffic on the roads in and out of Long Stratton & these would need to be upgraded as vehicles travel across country in many instances & no matter what the A 140 bypass is required to be in place first should Option 2 or 3 eventually be proceeded with.	Noted. New development will have to produce the services and infrastructure to support that growth.	No change to plan.

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7018 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment	Delivering growth in the sub-region is likely to require a significant investment in infrastructure. However, the starting point for any strategy and development must be to manage the impact on existing infrastructure and change travel and consumption behaviours. Our proposals for Easton seek to deliver improvements in non-car facilities and access to Easton College so as to lessen the impact on existing infrastructure such as the	Potential role in sustainable transport improvements related to proposals at Easton noted.	Take account of sustainable transport potential at Easton in relation to choice of options.

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******Council's Assessment******Action***

Decision on Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Ensure issue of use of Northumberland Stareet industrial area is considered through the Norwich Site Allocation Plan.

Take account of constraints in Little Melton and Hethersett area.

Ensure highways implications of the choice of options is considered further.

Engage police furtherthrough JCS to identify best use of existing resources and further infrastructure needs.

Consider support for growth at Easton Costessey in choice of options.

Investigate further with Network Rail if such a station would be acceptable and practicable on the London mainline.

Further investigate the potential for a rail halt on the Sheringham line to serve any future growth.

No change to plan. Ensure Level 2 SFRA done for Norwich site allocation DPD.

Consider option for housing and employment growth at Cringleford.

Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans.

Take account of ecotown proposal in considering choice of options

Take account of views on limited services in Hethersett to accommodate growth.

Ensure Water Cycle Study continues to inform emerging plan.

Consider surface water issues through the plan

Take account of services regarded as necessary to support any growth at Long Stratton.

Consider potential of smaller urban fringe areas in helping to achieve overall growth targets.

The amount of investment required in different options will be a key issue for members in choosing the growth option.

Consider issue of broadband connections.

Take account of water infrastructure issues as required by RSS when choosing options.

Take account of views on growth in Wymondham and the need for any growth to be supported by infrastructural improvements and landscape protection.

Consider broadband services in Costessey area.

Take account of sustainable transport potential at Easton in relation to choice of options.

Consider including Trowse in option 1.

Take account of existing infrastructure and services in making choice of options.

Ensure further work is undertaken concerning transport improvements required to support growth.

Take account of opposition to growth in Hethersett

Take account of potential threats to the Yare Valley in the choice of options.

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Take account of the view that multiple urban fringe sites should be promoted through the strategy		
Q4. FOR OPTION 1 - What are the constraints to delivery?				
7349 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]	Comment	see question 3	see question 3	None
6842 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2a	Noted	No change to plan at this stage. Incorporate later findings of Water Cycle Study as plan develops
6978 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Comment	Need for greater clarity concerning the proposed settlement hierarchy	Noted	Ensure hierarchy policy provides clarity
7208 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Need for coordination between agencies and planning of infrastructure.	Co-ordination between agencies is vital for the successful implementation of the plan. It is a requirement that the strategy contains a framework for infrastructure delivery and this will be included in later revisions.	Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.
7232 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	Comment			
7533 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment			
7678 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	Comment			
7019 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment			
7431 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	All infrastructure should be in place in time, and where relevant operational, for development. This is as applicable for green infrastructure as for conventional infrastructure. Use of phasing will be important to enable AWS to factor any required improvement works into their business plans.	Noted. Detailed site specific phasing will be established through relevant DPDs and masterplans. The WCS will continue to inform plan making and a level 2 s fra will be done to inform the site allocation plan.	No change to plan
		The WCS provides information on the relative constraints of development in the locations proposed we assume that the findings of stage 1 have already been taken into account when deciding on the proposed areas for development and that stage 2a will be used to narrow down the options further.		
		Within Norwich City Centre, flood risk is likely to be the greatest environmental constraint. As discussed above, a level 2a SFRA would help to assess the varying risk across the City Centre and plan around it. We would also support an interdisciplinary approach, for example allocating green spaces to areas unsuitable for built development due to high flood risk. Such an approach may help reduce food risk overall by securing or even improving the provision of floodplain within Norwich.		

Q4. FOR OPTION 1 - What are the constraints to delivery?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7856 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	Comment	In terms of the proposed increase in South & East Wymondham delivery is constrained by access to the proposed land. There is currently no access to the All and access to the existing Town centre is through a relatively narrow rail bridge. This will result in a separate community being created.	The comments relate to detail of constraints of a specific site. The level of detail is inappropriate for this joint core strategy. The site constraints will be considered at the site specific stages.	No change to plan
7364 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	Highway infrastructure required	Co-ordination between agencies is vital for the successful implementation of the plan. It is a requirement that the strategy contains a framework for infrastructure delivery and this will be included in later revisions.	Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.
7575 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Regarding green infrastructure to the West, the Yare Valley and Bawburgh Lakes already have high biodiversity value and it will be critical to retain this value if there is increased public access to these areas. The evidence for this can be found in the number of County Wildlife Sites in the area whose ecological value is only maintained through management that seeks to zone areas for wildlife and for public access. In contrast Bawburgh Pits CWS currently provides a secluded wildlife area with limited public access and careful development would be required to ensure that increased access did not harm the biodiversity value of this area.	Policy 17 refers to the green infrastructure and the draft green infrastructure strategy	No change to plan
6929 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Comment	Delivery of housing land in Wymondham will require considerable site assembly and co-ordination of landowners by a promoter	Noted	No change to plan
6908 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027]	Comment	The proposed improvements to the A11 at Elvedon, expansion of the NRP, additional housing at Wymondham, Longwater, Cringleford and Attleborough will all put additional load on the B1108/A47/A11 - to put a new town into the middle of this would be disastrous!	Any new location for development would have to provide the necessary infrastructure to enable that development to go ahead.	Ensure implementation of plan section includes infrastructure required to support any growth location.
7759 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	As stated previously the level of social infrastructure in Hethersett and Little Melton is incapable of absorbing 4,000 new dwellings. A larger amount of housing should be allocated in Wymondham where there is already a range of social infrastructure that could comfortably be developed further through the plan period.	The current levels of social infrastructure in Hethersett and Little Melton is insufficient to support the growth proposed in this option. Along side housing growth the strategy proposes significant enhancement to the full range of social infrastructure and new local employment sites appropriate to the scale of growth proposed.	No change to plan
7619 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	Programming of infrastructure works Ensuring adequate and timely investment in public	Agreed, it is agreed that the timely provision and funding for infrastructure is fundamental to the success of this	Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.
7815 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	This option would create additional jobs in the health sector. A major constraint to delivery could be availability of appropriately skilled staff in the primary, community and secondary healthcare sectors.	Ensuring a supply of the skilled staff to deliver services will be a challenge. This question is concerned with physical infrastructure and therefore the comment is not directly relevant.	No change to plan

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7196 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	Comment	The growth strategy for Wymondham should favour more, smaller sites as opposed to fewer larger sites that are dependent on considerable investment in associated infrastructure. Such a strategy carries less risk and improves housing delivery rates.	The comments are noted.	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. No change to the plan
7184 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]	Comment	All existing employment sites are constrained. To deliver the 250 Ha of required to drive employment growth, a further strategic employment site should be allocated in the joint core strategy and this should be at Harford Bridges that will enable early delivery.	The strategic employment locations Broadland Business Park, Longwater, the Airport and NRP are supported in the East of England Plan. There are constraints to these sites at present, but as strategic sites the emphasis is on overcoming these known problems rather than looking to new sites. There is no evidence to suggest that a new strategic site as proposed would be any less constrained than existing sites.	
6946 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	Cost of large scale infrastructure provision and the time take to develop it, links should be made with the existing infrastructure to remove this potential constraint.	Noted	Ensure implementation plan takes account of making best use of existing infrastructure
7043 - Horsham & Newton St Faith Parish Council (Mr Michael Haslam) [7652]	Comment	Concerned that the triangle symbol for this proposed strategic employment business park on all three option diagrams is located to the south of the proposed northern distributor road (NNDR) and on land that is within the operational area of the airport and is not therefore available for development.	A key diagram is not intended to give a detailed location for potential development, but rather a strategic	Consider amendment to key diagram to relocate employment symbol to north of airport

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7007 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Comment	<p>Issues over</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. water availability and quality; 2. proximity to designated sites (including County Wildlife Sites and Roadside Nature Reserves as well as statutorily designated sites; 3. impacts on protected species (with special reference to great crested newts in the south Norfolk claylands); 4. impacts on biodiversity action plan species and habitats; potential to damage linkages and green corridors between existing sites of biodiversity importance; 5. funding shortfalls especially with regard to continuing management of green infrastructure provision. <p>Notwithstanding the above, when individual site allocations are proposed, it will be necessary to survey the sites for protected species and priority BAP habitats and species.</p> <p>List of potentially vulnerable sites within the Norwich policy area provided</p>	<p>Noted. The plan is informed by a Water Cycle Study and is subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment to ensure that the chosen option has does not have a negative impact on biodiversity assets.</p>	<p>Ensure that the plan takes account of the findings of the evidence base and environmental appraisals so that growth options enhance and promote biodiversity assets</p>
7555 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	<p>Norfolk Constabulary will require capital funding via the community levy scheme to provide additional Police infrastructure to growth areas.</p>	<p>The requirements Norfolk Constabulary are noted.</p>	<p>Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.</p>
7084 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	Comment	<p>Doubts over provision of infrastructure first</p>	<p>Any new development will have to provide the necessary infrastructure to enable that development to go ahead. The necessary infrastructure fro teh chosen growth option will be set out in the implementation section of the plan.</p>	<p>No change to plan</p>
7135 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	<p>Area NE of Norwich in multiple ownership. Landowners wish to work with GNPD through JCS, site specific plans and planning application process to ensure delievery of new community. Link road from Wroxham Road to Broadland Business Park important to ensuring delivery</p>	<p>Noted. Co-operation in working in working through the development plan process is welcomed.</p>	<p>No chnage to plan</p>
7691 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Comment	<p>Early development would be possible provided that all land west of A1151 is treated as a discrete part of the Growth sector, with its own Brief, and is not held back by being required to form a single Masterplan exercise with the Rackheath/Thorpe End main parts [as implied by</p>	<p>The large scale growth locations will need to be considered in their entirety to ensure proper infrastructure planning and delivery. This is why the JCS proposes a single</p>	<p>No change to plan</p>
7788 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	<p>For Option I a thorough inspection in respect of the adequacy of drainage and water is required, and improvements as found to be necessary proceeded with</p>	<p>Co-ordination between agencies is vital for the successful implementation of the plan. It is a requirement that the strategy contains a framework for infrastructure delivery and this will be included in later revisions. A Water Cycle Study has been done as part of the evidence base for this startegy which informs Anglian Water of water infrastructure needs to serve new development.</p>	<p>Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7499 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	Comment	It is important to emphasise that the above site has minimal constraints to delivery (questions 4 and 8) and therefore housing provision to meet demand could be brought forward in a relatively short space of time. As stated above, there are not anticipated to be significant infrastructure requirements although the impact upon the Longwater junction which is expected to be minimal will need to be confirmed. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 and given the current use of the site as agricultural land, it is not thought that there will be any significant issues in terms of archaeology or contamination. Work is also on-going with Norfolk Wildlife Services with regard to ecology to ensure that these issues are fully addressed once the site comes forward.	The comments relate to detail of constraints of a specific site. The level of detail is inappropriate for this joint core strategy. The site constraints will be considered at the site specific stages.	No change to plan
7120 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	Comment	The trust will work with through the Princes Trust on an Enquiry by Design process with landowners and other stakeholders NE of Norwich. This will ensure there is effective masterplanning and assessment of the infrastructure required to enable development of this area to go ahead.	Such an approach is welcomed if it can be timed to contribute to the legal plan making process through the JCS and Area action plans in Broadland	No change to plan
7721 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	If this option was taken without a link between the NNDR and the A47 amount of traffic generated trying to access north of Norwich would be unsustainable.	The County Council were persuaded that the conflict with internationally important ecological considerations ruled out the possibility of completing of the link across the Wensum valley to the A 47	No change to plan
7170 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]	Comment	Employment land should be protected, but the definition of employment uses should not be overly restrictive to restrict employment choice and opportunity.	Comment noted but does not identify a constraint to delivery for the strategy.	No change. Detailed issues of use classes will be resolved in site specific and area action plan
7839 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]	Comment	The option is heavily dependent on bringing forward large sites in undeveloped locations, increasing the need for infrastructure and putting additional cost burden on development which may lead to slower than expected delivery.	The spatial distribution of growth has sought to maximise capacity in existing infrastructure. Even so significant investment is required.	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
7093 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	Comment	Several of the proposed development areas contain sites of archaeological importance. Impact of development on these sites will require mitigation in the form of preservation by record or preservation in situ.	Noted. Subsequent plans will set out detailed archaeological requirements	Ensure JCS contains a strategic requirement for development to take account of archaeology and subsequent plans provide detailed development management

Q4. FOR OPTION 1 - What are the constraints to delivery?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7047 - Mr & Mrs L Dale [6251]	Comment	Little detail in plan on phasing of building land	Given the scale of growth in the area required and the fact that this is a strategic document, no phasing of development sites is provided at this stage of plan	Consider further if there is a need for phasing of development sites through the JCS or subsequent plans
7458 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	Change in government policy. Housing market volatility. Erosion of green belt and open countryside. It is essential that Hethersett maintains its own identity	The area is required to provide the housing and employment targets set out in the Regional plan to provide for housing and employment need. Whilst there is no green belt around Norwich, green infrastructure will provide gaps between settlements. Design policies will ensure that new development reflects local distinctiveness.	No change to plan
6928 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Comment	None	Noted	No action

Decision on Q4. FOR OPTION 1 - What are the constraints to delivery?

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

Consider further if there is a need for phasing of development sites through the JCS or subsequent plans

Ensure implementation plan takes account of making best use of existing infrastructure

Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.

Ensure JCS contains a strategic requirement for development to take account of archaeology and subsequent plans provide detailed development management policies.

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

Consider amendment to key diagram to relocate employment symbol to north of airport

Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.

No change to plan at this stage. Incorporate later findings of Water Cycle Study as plan develops

No change. Detailed issues of use classes will be resolved in site specific and area action plan DPDs.

Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.

Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.

Ensure implementation of plan section includes infrastructure required to support any growth location.

Ensure that the plan takes account of the findings of the evidence base and environmental appraisals so that growth options enhance and promote biodiversity assets locally.

Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.

Q5. FOR OPTION 1 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Q5. FOR OPTION 1 - What opportunities does this option present?</i>				
7123 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	Comment	Support for development north east of Norwich	Noted	Take account of support for option
7020 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment	This option supports the growth of Easton, the delivery of more affordable homes for local people at Easton and the development of improved community facilities, including village hall, recreational space, and transport	Noted	Take account of support for option including growth at Easton.
7558 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	Norfolk Constabulary considers that growth will provide the opportunity for greater cross working between public service providers to share new infrastructure (sites) to mitigate the cost impact to services and the public.	Noted.	No change to plan
7059 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]				
7857 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	Comment	The only perceived benefits to this large scale development is the provision of a new high school rather than improvements to existing schools should option 2 or 3 be chosen.	Agreed that larger scale development could help to fund a new high school	In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
7534 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment	The option would create a strong cross-city development corridor which would support high quality road- and rail-based public transport, making the best use of existing resources.	Noted	Consider transport issues in choice of options
7760 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	Option for Wymondham should be increased from 4,000 to 6000- 8000 new dwellings, based on JCS evidence base. Wymondham is well connected to key locations, with a range of social infrastructure, employment and retail to accommodate such growth.	Support for greater expansion of Wymondham noted.	Consider greater focus on growth in Wymondham in choice of
7459 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	Additional employment to the area. extra leisure facilities. Additional affordable housing. Possible sixth form college. New medical centre. Completion of cycleway to Wymondham.	Noted	Take account of identification of local service needs that could be addressed through any development at Hethersett
7233 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	Comment	The option would create a strong cross-city development corridor which would support high quality road- and rail-based public transport, making the best use of existing resources.	Noted	Consider transport implications in choice of options

Q5. FOR OPTION 1 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7816 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	This option presents the opportunity to review and plan strategically for the health needs of the Greater Norwich Area over the next 15 - 20 years.	Noted. The purpose of spatial planning is to enable such a co-ordinated approach.	No change to plan
6843 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report	Noted	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report
7185 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]	Comment	For the reasons outlined under Question 4 the option is likely to fail to realise the economic opportunity that the RSS growth strategy has put in place for the Norwich sub-region. In terms of employment growth therefore it represents a missed opportunity.	Noted	Take account of employment opportunities in choice of growth options
6947 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	A large scale growth location on land that is suitable for development with sustainable transport infrastructure. There is the potential to expand in the Rackheath Area in the future	Noted. Potential for good public transport links will be a key element in choosing options.	Consider public transport issues in choice of options
7044 - Horsham & Newton St Faith Parish Council (Mr Michael Haslam) [7652]	Comment	This proposal presents an opportunity to develop a new business park associated with the airport but on land that is capable of being developed in the short term. We request that the symbol be moved to the north of the NNDR, or at the very least to straddle it, so that it includes land over which Dencora 2000 Ltd has an option to purchase for employment development.	The key diagram is both diagrammatic and strategic. Specific locations for areas identified for employment growth will be identified through subsequent plans.	Consider amendment to key diagram to move symbol for employment development near the airport to the north
7268 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	Option 1 or 2 is strongly preferred over Option 3. Hethersett / Little Melton area has potential for good access and services	Noted	Take account of support for options 1 and 2

Q5. FOR OPTION 1 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7500 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	Comment	<p>The site is in single ownership and Mr Green is committed to bringing development forward as soon as possible. Therefore when looking at the opportunities provided by Options 1 and 2 (questions 5 and 10), given the lack of constraints it is clear that this site could potentially make a rapid contribution in the early years of the Plan to the provision of 2000 dwellings. Larger sites in Costessey are likely to have more significant infrastructure requirements and potentially other issues to be overcome before development can commence, so delivering high levels of housing growth in the early years of the Plan is likely to place reliance on smaller sites coming forward, such as Mr Green's.</p> <p>It is considered that development of Mr Green's site has significant benefits, as it is situated very close to Norwich and nearby centres of activity including Norwich Research Park, University of East Anglia, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, Wymondham and the Longwater Employment Area. It is located on the All and close to the Thickthorn Park & Ride site enjoying excellent public transport (bus) links to Norwich City Centre. These advantages are also shared by the significant growth proposed for Hethersett/Little Melton under options 1 and 2 and therefore Mr Green supports strongly the choice of either Option 1 or Option 2 (questions 7 and 12).</p>	Noted	Recommendation In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options
7679 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	Comment	The proposals for the Royal Norwich Golf Club help to meet the housing requirement in a sustainable location in accordance with the spatial vision for the Norwich Policy Area	The strategy sets out the requirement for housing development sites on the north Norwich fringe. Individual sites will be considered through more detailed site specific development plan documents.	No change to plan
7365 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	Better use of park and ride	Noted	No change to plan
7036 - Gerald Eve (M Moss)	Comment	Support this option	Noted	Take account of support for the option
6899 - M. Falcon Property Solutions (Mr Michael Falcon) [7186]	Comment	Mangreen will be a vibrant new sustainable community, with superb community facilities and public transport links, which extend well beyond the settlement to enhance the quality of life for communities throughout the wider South Norwich area. The town will be a mecca for enterprise and innovation and a showcase for sustainable	Noted	Consider Magreen in choice of growth options
7620 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	The option would create a strong cross-city development corridor which would support high quality road- and rail-based public transport, making the best use of existing resources.	Agreed	No change to plan
7434 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	There are opportunities for green infrastructure and improved water infrastructure.	Noted	No change to plan

Q5. FOR OPTION 1 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7722 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	Limited. The amount of investment in restricted existing environments at Easton, Wymondham and Hethersett make this an unviable option.	Noted	Take account of opposition to this option
7171 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]	Comment	The provision of a suitable employment definition would allow appropriate employment uses to locate with the Strategic Employment Locations and would therefore stimulate and encourage suitable growth within these	The representation concerns a detailed definition of the type of uses that are suitable in employment areas. Such definitions are not strategic issues and will be covered in subsequent DPDs	No change to plan
7136 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	Core Strategy should explicitly identify North East Norwich as an area of major growth for the plan period and beyond of at least 10,000, with 6,000 homes to be delivered by 2026.	Noted	Consider growth beyond 2026
7277 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Comment	support the identification of Wymondham as a location for major change and development, but note the current imbalance between homes and jobs. Further employment land needs to be identified. Promote site at Browick Road . Do not agree with the Arup study's proposed reliance on currently identified sites. Believe re-use of "no longer fit for purpose employment sites" is appropriate response. JCS should be more explicit about the need to provide for more commercial land at Wymondham and should also allow a framework for the release of no longer "fit for purpose employment sites" to other uses - site at Browick Road is largely unconstrained, though representation accepts refresh of archaeological and ecological evidence would be appropriate. Appropriate policy could enable site to be brought forward by SPD rather than require sites allocations DPD.	Further employment allocations would be appropriate at Wymondham, but should be undertaken in the context of a site specific allocations DPD	No change to plan. Ensure site allocation pain for South Norfolk covers employment allocations at Wymondham.
7297 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	Comment	Support for option as it would lead to road, rail and other public transport improvements on A11 corridor.	Noted	Note Breckland's support for option and associated transport improvements
7692 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Comment	Farm ownership and occupation interests can both enable an early phased development in conjunction with Norfolk CC land, and assumed to be required in 2010-16. The land is adjacent to the existing urban area utilities and facilities, with public transport. The landscape compartments and retention of historic parkland framework in this sub-area tend to favour a development form as an extension of the urban area, rather than being part of a contiguous Rackheath new town.	Noted. - it is probable that it will be necessary for development to proceed in the north east simultaneously in a number of locations to achieve the necessary delivery rates. It is also likely that the ultimate form of development will consist of a number of "villages" or "neighbourhoods" each with their own local facilities. However there are certain elements of high level infrastructure which will need to be shared, for example a high school and major public transport infrastructure and therefore some coordination between the different	Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed
7209 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Major improvements to the items listed in Q3.	Noted	No change to plan
7789 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	Ensuring satisfactionâ€removal of unpleasant smells	Noted	No change to plan

Q5. FOR OPTION 1 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7008 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934] 7576 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Opportunities for improvements to green infrastructure. Habitata creation in NE should include parkland, woodland, grassland and heathland.	Noted	Ensure subsequent plans take account of specific green infrastructure requirements in different locations.
Decision on Q5. FOR OPTION 1 - What opportunities does this option present?				
Take account of identification of local service needs that could be addressed through any development at Hethersett				
Ensure subsequent plans take account of specific green infrastructure requirements in different locations.				
Consider amendment to key diagram to move symbol for employment development near the airport to the north				
Take account of support for option				
Note Breckland's support for option and associated transport improvements				
Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans.				
Consider Magreen in choice of growth options				
Take account of support for option including growth at Easton.				
Take account of support for options 1 and 2				
Take account of employment opportunities in choice of growth options				
Recommendation In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options				
Action: Consider public transport issues in choice of options				
Consider growth beyond 2026				
Action: No change to plan. Ensure site allocation plan for South Norfolk covers employment allocations at Wymondham.				
Take account of opposition to this option				
Take account of support for the option				
Consider transport issues in choice of options				
In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.				
Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report				
Consider transport implications in choice of options				
Consider greater focus on growth in Wymondham in choice of options.				

Q6. FOR OPTION 1 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Q6. FOR OPTION 1 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</i>				
7561 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	The Force is already investing in its 'Long Term Estates Strategy' to replace Police Stations and premises which are not fit for purpose in the County of Norfolk. Additional population growth will place additional demand on capital budgets to provide the required Police infrastructure to support the new communities.	Noted	No change to plan
7126 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	Comment	As a trust, TFT has a long term commitment to the sustainable development of the area. As such their financial models are based on long-term investment as opposed to short-term returns. The TFT and other members of the consortium are committed to achieving a longterm strategy for their land-holdings, which is consistent for good place making and creating a sustainable urban extension in North East Norwich. However, the financial models to deliver this need to be carefully constructed in terms of timescales and yields for the relevant landowners in respect of acquisition of funds, cash flows and anticipated returns.	Noted	No change to plan
7790 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	Will provide a better foundation for additional future residents to 'tap into'	Noted	No change to plan
7366 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	It will not	Noted	No change to plan
7761 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	As previously stated the option allocated 4,000 dwellings to Wymondham. Hopkins Homes interests relate to land south of Wymondham, where Hopkins Homes seek to deliver a high quality residential led mixed use scheme, including employment uses, affordable homes, and public open space. Hopkins Homes therefore seek an allocation for this site, within the housing requirements for	Suupport for growth at Wymondham noted.	No change to plan. Allocation of specific sites for housing development will be through subsequent Development Plan Documents.
7137 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	Allocation of this broad area for major development will enable an investment strategy to be developed as an integral part a masterplan for the long term sustainability of the new neighbourhoods. Such a strategy will need to encompass the future management arrangements of community facilities and open spaces. The scale of development proposed, including identification of growth beyond the plan period, will provide the landowners and developers confidence to invest for the long term.	Noted	Consider potential for achieving on site provision of services as a key element in choosing appropriate growth options.
7577 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Habitat creation initiatives in south Norfolk countryside co-incide with NWT proposals to take forward a "Claylands" Living Landscape Project as part of our	Noted	Ensure co-ordination through the plan between green infrastructure provided by new developemnt and existing projects in South Norfolk.

Q6. FOR OPTION 1 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7723 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	There would be no direct link.	Noted	No action
6900 - M. Falcon Property Solutions (Mr Michael Falcon) [7186]	Comment	Option 3 includes the a new "country town" of 4,500 houses at Mangreen . It can deliver 4,500 houses in the period to 2026 to assist in meeting growth point and RSS housing growth requirements.	Noted	Consider Mangreen amongst the options for achieving housing growth targets.
7045 - Horsham & Newton St Faith Parish Council (Mr Michael Haslam) [7652]	Comment	This proposal fits neatly into our company's investment strategy which provides for the development of a new business park in the Norwich area within the next five	Noted	No change to plan
6844 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report	Noted	Consider water Cycle Study in choosing growth options.
6909 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027]	Comment	It is completely opposed to our plans. Little Melton produced a Parish Plan in 2006 (based on a survey of all residents) - a large majority of residents want no significant development to occur in the village.	Noted	Take account of opposition to major growth in Little Melton expressed through 2006 Parish Plan.
7437 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	Within our remit are permissive rights for the maintenance of designated main rivers and the construction of flood defences and control structures. Whilst our work is not directed by local authorities' development frameworks, synergy between our organisations can result in a better outcome for all parties. We therefore recommend that as plans develop and final options are chosen, with timings, phasings, etc. we are kept up-to-date to ensure opportunities for close	Noted. The plan will include an implementation framework to enable such co-ordination.	Ensure there is adequate consultation and agreement on the implementation framework set out in the plan to ebalance this spatial plan to co-ordinate between agencies and developers.
7234 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	Comment	We welcome the fact that the option identifies a strategic employment site at Norwich Airport. This is in line with our investment strategy for land north of the Airport, which will maximise the benefits offered by this regionally important facility and the accessible location within the Greater Norwich area. The position of the symbol suggests that the site should lie to the south of the Distributor Road which would be unduly restrictive if the site is to be of a strategic nature.	Noted. This is a strategic plan which does not identify specific sites for development - the location of the symbol is not intended to favour any particular location	Consider need to amend plan to relocate airport employment area symbol.
7062 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	The Force is already investing in its 'Long Term Estates Strategy' to replace Police Stations and premises which are not fit for purpose in the County of Norfolk. Additional population growth will place additional demand on capital budgets to provide the required Police infrastructure to support the new communities.	Noted	No change to plan

Q6. FOR OPTION 1 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7021 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment	The partners are committed to investing to securing a more sustainable and viable settlement. Development at Easton will allow investment in community facilities and the delivery of key worker and student housing to support the College, UEA and the Hospital. It will enable the College to invest and develop the educational facilities to the benefit of Norfolk, the Region and the UK.	Noted	Consider growth at Easton as one of the growth options.
7460 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	Will link to the Parish Plan with potential to delay revised local plan until detail of potential development known.	Noted. Revisions to the Parish Plan must take account of planning policies set out in the Local Development Framework.	No change to plan
6948 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	Mangreen proposal will help to deliver growth requirement for Norwich.	Noted	Consider Mangreen as one of the options to meet growth
7621 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	There would be a strong link with our long term investment strategy which aims to deliver an eco-community at Rackheath. This would make a significant contribution to the identified strategic growth location of 6000 houses in the north-east sector	Noted	No change to plan
7693 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Comment	This farm estate has been working in detail with Highways (Charles Auger) to facilitate the NNDR central section. Farming operations would be maintained in one block from the airport to Rackheath Church Wood, still centred on Red Hall Farm, Beeston Lane.	Noted	No change
7817 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	This will help to drive our longer term investment	Noted	No change to plan

Decision on Q6. FOR OPTION 1 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?
Consider Mangreen as one of the options to meet growth requirement.

Consider growth at Easton as one of the growth options.

Ensure there is adequate consultation and agreement on the implementation framework set out in the plan to enable this spatial plan to co-ordinate between agencies and developers.

Consider potential for achieving on site provision of services as a key element in choosing appropriate growth options.

Consider need to amend plan to relocate airport employment area symbol.

Ensure co-ordination through the plan between green infrastructure provided by new development and existing projects in South Norfolk.

Consider Mangreen amongst the options for achieving housing growth targets.

Take account of opposition to major growth in Little Melton expressed through 2006 Parish Plan.

Consider water Cycle Study in choosing growth options.

No change to plan. Allocation of specific sites for housing development will be through subsequent Development Plan Documents

Q7. FOR OPTION 1 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Q7. FOR OPTION 1 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?</i>				
7818 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	NHS Norfolk would support the appropriate healthcare developments of whichever option is chosen.	Noted	No change to plan
7724 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	Parish councils opposed to this option.	Noted	Take account of opposition of these parish councils to option 1.
6910 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027]				
7755 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]				
7461 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]				
7535 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment	Yes, provided that the option is modified to include reference to residential development at Colney Lane/Cringleford	Noted	Take account of support for this option dependent on identification of Colney/Cringleford for growth
7440 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	With all proposed options we are unable to lend direct support, however, our organisation produces, or is involved in, a number of studies that will benefit whichever option is chosen. Studies include Catchment Flood Management Plans, Shoreline Management Plans, the Review of Consents, Greater Norwich WCS, Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Study (GIS) and the Norwich City Council, Broadland District Council, South Norfolk District Council and Broads Authority SFRA's	Noted	Ensure the water related evidence base is taken full account of when choosing the appropriate growth options.
7298 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	Comment	This option would need to be mindful of the significant growth planned at Attleborough, Thetford and Dereham and linkages with Norwich in terms of the transport capacity of both the A47 and A11 and energy provision. Breckland will work with GNDP on these issues	Noted	Take account of growth planned in Breckland in choosing options for growth.
7367 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	No and south of NPA needs growth and investment, this option concentrates it away from the south.	Opposition to option 1 noted	Take account of opposition to option 1.
7858 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	Comment	If option 1 is chosen then, with reluctance and reservations, the Town Council would offer its support to ensure that it would be able to full participate in	Noted	Consider views of Wymondham Town Council in choice of options for growth
7694 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Comment	Yes	Commitment to support option noted	Take account of commitment to support option 1 by Belton Estate in choice of options
7182 - Marks and Spencer Ltd (Norwich) (Mr Neil Goldsmith) [7658]	Comment	Support city centre proposals in plan	Noted, city centre proposals are not dealt with in this	No action

Q7. FOR OPTION 1 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7762 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	Hopkins Homes could support this option with their site to the south of Wymondham. As demonstrated within the supporting document the site is deliverable, available, suitable, and achievable. As a result and given the sites strategic nature, we ask that this site be allocated for development within the Joint Core Strategy in line with guidance in PPS3 and PPS12.	Noted	Take account of support for growth at Wymondham
7037 - Gerald Eve (M Moss)	Comment	Welcomes the identification of 6000 new homes to be delivered in the Sprowston/Rackheath Area in all three proposed development options. It is noted however, that the Sprowston/Rackheath Strategic Growth Location for Growth in the area as identified on the Growth Options excludes sites at the settlement boundary to the east of the airport and to the South of the proposed route of the North Norwich Distributor Road, which is assessed in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Although it is acknowledged that these maps are illustrative, it is considered important that they are revised to clearly show this area as part of Sprowston/Rackheath Strategic Growth Location	Noted. Detailed site allocations will be made through an Area Action plan for the NE of Norwich.	Consider site in relation to Area Action plan
6906 - Greenhouse Trust (Mr Richard Bickle) [919]	Comment	Support all settlements to be as self-sufficient in terms of employment and services as possible, thereby reducing commuting which wastes both time and natural resources, and undermines quality of life. To this end, we would tend to oppose further developments of commuter towns and villages in Norwich's rural fringe, but would support limited development in smaller villages if that could be shown to make them more sustainable communities - for example, to become large enough to support a shop and other basic services. We would look for developments in small villages to be undertaken exclusively on the basis of locally controlled Community Land Trusts which would hold the houses and other buildings constructed as an affordable community resource in perpetuity. We would also urge local authorities to work with agencies such as the Village Retail Services Association (part of the Plunkett Foundation - see www.plunkett.co.uk) to provide a funding programme to support the development of community	Noted. Any chosen strategy will need to take account of the planning's role in reducing the need to travel.	Take account of reducing the need to travel in choosing growth options and support for some growth in smaller villages to support local services.
6845 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Yes, assuming the Water Cycle Study produces an agreed strategy	Noted	Ensure WCS completed and informs strategy

Q7. FOR OPTION 1 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7210 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	No - it represents over-development of the area.	Opposition noted	Take account of opposition to option 1 in considering choice of options.
7791 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	Support option 1 and will commit to it	Commitment noted	Take account of commitment to option 1
7785 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]				
7022 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]				
7350 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]				
7129 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]				
6949 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]				
6999 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]				
7046 - Horsham & Newton St Faith Parish Council (Mr Michael Haslam) [7652]				
7600 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]				
7235 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]				
7622 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]				
7680 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]				
7138 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]				
7578 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	We would support if the opportunities for green infrastructure and creation of new biodiversity rich landscapes were an integral part of any new developments and if they represent the eco-town target of 40% greenspace	Noted	Consider appropriate proportion of new developments to be given over to green infrastructure through this plan.
7564 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	Norfolk Constabulary has a statutory duty to provide a	Noted	No action
7065 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	t	Police service to communities in Norfolk.		
6980 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Comment	Favour option 1. Wymondham represents a highly sustainable opportunity for further growth, with the levels of services and facilities provided within the town and its accessibility by public transport justifying the delivery of 4,000 dwellings at Wymondham, rather than the 2,000 dwellings which are proposed under Options 2 and 3. Do not favour growth at Mangreen	Noted	Take account of support from focussing growth at Wymondham.

Q7. FOR OPTION 1 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Decision on Q7. FOR OPTION 1 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected? Take account of opposition to option 1.		
		Take account of reducing the need to travel in choosing growth options and support for some growth in smaller villages to support local services.		
		Consider views of Wymondham Town Council in choice of options for growth		
		Take account of support for growth at Wymondham		
		Take account of opposition to option 1 in considering choice of options.		
		Consider appropriate proportion of new developments to be given over to green infrastructure through this plan.		
		Take account of support for focussing growth at Wymondham.		
		Ensure WCS completed and informs strategy		
		Take account of opposition of these parish councils to option 1.		
		Take account of commitment to support option 1 by Belton Estate in choice of options		
		Take account of support for this option dependent on identification of Colney/Cringleford for growth		
		Take account of growth planned in Breckland in choosing options for growth.		
		Consider site in relation to Area Action plan		
		Take account of commitment to option 1		
		Ensure the water related evidence base is taken full account of when choosing the appropriate growth options.		

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

6950 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	There should be links to existing infrastructure, housing and employment sites rather than requiring entirely new infrastructure (MB)	Given the likely funding gap between funds available and infrastructure required, there is considerable merit in making the best use of what infrastructure is already available. This is also in line with the approach of the east of England plan. (MB)	In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options (MB)
---	---------	---	--	---

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7319 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Comment	<p>Wymondham More detailed maps are needed.</p> <p>To the south and south-west of the town is the Bay River valley. This with an adequately proportioned buffer zone, should act as a barrier to westward expansion of development.</p> <p>The recent application for 3000 homes at land south of the town shows the kind of issues any development here would be confronted with. Natural England objected on the basis that it would contravene the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) and viewed development as being a serious threat to biodiversity.</p> <p>Wymondham is a historic market town with its own unique heritage and identity. The proposed amount of development would erode the character. A consultation undertaken by Wymondham Town Council found that resisting further major development was a key priority, improvements to services and infrastructure should come ahead of any development and the protection of the natural environment was of prime importance. The town council foresees securing additional housing through small scale development only (to allow the provision of affordable and special needs homes).</p> <p>The railway line would make it hard to integrate new housing with the rest of the community. (MB)</p>	<p>No detail on the potential location of any development in Wymondham can be given at this stage as this is a strategic document.</p> <p>Wymondham has good local services and public transport links, with potential for further improvement through a bus rapid transit link to Norwich. To promote sustainability, growth should be located in and around such areas to reduce the need for car travel, to meet many needs locally and to enable provision of good quality public transport to higher level services in Norwich.</p> <p>Any development would have to protect and enhance environmental designations and provide green infrastructure to enhance landscape, biodiversity and sustainable transport.</p> <p>Developers would have to ensure any new development to the south east of Wymondham could be effectively linked to the rest of the town. (MB)</p>	No change (MB)
7462 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	<p>Additional roads/transport provision to enable access to the new development from existing major roads. Current minor roads not suitable for large increase in traffic and consideration should be given to some form of restriction for direct access for traffic and the potential increase in the volume of traffic through existing villages. (MB)</p>	<p>Any new development will be required to provide the infrastructure necessary to enable that development to go ahead. This strategic document will set out the overarching policies to require this. Further detail will be set out in forthcoming plans dealing with the detail of different developments. (MB)</p>	No action (MB)
7278 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Comment	<p>(Harts Farm) Ltd contend that a commercial led mixed use development scheme at East Wymondham (Browick Road) can be delivered within existing infrastructure</p>	<p>Noted. Subsequent DPDs will deal with site allocations and the infrastructure required to support them.</p>	No change to plan
7368 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	<p>Identified highway improvements and foul and surface water discharge problems in Wymondham. (MB)</p>	<p>Any new development will be required to provide the infrastructure necessary to enable that development to go ahead. This strategic document will set out the overarching policies to require this. The Water Cycle study identifies drainage issues in relation to Wymondham, showing the amount of growth set out in this document is acceptable. The final stage of the WCS will give further detail on drainage requirements to inform later DPDs and masterplans. (MB)</p>	No action (MB)

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7211 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Transport, sewerage, drainage infrastructure and high speed internet access are generally inadequate. (MB)	The plan acknowledges that these are needed to be improved to cater for major growth. Although the improvement will be focused on areas of new development, existing communities nearby may also reap some benefit (MB)	No change needed (MB)
7118 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	Comment	Acknowledge the need for need infrastructure to support the growth of the city which relate to the need for new transport, social and utility/service infrastructure. The delivery of such infrastructure requires the coordination of a range of public sector organisations and the private sector. We acknowledge that the NNDR is a significant piece of the NATS and will play an important part in supporting major growth. Other initiatives to improve the local transport network include utilising the existing capacity on the underused Bittern Line and the insertion of a rail halt within a new urban extension in the north east. (MB)	Noted. (MB)	Consider detailed transport requirements for development in the NE through the Area Action Plan and other DPDs. (MB)
7429 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	Provision of green infrastructure forming a coherent scheme across the JCS area should be considered at an early stage. Whilst open/green spaces can be created within development adequate links and corridors may require more strategic planning. An assumption has been made within stage 2 of the WCS that all sewer networks are at capacity and therefore costs and timings will need to be factored into any future growth. (MB)	The strategy is informed by the findings of the Water Cycle Study and the Green Infrastructure study. The identification of growth locations has been assisted by these studies and plan policies and masterplanning of major sites will ensure that implementation includes necessary infrastructure to support growth and ensure it is	None (MB)
7725 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	Need for link between NNDR and A47 (this comment appears to apply to all options). The infrastructure requirements of option 2 make it an expensive option.	The County Council considered the arguments for and against linking the NNDR to the A47 west of Norwich and concluded it was impractical given the nature conservation constraints. Given the likely funding gap between funds available and infrastructure required, there is considerable merit in making the best use of what infrastructure is already available. This is also in line with the approach of the East of England Plan. The evidence so far gathered suggests option 3 is a relatively expensive option (MB)	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7662 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Comment	No indication is given as to how public transport priority will be achieved in the A140 corridor or whether the A140/A47 junction has sufficient spare capacity to accommodate traffic generated by additional development at Long Stratton- evidence should be sought. The possibility of re-introducing local stations (such as Forncett) should be investigated and there should be sound reasons for discounted it before a major development at Long Stratton is accepted without access to the railway being provided. Scaled-down allocation at Wymondham may fail to reach the 'critical mass' to support the level of public transport provision envisaged in option 1. Option 2 might result in a more car-dependent outcome not only at Long Stratton but also at Wymondham. (MB)	The document acknowledges that development will have to provide improved public transport facilities and potential junction improvements on the A47 to serve any development on the A140 corridor. Potential rail services will be investigated with Network Rail, though it has already been established that further stations on the mainline route will be difficult to achieve. (MB)	Assess need for further consultation with Network Rail.
7085 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	Comment	Doubts over the provision of infrastructure first. (MB)	The plan requires developers, together with government, to fund new infrastructure to serve new development. It also enables different service providers, such a health and water, to plan and co-ordinate their provision of infrastructure for new development. (MB)	No change needed (MB)
7553 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	Requirement for an increase in police resources. The main impacts relate to increasing the size of Safer Neighbourhood Teams and enhancing Response and Protective Police Services. Other impacts will be on levels and investigation of serious crime, custody capacity and Norfolk Constabulary's support services. Concerns include the need for additional resources for the Safer Neighbourhood Team in the south west and Wymondham and the police stations in the north east and west are too small to expand. (MB)	A further study into infrastructure needs for the favoured option will highlight where additional emergency services facilities are required, for example enhanced Safer Neighbourhood Teams. Based on the earlier broad brush work by EDAW, major development such as that proposed in the north east, would be likely to require such investment. Subject to the more detailed work referred to above, similar investment may be needed elsewhere (MB)	Based on more detailed work into infrastructure requirements for the favoured option, should include a reference to the need for additional police infrastructure in major development locations as appropriate (MB)
6921 - Norfolk Environmental Waste Services (Mr David Beadle) [4376]	Comment	Strategic waste management facilities should be referred to as necessary infrastructure (MB)	Agreed - the study into infrastructure requirements should include some assessment of strategic waste management facilities. (MB)	Agreed - these should be included in the implementation strategy
7501 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	Comment	The 2.2ha site, north of Town House Road, Costessey has minimal constraints to delivery and there are not anticipated to be significant infrastructure requirement although there will be minimal impact on the Longwater junction. (MB)	Improvements to the Longwater junction of the southern bypass are likely to be a priority. (MB)	No change required. (MB)
7579 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Extensive new green infrastructure is needed between Wymondham and the bypass and Hethersett and Wymondham. We assume that this is intended with references to Tiffey valley but it should be made more explicit. If significant growth takes place at Long Stratton, new development will require habitat creation in addition to investment in a green infrastructure corridor. This should include new grassland and woodland to build on existing 'natural' green infrastructure of the 'claylands' landscape. (MB)	It is important that green infrastructure is protected and enhanced, and this should be guided by the green infrastructure work already undertaken. Clearly where there are local issues within the option selected these it will need to be taken on board at the masterplanning stage.	No change needed, though the points made are valid and will need to be taken on board at the site specific/area action plan stage, and in any masterplanning work.

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7613 - Yare Valley Society (Mrs Andrew J Salisbury) [1006]	Comment	Large scale growth at Hethersett/Little Melton would add to the problems of already overloaded road links and junctions. It would create pressures for further major roadworks, potentially damaging to the environment and the Yare Valley in particular. (MB)	Any growth to the south of the bypass would have to be accompanied to improvement to relevant transport infrastructure. The Yare Valley is identified as part of the green infrastructure in the area and may benefit from funding for improvements to the environment through the strategy.	No action (MB)
7324 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Comment	Long Stratton poor transport links and surrounded by attractive countryside (currently designated under ENV8) which includes two County Wildlife Sites of which Wood Green would possibly be affected by the planned bypass. Proposals would significantly alter its character. Considered that funding from either Section 106 contributions or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would be insufficient to meet the expected cost.	Noted. Any proposed development would have to provide the infrastructure to support growth. Long Stratton by pass has planning permission.	Take account of potential constraints to growth in Long
7322 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Comment	Hethersett and Little Melton More precise plans of the area under consideration are needed to fully assess the proposal. The character and separate identity of villages would be lost. Within the area there is a site of local nature conservation interest and a County Wildlife Site along the watercourse to the west of Little Melton. Fragmentation of the surrounding natural environment would be a threat to their biodiversity. Large scale development would be detrimental to the setting and habitat value of the Church Plantations and the grounds of Thickthorn Hall (both historic parkland). There will be increased pressure on the road network. The B1108 is already congested to capacity and the Thickthorn roundabout would also experience significant increased traffic. (MB)	No detail of potential growth sites is available at this stage as this is a strategic plan which considers wider issues relating to growth. Any new development would have to protect nature conservation sites and heritage designations and create green links to enhance biodiversity and green spaces. Improved capacity at by-pass junctions will be required to serve new development. (MB)	No change (MB)
7859 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	Comment	Provision of new or enhanced leisure facilities, sports grounds and community halls (MB)	Any new development will be required to provide the sport, leisure and community facilities necessary to enable that development to go ahead. This strategic document will set out the overarching policies to require this. Further detail will be set out in forthcoming plans dealing with the detail of different developments. (MB)	No action (MB)
7652 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Comment	The amount of housing development is incompatible with maintaining a rural hinterland to Norwich. (MB)	The Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England sets out how many homes must be built in Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. Green infrastructure to serve new development will help to promote biodiversity. (MB)	No change needed. (MB)
7819 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	NHS Norfolk would need to consider what additional capacity will be required for community services (e.g. district nursing, health visiting, midwifery, physio) as well as secondary care capacity (including acute and mental health care). (MB)	The point is a valid, though revenue funding from development is difficult (MB)	Add a reference to community health services under the "health" bullet points in a policy 18 (MB)

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7840 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]	Comment	The Long Stratton By Pass needs to be irrevocably committed before the strategy can deliver 2000 houses. This proposal has been around - on and of - for at least 20 years so its chances of coming forward in a highways capital programme are not great. It is unlikely to be developer funded especially if the normal S106 requirements are expected of the developer.	Noted	Consider implications for section 106 monies available to support development in Long Stratton.
7251 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	Comment	The option should include Trowse (MB)	There is an ambiguity in the consultation document regarding Trowse. It is included as a reference in the Norwich fringe parishes but also as a "service village". This needs to be resolved and Trowse should be referred to as a fringe parish. (MB)	Delete reference to Trowse and as a "service village" and ensure it is retained within the description of Norwich urban fringe parishes in policy 1 or its successor. (MB)
7681 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	Comment	The Royal Norwich Golf Club Site has the usual infrastructure requirements. Drayton Road has congestion issues however junction improvements and the proposed NNDR will improve traffic in the vicinity of the site. The existing foul drainage system through Norwich is assumed to be at capacity. (MB)	This plan is a strategic document which identifies broad locations for growth. This includes the need to identify sites for 2,000 dwellings in Broadland on smaller sites in the Norwich Policy Area. It also sets out the main requirements for such growth, including major infrastructure. The forthcoming Site allocation plan for Broadland will consider the applicability of allocating the site for development and if it is allocated, will set out more detailed development requirements such as road links and	No action (MB)
7623 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	<p>Agree with assessment of the critical infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>As part of the Eco-community development process we will be working with the utility companies to ensure that appropriate improvements to water supply and sewage disposal are secured. We will be designing the development to minimise both water consumption and the need to dispose of waste off-site and anticipate that a similar approaches will be adopted for the other major allocations identified in the emerging Strategy, thus reducing pressures on existing infrastructure and the need for significant investment to secure improvements to it.</p> <p>While the Northern Norwich Distributor Route is not critical to the Rackheath Eco-community, we consider that its implementation will benefit economic development in the area. In addition it will provide a key orbital route, which will enable us to develop high quality public transport links between the Broadlands Business Park area, the community and the Airport.</p> <p>Long Stratton Bypass (MB)</p>	Noted. Any eco-community development will have to be built to the exacting standards to be set out in the government's Planning Policy Statement on ecotowns and should act as an exemplar of sustainable development.	No action (MB)

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7023 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment	A significant investment in infrastructure is required. The starting point of this strategy should be to manage the impact on existing infrastructure and change travel and consumption behaviours. The partners of Easton College are committed to improving pedestrian and cycle links between Easton and the college, improve pedestrian and cycle links to Costessey Park and Ride and implementation of a new shuttle bus linking Easton, the college and Costessey. (MB)	Noted. Easton/ Costessey is identified in the plan for growth and such growth will require measures to promote sustainable transport. (MB)	No action (MB)
7601 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]	Comment	A47/A146 used as a rat run. Growth of Loddon/Chedgrave and Long Stratton will cause further delays. (MB)	While problems no doubt to exist at the A47/A146 junction, improvements to the Longwater, Thickthorn and Harford junctions of the southern bypass are likely to be the priority to accommodate growth. The A 146 will remain the main route for traffic from Waveney area to Norwich.	No change required (MB)
6930 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351] 7695 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691] 7536 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment	Critical infrastructure requirements have been correctly identified.	Noted	No change necessary
7327 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Comment	Costessey and Easton This area forms part of the Bypass Landscape Protection Zone and the Yare Valley. The north and west of the area forms part of the 'green wedge' and the woodland to the north of Dereham Road and the A47 to the west is a further barrier to development. The structure plans aim of preserving the attributes of the City's natural setting which contributes to its environmental quality should not be overridden. The site is some distance from railway access. (MB)	There is scope for development in these areas without infringing existing landscape constraints and improving the setting of Norwich through investment in green infrastructure associated with that development. Although it is agreed that there is no local rail access, the sites would be served by efficient public transport through a bus rapid transit system (MB)	No change (MB)
7763 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	Based on text in Core Strategy Issues and Options report, Long Stratton is less appropriate for growth than Wymonham.	Noted	Take account of existing evidence in choosing growth options.

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7139 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	<p>All major growth locations identified will involve significant investment in infrastructure. Development should be maximised in the North East to support that infrastructure and utilise the capacity created. Maximising growth in this area would assist in the investigation of further options for sustainable infrastructure, such as the potential for the urban extension to be served by rail services.</p> <p>The strategy should identify the overall scale of development in the north east including beyond the plan period. This will assist with planning and delivering the infrastructure to ensure it functions as an integrated and sustainable urban extension. The vision and core policies should make reference to 10,000 homes, of which 6,000 are to be delivered by 2026.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should clarify the intentions regarding growth within the NNDR and at Rackheath. We consider that there is scope for a mixed use urban extension of at least 6,000 homes within the area bounded by Wroxham Road, the proposed NNDR and A47 at Postwick over the long term. (MB)</p>	Noted (MB)	Consider the need to identify the scope for development beyond 2026 through this document. Consider the potential size of development NE of Norwich within the proposed NNDR through the Area Action Plan and other DPDs. (MB)
7792 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	<p>More of all aspects of infrastructure including some improvements to side roads and those bringing in and taking out traffic and provision of footpaths where needed. (MB)</p>	<p>This is a strategic plan which identifies appropriate amounts of development in locations based on major opportunities and constraints such as local services, major roads, public transport and environmental designations of land.</p> <p>Detailed aspects of any development resulting from this plan will be dealt with through more detailed plans and at</p>	No change (MB)
6846 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	<p>Option 2 is the second most readily deliverable option taking into account water and wastewater infrastructure requirements, but this should be validated by the Water Cycle Study before final selection. (MB)</p>	Noted (MB)	No action (MB)
7453 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Comment	<p>The amount of housing development is incompatible with maintaining a rural hinterland to Norwich. (MB)</p>	<p>The Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England sets out how many homes must be built in Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. Green infrastructure to serve new development will help to promote biodiversity. (MB)</p>	No change needed. (MB)

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Decision on Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be? Take account of potential constraints to growth in Long Stratton.		
		Based on more detailed work into infrastructure requirements for the favoured option, should include a reference to the need for additional police infrastructure in major development locations as appropriate (MB)		
		Agreed - these should be included in the implementation strategy (MB)		
		Assess need for further consultation with Network Rail. (MB)		
		Consider detailed transport requirements for development in the NE through the Area Action Plan and other DPDs. (MB)		
		In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)		
		Add a reference to community health services under the "health" bullet points in a policy 18 (MB)		
		In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options (MB)		
		Delete reference to Trowse and as a "service village" and ensure it is retained within the description of Norwich urban fringe parishes in policy 1 or its successor. (MB)		
		Consider implications for section 106 monies available to support development in Long Stratton.		
		Take account of existing evidence in choosing growth options.		
		No change needed, though the points made are valid and will need to be taken on board at the site specific/area action plan stage, and in any masterplanning work. (MB)		
		Consider the need to identify the scope for development beyond 2026 through this document. Consider the potential size of development NE of Norwich within the proposed NNDR through the Area Action Plan and other DPDs. (MB)		
<i>Q9. FOR OPTION 2 - What are the constraints to delivery?</i>				
7537 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment	Programming of infrastructure works and ensuring adequate and timely investment in public transport. Requires the coordination of a range of public sector organisations, the private sector and agencies to facilitate cross sectoral co-operation and ensure that adequate investment is available in order to deliver the necessary infrastructure to support new communities (MB)	Infrastructure is indeed critical, and a more detailed study looking at the infrastructure requirements of the favoured option should help to quantify this in detail, and also identify potential funding sources. The JCS will need to include an implementation strategy which will be tested at the examination. It is essential that "buy-in" is obtained from the key service providers (MB)	No change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document (MB)
7048 - Mr & Mrs L Dale [6251]	Comment	Little to show how a phased regular supply of building plots can be assured. (MB)	Given the scale of growth required, it is not proposed at this stage to phase one major development before another. However, within developments it is possible that further dpds and masterplans will require phasing of	Consider further the need for phasing through subsequent DPDs and masterplans. (MB)

Q9. FOR OPTION 2 - What are the constraints to delivery?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7186 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]	Comment	The Arup study places insufficient emphasis on the availability of sites to drive job creation. The study focuses on non-land use measures to deliver growth; however we consider that a major element of the strategy must be to ensure that sufficient land is delivered to facilitate the provision of employment floorspace. The options fail to deliver sufficient sites of the right type in the right location at the right time and that this will be a constraint on development. The strategy is reliant on sites which are constrained and unlikely therefore to deliver, particularly in the short term. (MB)	The strategic employment locations at Thorpe St Andrew, the Airport, NRP, and Longwater are supported by the East of England Plan. It is acknowledged that there are constraints affecting some of these at present, but as strategically supported sites, the focus should be on resolving problems rather than abandoning the sites for future development. (MB)	No change needed (MB)
7556 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7057 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	Additional capital funding for police services will be required from Community Infrastructure Levy. (MB)	The study into infrastructure needs for the favoured option will highlight the additional demands on various infrastructure providers. It is reasonable to expect that the scale of development proposed will require additional police facilities. However, mainstream funding should be the first funding option rather than a reliance on CIL. CIL may well be able to offer some "top-up" but should not be seen as a substitute for mainstream funding which should take account of the demands on a service, and their growth as a consequence of the development, through the various funding formulae. (MB)	The implementation strategy will need to take account of additional demands on police facilities, and indicate an appropriate level of contribution from developer funding to the extent that it is necessary to top up mainstream
7696 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Comment	Delivery of northeast major growth area will be delayed if a single master plan is required. The area should be delivered in discrete parts (MB)	It is probable that it will be necessary for development to proceed in the north east simultaneously in a number of locations to achieve the necessary delivery rates. It is also likely that the ultimate form of development will consist of a number of "villages" or "neighbourhoods" each with their own local facilities. However there are certain elements of high level infrastructure which will need to be shared, for example a high school and major public transport infrastructure and therefore some coordination between the different elements of the major development is essential. (MB)	Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. (MB)
6847 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report (MB)	Noted (MB)	No change needed. (MB)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7764 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	Hethersett, Little Melton and Long Stratton are unable to accommodate the proposed level of growth. (MB)	Noted (MB)	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB) No change needed (MB)
7820 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	Lack of appropriately skilled staff in the primary, community and secondary healthcare sectors. (MB)	Noted; however it is essential to obtain the commitment of NHS Norfolk to the final strategy (MB)	
7094 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	Comment	Several of the areas of search include sites of archaeological importance- will require mitigation in the form of preservation by record or preservation in situ.	Noted - an appropriate caveat should be included within the pre submission publication. (MB)	To be added-check existing references within document (MB)
7463 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	Change in government policy. Hethersett must maintain its own identity. (MB)	Noted (MB)	Design and green infrastructure policies must ensure that any new development takes careful account of its setting and that green spaces are created within and between settlements. (MB)
7280 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Comment	Support the identification of Wymondham as a 'location for major change and development' but note the current imbalance between homes and jobs and the need to release further commercial land at Wymondham. Promote site at Browick Road. Do not agree with the Arup study's proposed reliance on currently identified sites. Believe re-use of "no longer fit for purpose employment sites" is appropriate response. Support policy 15 but believes JCS should be more explicit about the need to provide for more commercial land at Wymondham and should also allow a framework for the release of no longer "fit for purpose employment sites" to other uses. The site at Browick Road is largely unconstrained and is available for immediate development. Representation accepts refresh of archaeological and ecological evidence would be appropriate. Appropriate policy could enable site to be brought forward by SPD rather than require sites allocations DPD. (MB)	Further employment allocations would be appropriate at Wymondham, but should be undertaken in the context of a site specific allocations DPD. (MB)	No change required. (MB)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6931 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Comment	None, except that the vast majority of the land within the line of the proposed Long Stratton bypass is (or is soon to be) within the control of a single landowner. This makes the scheme potentially deliverable through a developer-funded scheme (depending on the scale of development, and the S106 and CIL costs) without the need for public money. (MB)	Noted (MB)	No action (MB)
7682 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	Comment	The land owners and the developers for the Royal Norfolk Golf Club have made a firm commitment to the delivery of this site. There are no insurmountable constraints to development (MB)	Noted. The Broadland fringe of Norwich is identified for providing 2,000 dwellings and this site will be considered through the Broadland Site Allocation Plan. (MB)	Ensure the Royal Norfolk Golf Club is considered for allocation through later DPDs. (MB)
6951 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	A large scale growth location on land that is suitable for development with sustainable transport infrastructure. There is the potential to expand in the Rackheath Area in the future. (MB)	Noted. The Rackheath area has been identified as a potential site for growth as part of a wider "Growth triangle" (MB)	No action (MB)
7860 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	Comment	If development is spread over a number of sites throughout the town there will be additional pressure on existing services including highways, drainage and water supplies. (MB)	Any development will have to provide infrastructure and services to serve it, though it is accepted that numerous very small site allocations would prevent economies of scale being made. (MB)	Consider sites for development through the South Norfolk Site Allocation Plan. (MB)
7793 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029] 7841 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]	Comment	Need more employment as large scale development and commuting would lead to transport problems. The bypass. It is very unlikely that this site can make an early contribution to meeting housing requirements. (MB)	The inclusion of Long Stratton in options 2 and 3 is in response to local problems rather than its strategic significance within the Norwich policy area. Nevertheless, if an option including development at Long Stratton is selected, it would be appropriate to recognise the need to encourage further employment in the town. (MB)	In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. If this is the case, and the final strategy includes development at Long Stratton, it should make it clear that additional employment at Long Stratton is part of the strategy, and appropriate allocations should be made. (MB)
7172 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]	Comment	The JCS should adopt a flexible, but clear framework in which to guide employment uses and define uses which are appropriate on employment land. This should include sui generis (such as warehouse clubs, cash and carry businesses and builders merchants) which are commonly found in industrial estates. (MB)	The point made by the representation is reasonable in that there are various sui generis uses frequently found on mainstream employment areas. However the level of detail sought by the representation seems more appropriate to a development control policies DPD. (MB)	No change needed (MB)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7009 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Comment	Development at Long Stratton may have an adverse impact on Flordon Common SSSI, Fritton Common SSSI, Aslacton Parish Land SSSI, Fornsett Meadows SSSI and Pulham Market Big Wood SSSI. (MB)	Noted (MB)	Ensure any development takes careful account of environmental designations and provides links to such sites, if appropriate through more detailed DPDs and masterplans. (MB)
7121 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994] 7212 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661] 7236 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681] 7624 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	Programming of infrastructure works and ensuring adequate and timely investment in public transport. Requires the coordination of a range of public sector organisations, the private sector and agencies to facilitate cross sectoral co-operation and ensure that adequate investment is available in order to deliver the necessary infrastructure to support new communities. (MB)	Infrastructure is indeed critical, and a more detailed study looking at the infrastructure requirements of the favoured option should help to quantify this in detail, and also identify potential funding sources. The JCS will need to include an implementation strategy which will be tested at the examination. It is essential that "buy-in" is obtained from the key service providers (MB)	No change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document (MB)
7580 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Critical to retain areas of high biodiversity value at Yare Valley and Bawburgh Lakes. Increasing access at Bawburgh Pits CWS would need to be done carefully to ensure that increased access did not harm the biodiversity value of this area. (MB)	The Green infrastructure Strategy identifies the need for improvements to the Yare Valley and any such improvements would have to take account of designations and the reasoning behind them. (MB)	Ensure green infrastructure projects take careful account of environmental designations. (MB)
7024 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment	There are no significant constraints to delivery. The landowners are working together to ensure that development can be brought forward at the earliest opportunity. (MB)	Noted (MB)	No action (MB)
7432 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	There is a need for a level 2 SFRA in Norwich City Centre. Green infrastructure needs to be planned from the outset, with existing sensitive sites carefully managed and alternative green infrastructure provided through development The Stage 2a Water Cycle Study should be used to	This study is currently being undertaken and will inform the site allocations DPD. Ensure the pre submission publication plan includes within the description of the strategy clear reference to the need for green infrastructure to be included as an integral part of the	No change needed. (MB)
7140 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	The area at North East Norwich is in multiple ownership. Landowners behind this representation wish to work together (with the GNDP) to move swiftly from an in principle decision regarding the broad location for development to a site specific proposal and to secure planning permission. An important element of delivery of the North East is the completion of an inner link from Wroxham Road to Broadland Business Park. (MB)	It is probable that it will be necessary for development to proceed in the north east simultaneously in a number of locations to achieve the necessary delivery rates. It is also likely that the ultimate form of development will consist of a number of "villages" or "neighbourhoods" each with their own local facilities. However there are certain elements of high level infrastructure which will need to be shared, for example a high school and major public transport infrastructure and therefore some coordination between the different elements of the major development is essential. While the early delivery of housing is important, piecemeal development following partial provision of the infrastructure necessary for the development in the north east is not seen as an appropriate solution. It will be necessary to ensure that all development contributes appropriately to the key elements of shared infrastructure. (MB)	Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. (MB)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7726 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	The option requires the completion of the Norwich northern distributor road (presumably equally applicable to all options) (MB)	The County Council were persuaded that the conflict with internationally important ecological considerations ruled out the possibility of completing of the link across the Wensum valley to the A47. (MB)	No change necessary (MB)
7369 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	Infrastructure problems in Wymondham. (MB)	Wymondham has a strong shopping centre, good public transport with the potential for further improvement and good access to employment. Any new development will have to provide the infrastructure necessary for that development to go ahead. (MB)	Ensure further dpds and masterplans contain further detail on infrastructure required to support any development in Wymondham (MB)

Decision on Q9. FOR OPTION 2 - What are the constraints to delivery?

Ensure any development takes careful account of environmental designations and provides links to such sites, if appropriate through more detailed DPDs and masterplans. (MB)

No change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document (MB)

Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Ensure green infrastructure projects take careful account of environmental designations. (MB)

Ensure further dpds and masterplans contain further detail on infrastructure required to support any development in Wymondham (MB)

Action: Consider further the need for phasing through subsequent DPDs and masterplans. (MB)

Design and green infrastructure policies must ensure that any new development takes careful account of its setting and that green spaces are created within and between settlements. (MB)

The implementation strategy will need to take account of additional demands on police facilities, and indicate an appropriate level of contribution from developer funding to the extent that it is necessary to top up mainstream funding. (MB)

Consider sites for development through the South Norfolk Site Allocation Plan. (MB)

Ensure the Royal Norfolk Golf Club is considered for allocation through later DPDs. (MB)

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. If this is the case, and the final strategy includes development at Long Stratton, it should make it clear that additional employment at Long Stratton is part of the strategy, and appropriate allocations should be made. (MB)

To be added-check existing references within document (MB)

No change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document (MB)

Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. (MB)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Q10. FOR OPTION 2 - What opportunities does this option present?</i>				
7173 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]	Comment	Flexible approach to accommodating sui generis uses within the mainstream employment areas would assist economic growth (common to all options) (MB)	A degree of flexibility is an essential part of the planning process. However, the degree of detail sought by the representation appears more appropriate to a development control policies DPD than a core strategy. (MB)	No change needed (MB)
7269 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	Support option 1 and 2. Hethersett/Little Melton is well situated and connected to Norwich, has good range of shops and services. Initial investigations have highlighted the strengths of the location as well as identifying challenges to overcome. (MB)	Noted. The relative merits of potential growth locations will be assessed. (MB)	Assess the relative merits of the potential growth options. (MB)
7861 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	Comment	It will be easier to assimilate residents from 2,000 homes (rather than 4,000 homes) into the town's life and culture. It would prevent a separate settlement being formed (MB)	Noted (MB)	No action (MB)
7153 - Norwich Consolidated Charities (Mr S. A. Franklin) [1325]	Comment	The Joint Core Strategy should be sufficiently robust to accommodate an increase in housing provision assigned in the review of the East of England Plan to the Norwich Key Centre for Development and Change. (MB)	Noted. Consideration is being given to growth beyond 2026 through this strategy. A review of the strategy will take place after the RSS review. (MB)	Review this strategy dependent on regional strategy review. (MB)
7026 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment	Growth at Easton will provide more affordable housing for local people, the development of improved community facilities, including village hall, recreational space and transport services. (MB)	Noted. Studies have been undertaken to identify infrastructure needs related to development This document will set out overarching infrastructure policies and detailed site by site requirements will be set out in subsequent dpds. (MB)	Ensure infrastructure needs to serve new development for Hethersett are incorporated in plans. (MB)
7141 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	Large scale growth location with potential for further development in future, at Rackheath and NE in general . Needs clarity over longer term growth potential. Offers opportunities to complete link from Wroxham Road to business park to improve connectivity (common to all options) (MB)	The representation is essentially supportive of all options, but the ultimate scale of development should be made clear in the policy and supporting text (MB)	Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text in all locations where development is expected to continue after 2026. (MB)
7765 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	Allocation at Wymondham should be increased to allow Norwich related growth to be accommodated in settlements close to Norwich. (MB)	The allocation at Wymondham was reduced in option 2 in order to make allocations at the Long Stratton in order to secure a bypass, and deal with a widely acknowledged local issue. It remains appropriate to consider specific local issues such as this as well as the strategic picture.	In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Q10. FOR OPTION 2 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7821 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	Opportunity to review and plan strategically for health needs (common to all options) (MB)	This is an inherent benefit of strategic scale planning, but further work on infrastructure requirements of the favoured option will need to be completed before an appropriate implementation strategy can be prepared. This will be an integral part of the overall strategy and will be tested at examination. (MB)	No change required. (MB)
7237 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681] 7538 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223] 7625 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	Option 2 would create a strong cross-city development corridor which would support high quality road and rail based public transport. However the reduced growth at Wymondham could limit the development of rail based solutions. (MB)	Noted. It is envisaged that the majority of public transport journeys between Wymondham and Norwich will be by bus rapid transit. (MB)	No action. (MB)
7464 - Hetherset Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	Additional employment, leisure facilities, affordable housing, medical centre, cycleway from Hetherset to Wymondham and possible sixth form college. (MB)	Noted. Studies have been undertaken to identify infrastructure needs related to development and requirements will be established in subsequent versions of this document and in other dpds. (MB)	Ensure infrastructure needs to serve new development for Hetherset are incorporated in plans. (MB)
7213 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Major improvements to transport, drainage, sewerage and internet provision. (MB)	Noted (MB)	No change required. (MB)
7727 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	All options have overlooked the potential to create a new town at Long Stratton (MB)	The creation of a new community has not been overlooked, and is an integral part of option 3. Given the need to accommodate Norwich based growth in proximity to the facilities, services and employment offered close to the urban area, there is no apparent benefits in a strategy which seeks to focus exclusively on largely on Long	No change needed (MB)
7559 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7060 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	The growth will provide the opportunity for greater cross working between public service providers to share new infrastructure to mitigate the cost impact to services and the public. (MB)	This is an inherent benefit of strategic scale planning, but further work on infrastructure requirements of the favoured option will need to be completed before an appropriate implementation strategy can be prepared. This will be an integral part of the overall strategy and will be tested at examination. (MB)	No change required (MB)
7124 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	Comment	The proposal in the north east offers the opportunity for a well planned coherent development with good connectivity that; the potential for workable neighborhoods; landscape and biodiversity enhancement; access to a range of employment opportunities; the creation of distinctive neighborhoods; innovative design; enhanced local services serving new and existing communities; sustainable design and construction	The representation is supportive of the north east which appears in all options (MB)	No change needed (MB)
7188 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]	Comment	Option 2 is likely to fail to realise the economic opportunity that the RSS growth strategy has put in place for the Norwich sub-region. In terms of employment growth therefore it represents a missed opportunity. (MB)	Noted. An employment study has been undertaken to inform the identification of employment sites. (MB)	Use the findings of the employment study to identify appropriate locations for employment growth and consider further through subsequent dpds
6848 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report (MB)	Noted (MB)	Not applicable (MB)

Q10. FOR OPTION 2 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7581 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] 7435 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	Creates opportunities for new greenspaces links and corridors including improvement of water environment, removing the reliance on old sewer networks. Habitat creation in the north east sector should encompass parkland grassland and woodland as well as heathland. In south Norfolk area green infrastructure should reduce pressure on the Yare valley bottom, by offering opportunities on the valley slopes and include woodland grassland and heathland habitats. (MB)	Noted-these comments appear applicable to all options.	Ensure that the detailed text supporting the favoured option includes the reference to the need for green infrastructure to the plan from the outset and to embrace a variety of habitats, and to provide alternatives to take pressure off existing valued
6952 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	Rackheath is suitable for development with sustainable transport infrastructure. There is potential to expand it in the future. (MB)	Noted. Rackheath is identified as part of the "Growth Triangle". Detailed Sites will be considered through an Area Action Plan. (MB)	No action (MB)
7697 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Comment	Land ownership and occupation interests will ensure phased release of land within of the north east. The area offers the opportunity for historic park land to be retained as green infrastructure. The location of the land in question favours an urban extension rather than being integral with the Rackheath development (common to all	Noted (MB)	No change needed (MB)
7683 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	Comment	Refer to other question (MB)	Not applicable (MB)	Not applicable (MB)
7197 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	Comment	This option offers a strategy that spread new development around Wymondham in a larger number of smaller developments. This reduces the risk of delay and allows better use of existing infrastructure. Cost of new infrastructure can be shared between various developers. There would also be a shorter lead in period for developments. (MB)	It is true that a number of smaller sites are likely to reduce the likelihood and severity of any delay which is inherent in a larger scale development. It is not clear however how this will facilitate the provision of major infrastructure required to meet the totality of development, when some key contributing sites may not have commenced at the point the infrastructure is needed, and respective developers may not be in place (MB)	No change necessary (MB)
7794 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029] 7370 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 6932 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Comment	A bypass at Long Stratton would relieve the single largest bottleneck on a major route between Ipswich and Norwich, bringing wider benefits to the region through improved transport links but this is subject to funding being available for the bypass Investment is much needed in the south NPA, making use of the A140	The potential to create a bypass at Long Stratton is clearly a significant factor, and is one of the key factors which differentiates options 2 and 3 from option 1. The question of funding is subject to ongoing dialogue with the promoters of a large development at Long Stratton. If an option with long Stratton is to be selected it is critical that development can fund an appropriate bypass and that investment needed elsewhere does not have to be	In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Q10. FOR OPTION 2 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7281 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Comment	An opportunity is being missed by reliance on existing identified employment areas as recommended in the Arup study. Representations suggest further land identified at Browick Road, Wymondham (MB)	The strategic employment locations at Thorpe St Andrew, the Airport, NRP, and Longwater are supported by the East of England Plan. It is acknowledged that there are constraints affecting some of these at present, but as strategically supported sites, the focus should be on resolving problems rather than abandoning the sites for future development. Allocations may be appropriate at Wymondham, but these should be considered in the context of an area action plan or site specific allocations	Consider the need for any further employment allocations in Wymondham through an area action plan or site specific allocations DPD. (MB)
7502 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	Comment	Strongly support option 1 or 2. Mr Green's site (A11 near Thickthorn Park and Ride) is in single ownership, has few constraints and he is committed to bringing development forward as soon as possible. (MB)	Noted. Specific sites will be identified through the South Norfolk Site Allocation Plan. (MB)	No action (MB)

Decision on Q10. FOR OPTION 2 - What opportunities does this option present?

Use the findings of the employment study to identify appropriate locations for employment growth and consider further through subsequent dpds (MB)

Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text in all locations where development is expected to continue after 2026. (MB)

Ensure that the detailed text supporting the favoured option includes the reference to the need for green infrastructure to the plan from the outset and to embrace a variety of habitats, and to provide alternatives to take pressure off existing valued habitats. (MB)

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Review this strategy dependent on regional strategy review. (MB)

Assess the relative merits of the potential growth options. (MB)

Consider the need for any further employment allocations in Wymondham through an area action plan or site specific allocations DPD. (MB)

Ensure infrastructure needs to serve new development for Hethersett are incorporated in plans. (MB)

Ensure infrastructure needs to serve new development for Hethersett are incorporated in plans. (MB)

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Q11. FOR OPTION 2 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Q11. FOR OPTION 2 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</i>				
7766 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	Support the allocation of 2000 dwellings at Wymondham. The client's interests relates to land south of Wymondham. (MB)	Noted. (MB)	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB) Not applicable (MB)
6849 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report (MB)	Not applicable (MB)	Not applicable (MB)
6953 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	There is the potential to expand in the Rackheath Area in the future due to the availability of land and its location. (MB)	Noted. The ultimate scale of development should be made clear in the policy and supporting text (MB)	Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text. (MB)
7729 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	No link (MB)	Not applicable (MB)	Not applicable (MB)
7238 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	Comment	Supports the identification of a strategic employment site at Norwich Airport. Promote site on the land to the north of the Airport, but believe the area of search should extend north and south of the NNDR (common to all	Expansion of employment in the vicinity of the Airport is compatible with the East of England Plan, which identified it as a strategic employment location. The precise selection of the site to be allocated will be made through the Broadland site specific allocations DPD. (MB)	No change necessary (MB)
7562 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7063 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	Police are already investing its facilities, but the additional growth would place further demand on capital budgets (common to all options) (MB)	Additional growth is likely to put pressure on a wide range of facilities, and this will need to be taken into account in the preparation of an implementation strategy. However the availability of mainstream funding to help accommodate growth should be the first priority, with developer contributions topping up as necessary. (MB)	Include police and other emergency services in the development of an implementation of strategy, but seek to utilize mainstream funding as far as possible. (MB)
7127 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	Comment	Land owner (part of the north east) is committed to sustainable development, and investment strategy is long-term rather than directed at short term profit, but would need a compatible approach by other landowners (common to all options) (MB)	Noted. The policies in the pre submission publication will need to be sufficiently robust to ensure quality is achieved, and this may well point to the need to ensure a coordinated approach between landowners. (MB)	Ensure the policies governing quality in major developments are sufficiently robust and take account of the need for coordination between developers and/or landowners. (MB)

Q11. FOR OPTION 2 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7198 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	Comment	Option 2 is compatible with representor's aspirations to develop a site at Wymondham (MB)	Noted (MB)	Wymondham was included in all the options consulted upon, though the scale of allocation varied. In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options, but the merits of Wymondham will need to be considered. (MB)
7539 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment	Support identification of strategic employment site at Colney but seek clarification about the scale of residential development which might take place in the vicinity of Colney Lane. (MB)	Some development is likely to take place in the urban fringe in both Broadland and South Norfolk, but it would be inappropriate to name locations unless that development were likely to be of a strategic scale. Nevertheless, in shaping the favoured option, the benefits of a location within easy reach of NRP should be taken into account.	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)
7626 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	Clients are committed to the development of an eco community at Rackheath (common to all options) (MB)	Noted (MB)	No change needed (MB)
6933 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Comment	Will provide an important growth point in the region (MB)	Noted (MB)	No change needed (MB)
7582 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Habitat creation initiatives in south Norfolk would be consistent with the NWT project for "Claylands" Living Landscape project. (MB)	Noted - whatever the favoured option agreed by members for submission, it is important that green infrastructure plays an important part. (MB)	Ensure that the description of the favoured option includes appropriate references to the creation of green infrastructure. (MB)
7438 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	Whichever option selected, continued cooperation between Environment Agency and local planning authorities is essential. (MB)	Noted (MB)	No change needed. (MB)

Q11. FOR OPTION 2 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7795 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	Could perhaps combine with other villages in some ways (MB)	Noted (MB)	No action (MB)
7465 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	A- Will link to the Parish Plan with potential to delay revised local plan until detail of potential development	Noted. It is important that the parish plan is in agreement with planning policies set out in the Local development Framework, thus delaying production would be advantageous.	No action
7698 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Comment	Development of part of the Beeston Estate as part of the north east is compatible with continued farming on other parts (common to all options) (MB)	Noted (MB)	No change needed (MB)
7371 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	Supports emphasis on A140 corridor - promote site at Tasburgh (MB)	Noted (MB)	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)
6912 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027]	Comment	Completely opposed to the Little Melton Parish Plan in 2006 where the majority of residents want no significant development to occur in the village. (MB)	Not applicable (MB)	Not applicable (MB)
7027 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment	Supports growth at Easton as it will enable the College to invest and develop the educational facilities to the benefit of Norfolk, the region and the UK. (MB)	Noted. (MB)	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)
7822 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	Option selected will guide investment strategy for NHS Norfolk (common to all options) (MB)	Noted (MB)	No change needed (MB)

Q11. FOR OPTION 2 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
7142 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	Identifying growth locations beyond the plan period, will provide the landowners and developers confidence to invest for the long term. (MB)	The ultimate scale of development should be made clear in the policy and supporting text. (MB)	Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text in all locations where development is expected to continue after 2026 (MB)
7282 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Comment	Additional land for commercial use should be identified at Wymondham, and the JCS should include a more flexible policy approach to the reuse of "no longer fit for purpose" existing employment sites. Dispute the recommendation of the Arup study emphasising reliance on existing industrial areas. (MB)	The study by Arup did not suggest large scale allocations were necessary for B2/B8 class uses, but some additional allocations may be considered appropriate. The east of England plan recognizes the Wymondham area as a strategically appropriate for employment, and in finalizing the policies relating to the economy, an indication of the scale of allocation proposed should be included. (MB)	In the light of the Arup study, consider the need for additional allocations for employment purposes, and clarify the scale of any such allocations in the pre submission publication. (MB)

Decision on Q11. FOR OPTION 2 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text in all locations where development is expected to continue after 2026 (MB)

Include police and other emergency services in the development of an implementation of strategy, but seek to utilize mainstream funding as far as possible. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Wymondham was included in all the options consulted upon, though the scale of allocation varied. In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options, but the merits of Wymondham will need to be considered. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

In the light of the Arup study, consider the need for additional allocations for employment purposes, and clarify the scale of any such allocations in the pre submission publication. (MB)

Ensure the policies governing quality in major developments are sufficiently robust and take account of the need for coordination between developers and/or landowners. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text. (MB)

Ensure that the description of the favoured option includes appropriate references to the creation of green infrastructure. (MB)

Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?</i>				
7540 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment	Support, provided that the option is modified to include reference to residential development at Colney Lane/Cringleford. (MB)	Noted. Some development is likely to take place in the urban fringe in both Broadland and South Norfolk, but it would be inappropriate to name locations unless that development is likely to be of a strategic scale. Nevertheless, in shaping the favoured option, the benefits of a location within easy reach of NRP should be taken	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)
7283 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Comment	Supports the identification of Wymondham as a location for major change and development; however identifies that there is a need to release further commercial land at Wymondham- promotes site at Browick Road. (MB)	The support is noted. The selection of any land for employment development at Wymondham will need to be undertaken through a site specific allocations development plan document, but the core strategy should be more explicit about the scale of employment allocations required	Whatever option is selected, the scale of employment allocation who should be more clearly indicated. (MB)
7201 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 7028 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750] 7372 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 6934 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351] 6954 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449] 7239 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681] 7699 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691] 7627 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224] 7684 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	Comment	Support option 2 (MB)	Noted (MB)	No change needed (MB)

Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7583 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]

Comment Support the option provided green infrastructure and the need for new biodiversity rich landscapes were an integral part of any new development, achieving the eco town standard of 40% (implicitly applies to all options) (MB)

Noted, but the requirements set for eco towns by the government are specific to this programme, and it will be difficult to replicate these standards as a matter of a general practice, where they exceed current legislation, unless some very specific local requirements can be

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations, including the potential for green infrastructure, and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options (MB)

7796 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]

Comment Cannot commit to support until funding position known

Noted (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

However, a decision on an option will need to be made, and may well need to be made in the absence of complete certainty about funding. The text of the pre submission publication document will need to be more explicit about contingencies (MB)

Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6981 - Diocese of Norwich [2708] t 7767 - Hopkins Homes Limited	Commen t	Wymondham represents a highly sustainable opportunity for further growth which could deliver a much greater amount of development than proposed within this option - site south of Wymondham is promoted. (MB)	Noted (MB)	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB) No change needed (MB)
7441 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Commen t	No preference expressed, but offer assistance with developing evidence place to facilitate informed selection of option. (MB)	Noted (MB)	
7565 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7066 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Commen t	Norfolk Constabulary has a statutory duty to provide a police service to communities in Norfolk. (MB)	Noted. (MB)	No change needed. (MB)
7823 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Commen t	NHS Norfolk would support the appropriate healthcare developments of whichever option is chosen. (MB)	Noted. (MB)	No change needed. (MB)
6850 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Commen t	Support, assuming the Water Cycle Study produces and agreed strategy. (MB)	Noted (MB)	No change needed. (MB)
7753 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]	Commen t	Oppose the scale of development irrespective of the option selected (MB)	Noted, but the JCS must deliver the scale of growth required in the adopted East of England Plan, as a	No change needed. (MB)
7466 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Commen t	Definitely not the preferred option; however the Parish Council would work with relevant agencies to obtain the best benefit for the village. (MB)	Noted (MB)	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7130 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994] 7038 - Gerald Eve (M Moss) [7525] 7143 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer	Comment	Welcomes the identification of 6000 new homes in Sprowston/Rackheath Area. Landowners are committed to deliver a vital and viable urban extension. The Growth option maps need revising to clear show the area which forms part of the Sprowston/Rackheath Strategic Growth Location. (MB)	The support is noted. The definition of the north east (the area to be covered by an area action plan) will need careful consideration. (MB)	No change needed. (MB)
6982 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Comment	Options 1 and 2 are more sustainable than 3 as growth is located in more sustainable urban extensions rather than a new settlement. (MB)	Noted. (MB)	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB) No action (MB)
6897 - East Carleton Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1997] 7730 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	Option 2 would seem the least objectionable proposal, although all options would result in the urbanisation of the rural areas of South Norfolk which is undesirable. Concern that all options are based on the assumption of new jobs being brought into the area and it is unclear where these jobs are coming from. Option 2 would seem the least objectionable proposal, although all options would result in the urbanisation of the rural areas of South Norfolk which is undesirable. Concern that all options are based on the assumption of new jobs being brought into the area and it is unclear where these jobs are coming from. (MB)	Noted. Housing and employment targets have been set through the regional spatial strategy. Well designed development and the provision of green infrastructure required through the plan will minimise the environmental impact of the development. Employment creation has been very successful in the early years of the plan (2001-2008), beyond the annual requirements targets necessary to meet targets. (MB)	
7862 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	Comment	If option 2 is chosen then, whilst mitigating the pressure on the Town as opposed to option 1 the Town Council would still have reservations but would offer its support to ensure that it would be able to full participate in development proposals. (MB)	Noted (MB)	No action (MB)

Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6911 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027]	Comment	Oppose. It would destroy Little Melton as a village with there being continuous development from Norwich to Wymondham. (MB)	Noted (MB)	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB) In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)
7108 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400] 7214 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661] 7603 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]	Comment	Oppose option 2 (MB)	Noted (MB)	

Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******Council's Assessment******Action***

Decision on Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

However, a decision on an option will need to be made, and may well need to be made in the absence of complete certainty about funding. The text of the pre submission publication document will need to be more explicit about contingencies (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations, including the potential for green infrastructure, and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Whatever option is selected, the scale of employment allocation who should be more clearly indicated. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

7328 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]

Comment

oppose developments at the west other than existing allocations - the landscape constraints in the Yare valley and the southern bypass landscape protection zone which define the historic setting of Norwich should not be breached. [R. B.]

the west is included in all options, and therefore this comment applies to all. Representations from promoters of development, e.g. at Easton, have demonstrated that significant amounts of development could be accommodated without infringing such constraints, and this would be an issue for the site specific applications development plan document [R. B.]

no change required [R. B.]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7119 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994] 7144 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	under any option development in the north east should be maximized. the scale of growth in particular locations beyond the plan period should be clarified (rather than being a reference solely in an appendix). The plan should clarify how much development is proposed inside the northern distributor road in the north east, and how much at Rackheath. One representation argues 6000 dwellings can be accommodated within the north east inside the NDR and south of Wroxham Road. The representations broadly agree the infrastructure identified to promote land at the north east [R. B.]	the precise level of growth in particular components of the north east growth sector will need to be determined through the area action plan/masterplanning approach, as will the precise area for development. However the plan should be clearer about the ultimate scale of development proposed in particular locations, rather than confining references to the scale of growth post 2026 to an appendix [R. B.]	include references to the ultimate scale of development at particular locations expected to continue growing beyond 2026 within the relevant policies and supporting text [R. B.]
7029 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750] 6955 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	existing infrastructure should be used as much as possible and rather than promoting development which requires new infrastructure. One representation, promoting development at Easton characterizes option 3 as more dispersed and therefore offering reduced opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport [R. B.]	given the likely funding gap between funds available and infrastructure required, there is considerable merit in making the best use of what infrastructure is already available. This is also in line with the approach of the East of England plan. The evidence so far gathered suggests option 3 is relatively expensive [R. B.]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.] In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]
7345 - Pelham Holdings Ltd [8302]	Comment	support option 3 [R. B.]	noted [RB]	

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7454 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
 7653 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
 7341 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]
 7323 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]

Comment strongly oppose Mangreen on environmental grounds. The benefit of the rail connection is not certain. Compared with other options this adds significant transport investment costs. Swardeston Parish Council's representation also raises the question of flooding, and the difficulty of creating a distinct identity, in part because of the problems of establishing local facilities. They also expressed scepticism about the overall scale of growth required. Other representations also expressed opposition to the scale of growth required, irrespective of the option of chosen to accommodate it. [R. B.]

the scale of growth in general is fixed by the East of England Plan and, and unless the local investigations suggest it simply cannot be accommodated, must be viewed as fixed. The role of the core strategy is to determine how to accommodate that growth in the most sustainable manner. Clearly this includes the minimisation of environmental damage. While the western part of the Mangreen area is not so inherently suited to drainage by infiltration alone as the eastern part, there is no particular reason to assume flooding would be more of a problem here, subject to appropriate design of a sustainable drainage system [R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]

7503 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]

Comment for options 2 and 3, the Long Stratton bypass is also a piece of significant infrastructure which is needed [R B.]

option 3 does appear to be a relatively expensive option[R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7284 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425] 7320 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197] 7863 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708] 7768 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	reduced allocation at Wymondham compared with option 1 will assist social assimilation and avoid the need for new settlement. There are areas of a very significant wildlife interest and flood-risk which must be avoided. The impact on services is critical. In the south east, the presence of the railway line creates a barrier which will make it hard to integrate new communities into the town centre. A further representation argues that a commercial Lead mixed use development could be accommodated at Wymondham at Browick Road, and that this can be accommodated within the existing capacity of the A11 junction. One representation argues that Wymondham is much better suited to accommodate development than Long Stratton (considerations of proximity to Norwich, employment, public transport access etc) and therefore opposes option 3. [R. B.]	comments noted. However, social assimilation may depend on more than simply numbers - it may also depend on appropriate additional infrastructure for the town, and the way in which the additional development is planned. The Taylor report (Living Working Countryside: the Taylor Review of Rural Economy and Affordable Housing CLG 2008) cautions against continued incrementalism in the expansion of market towns. It is not clear why the larger scale of growth proposed an option 1 would involve the creation of a separate settlement. Nonetheless the views of Wymondham Town Council opposing option 1 are noted. The reduced allocation at Wymondham in option 2 was linked to the desire to provide a developer funded bypass for Long Stratton, and the potential to resolve local issues at the Long Stratton also needs to be considered. Choice of site at Wymondham is critical. Whichever option is selected, all of those included in the consultation document included development at Wymondham, and it will be essential at the area action plan stage to take on board the local issues raised. [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]
7554 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	police facilities should be included in critical infrastructure. The scale of growth envisaged will require additional police facilities, especially safer neighbourhood teams, specifically at the north east, south west (if selected for major growth) south (if selected for major growth) Wymondham (if selected for major growth) and	a further study into infrastructure needs for the favoured option will highlight where additional emergency services facilities are required, for example enhanced Safer Neighbourhood Teams. Based on the earlier broad brush work by EDAAW, major development such as that proposed in the north east, or in this option at Mangreen would be likely to require such investment. Subject to the more detailed work referred to above, similar investment may be needed elsewhere [R. B.]	based on more detailed work into infrastructure requirements for the favoured option, include a reference to the need for additional police infrastructure in major development locations as appropriate [R. B.]
7842 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310] 7541 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223] 7628 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	- for options 2 and 3, the Long Stratton bypass is also a piece of significant infrastructure which is needed [R B.]	the appendices outlining options 2 and 3 include the phrase " completion of a bypass is a prerequisite for the scale of growth identified in Long Stratton". This is considered to be an appropriate reference. [RB]	depending on the option for growth selected, retain the reference to the need for a Long Stratton bypass [R. B.]
6935 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351] 7700 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691] 7685 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	Comment	The summary of infrastructure requirements in the plan is considered correct. One representation also correctly refers to the evidence of the water cycle study that the sewerage system within Norwich is generally believed to be at capacity. [RB]	Noted [R. B.]	No change necessary [R. B.]
7467 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	See response to questions 22 to 25	not applicable	not applicable
7331 - North Norfolk District Council (Ms. Jill Fisher) [1570]	Comment	North Norfolk District Council wish to be involved in any cross border issues relating to the north east [R. B.]	this is a reasonable request and will need to be taken on board by Broadland District Council in site specific allocations work [R. B.]	no change required [R. B.]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7086 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	Comment	general scepticism over provision of infrastructure to accommodate growth [R. B.]	this is a widespread concern, and one difficult to allay fully. One way to approach this is to adopt the strategy which makes the best use of existing infrastructure and appears at least costly in terms of new infrastructure requirements [R. B.]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]
7797 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	even more needed than in respect of option 2 [Long Stratton parish council -] [R. B.]	It is true that the totality of infrastructure needed appears greater with option3 but in the particular case of Long Stratton option 2 may require more investment locally	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]
6922 - Norfolk Environmental Waste Services (Mr David Beadle) [4376]	Comment	strategic waste management facilities should be referred to as necessary infrastructure [R. B.]	agreed - the study into infrastructure requirements should include some assessment of strategic waste management facilities[R. B.]	agreed - these should be included in the implementation strategy [R. B.]
7824 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	additional community health services will be required for all options, as well as primary care facilities [R. B.]	the point is valid, though revenue funding from development is difficult [RB]	add a reference to community health services under the "health" bullet points in policy 18 [R. B.]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7584 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]
7430 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]

Comment provision of green infrastructure within and connecting developments according to an overall strategy is needed. This should not be introduced as an afterthought. The Environment Agency also reflects the concerns (common to all options) that sewerage capacity limitations will need to be resolved and included in Anglian Water's capital programme. This may affect the timing of some growth. Within Norwich city centre more detailed work on flood-risk will need to be done to guide specific allocations. The Norfolk Wildlife Trust representations echo the point about the need for coherent green infrastructure from the outset, and make the point that habitat creation will be required in addition to the in the case of development at Long Stratton (options 2 and 3), at Mangreen (option 3) [R. B.]

it is important that green infrastructure is protected and enhanced, and this should be guided by the green infrastructure work already undertaken. Clearly where there are local issues within the option selected these it will need to be taken on board at the master planning stage.

no change needed, though the points made are valid and will need to be taken on board at the site specific/area action plan stage, and in any masterplanning work.

7731 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]

Comment Need for link between NNDR and A47. (this comment appears to apply to all options) the parish council also comments that the infrastructure requirements of option 3 make it an expensive option [R. B.]

the County Council considered the arguments for and against linking the NDR to the A47 west of Norwich and concluded it was impractical given the nature conservation constraints. Given the likely funding gap between funds available and infrastructure required, there is considerable merit in making the best use of what infrastructure is already available. This is also in line with the approach of the East of England Plan. The evidence so far gathered suggests option 3 is a relatively expensive option [R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R. B.]

7325 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]

Comment oppose growth at Long Stratton: not strategically the right choice because of its distance from Norwich, Wymondham has better rail connections, challenge of the viability of a developer funded bypass, environmental constraints at Long Stratton [R. B.]

Long Stratton was introduced into option 2 and retained in option 3 for primarily local environmental reasons related to traffic impacts in the town -it is accepted that there will be instances where dealing with a particular local issue may move the selected growth strategy away from one which focuses entirely on strategic considerations. If an option including Long Stratton is selected, the constraints raised will need to be taken into account at the site specific allocations DPD/area action plan stage [R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R. B.]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7109 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]	Comment	numerical data is offered to indicate that additional retail provision is needed to cater for convenience and lower order comparison of goods in areas of major growth, in the northeast the at the "existing" district centre at Sprowston anchored by the Tesco store. In relation to the Mangreen proposal in option 3, similar data is used to suggest a slightly lower level of expenditure, again the representation suggests that apart from very local facilities, enhanced facilities around the Tesco store at Harford would be an appropriate response.	in the case of the north east, which is common to all options, the overall scale of development is likely to rise to 10,000. The representation's numerical data is based on 6000. The overall scale of development in the north east is considered likely to justify a new district centre which would be qualitatively better than relying on an existing centre which would inevitably be at the margin of the new community. In the case of Mangreen, a smaller development of 4500 dwellings may well struggle to justify a new district centre, based on experience elsewhere (e.g. Cambourne in Cambridgeshire). This would clearly be one of the challenges if option 3 were to be selected. [R. B.]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]
6851 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069] 7373 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	sewerage capacity at Wymondham should be referred to. More generally, Anglian Water Services suggest that option 3 is the least deliverable option in terms of water related infrastructure, but this will need to be validated by more detailed work on the water cycle study. [R. B.]	noted[RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]
7252 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	Comment	The option should include Trowse [R. B.]	there is an ambiguity in the consultation document regarding Trowse. It is included as a reference in the Norwich fringe parishes but also as a " service village" this needs to be resolved, and Trowse should be referred to as a fringe parish. This applies to all options [R. B.]	delete reference to Trowse and as a "service village" and ensure it is retained within the description of Norwich urban fringe parishes in policy 1 or its successor [R. B.]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7663 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Comment	agree option 3 would require major junction improvements at the Harford junction. More clarification is needed on traffic restraint to prevent a new business park becoming car dependent. Further investigation of the possibility of a rail connection is needed: option 3 is not so well related to strategic non car facilities, but could spread impacts on the trunk road. However this will need to be strongly evidenced. The representation supports the proposal to develop bus rapid transit and the potential for enhanced use of the Bittern line [RB]	the need for additional evidence to support the access arrangements and work to the Harford junction on the Southern bypass for option 3 is noted. If this option is favoured by members that work will need to be undertaken [R. B.]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.] no change needed [R. B.]
7215 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	transport, sewerage and drainage infrastructure is generally inadequate. High speed Internet access is inadequate [R. B.]	the plan acknowledges that these are needed to be improved to cater for major growth. Although the improvement will be focused on areas of new development, existing communities nearby may also reap some benefit [R. B.]	no change needed [R. B.]
7602 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]	Comment	any option should include the need for improvements to the A47/A146 junction, but especially options 2 and 3 if major development takes place in the A140 corridor [rb]	while problems no doubt do exist at the junction mentioned, improvements to the Longwater, Thickthorn and Harford junctions of the southern bypass are likely to be the priority to accommodate growth and set out in option 3	no change required [R. B.]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------

Decision on Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

include references to the ultimate scale of development at particular locations expected to continue growing beyond 2026 within the relevant policies and supporting text [R. B.]

add a reference to community health services under the "health" bullet points in policy 18 [R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

agreed - these should be included in the implementation strategy [R. B.]

based on more detailed work into infrastructure requirements for the favoured option, include a reference to the need for additional police infrastructure in major development locations as appropriate [R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******Council's Assessment******Action***

delete reference to Trowse and as a "service village" and ensure it is retained within the description of Norwich urban fringe parishes in policy 1 or its successor [R. B.]

no change needed, though the points made are valid and will need to be taken on board at the site specific/area action plan stage, and in any masterplanning work. [R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

depending on the option for growth selected, retain the reference to the need for a Long Stratton bypass [R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

Q14. FOR OPTION 3 - What are the constraints to delivery?

7433 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Commen t	need more detailed flood-risk assessment in Norwich city centre (presumably equally applicable to all options). [RB]	noted, this is largely a matter to be picked up in the more detailed site specific or area action plan DPD's. However there is merit in referring to the need for more detailed assessment in the City Centre section of the JCS[RB]	Refer to the need for more detailed, level 2, flood risk assessment in the supporting text to the city centre policy [RB]
7095 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	Commen t	several areas of search include sites of archaeological interest - will require preservation by record or in situ [RB]	noted - Policy 17 refers in general to environmental assets and the supporting text makes it clear this includes archaeology [RB]	No change needed [RB]

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7798 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029] 7843 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310] 6936 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351] 7769 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	Long Stratton unable to accommodate levels of growth proposed in options 2 and 3. Wymondham should have increased allocation (as in option 1). Long Stratton is not a sustainable location and has little employment other than South Norfolk Council, and no rail access. Other representations on behalf of proposers at Long Stratton acknowledge scale of development proposed in option 3 may not enable a fully developed the funded bypass, but undertake to continue working with the GNDP to that end. Long Stratton Parish Council make the point that more employment is needed if the town is to grow to avoid increased commuting. [RB]	the inclusion of Long Stratton in options 2 and 3 is in response to local problems rather than its strategic significance within the Norwich policy area. Nevertheless, if an option including development at Long Stratton is selected, it would be appropriate to recognise the need to encourage further employment in the town. [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. If this is the case, and the final strategy includes development that Long Stratton, it should make it clear that additional employment at Long Stratton is part of the strategy. [R. B.] Some consideration of phasing should be undertaken but any artificial restraint is unlikely to be justified on the basis of evidence to date [RB]
7049 - Mr & Mrs L Dale [6251]	Comment	Phasing mechanism is critical to delivery [RB]	Consideration needs to be given to delivery, but work to date on possible trajectories for all the options consulted on suggests that delivery will be a challenge and any phasing arrangement should not be designed to restrain development. One risk which must be avoided however is the possibility of a number of smaller sites beginning simultaneously, and proceeding slowly as a result of competing with each other. In the case of larger developments such as the north east, the need for critical infrastructure will limit potential start dates and any subsequent phasing is likely to be limited to the provision of infrastructure within the development [RB]	
7010 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934] 7585 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	green infrastructure needs to be planned from the outset, with existing sensitive sites carefully managed and alternative green infrastructure provided through development . The Mangreen area does not contain nationally designated sites, but the general need for environmental protection remains equally applicable. [RB]	noted- [RB]	ensure the pre submission publication plan includes within the description of the strategy clear reference to the need for green infrastructure to be included as an integral part of the strategy [RB]
7732 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	the option requires the completion of the Norwich northern distributor road (presumably equally applicable to all options) [RB]	the County Council were persuaded that the conflict with internationally important ecological considerations ruled out the possibility of completing of the link across the Wensum valley to the A 47 [RB]	no change necessary [RB]

Q14. FOR OPTION 3 - What are the constraints to delivery?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7145 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	support major development in north east, though land is in a multiple ownership. Landowners behind this representation wish to work together to move quickly to site specific proposals and planning permission. Believe completion of an inner link from Wroxham Road to Broadland Business Park should enable early commencement [RB]	it is probable that it will be necessary for development to proceed in the north east simultaneously in a number of locations to achieve the necessary delivery rates. It is also likely that the ultimate form of development will consist of a number of "villages" or "neighbourhoods" each with their own local facilities. However there are certain elements of high level infrastructure which will need to be shared, for example a high school and major public transport infrastructure and therefore some coordination between the different elements of the major development is essential. While the early delivery of housing is important, piecemeal development following partial provision of the infrastructure necessary for the development in the north east is not seen as an appropriate solution. It will be necessary to ensure that all development contributes appropriately to the key elements of shared infrastructure. [RB]	ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]
6852 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069] 7374 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 7468 - Hetherset Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	refer to response to other questions, or evidence studies [RB]	not applicable [RB]	not applicable [RB]
7174 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]	Comment	lack of clarity in definition of uses to be accommodated on employment sites. Definition should include flexibility to account for sui generis uses with similar characteristics to primary use (definition suggested) [RB]	the point made by the representation is reasonable in that there are various sui generis uses frequently found on mainstream employment areas. However the level of detail sought by the representation seems more appropriate to a development control policies DPD [RB]	no change needed [RB]
7557 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	additional capital funding for police services will be required from Community Infrastructure Levy [RB]	the study into infrastructure needs for the favoured option will highlight the additional demands on various infrastructure providers. It is reasonable to expect that the scale of development proposed will require additional police facilities. However, mainstream funding should be the first funding option rather than a reliance on CIL. CIL may well be able to offer some "top-up" but should not be seen as a substitute for mainstream funding which should take account of the demands on a service, and their growth as a consequence of the development, through the various funding formulae. [RB]	the implementation strategy will need to take account of additional demands on police facilities, and indicate an appropriate level of contribution from developer funding to the extent that it is necessary to top up mainstream funding. The implementation strategy will be tested alongside the Core strategy at the Public
7701 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Comment	delivery of northeast major growth area will be delayed if a single master plan is required. The area should be delivered in discrete parts [RB]	- it is probable that it will be necessary for development to proceed in the north east simultaneously in a number of locations to achieve the necessary delivery rates. It is also likely that the ultimate form of development will consist of a number of "villages" or "neighbourhoods" each with their own local facilities. However there are certain elements of high level infrastructure which will need to be shared, for example a high school and major public transport infrastructure and therefore some coordination between the different elements of the major development is essential. [RB]	ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7290 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Comment	support the identification of Wymondham as a location for major change and development, but note the current imbalance between homes and jobs. Further employment land needs to be identified. Promote site at Browick Road . Do not agree with the Arup study's proposed reliance on currently identified sites. Believe re-use of "no longer fit for purpose employment sites" is appropriate response. JCS should be more explicit about the need to provide for more commercial land at Wymondham and should also allow a framework for the release of no longer "fit for purpose employment sites" to other uses - site at Browick Road is largely unconstrained, though representation accepts refresh of archaeological and ecological evidence would be appropriate. Appropriate policy could enable site to be brought forward by SPD rather than require sites allocations DPD. [RB]	further employment allocations would be appropriate at Wymondham, but should be undertaken in the context of a site specific allocations DPD [RB]	Indicate the broad scale of allocations to be made at strategic employment locations in the Core Strategy, including Wymondaham [RB]
7825 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	Lack of appropriately skilled staff (in various parts of health service) [RB]	noted however it is essential to obtain the commitment of NHS Norfolk to the final strategy[RB]	no change needed [RB]
7189 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]	Comment	agree with the conclusions of the Arup study concerning the overall scale of job growth to be planned for, but not the emphasis on currently identified employment sites - too many constrained. Support NRP and identification of land at the Airport (but currently constrained by access). Believe Longwater unlikely to deliver - has proven unattractive in the past. Promote a site at Harford bridge as an employment allocation [RB]	under option 3 it is proposed that the major development at Mangreen will include specific provision for local employment within the development. The strategic employment locations at Thorpe St Andrew, the Airport, NRP, and Longwater are supported by the East of England Plan. It is acknowledged that there are constraints affecting some of these at present, but as strategically supported sites, the focus should be on resolving problems rather than abandoning the sites for future development. A new site in this location would be likely toned significant infrastructure investment.[RB]	no change needed [RB]
7122 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	Comment	supports proposal for north least but will require coordination of infrastructure, achieved through an appropriate master planning process (support Enquiry by Design) and need to look carefully at what infrastructure is needed locally and the potential offered by different funding streams. EBD, as a process, is helpful in identifying infrastructure and potential economies [RB]	it is probable that it will be necessary for development to proceed in the north east simultaneously in a number of locations to achieve the necessary delivery rates. It is also likely that the ultimate form of development will consist of a number of "villages" or "neighbourhoods" each with their own local facilities. However there are certain elements of high level infrastructure which will need to be shared, for example a high school and major public transport infrastructure and therefore some coordination between the different elements of the major development is essential. [RB]	ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]

Q14. FOR OPTION 3 - What are the constraints to delivery?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7270 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	oppose Mangreen - little background work and consequent unanswered questions about how major development at Mangreen could be delivered - first time the potential for major development at Mangreen has appeared in the JCS - believe Hethersett/Little Melton is a better alternative	it is not true that this is the first stage Mangreen has appeared in the JCS. One of the locations tested in the issues and options consultation was the south, in the Mangreen area. Nevertheless, from work undertaken so far, option 3 appears to be relatively costly in terms of infrastructure. [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]
7299 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	Comment	Breckland District Council argue that limited growth at Wymondham may not provide a critical mass for improvements on the Thickthorn junction and public transport corridors. This is significant in the context of further growth elsewhere along the A11 corridor. [RB]	all the options will require major improvements to the Thickthorn junction. Others have made the related point that option 3 will also require major improvements to the Harford junction and therefore may be costly particularly in transport infrastructure terms. However if the additional growth elsewhere on the A11 corridor is seen as a significant factor, requiring improvements to the Thickthorn junction, it should make appropriate	seek clarification from the Highways Agency and Breckland District Council what contributions can be expected to improvements to the Thickthorn junction, from developments elsewhere in the A11 corridor. [RB]
6956 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449] 7216 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661] 7240 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681] 7542 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223] 7629 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	programming of infrastructure, including the timely public transport investment critical. Lack of coordination by agencies is a risk [RB]	infrastructure is indeed critical, and a more detailed study looking at the infrastructure requirements of the favoured option should help to quantify this in detail, and also identify potential funding sources. The JCS will need to include an implementation strategy which will be tested at the examination. It is essential that "buy-in" is obtained from the key service providers[RB]	no change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document[RB]

Q14. FOR OPTION 3 - What are the constraints to delivery?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7030 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment	option 3, being more dispersed than others risks increasing infrastructure cost and reducing opportunity to deliver high quality development. [RB]	earlier broad brush work on infrastructure suggested there may be a funding gap. Therefore the cost of the strategy is a highly relevant consideration. [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]
<i>Q15. FOR OPTION 3 - What opportunities does this option present?</i>				
7285 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425] 7191 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]	Comment	An opportunity is being missed by reliance on existing identified employment areas as recommended in the Arup study. Representations suggest further land identified at Harford Bridge and Wymondham [RB]	under option 3 it is proposed that the major development at Mangreen will include specific provision for local employment within the development. The strategic employment locations at Thorpe St Andrew, the Airport, NRP, and Longwater are supported by the East of England Plan. It is acknowledged that there are constraints affecting some of these at present, but as strategically supported sites, the focus should be on resolving problems rather than abandoning the sites for future development. Allocations may be appropriate at Wymondham, but these should be considered in the context of an area action plan or site specific allocations DPD [RB]	No change needed {RB}
6853 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069] 7469 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	refer to other questions [RB]	not applicable [RB]	not applicable [RB]

Q15. FOR OPTION 3 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7770 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	allocation at Wymondham should be increased to allow Norwich related growth to be accommodated in settlements close to Norwich (comment options 2 and 3)	the allocation at Wymondham was reduced in option 2 in order to make allocations at Long Stratton in order to secure a bypass, and deal with a widely acknowledged local issue. It remains appropriate to consider specific local issues such as this as well as the strategic picture. The addition of Mangreen in option 3 will, on the basis of evidence to date, add to infrastructure costs [RB]	In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7586 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] 7436 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	creates opportunities for new greenspaces, links and corridors including improvement of water environment. Habitat creation in the north east sector should encompass parkland, grassland and woodland as well as heathland. In South Norfolk area green infrastructure should reduce pressure on the Yare valley bottom, by offering opportunities on the valley slopes and include woodland grassland and heathland habitats. [RB]	noted-these comments appear applicable to all options.	ensure that the detailed text supporting the favoured option includes the reference to the need for green infrastructure to be planned from the outset and to embrace a variety of habitats, and to provide alternatives to take pressure off existing valued habitats. [RB]
7110 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]	Comment	would maximize the use of existing retail infrastructure	clearly the presence of the Tesco superstores at Sprowston and Harford cannot be ignored. However in terms of creating large scale communities, a car based store peripheral to the development in question is not necessarily ideal. In the case of the north east, where development is expected to rise to 10,000 dwellings eventually, an additional district centre/high street appears to be justified, along with more local shopping facilities to serve local communities. In the case of Mangreen, where option 3 envisages 4500 dwellings, with unspecified potential for growth post 2026, proximity of the Tesco store may make it harder to establish full scale district centre, and retail facilities within the development may be confined to a more local scale. This may need more detailed work at the area action plan stage [RB]	no change needed [RB]
7175 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]	Comment	flexible approach to accommodating sui generis uses within the mainstream employment areas would assist economic growth (common to all options) [RB]	a degree of flexibility is an essential part of the planning process. However, the degree of detail sought by the representation appears more appropriate to a development control policies DPD than a core strategy [RB]	no change needed [RB]

Q15. FOR OPTION 3 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7199 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	Comment	reliance on smaller sites in Wymondham reduces risk of delay inherent in single large site and offers opportunity to share infrastructure costs (common to options 2 and 3)	It is true that a number of smaller sites is likely to reduce the likelihood and severity of any delay which is inherent in a larger scale development. It is not clear however how this will facilitate the provision of major infrastructure required to meet the totality of development, when some key contributing sites may not have commenced at the point the infrastructure is needed, and respective developers may not be in place [RB]	no change necessary [RB]
7543 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223] 7630 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	this option offers less opportunity for a coherent public transport led strategy [RB]	it is accepted that accommodating significant development at Mangreen will entail significant challenges in terms of creating public transport access. This will need further work if an option including major development at Mangreen is selected. It is acknowledged that evidence to date suggests this option is more expensive in terms of transport infrastructure requirements [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB] no change needed [RB]
7733 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	all options have overlooked the potential to create a new town at Long Stratton [RB]	the creation of a new community has not been overlooked, and is an integral part of option 3. Given the need to accommodate Norwich based growth in proximity to the facilities, services and employment offered close to the urban area, there is no apparent benefits in a strategy which seeks to focus exclusively or largely on Long	no change required [RB]
7560 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7061 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7217 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661] 7826 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	opportunity to review and plan infrastructure strategically (health needs, police, and other infrastructure)(common to all options) [RB]	this is an inherent benefit of strategic scale planning, but further work on infrastructure requirements of the favoured option will need to be completed before an appropriate implementation strategy can be prepared.This will be an integral part of the overall strategy and will be tested at examination [RB]	no change required [RB]
6957 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449] 7146 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	Large scale growth location with potential for further development in future, at Rackheath and NE in general . Needs clarity over longer term growth potential. Offers opportunities to complete link from Wroxham Road to business park to improve connectivity (common to all options) [RB]	the representation is essentially supportive of all options, but the ultimate scale of development should be made clear in the policy and supporting text [RB]	clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text in all locations where development is expected to continue after 2026. [RB]

Q15. FOR OPTION 3 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7799 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029] 7375 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 6937 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Comment	bypass at long Stratton, and making use of the A140 corridor within the NPA, but subject to funding being available for the bypass [RB]	the potential to create a bypass at Long Stratton is clearly a significant factor, and is one of the key factors which differentiates options 2 and 3 from option 1. The question of funding is subject to ongoing dialogue with the promoters of a large development at Long Stratton. If an option with Long Stratton is to be selected it is critical that development can fund an appropriate bypass and that investment needed elsewhere does not have to be	In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7300 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	Comment	reduced scale of growth at Wymondham means that this option, and option 2 miss the opportunity to focus transport investment and public transport investment in the A11 corridor, and to locate housing in proximity to key employment areas [RB]	the evidence to date suggests that this option is a relatively expensive in terms of the need for transport investment, and public transport investment [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7125 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	Comment	the proposal in the north east offers the opportunity for a well planned coherent development with good connectivity that; the potential for workable neighborhoods; landscape and biodiversity enhancement; access to a range of employment opportunities; the creation of distinctive neighborhoods; innovative design; enhanced local services serving new and existing communities; sustainable design and construction (common to all	the representation is supportive of the north east which appears in all options [RB]	no change needed [RB]
7702 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Comment	land ownership and occupation interests will ensure only phased release of land within of the north east. The area offers the opportunity for historic park land to be retained as green infrastructure. The location of the land in question favours an urban extension rather than being integral with the Rackheath development (common to all	noted[RB]	no change needed [RB]

Q15. FOR OPTION 3 - What opportunities does this option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7519 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]	Comment	Support the increase on small sites in Broadland in this option. Representation promotes sites at Blofield [RB]	noted-if this option is selected, the choice of specific sites in Broadland to meet the smaller sites allocation, whether in Blofield or elsewhere, will be considered through a site specific allocations DPD [RB]	no change needed [RB]

Decision on Q15. FOR OPTION 3 - What opportunities does this option present?

no change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document[RB]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]

Refer to the need for more detailed, level 2, flood risk assessment in the supporting text to the city centre policy [RB]

Some consideration of phasing should be undertaken but any artificial restraint is unlikely to be justified on the basis of evidence to date [RB]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. If this is the case, and the final strategy includes development that Long Stratton, it should make it clear that additional employment at Long Stratton is part of the strategy. [R. B.]

seek clarification from the Highways Agency and Breckland District Council what contributions can be expected to improvements to the Thickthorn junction, from developments elsewhere in the A11 corridor. [RB]

ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]

the implementation strategy will need to take account of additional demands on police facilities, and indicate an appropriate level of contribution from developer funding to the extent that it is necessary to top up mainstream funding. The implementation strategy will be tested alongside the Core strategy at the Public Examination. [RB]

ensure the pre submission publication plan includes within the description of the strategy clear reference to the need for green infrastructure to be included as an integral part of the strategy [RB]

Indicate the broad scale of allocations to be made at strategic employment locations in the Core Strategy, including Wymondaham [RB]

Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</i>				
7587 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	habitat creation initiatives in south Norfolk would be consistent with the NWT project for "Claylands" Living Landscape project [RB]	noted - whatever the favored option agreed by members for submission, it is important that green infrastructure plays an important part [RB]	ensure that the description of the favoured option includes appropriate references to the creation of green infrastructure. [RB]
7128 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	Comment	Land owner (part of the north east) is committed to sustainable development, and investment strategy is long-term rather than directed at short term profit, but would need a compatible approach by other landowners (common to all options) [RB]	noted. The policies in the pre submission publication will need to be sufficiently robust to ensure quality is achieved, and this may well point to the need to ensure a coordinated approach between landowners [RB]	ensure the policies governing quality in major developments are sufficiently robust and take account of the need for coordination between developers and/or landowners [RB]
7544 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment	support identification of strategic employment site at Colney but seek clarification about the scale of residential development which might take place in the vicinity of Colney Lane [RB]	some development is likely to take place in the urban fringe in both Broadland and South Norfolk, but it would be inappropriate to name locations unless that development were likely to be of a strategic scale. Nevertheless, in shaping the favoured option, the benefits of a location within easy reach of NRP should be taken into account	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7111 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]	Comment	option 3 proposes development close to both Tesco's superstores at Sprowston and Harford and would encourage investment in them [RB]	noted - [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7734 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	no link [RB]	not applicable [RB]	not applicable [RB]

Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7771 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	support the allocation of 4000 dwellings at Wymondham. The client's interests relates to land south of Wymondham which would be compatible with this policy approach (presumably relates to option 1) [RB]	option 3 does not propose 4000 dwellings at Wymondham [RB]	not applicable in relation to this option. However, in selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7200 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	Comment	option 3 is compatible with representor's aspirations to develop a site at Wymondham [RB]	noted [RB]	Wymondham was included in all the options consulted upon, though the scale of allocation varied. In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options, but the merits of Wymondham will need to be considered.[RB]
7286 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Comment	believe additional land for commercial use should be identified at Wymondham, and believe the JCS should include a more flexible policy approach to the reuse of "no longer fit for purpose" existing employment sites. Dispute the recommendation of the Arup study emphasising reliance on existing industrial areas [RB]	The study by Arup did not suggest large scale allocations were necessary for B2/B8 class uses, but some additional allocations may be considered appropriate. The east of England plan recognizes the Wymondham area as a strategically appropriate for employment, and in finalizing the policies relating to the economy, an indication of the scale of allocation proposed should be included [RB]	in the light of the Arup study, consider the need for additional allocations for employment purposes, and clarify the scale of any such allocations in the pre submission publication [RB]

Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7800 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029] 7376 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	supports emphasis on A140 corridor - promote site at Tasburgh . A140 corridor offers opportunity to spread development and investment[RB]	noted [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7563 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7064 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	police are already investing in facilities, but the additional growth would place further demand on capital budgets (common to all options) [RB]	additional growth is likely to put pressure on a wide range of facilities, and this will need to be taken into account in the preparation of an implementation strategy.However the availability of mainstream funding to help accommodate growth should be the first priority, with developer contributions topping up as necessary. [RB]	include police and other emergency services in the development of an implementation of strategy, but seek to utilize mainstream funding as far as
7827 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	option selected will guide investment strategy for NHS Norfolk (common to all options) [RB]	noted [RB]	no change needed [RB]
6854 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069] 7470 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	Refer to other studies [RB]	not applicable [RB]	not applicable [RB]
7031 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment	option3 risks undermining the investment strategy of Easton College [RB]	noted. Elsewhere, Easton College have argued against a strategy of dispersal on the grounds it would dilute the necessary investment in infrastructure [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
6938 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son	Comment	Will provide an important growth point in the region [RB]	noted [RB]	no change needed [RB]

Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7241 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	Comment	supports the identification of a strategic employment site at Norwich Airport. Promote site on the land to the north of the Airport, but believe the area of search should extend north and south of the NNDR (common to all	expansion of employment in the vicinity of the Airport is compatible with the East of England Plan, which identified it as a strategic employment location. The precise selection of the site to be allocated will be made through the Broadland site specific allocations DPD [RB]	Ensure Key diagram does not imply undue precision [RB]
7703 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Comment	development of part of the Beeston Estate as part of the north east is compatible with continued farming on other parts (common to all options) [RB]	noted [RB]	no change needed [RB]
7439 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	whichever option selected, continued cooperation between Environment Agency and local planning authorities is essential [RB]	noted [RB]	not applicable [RB]
6958 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449] 7631 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224] 7147 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	Clients are committed to the development of an. eco - community at Rackheath (common to all options) [RB]	noted [RB]	no change needed [RB]

Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Decision on Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB] In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. However, a decision on an option will need to be made, and may well need to be made in the absence of complete certainty about funding. The text of the pre submission publication document will need to be more explicit about contingencies [RB] In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB] In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB] In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations, including the potential for green infrastructure, and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB] In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.	
			Whatever option is selected, the scale of employment allocation who should be more clearly indicated.[RB]	
<i>Q17. FOR OPTION 3 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?</i>				
6896 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	Commen t	oppose option 3 (reasons given include limited growth proposed at Wymondham, difficulties of achieving public transport solutions with option 3, undermining of investment plans at Easton, proposal to create a major including access to employment,	noted [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria
6984 - Diocese of Norwich [2708] town in the Mangreen area) [RB]				access by non car modes,
6983 - Diocese of Norwich [2708] environmental considerations and				infrastructure implications,
7032 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]				including cost and deliverability,
7604 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]				alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7242 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]				
7545 - Barratt Strategic/John				

Q17. FOR OPTION 3 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7442 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517] 6855 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	no preference expressed, but offer assistance with developing evidence base to facilitate informed selection of option [RB]	noted [RB]	no change needed [RB]
7202 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 7131 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994] 6959 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449] 7566 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7067 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7828 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 7704 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691] 7686 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271] 7148 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	yes (implicitly to all options) [RB]	noted [RB]	no change needed [RB]
7801 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	cannot commit to support until funding position known	noted [RB]	<p>In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.</p> <p>However, a decision on an option will need to be made, and may well need to be made in the absence of complete certainty about funding. The text of the pre submission publication document will need to be more explicit about contingencies [RB]</p>

Q17. FOR OPTION 3 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7377 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 6939 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Comment	support (implicitly options 2 and 3) [RB]	noted [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7218 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661] 7754 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]	Comment	oppose the scale of development irrespective of the option selected [RB]	noted, but the JCS must deliver the scale of growth required in the adopted East of England Plan, as a	no change needed [RB]
7588 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	support the option provided green infrastructure and the need for new biodiversity rich landscapes were an integral part of any new development, achieving the eco town standard of 40% (implicitly applies to all options) [RB]	noted, but the requirements set for eco towns by the government are specific to this programme, and it will be difficult to replicate these standards as a matter of a general practice, where they exceed current legislation, unless some very specific local requirements can be	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations, including the potential for green infrastructure, and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]

Q17. FOR OPTION 3 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7735 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022] 7112 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400] 7782 - Mrs H Williamson [6288] 6901 - M. Falcon Property Solutions (Mr Michael Falcon) [7186] 7471 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	support the option -existing retail facilities could be expanded to serve the north east and Mangreen, -- landowners at Mangreen have indicated support and the development would be deliverable,-- support the reduced allocation at Hethersett [RB]	noted [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7287 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425] 7039 - Gerald Eve (M Moss) [7525] 7632 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224] 7772 - Hopkins Homes Limited	Comment	support, but with reservations (comments include - interest lies in the north east, but question whether option 3 sustainable - interest lies in the north east, but request wider definition of north east than appears in consultation document - support identification of Wymondham as a location for major development in the NPA and but promotes additional site for employment at Browick Road - believe Wymondham could accommodate more than is proposed in this option) [RB]	The support is noted. The option selected will need to take account of the infrastructure implications. The definition of the north east (the area to be covered by an area action plan) will need careful consideration. The selection of any land for employment development at Wymondham will need to be undertaken through a site specific allocations development plan document, but the core strategy should be more explicit about the scale of employment allocations required [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. Whatever option is selected, the scale of employment allocation who should be more clearly indicated.[RB]

Q17. FOR OPTION 3 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Decision on Q17. FOR OPTION 3 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?		
		In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]		
		In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.		
		However, a decision on an option will need to be made, and may well need to be made in the absence of complete certainty about funding. The text of the pre submission publication document will need to be more explicit about contingencies [RB]		
		In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]		
		In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]		
		In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations, including the potential for green infrastructure, and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]		
		In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.		
		Whatever option is selected, the scale of employment allocation who should be more clearly indicated.[RB]		
<i>MAIN TOWNS - Q18 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?</i>				
7567 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	Police facilities at Aylsham, Diss and Harleston are adequate, but higher levels of growth at Wymondham will need investment for the Safer Neighbourhood Team	noted [RB]	the scale of such requirement will need to be examined through the infrastructure needs and funding study undertaken based around the favoured option, and incorporated in the implementation
7068 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]				
7736 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	Refer to need for completion of NNDR -- investment in infrastructure needed to make Wymondham a main town is prohibitive [RB]	The County Council has come to a view that the NNDR cannot be linked from the A1067 to the A47. In the case of Wymondham, like other areas identified for significant growth, there will be considerable investment needed, but the view of Wymondham as a main town is based on its current attributes including size, the range of facilities and function [RB]	no change needed [RB]

MAIN TOWNS - Q18 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7829 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	Scale of growth unlikely to require significant health infrastructure beyond current and potential investment at Wymondham and Diss [RB]	noted [RB]	no change needed, subject to the outcome of more detailed work on infrastructure requirements and funding. [RB]
7443 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517] 7288 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425] 7378 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 7864 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708] 7648 - Cemex [8191]	Comment	Relate to Wymondham - comments include: provision of more central bus/coach facilities: supporting the identification of Wymondham as a main town and proposing sites: current flooding and drainage problems need a resolution: foul and surface water sewers are old and of uncertain capacity - likelihood of significant investment being needed [RB]	The comments made have validity. The appendices describing the options refer to the need for improved bus connections to the centre. It is acknowledged that existing sewers are of uncertain capacity, and the assumption in the water cycle study is that there is no spare capacity to be exploited. Any new development will therefore need to take into account the need for appropriate provision. Anglian Water Services are participants in the water cycle study. None of the points, however, fundamentally challenge the position of Wymondham as a main town, or indeed a location for a significant level of growth. [RB]	no change needed, though these points will need to be taken into account in more detailed site specific work. [RB]
7511 - Alex and Peter Valori / Faircloth and Baker [7209]	Comment	Do not support identification of Wymondham as a location for growth - believe this contradicts the objective to reduce the need to travel. Undertaking junction improvements to accommodate growth here would simply encourage car based travel. [RB]	Do not agree. Wymondham has a wide range of facilities, and is well located in relation to strategic employment opportunities, and has good public transport connections to Norwich (with the potential for further enhancement) and also, by rail to Cambridge. [RB]	no change needed [RB]
7589 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] 7487 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232]	Comment	Improved green links to rural catchment are needed: potential link to "Claylands Project" currently being developed in South Norfolk [RB]	Noted. the descriptions of Wymondham as a strategic growth location do refer to the need to create extensive levels of green infrastructure, but the specific project could be named [RB]	In the favoured option, assuming Wymondham remains a location for major growth, retain the reference to the need for major green infrastructure, but include reference to the " Claylands
7670 - Mr Robert Debbage [6972]	Comment	Challenge the adequacy of the total scale of development in main towns, key service centres and service villages in South Norfolk --.these do not sum to the 2000 identified for smaller sites [RB]	the representation is based on a misunderstanding. The 2000 identified for smaller sites are within the Norwich policy area within the urban fringe or larger villages. Outside the Norwich policy area the key service centres and main towns contribute toward meeting the rural area	no change needed, though check the wording to ensure the plan is clear [RB]

MAIN TOWNS - Q18 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7657 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Comment	<p>Wymondham - growth will require improvement of the A11/B1172/ Tuttlles Lane junction.</p> <p>Aylsham - sewage treatment works capacity limitations alone do not justify lack of allocation and additional pressure on Acle (trunk road issue) [RB]</p>	<p>- Wymondham -- the need for improvements at the junction named is noted. It is not clear whether the scale of improvements in is directly connected to the scale of development proposed, but this will need to be taken into account in site specific work, and it may be a factor in the scale of sites to be allocated, at least in coordinating appropriate developer contributions. It does not however fundamentally challenge the appropriateness of Wymondham as a main town or location for growth</p> <p>Aylsham - the comments are noted. Stage2B of the water cycle study will look at Aylsham to try and establish as precisely as possible the scale of the difficulties highlighted in earlier stages of the water cycle study. Although the scale of allocation at Acle has been slightly increased to take account of the difficulties at Aylsham, it is well placed to function as a key service centre as it has a good range of facilities and public transport connections by both road and rail. [RB]</p>	<p>ensure that in the favoured option any description of Wymondham as a location for major development includes a reference to the need for local trunk road improvements, and incorporate in implementation strategy.</p> <p>Reconsider the potential for an allocation at Aylsham depending on the outcome of the water cycle study the stage 2B [RB]</p>
7595 - Redenhall with Harleston Town Council (Mr B Harding) [2042]	Comment	<p>Harleston - there would be pressure on leisure facilities which would need expanding: primary health care need improvement: drainage and sewer systems need improvement: local traffic improvements needed [RB]</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk have not identified the need for additional health facilities at Harleston, to date. The water cycle study assumed sewers generally to be at capacity, though the sewage treatment works has the volume capacity to accommodate this scale of growth. It is understood that leisure facilities in Harleston are in need of improvement</p>	<p>Add reference to need to improve leisure facilities at para 7.13 or 7.14[RB]</p>
7113 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400] 7844 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310] 6940 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Comment	<p>Relate to Diss - comments include: growth will require additional retail floorspace which should be centrally located - Tesco store should be expanded to cater for this: detailed traffic management measures required to focus movement towards the town centre, not the edge, to support town centre retailing: Diss is a highly sustainable location and the allocation should be</p>	<p>policy 6 describes the need for significant expansion adjacent to the town centre at Diss, which seems to accord with the views expressed. There may be merit in considering adjusting the scale of allocation between main towns, and in particular Diss and Harleston which are relatively close. In terms of services, education requirements may also suggest some reconsideration.</p>	<p>look again at the critical infrastructure requirements for Diss and Harleston to consider whether adjustments to the housing provision figure should be made. [RB]</p>

MAIN TOWNS - Q18 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7708 - Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement [8170]	Comment	[relates more to locations for major change and development in the Norwich policy area] Broadly support the strategy including the sustainability of the A11 corridor (public transport facilities and access to employment) but believe more explicit support needed for development in this corridor at the urban edge where there is good access to Norwich Research Park. The strategy recognises the need for expanded employment opportunities not only in the city centre but at key locations on the edge of the urban area - this is supported	noted; the strategy does allow for additional development within the fringe parishes or larger villages with an indicative total of 2000 in all options for South Norfolk. In strategic terms, there is much to be said for this location in terms of access to employment and public transport potential, and members will wish to give this consideration in selecting sites to meet the unidentified 2000 requirement	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
6856 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069] 7254 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] 7515 - Kier Land Ltd [8254] 6992 - Harrold, Holman and	Comment	Aylsham - sewage treatment works capacity limitations alone do not justify lack of allocation - can be overcome at reasonable cost, and the cost of sewage treatment costs such as water supply: criticism that the water cycle study is following rather than leading the technical consultation: costs should not be seen as an issue as they are not borne by the developer: policy follows policy WAT2 of the East of England Plan too slavishly: other facilities available at Aylsham justify increasing allocation to 600-1000 houses: further research into sewage treatment works capacity limitation needed: sewage treatment works can be expanded if a new consent can be agreed with the Environment Agency - this will be explored in the water cycle study stage 2B [RB]	the comments are noted. Stage2B of the water cycle study will look at Aylsham to try and establish as precisely as possible the scale of the difficulties highlighted in earlier stages of the water cycle study. While the cost may not be an issue for developers, the relevant policy in the East of England Plan is part of the development plan for the area and is clearly directed towards making the best use of public investment. This remains a worthwhile aim. Although Anglian Water Services are included in those making this comment, they were party to the water cycle study. The issue is more concerned with the granting of consents by the Environment Agency for further discharges, and this has got caught up in a wider review of consents being undertaken by the Environment Agency. To date their advice has been to exercise caution in assuming the problems can easily be overcome, but they too are party to the water cycle study [RB]	Further consideration will need to be given at the site specific stage to the identification of the "smaller sites" allowance of 2000. [RB] reconsider the scale of allocation which could be made at Aylsham, following stage2B of the water cycle study [RB]
7610 - Trafford Estate Rackheath [8291]	Comment	Support the strategy in general including the need for a range of sites in a number of locations including key service centres such as Wroxham [relates to K. S. C's] [RB]	noted [RB]	no change needed [RB]
7472 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	No comment [RB]	Not applicable [RB]	Not applicable [RB]

MAIN TOWNS - Q18 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7314 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]

Comment
t There is a recurring theme about the limitations of water related utilities in the main towns and key service centres. This must surely also apply to the larger scale growth proposed within the Norwich Policy Area [RB]

while the water cycle study has highlighted local issues which will need to be overcome, the overall scale of development to be accommodated is fixed by the East of England Plan, and this was approved taking into account the stated positions of the Environment Agency and utility companies such as Anglian Water. In general terms, earlier stages of the water cycle study have not shown volumetric limitations at Whittingham sewage treatment works, though there are quality issues which need to be addressed. Likewise, the issue about water supply is more related to distribution networks and it is true that accommodating the scale of development proposed will require major investment in water infrastructure. The point of the water cycle study stage 2B is to test out the favoured option and enable Anglian Water to include appropriate provision in their future capital programmes. [RB]

no change needed [RB]

MAIN TOWNS - Q19 What opportunities can growth bring?

7596 - Redenhall with Harleston Town Council (Mr B Harding) [2042]

Comment
t points made include: business/employment (Wymondham): town centre services and retail(Diss) with a focus on local businesses and rather than edge of town car-based sites (Diss). Concern over potential transfer of land earmarked for business to housing could undermine this potential(Harleston) [RB]

agreed, growth in main towns is likely to promote further employment, though the extent can be hard to predict. Policy 6 in the technical consultation report indicates that additional employment is expected at all the identified main towns though in the case of Aylsham and Harleston this is expected to take place on existing identified employment areas. Within the Norwich policy area, policy 2 promotes expansion of employment activity at Hethel but does not specifically refer to Wymondham. Further consideration will need to be given to the possible need for further employment allocations at the town. In the case of retail, policy 6 notes the need for modest town centre expansion at Aylsham, Diss and Harleston. All three options recognise the need for some expansion of Wymondham town centre. [RB]

consider further the potential for employment growth at Wymondham, and include more explicit guidance on the scale of land allocations for employment throughout the core strategy

6941 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]
7865 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]
7040 - Spen Hill Developments Limited [8201]

Comment
t

covered in question 18 [RB]

covered in question 18 [RB]

covered in question 18 [RB]

7069 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]

Comment
t

covered in question 18 [RB]

it is gratifying to note the general support for the role envisaged for the main towns. It is expected that some refinement of the scale of growth in different markets towns may be appropriate if a better understanding of thresholds can be achieved. In particular, the extent of any sewage treatment works constraints at Aylsham should be clarified through stage2B of the water cycle study. The key constraints at Harleston and Diss(apart from any further findings from the water cycle study) are likely to be education. A dialogue with Children's Services may help to refine the scale of allocation appropriate to each town. [RB]

consider the outcome of stage 2B of the water cycle study and further dialogue with Children's Services and NHS Norfolk to see if an adjustment to the scale of allocation in individual main towns is justified. [RB]

7488 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232]
7087 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]
7203 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]
7379 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]
7845 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]
7178 - Hopkins Homes Ltd (Mr Chris Smith) [7104]
7773 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]

Comment
t

housing delivery, particularly in comparison to a larger scale developments, in relation to sites at Wymondham, Harleston and Diss, including the argument that allocations should be increased - scale of allocation proposed would not even meet locally generated demand over the plan period. Main towns are generally sustainable locations. Many representations are promoting specific sites. Main towns provide sustainable access to jobs and services for surrounding rural area [RB]

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6993 - Harrold, Holman and Buckingham [8287]	Comment	growth at Aylsham would make better use of existing underused infrastructure and provide affordable homes, a range of market homes and key worker housing and increase local spending.would also provide open space and green infrastructure [RB]	the principal unknown factor at Aylsham concerns the capacity of the sewage treatment works, and the prospects for its expansion, which is dependent on a further discharge consent from the Environment Agency. If the problems can be overcome it would make sense to identify Aylsham for a modest allocation, of potentially around 300 houses (taking into account the overall scale of development likely to be needed in the rural parts of Broadland). However any such allocation would need to be clearly conditional upon the obtaining of consent for the appropriate expansion of the sewage treatment works, or would need to follow confirmation that such consent would definitely be forthcoming. [RB]	reexamine the potential for an allocation at Aylsham following completion of the stage2B of the water cycle study. [RB]
6857 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069] 7473 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	refer to other studies/ no comment [RB]	not applicable [RB]	not applicable [RB]
7444 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	development could promote provision of green infrastructure (particular reference to Wymondham)	agreed- this is already referred to in the appendices describing the potential for development at Wymondham in all the options consulted upon [RB]	no amendment needed [RB]
7737 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	oppose Wymondham as a main town - Long Stratton should be expanded to become a rural focus for the surrounding area [RB]	disagree. Wymondham has all the attributes of a main town in terms of its facilities, access to employment, and sustainable transport links [RB]	no change needed [RB]
<i>MAIN TOWNS - Q20 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?</i>				
7204 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 7774 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	a strategy of using smaller sites will assist in avoiding lead in delays, and make better use of local infrastructure. Developers can share the costs of the more major infrastructure needed. Various sites promoted at Wymondham [R B]	clearly where smaller sites within the existing built up area exist, and are suitable for development they should be considered. However, where greenfield sites need to be allocated it may not necessarily be advantageous to allocate exclusively smaller sites, though this will be a matter for decision at the site specific allocation/area action plan stage. While the use of smaller sites may introduce a natural form of phasing, it may not always be easy to secure contributions from the developers of sites brought forward early towards improved infrastructure required only as a consequence of the cumulative impact of the various sites allocated. It may also mean difficulties of timing of infrastructure improvements, if the final contribution is dependent on the last site to be brought forward. A further difficulty may be in agreeing appropriate apportionment between sites, when the nature of development on some of those allocated, or indeed the identity of the developer, is not firmed up. Some of these difficulties maybe eased by the introduction of the community infrastructure Levy. [R B]	no change required [R B]

MAIN TOWNS - Q20 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7088 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	Comment	economic climate [R B]	clearly the economic climate will have an effect. The most obvious effects are in the likely rate of development, and also in the ability of development to fund infrastructure enhancement. This makes it all the more important that current work on infrastructure requirements and potential funding sources feeds into the implementation strategy in the plan. [R B]	ensure that the implementation strategy takes full account of all "mainstream" funding sources [R B]
7516 - Kier Land Ltd [8254] 6994 - Harrold, Holman and Buckingham [8287]	Comment	in the case of Aylsham the only significant constraint is the lack of capacity at the sewage treatment works. This can be overcome through the provision of the necessary infrastructure through Anglian Water's capital programme. [R B]	noted -if the sewage treatment works constraints at Aylsham can be overcome, it would be appropriate to make an allocation. Given the overall scale of the allocation needed in the rural part of the Broadland, an allocation of about 300 dwellings would seem appropriate. The position should be clarified through stage 2B of the	consider an allocation at Aylsham, of about 300 dwellings, subject to the outcome of stage 2B of the water cycle study. [R B]
7489 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232] 7380 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	transport, delivery of most appropriate renewable energy options and local objections are the key obstacles. The means of overcoming these include working with developers and inclusive consultation. [RB]	transport : All the main towns have been or will be subject to Market Town Transport studies under the Local Transport Plan. These will help pinpoint problems and possible interventions. The situation will in part be affected by the choice of sites allocated. [RB/RD] Appropriate renewable energy options will be derived following consideration of a study being undertaken into the area's potential for renewable energy. It is likely, however, that wind power will be one of the leading options to be considered, and if renewable energy is to form a larger share of the area's overall energy consumption, wind energy may well need to play a large part. [R B]	transport ; no change needed [RB/RD] Policy 13 deals with reducing environmental impact, referring to the need for new housing to match current Housing Corporation requirements and non housing development to incorporate some onsite renewable energy generation. In the light of the renewable energy study, this policy should be strengthened and made more explicit. [R B]
7011 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Comment	local areas of environmental sensitivity will need to be protected [R B]	Policy 17 refers to the protection of environmental assets. There are statutory processes to protect nationally and internationally designated areas of wildlife importance, and the policy refers to the need to protect environmental assets outside these areas too. The policy is considered appropriate for a core strategy, though more detail may be appropriate in development management policies DPDs. [R B]	no change needed [R B]
7096 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	Comment	sites of archaeological importance - impacts will need to be mitigated through preservation/recording [R B]	noted. Policy 17 refers to the need for the environmental assets of the area to be protected, maintained and enhanced, and the supporting text includes reference to the archaeological assets of the area. At the level of a core strategy this reference is considered appropriate, though more detailed guidance may be needed in a development management policies DPD [R B]	no change necessary [R B]

MAIN TOWNS - Q20 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7738 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022] 7866 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	Comment	Land within main towns suitable for development and with easy access to central area facilities [R B]	it is probable that the scale of development required in main towns will not always be able to be accommodated on central area sites, but it is important that the sites selected, through the site specific allocations DPD or area action plan, take account of the need for residents of the new areas to have ready access to the town's facilities. This however is a matter for future DPDs [R B]	no change required [R B]
7445 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517] 6858 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069] 7474 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	no comment/refer to other studies [R B]	not applicable [R B]	not applicable [R B]
6942 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Comment	traffic flows (implicitly local flows) [R B]	noted . All the main towns have been or will be subject to Market Town Transport studies under the Local Transport Plan. These will help pinpoint problems and possible interventions. The situation will in part be affected by the choice of sites allocated.[R B/RD]	No change needed[R B/RD]
<i>MAIN TOWNS - Q21 How could growth in main towns link with your longer term investment strategies?</i>				
7243 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	Comment	concern Aylsham and include: growth could support better public transport in the A140 corridor and park and ride at the Airport [RB]	Aylsham would be a suitable place to make an allocation. The only reason it has not been proposed to date concerns the outcome of the early stages of the water cycle study. The position at the auction is being examined as part of stage 2B of the study, and subject to the outcome, the potential for an allocation at Aylsham should be reconsidered [RB]	consider the potential for an allocation at Aylsham in the light of the water cycle study stage 2B [RB]
7194 - Sainsburys Supermarket Ltd [7040]	Comment	[relates to policies five and twelve] existing Sainsbury's store could anchor centre serving growth in the west within Norwich policy area - suggest this store is categorized as a "district centre"The retail and town centre study by Grimleys identifies the potential for increased convenience floorspace - this could be matched by expanding existing stores in the city centre such as Queens Road Sainsbury's [RB]	district centres have been defined having regard not only to a single store. Although the Sainsbury store at Longwater is the nearest large store to existing recent residential development, it is not within the development and is some distance from residential areas, and therefore the case for its designation as a district centre remains unproven. Depending on where allocations are made at the site specific stage in the west this may change, but it is by no means certain, and at this stage it appears premature to regard the store as the foundation for a district centre. With regard to the potential to accommodate further convenience goods floorspace within the city centre, the core strategy cannot be site specific, and the disposition of expanded city centre functions will be determined through area action plans or masterplans for areas such as the North City Centre or the St Stephens area. [RB]	no change needed [RB]

MAIN TOWNS - Q21 How could growth in main towns link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7739 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022] 7381 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	there is no connection to the investment strategy [RB]	noted [RB]	noted [RB]
6913 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027] 7490 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232] 7115 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400] 7846 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]	Comment	plan should include Attleborough [RB] Responses concern Diss and include: existing store in the town could be expanded to serve a growing population: enabled steady flow of housing land and minimise public investment in infrastructure: additional town centre uses and employment -green transport links could connect with surrounding villages [RB]	Attleborough is outside plan area [RB] the retail and town centres study notes there is potential for modest expansion at Diss, but the form this takes will need to be considered through the site specific allocations DPD. In response to other representations it has been a suggested that the precise scale of allocation at Diss should be reconsidered taking into account service thresholds. Diss appears a suitable place for further allocations subject to servicing considerations for the reasons mentioned in the representations [RB]	not applicable [RB] reconsider the precise scale of allocation proposed at capital Diss in discussion with service providers and in the light of the water cycle study stage 2B. [RB]
7546 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223] 7633 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224] 7775 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	responses concern Wymondham and include: development will support northeast/southwest public transport axis: mixed use development including employment affordable housing and open space (promoting site) (one representation promoting site at Cringleford which will share and support the public transport corridor benefits) [RB]	noted -one of the benefits of locating development at Wymondham is the potential to make use of a public transport corridor which already performs well.The town has a number of facilities which will benefit new development, so long as it can be appropriately integrated into the fabric of Wymondham [RB]	no change necessary [RB]
6859 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069] 7475 - Hetherset Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	no comment/refer to other strategies [RB]	not applicable [RB]	not applicable [RB]
6943 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Comment	development in main towns would support viability of services serving rural areas [RB]	noted [RB]	no change necessary [RB]
KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q22 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?				
6867 - Hingham Town Council (Mrs C Edwards) [2017]	Comment	Policy 7: Hingham may have a good range of services, but 100 additional dwellings would overstretch capacities at the doctors surgery, primary school and library, while there is already very low water pressure and extra surface water run off would affect parts of the town prone to flooding after heavy rain.	To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS based on responses from the technical consultees.
7634 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	1) Policy 7: Further consideration should be given to the role and scale of development proposed for Wroxham - There would be advantages in strengthening it. 2) Policy 8: The inclusion of Rackheath as a Service Village is at variance with its designation as a growth location. 3) Policy 12: Supports the hierarchy of centres and provisions for flexibility.	1) Significant growth is provided for. Any reconsideration will be part of the production of the Submission version of the JCS. 2) To be resolved as part of production of submission version of the JCS 3) Noted. DSW	Issues will be examined as part of preparation of submission version of the JCS.

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q22 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7306 - DuBrow, R Key and D Hibbet [8286]	Comment	1) Policy 7: Objection to the lack of new housing land allocations at Poringland. 2) Proposes new site off Pigot Lane and Oaklands for new housing, high school playing fields and new employment area.	1) To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS based on responses from the technical consultees. 2) To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document in relation to any JCS amendments. DSW	1) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS. 2) Consider as part of preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
7446 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	An assumption has been made within stage 2 of the WCS that all sewer networks are at capacity and therefore costs and timings will need to be factored into any future	Any additional development would be expected to make appropriate contributions to infrastructure, and infrastructure providers would be expected to plan for the necessary provision where this is a statutory requirement.	Assess the outcomes of the Water Cycle Strategy on the timing of development in Key Service Centres and identify any key constraints in the JCS.
6860 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report	The role/function of these settlements and the potential for allocations will be considered in the context of the Water Cycle Study. (SM)	Review the potential for allocations in the context of the Water Cycle Study.
7671 - Mr Robert Debbage [6972]	Comment	Alpington/ Yelverton (a Policy 9 "Other Village") and Bergh Apton have sufficient shared services to be combined as a Policy 8 "Service Village"	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. DSW	Consider as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.
7714 - Sunguard Homes [8320]	Comment	Identifies a site (circa 150 units) in Tharston/Long Stratton and the existing infrastructure capacity/constraints - specifically the ability to access further development to the west of the village.	Site already identified through the SHLAA and consideration will be given to its allocation, including addressing any infrastructure issues, through the South Norfolk Site Specific policies DPD/Area Action Plan for	Consider the role/function/constraints/requirements of Long Stratton as a Growth Location, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy not a Growth Location.
7219 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Wroxham/Hoveton would require improved road access or a bypass. Others - no comment	Transport improvements related to growth are a key consideration in the Joint Core Strategy and will also be reflected in the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy. No proposals currently exist for a Wroxham/Hoveton bypass. (SM)	Consider the transport improvements necessary to facilitate further growth at Wroxham and that already planned for Hoveton in the North Norfolk Core Strategy and make a specific reference to NATS in
7258 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) (Mr Martin C Davidson) [2592]	Comment	Supports the identification of Brundall as a Key Service Centre, but considers the current 20-50 units too low, particularly given the good public transport links. Identifies a site (circa 1-200 units) in Brundall, currently allocated for recreation/public open space uses, and suggests that housing could facilitate bringing forward this long-standing allocation.	The role/function of settlements is being considered as part of the review of the settlement hierarchy. Consideration will be given to allocating particular sites, including addressing any infrastructure issues, through the Site Specific Policies DPD, in the context of the JCS.	Consider the role/function of Brundall, including the potential for larger housing allocations, in the review of the settlement
7802 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	For any of the options, more employment at Long Stratton is required, and of course in respect of options 2 and 3 a lot more. Upgrading/renewal of sewerage and foul water systems.!!	Local employment opportunities would be promoted in both Growth Locations and Key Service Centres. Any additional development would be expected to make appropriate contributions to infrastructure, and infrastructure providers would be expected to make the necessary provision where this is a statutory requirement, including sewerage and foul water systems. (SM)	Consider the need to identify a specified employment allocation at Long Stratton in the JCS.

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q22 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7332 - North Norfolk District Council (Ms. Jill Fisher) [1570]	Comment	Identifying Wroxham as A Key Service Centre is consistent with the status of Hoveton in the North Norfolk Core Strategy. Proposed 1-200 dwellings would need coordination with proposed development in Hoveton, particularly re. highway capacity and infrastructure.	Support noted. Para 7.26 notes that the combined impacts of the proposed development at Wroxham and Hoveton have been taken into account in the current proposals. (SM)	No change.
7658 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Comment	Impact on the trunk road will be lessened by promoting local employment opportunities at Key Service Centres. However HA concerned about any development at Acle.	Acle is well placed to function as a Key Service Centre as it has a good range of facilities and public transport connections by both road and rail. (RB/SM)	Review the function/role of Acle as part of the overall review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
7506 - Carter Jonas (Jenny Page) [6766]	Comment	Policy 7: The proposed numbers of new dwellings at Acle, Hingham, Loddon and Reepham are inconsistent with the lack of capacity in the necessary services and too low to justify costly new investment.	To be resolved as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Consider as part of preparation of submission version of the JCS.
7476 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	Sewerage improvements necessary. School capacity. Health provision, particularly for the growing elderly population. Road improvements.	Noted. Any development would be required to provide the infrastructure and services to support that development.	Take account of infrastructure requirements required to serve any growth at Hethersett
7830 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	Will take account of planned growth as part of the primary care development already under consideration in Key Service Centres.	Active consideration of the need for new/improved facilities to meet growth is welcomed. (SM)	No change.
7520 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]	Comment	Policy 7: Blofield has sufficient or planned infrastructure improvements to support up to both the proposed 50 dwellings and beyond to 100-200 dwellings.	Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS.
7382 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	Generally road and public transport improvements as many are poorly serviced by road network and public	Key Service Centres have been chosen because they offer a range of local services/facilities/employment, which can reduce the need to travel, as well public transport options for accessing higher order settlements.	Consider the role/function of these settlements in the review of the settlement hierarchy.
7605 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]	Comment	Concern re access from Loddon to Norwich (via Thurton) re. existing bus services (reliability, quality and lack of evening service), problems with the A146/A47 junction and the need for a Park and Ride at Trowse.	Continuing to improve public transport to/between Main Towns and Key Service Centres is contained in Policy 16 'Strategic Access and Transportation', and therefore these will be a focus for contributions to infrastructure collected under Policy 19 'Implementation and Monitoring'. In addition Norfolk County Council is assessing the impact of further growth on the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass junction. At present Park and Ride is referred to in the supporting text to Policy 16 as important for the rural areas, however consideration could be given to making a reference to supporting/enhancing Park and Ride in Policy 16. (SM)	Consider a reference to enhancing the Park and Ride network in Policy 16 (is Trowse Park and Ride still featured in NATS??).

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q22 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7611 - Trafford Estate Rackheath [8291]	Comment	<p>1) Policy 7: Supports Key Service Centres identification.</p> <p>2) Policy 8: Supports Service Villages identification.</p> <p>3) Policy 7: Supports designation of Wroxham as a KSC for up to 200 dwellings.</p> <p>4) Policy 7: Supports the potential accommodation of the 200 dwellings on land to the south of Wroxham broadly enclosed by The Avenue, Charles Close, Keys Drive and Broad farm.</p> <p>5) Policy 8: Rackheath should provide for more than the proposed 10-20 new dwellings proposed by Policy 8 due to the existing and potential enhanced transport links, the availability of the local industrial area and the eco-town proposals.</p> <p>6) Policy 8: Supports the potential development of land in Rackheath in the general area of Wroxham Road/ Green Lane West/ Wendover Road.</p> <p>7) Policy 8: Supports the designation of Spixworth as a Service Village.</p> <p>8) Policy 8: Suggests that additional growth should be proposed for Spixworth to ensure the provision of necessary community facilities, overcome open space deficiencies and to support local services.</p> <p>9) Policy 8: Proposes land for mixed use development for housing and community facilities as an extension to the east of Spixworth between Spixworth and the B1150 within Crostwick parish.</p> <p>10) Area wide policies/ Housing - para. 8.4: Endorses provision for housing for the period 2021-2026 to meet the obligations of PPS 3 to provide for a 15 year housing land supply at the point of adoption of the DPD.</p> <p>11) Re Para. 3.5 and the EEP review to take account of updated household forecasts to 2031; proposes that the JCS should establish a sound and sustainable spatial strategy capable of accommodating and managing housing growth to 2031.</p>	<p>1) Noted.</p> <p>2) Noted.</p> <p>3) Noted.</p> <p>4) To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document .</p> <p>5) To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.</p> <p>6) To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document .</p> <p>7) Noted.</p> <p>8) To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.</p> <p>9) To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>10) Noted.</p> <p>11) To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. DSW</p>	<p>1) None.</p> <p>2) None.</p> <p>3) None.</p> <p>4) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document .</p> <p>5) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS.</p> <p>6) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document .</p> <p>7) None.</p> <p>8) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.</p> <p>9) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>10) None.</p> <p>11) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.</p>
7262 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	Identifies the infrastructure issues in relation to a specific site in Loddon.	Site already identified through the SHLAA and consideration will be given to its allocation, including addressing any infrastructure issues, through the South Norfolk Site Specific policies DPD, in the context of the	No change.
7167 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	<p>1) Policy 7: Supports Wroxham as a Key Service Centre.</p> <p>2) Growth targets for the Key Service centres should not be expressed as ceilings on development but rather as minimum targets to be achieved.</p> <p>3) Land to the south of Wroxham offers the best location</p>	<p>1) Noted.</p> <p>2) To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS. However any formal housing provisions may be exceeded by local infill and windfall housing developments.</p> <p>3) To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document . DSW</p>	<p>1) None.</p> <p>2) To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS.</p> <p>3) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document .</p>

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q22 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7512 - Alex and Peter Valori / Faircloth and Baker [7209]	Comment	Support/comment on policies 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14 and 19	<p>Policy 1 - scale of growth at Wymondham and Long Stratton has been revised in the Public Consultation version of Reg 25. Consider the revised scale of growth to be appropriate for both locations.</p> <p>Policy 2 - Support noted. There are no proposals to introduce new rail halts on the Wymondham - Norwich line</p> <p>Policy 4 - Support noted</p> <p>Policy 5 - Support noted. The distribution of major housing areas allows for a choice of locations. The objector's suggestion that more development should be located at Rackheath rail corridor would place too much reliance on one location and could jeopardise delivery</p> <p>Policy 12 - the settlement hierarchy is being reviewed.</p> <p>Policy 13 - support noted</p> <p>Policy 14 - the fragility of the housing market is a temporary phenomenon and the policy is written to endure the current slump.</p> <p>Policy 19 - the policy is dependent on the government introducing the CIL and as drafted the policy is consistent with the information published on the draft CIL proposals. This includes the inclusion of the elements listed in the draft policy. TH</p>	None
7074 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	Comment	Identifies two sites as part of the Ditchingham Estate.	<p>Sites will be considered in the South Norfolk Site Specific Policies DPD, in the context of the JCS. (SM)</p>	Consider the role and function of Ditchingham as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
6823 - Acle Parish Council (The Parish Clerk) [7454]	Comment	Infrastructure needed - additional sewerage capacity, new buildings at the primary and high schools, additional funding for healthcare services.	Noted - any additional development would be expected to make appropriate contributions to these elements of infrastructure. (SM)	Assess the extent of the infrastructure constraints listed and whether they can be addressed by an allocation of 1-200 dwellings and local
7100 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) (Mr Martin C Davidson) [2592]	Comment	<p>Acknowledge the need for additional infrastructure, particularly the new inner link road between Wroxham Road and the Broadland Business Park.</p> <p>Infrastructure will require the coordination of a range of public and private sector organisations.</p>	Key infrastructure requirements and mechanisms for delivery will be set out in the IDP. The Site Specific Policies DPDs and Area Action Plans will identify more localised provision necessary for specific proposals. (SM)	No change.
7740 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	<p>All areas would require significant infrastructure development under these proposals.</p> <p>To plan efficiently Long Stratton should be the major growth area.</p>	Any additional development would be expected to make appropriate contributions to infrastructure, and infrastructure providers would be expected to make the necessary provision where this is a statutory requirement.	Consider the role/function/potential of Long Stratton in preparing the Favoured Option and in the review of the settlement hierarchy.
			The inclusion of major development at Long Stratton will be	

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q22 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7568 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7070 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	Proposed level of growth at Wymondham will have an impact on Police resources inc. Safer Neighbourhoods Team. Growth at Aylsham, Diss and Hareston is catered for by good Police Station facilities, although resources may be required for front line policing. All Key Service Centres are covered by adequate police stations or service partners (e.g. Safer Neighbourhoods Teams), so any investment would be to enhance/improve existing facilities.	Crime prevention and policing are covered by Policy 19 'Implementation and Monitoring' and Table 2 'Infrastructure Likely to be Funded Through a CIL'. However a distinction will have to be drawn between what can reasonably be required of developers and what should be covered by other funding streams. (SM)	Further clarification of what elements Policing/Crime Prevention may reasonably be covered by developer funding.
7641 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203] 7271 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	Identifies a site (circa 180 units) in Hethersett and the existing infrastructure capacity/constraints.	Site already identified through the SHLAA and consideration will be given to its allocation, including addressing any infrastructure issues, through the South Norfolk Site Specific policies DPD/Area Action Plan for Hethersett, in the context of the JCS. (SM)	No change.
KEY SERVICE CENTRES -Q23 What opportunities can growth bring?				
7715 - Sunguard Homes [8320]	Comment	Identifies a site in Long Stratton/Tharston that could contribute to the local housing needs in a location where people have good opportunities to reduce car use. (SM)	Site already identified through the SHLAA and consideration will be given to its allocation through the South Norfolk Site Specific policies DPD/Area Action Plan for Long Stratton, in the context of the JCS. (SM)	Consider the role/function/constraints/requirements of Long Stratton as a Growth Location, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy not a Growth Location.
7168 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	Suggest relocation of Wroxham Football Club and redevelopment of site	Site proposal noted, the site needs to be promoted at site-specific stages of the local development plan process	None
7477 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	A - Access to additional facilities but by managed development	Provision of new facilities will be broadly proportionate to the level of growth. (SM)	Consider the role/function of Hethersett as a Growth Location in the development of the Favoured Option, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy if not a Growth Location.
7263 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	Description of a potential site for allocation at George Lane, Loddon. Allocation would help sustain the village, which has a good variety of shops/services/facilities, in the longer term, including help retain/increase the proportion of families and younger people. The development would contribute to 'essential and local	Noted. Site already identified through the SHLAA and consideration will be given to its allocation through the South Norfolk Site Specific policies DPD. (SM)	No change.

KEY SERVICE CENTRES -Q23 What opportunities can growth bring?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6868 - Hingham Town Council (Mrs C Edwards) [2017] 7803 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029] 6825 - Acle Parish Council (The Parish Clerk) [7454] 7220 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Will support existing businesses.	Noted. (SM)	No change.
7075 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	Comment	Policy 8: Ditchingham should be categorised as a Key Service Centre.	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. DSW	Consider as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.
7179 - Hopkins Homes Ltd (Mr Chris Smith) [7104]	Comment	Policies 6 - 8: Considers that there should be an increase in the proportion of new dwellings provided for in the market towns and larger villages.	To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. DSW	Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
7642 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	Hethersett should be chosen as major growth location	Site details noted, the site needs to be promoted at site-specific stages of the local development plan process	None
7259 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) (Mr James Nicholls) [6785]	Comment	1) Policy 7: Supports Brundall's designation as a Key Service Centre. 2) Policy 15: Proposes a site for employment/commercial development. (NB: Map supplied but not attached to comment summary).	1) Noted. 2) To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. DSW	1) None. 2) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
7272 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	see rep 7642	see rep 7642 TH	see rep 7642
7165 - Mr A Semmence [6362]	Comment	1) Policy 7: Supports Hingham as a Key Service Centre. 2) Policy 7: Hingham's housing provision of 100 dwellings is too restrictive. 3) Policy 7: Growth targets for the Key Service Centres should not be expressed as ceilings for development and	1) Noted. 2) & 3) To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	1) None. 2) & 3) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
6861 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report	The opportunities provided by development in these settlements will be considered in the context of the Water Cycle Study. (SM)	Review the opportunities provided by development in the context of the Water Cycle Study.
7741 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	Long Stratton could become a strong vibrant community south of Norwich providing excellent links to the South with housing which people could afford and an existing rail network to Norwich and the South.	The role of Long Stratton as a Growth Location will be considered in developing the Favoured Option. However, direct access to the rail line at Long Stratton is not currently proposed. (SM)	Consider the role/function of Long Stratton as a Growth Location in the Favoured Option, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy if not a Growth Location.
7521 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]	Comment	Policy 7: Blofield requires additional housing growth to sustain its services and should be allocated land for some 100 - 200 dwellings in line with other proposed Key Service Centres	To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

KEY SERVICE CENTRES -Q23 What opportunities can growth bring?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6869 - Hingham Town Council (Mrs C Edwards) [2017] 7383 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 7307 - DuBrow, R Key and D Hibbet [8286]	Comment	Provide for more local employment and contribute to less need to travel.	Noted. (SM)	No change.
7071 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	Proposed level of growth at Wymondham will have an impact on Police resources inc. Safer Neighbourhoods Team. Growth at Aylsham, Diss and Harleston is catered for by good Police Station facilities, although resources may be required for front line policing.	Crime prevention and policing are covered by Policy 19 'Implementation and Monitoring' and Table 2 'Infrastructure Likely to be Funded Through a CIL'. However a distinction will have to be drawn between what can reasonably be required of developers and what should be covered by other funding streams. (SM)	Further clarification of what elements Policing/Crime Prevention may reasonably be covered by developer funding.
7635 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	Accepting environmental constraints, further consideration should be given to the scale of future development at Wroxham/Hoveton as this could provide a northern anchor for the north east - south west corridor and assist with the economics of rail services on	The current Wroxham Station is located in Hoveton and access in terms of large-scale development is therefore constrained by Wroxham Bridge, whilst Wroxham is a considerable distance from the next nearest station at Salhouse. The scale of development at Hoveton is an issue for the North Norfolk Core Strategy (SM)	Consider the role/function of Wroxham in the review of the settlement hierarchy.
7447 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	Opportunities for new green spaces, links and corridors, improving biodiversity and creating habitats. Opportunity to improve water resource and wastewater treatment, moving away from a reliance on old combined surface and foul water sewer networks.	Noted. Policies 17 'Environmental Assets' and 19 'Implementation and Monitoring' are designed to ensure that new development contributes positively to these aspects. (SM)	No change.
7101 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) (Mr Martin C Davidson) [2592]	Comment	Support the NE as a location for a sustainable major urban extension.	Support noted. (SM)	Review the role of the NE in accommodating major growth in developing the Favoured Option.
7507 - Carter Jonas (Jenny Page) [6766]	Comment	1) Policy 7: Implicitly supports Blofield as a Key Service Centre. 2) Proposes a site at Blofield for mixed use housing / employment development. (NB: Map supplied but not attached to comment summary).	1) Noted. 2) To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. DSW	1) None. 2) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q24 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?				
7013 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Comment	Some Key Service Centres are constrained by proximity to SSSIs, SACs, SPAs, NNRs and Ramsar sites. Increased visitor pressure, water abstraction, effluent could all have impacts. Water Cycle Study & infrastructure could alleviate some pressures.	The GNDP recognises the need to understand potential impacts upon designated sites and when development is considered appropriate, does not have an adverse impact upon the designation for adequate infrastructure/mitigation measures to ensure that the site remains protected. RBC	Note the detailed list of designated sites provided and further investigate any potential impacts upon them arising as a result consequence of development proposals.
6985 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Comment	1) Policy 7: Supports Hingham as a Key Service Centre. 2) Policy 7: The Hingham provision for 100 dwellings should be expressed as a minimum as development	1) Noted. 2) To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	1) None. 2) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q24 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7508 - Carter Jonas (Jenny Page) [6766]	Comment	1) Policy 7: Key Service Centre housing provisions should not be too low to provide viable solutions to infrastructure constraints such as sewerage capacity 2) Policy 7: Acle, Brundall and Wroxham have significant flooding constraints while these places plus Reepham have significant environmental constraints. 3) Policy 7: Blofield is free of environmental and infrastructure constraints and should have an increased housing allocation as part of the Broadland provision for 2000 homes on NPA smaller sites.	Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Noted. Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7643 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	Duplicate of Rep. 7273.	Duplicate of Rep. 7273.	Duplicate of Rep. 7273.
7264 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	Identifies a site in Loddon with no known constraints, which could deliver the 1-200 dwellings suggested.	Noted. Site already identified through the SHLAA and consideration will be given to its allocation through the South Norfolk Site Specific policies DPD. (SM)	No change.
6986 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Comment	Policy 7: Objects to the lack of new housing development provisions for Poringland on the basis of a lack of development on existing allocations.	Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Noted. Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7522 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]	Comment	Blofield: Proposes a minor extension to the settlement boundary at Garden Farm.	To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. DSW	Consider as part of the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
7308 - DuBrow, R Key and D Hibbet [8286]	Comment	No constraints to implementation.	Noted RBC	None required
7716 - Sunguard Homes [8320]	Comment	Discussion of junction capacity issues & solutions for potential site at Chequers Road	GNDP notes comments and would welcome detailed submissions at Sites Specifics stage. RBC	None
6987 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Comment	Policy 7: Proposes the allocation of a further 100 dwellings at Poringland.	Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Noted. Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7590 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Exception policies should seek to give same level of protection to biodiversity as other developments.	Consideration of biodiversity is duty of all local authorities in exercise of their functions. Therefore biodiversity considerations will be given the same level of consideration for all types of development. RBC	None required.
6870 - Hingham Town Council (Mrs C Edwards) [2017]	Comment	Parking is a big problem in Hingham. The greens are registered village greens and a valuable amenity area which needs to be preserved. Growth is to be applauded but thought should be given to the problems it creates, before it happens	GNDP notes comments re: parking in the Town and is conscious of the need to protect the character of market towns and is working with multiple agencies to ensure growth is properly planned. RBC	None at present. Await decision on level of growth in Town and site specifics DPD.

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q24 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7169 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	Gladedale Homes actively pursuing land on southern boundary of Wroxham and believes there are no constraints to its development. Should be considered as part of SHLAA.	Work is currently continuing on SHLAA and settlement hierarchy. GNDP will welcome any detailed site proposals as part of Site Specifics DPD. RBC	None, prior to publication of
7448 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	1) Policy 7: Reepham housing provisions leave little "headroom" re WTW capacity. Advises caution to avoid improvement works being too costly or discharge consents being restricted. 2) Policy 7: Acle housing provisions exceed the Stage 2 Water Cycle Study "headroom" for 141 dwellings only at the WTW. Any development should be located outside Flood Zones 2 and 3 in the SFRA. 3) Policy 7: Wroxham falls within a large Flood Zones 2 and 3 area. Growth should be planned outside this area. The encompassing Area of High Ground Water Vulnerability and Source Protection Zone limit potential for growth compared to other places.	1) Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. 2) Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW 3) Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees, and to be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees, and as part of the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
7102 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) (Mr Martin C Davidson) [2592]	Comment	There are no designations within the area which prevent major development. There may be a number of sensitive parts within the broad area, but a comprehensive masterplanning and design solution will ensure these areas are not adversely affected by development.	As part of the process of identifying and allocating development sites the GNDP will be assessing potential constraints. Site masterplans and layouts should seek to avoid sensitive areas that may be adversely affected as a consequence of development. RBC	None
7742 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	Policy 7: Objects to significant growth where there are infrastructure problems.	Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
6862 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report	Noted RBC	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report
7166 - Mr A Semmence [6362]	Comment	Hingham should accommodate at least 100 new dwellings and further growth where it would meet the town's needs, where capacity exists and where it would not unduly affect environmental assets.	Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7384 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	See answer to question 22	As per question 22 RBC	None
7273 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	Promotes a site for approx. 200 dwellings at Great Melton Road, Hethersett potentially available for early delivery. Recognises that development of 4,000 dwellings at Hethersett would require considerable new/improved	Noted. Site already identified through the SHLAA and consideration will be given to its allocation through the South Norfolk Site Specific policies DPD, in the context of the JCS.	No change.
7221 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Wroxham/Hoveton - existing and potential traffic congestion; could be reduced by building a bypass, but at environmental cost. We do not have confidence in achieving good enough coordination between agencies to ensure infrastructure improvements will be made at the right time and in the right order.	Whilst respecting the concerns, one of the main aims of the Joint Core Strategy is to co-ordinate the provision of infrastructure. TH	None

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q24 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7097 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	Comment	Several development areas contain sites of archaeological interest. May need mitigation, preservation or recording. Advice on impacts and mitigation available from Norfolk Landscape Archaeology	The GNPD is aware of the need for close liaison with NLA (and English Heritage) regarding potential impact upon archaeological sites. RBC	Continue to consult with NLA (& English Heritage) on potential growth locations and site specific proposals.
6826 - Acle Parish Council (The Parish Clerk) [7454] 7478 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	Lack of infrastructure, no delivery of facilities	GNPD has commissioned a number of studies to better understand the various levels of infrastructure investment (physical infrastructure, water & utilities infrastructure, green infrastructure etc.) associated with the levels of growth being proposed. These studies will inform the favoured option and the publication/submission document.	None required
7804 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	Further growth would spoil community feel.	The GNPD is aware of the need to create high quality, integrated developments that add to existing communities. Further work on placemaking and community cohesion is planned later in the process. RBC	None at this stage, although decision on how to promote community cohesion/placemaking will be key actions once growth locations decided.
<i>KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q25 How could growth in key service centres link with your longer term investment strategies?</i>				
7523 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]	Comment	Policy 7: To provide services support and planning gain, Blofield should be allocated 100-200 dwellings as for Acle, Loddon/Chedgrave, Reepham and Wroxham.	Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7805 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	The convenience of sites, and it being possible for all the infrastructure being in place, including the A140 bypass.	Noted. (SM)	No change.
7743 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022] 7385 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	No links.	None. (SM)	No change.
6863 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report	It is welcome to note that Anglian Water will link their investment strategy with the outcomes of the Water Cycle Study. (SM)	No change.
7309 - DuBrow, R Key and D Hibbet [8286]	Comment	Provision for the development of this site has already been made in the developer's future investment plans.	Noted. (SM)	No change.
7479 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	Will link to the Parish Plan, with potential to delay revised plan until detail of potential development known.	Noted. Any proposals in the current Parish Plan, or any subsequent revision, can be considered as part of the Site Specific Proposals DPD/Area Action Plan for Hethersett. (SM)	No change.

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q26 What additional significant requirements would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
SERVICE VILLAGES - Q26 <i>What additional significant requirements would there be?</i>				
6995 - Harrold, Holman and Buckingham [8287]	Comment	Anglian Water have verbally confirmed that there is sufficient land available at Aylsham STW to carry out the improvements necessary to accommodate a further 600 dwellings at an approximate cost of £1million, which would need to be factored into their programmed	Noted. Although the comments indicate that potential limitations at Aylsham STW can be overcome at a cost, the relevant policy in the East of England Plan is clearly directed towards making the best use of public investment when planning for new development. This remains a worthwhile aim. The verbal comments being relayed are from Anglian Water, who have been party to the Water Cycle Study for the area. The limitations at Aylsham STW are more concerned with the granting of consents by the Environment Agency for further discharges, and this has got caught up in a wider review of consents being undertaken by the Agency. To date their advice has been to exercise caution in assuming the problems can easily be overcome, but they too are party to the Water Cycle Study. (SM/RB)	Reconsider the scale of allocation which could be made at Aylsham, following stage 2B of the Water Cycle Study.
7386 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	None, if development is focussed to the Service Villages with good road and public transport links.	Noted. Although road and public transport access are key considerations, the plan needs to take account of the full range of infrastructure requirements. (SM)	The role, function and capacity of Service Villages will be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.
6967 - Nethergate Farms [6920]	Comment	1) Policy 8: Provisions for 10-20 dwellings should not be prescriptive and should be assessed on an individual village basis. 2) Policy 8: Service Villages criteria should include some evening bus services and a pub.	Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7673 - Little Plumstead Hospital West (Sec of State Health)	Comment	Service Villages in the NPA should be reclassified as Norwich Fringe. No evidence to support 10-20 units as the limit for Service Villages, particularly as the SHLAA is not yet complete. Restriction of 10-20 units does not accord with PPS3 re. the efficient use of brownfield sites. Proposes a redundant, brownfield site in Plumstead for circa 150 units.	The identified Service Villages in the NPA are clearly separated from the main built-up area of Norwich and are therefore not Norwich Fringe parishes. The SHLAA does not look at settlements below Key Service Centre level, as these are not considered to be Strategic locations for housing, consequently it will not provide additional evidence to justify this site, or otherwise. Although PPS3 supports the efficient re-use of brownfield sites, these should be in sustainable locations for the quantum of development proposed. The site will be considered through the Site Specific Policies DPD, in the context of the JCS (SM)	All parishes below Main Town level to be considered in the review of the Settlement Hierarchy. Reconsider the restriction of 10-20 units for Service Villages, particularly in the NPA.
7334 - Mr Chris Mutten [6926]	Comment	Policy 8: Proposes higher growth for Reedham based on its larger number of local services than shown in the JCS para. 7.27.	Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q26 What additional significant requirements would there be?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
7222 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Identifies a series of local infrastructure improvements to Salhouse, which are considered necessary by the Parish Council.	Noted. A number of these issues are covered by generic policies in the JCS, such as Policy 18 'Communities and Culture' and Policy 19 'Implementation and Monitoring'; however the level of detail put forward in the representation would be dealt with in subsequent Development Plan Documents. (SM)	No change.
6923 - Trowse Primary School (Mr James Macdonald) [7608]	Comment	10-20 new dwellings would be unlikely to require significant new infrastructure. However it should be noted that the school is at capacity and has no room to	Noted. Any new development proposed would need to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure and the potential to improve it. (SM)	The role, function and capacity of Trowse to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.
7659 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Comment	Policy 8: Supports growth for Service Villages which will help to disperse traffic and reduce impact on trunk	Noted. DSW	None.
7156 - Mr Chris Mutten [6926]	Comment	Policy 8: Proposes higher growth for Reedham based on its larger number of local services than shown in the JCS para. 7.27.	Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7491 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232]	Comment	Upgraded public utilities Public transport improvements Creation/ enhancement of green links	Noted. It is intended that these issues would be covered by policies such as 16 'Strategic Transport and Access', 17 'Environmental Assets' and 19 'Implementation and Monitoring'. (SM)	The role, function and capacity of Service Villages will be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.
7831 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	There are unlikely to be significant infrastructure requirements for the service villages.	Noted. (SM)	No change.
6864 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Service villages are beyond the scope of the Water Cycle Study. Each location would have to be reviewed in terms of wastewater treatment capacity.	Noted. GNDP will require further information from Anglian Water re the individual and cumulative impact of development in Service Villages on wastewater treatment. Note: cumulative impact may include looking at the combined effect with settlements/locations in higher tiers of the hierarchy. (SM)	Following a review of the Settlement Hierarchy request further information from Anglian Water as to the wastewater treatment capacity in these locations individually and in combination with other proposed development.
6960 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	Policy 8: The Service Villages should be viewed on an individual basis re their requirements.	Noted. DSW	None.
6879 - South Walsham Parish Council (Mrs P James) [4399]	Comment	There are problems with the sewerage pumping plant in School Road at times of heavy rainfall. This will need to be addressed. The school would need support in accommodating varying numbers of new children.	Noted. Any new development proposed would need to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure and the potential to improve it. (SM)	The role, function and capacity of South Walsham to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.
7480 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	No comment	None. (SM)	No change.

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q26 What additional significant requirements would there be?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
7744 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	All areas would require some infrastructure development under these proposals. To plan efficiently Long Stratton should be the major growth area with service villages left alone.	The majority of growth is being planned as part of large-scale growth locations, including Long Stratton in Options 2 and 3. However, smaller levels of development are planned for other settlements in order to help maintain the viability/sustainability of these communities and their services and help meet the housing pressures outside the growth locations. (SM)	Consider the role, function and capacity of Long Stratton in developing the favoured option and of the Service Villages in reviewing the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.
7077 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	Comment	Policy 8: The modest growth proposed would not require significant infrastructure improvements.	Noted. DSW	None.
<i>SERVICE VILLAGES - Q27 What opportunities can growth bring?</i>				
7481 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	No comment	None. (SM)	No change.
6969 - Nethergate Farms [6920]	Comment	Linked to responses to Q1 and Q26. Opportunities to make rural communities more sustainable are being missed by over concentration of new development; including bringing renewable energy systems as part of new development (such as ground source heat pumps) which could also be used for community buildings. 10-20 dwellings is too rigid and allocations should reflect the character, capacity, sustainability etc. of each	The JCS must be in conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy, which sets out a split in housing numbers between the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) and the Rural Area (RA). The Growth Locations in the NPA are needed to accommodate the concentration of development within this part of the GNDP area. Conversely the level of new allocations needed in the RA is limited and will be distributed amongst the Service Villages and the larger settlements (Key Service Centres and Main Towns). (SM)	Consider the role, function and capacity of Service Villages as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy, including whether different approaches are need in the NPA and RA.
7745 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	Increased opportunities for public disorder and crime in these currently rural areas.	Much of the new housing across the area is meeting the needs of people who already live in these communities; therefore changes to the make up of the population may be minimal. In addition, under Policy 19 'Implementation and Monitoring' new development would make contributions to emergency services including crime prevention, if appropriate. (SM)	No change.
7078 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	Comment	Policy 8: Supports market housing and other small scale developments in the Service Villages to provide affordable housing and other community benefits.	Noted. DSW	None.
6895 - Mr S Smith [8355]	Comment	Development land in long Stratton suggested	Site details noted, the site needs to be promoted at site-specific stages of the local development plan process	None
7180 - Hopkins Homes Ltd (Mr Chris Smith) [7104]	Comment	Policies 6-8: Supports the roles of the market towns and larger settlements but considers that they could accommodate higher growth than proposed.	Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7387 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	Jobs and contingency to growth targets.	Service villages are expected to make a contribution to small-scale local employment and will provide a range of smaller housing sites to help maintain consistent delivery. (SM)	Consider the number and role of Service Villages as part of the review of the Settlement

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q27 What opportunities can growth bring?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7492 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232] 6880 - South Walsham Parish Council (Mrs P James) [4399] 6961 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449] 6924 - Trowse Primary School (Mr James Macdonald) [7608] 7223 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Improve the sustainability, reduce the need to travel, support local businesses etc.	Comments noted. Policy 8 aims to support and facilitate new development that enhances Service Villages. (SM)	The role, function and capacity of Service Villages will be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.
7335 - Mr Chris Mutten [6926]	Comment	Policy 8: Supports further housing to a commensurate scale in Reedham.	Noted. DSW	None.
7157 - Mr Chris Mutten [6926]	Comment	Policy 8: Supports further housing to a commensurate scale in Reedham.	Noted. DSW	None.
7163 - Mr G Mackintosh [8284]	Comment	1) Policy 9: Objects to the designation of Barford as an "Other Village".which implies too low a level of growth to sustain the village. It should be reclassified as a "Service Village". 2) Objects to the Service Villages provisions for 10-20 dwellings as too limiting, not adequately justified, and for being expressed as ceilings to development rather than as minimum targets in accordance with the East of England Plan. The numbers should be based on individual village social, economic and environmental needs.	1) To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS. 2) Noted. To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	1) Consider as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS. 2) Considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
<i>SERVICE VILLAGES - Q28 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?</i>				
6962 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	Policy 8: Service Villages - (Q28) the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth are the need for significant infrastructure development. "Where this growth is due, service village should be elevated to accommodate greater levels of investment."	This implies providing for additional growth to encourage greater investment, presumably based on improved economies of scale. The distribution of growth will be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	To be considered as part of preparation of submission version of JCS.
7591 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Exception polices should seek to give the same level of protection to biodiversity as in other developments. There have been at least two cases in Norfolk last year where permission was ought to build on County Wildlife Sites under exception policy	Noted. Policy 17 'Environmental Assets' applies to all types of development. Any allocations or criteria based policies for exceptions site housing will be set out in Site Specific Policies and/or Development Control Policies	No change.
7449 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	No significant issues with these villages, however, growth should be directed towards flood zone 1 and should incorporate green infrastructure enhancement as part of the wider Norfolk strategy.	Noted. The location and contributions to infrastructure of development within service villages will be considered as part of a Site-Specific Policies DPDs. (CB)	No change.
7746 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	Existing infrastructure.	The scale of development in Service Villages will need to take into account the available infrastructure and the potential for improvement. (SM)	No change.

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q28 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7076 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	Comment	Ditchingham should be classified as a "Key Service Centre" and not as a "Service Village".	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. (DSW)	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.
7255 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	Comment	Trowse should be a service village	Trowse is referred to in Policy 1 and is considered alongside the Norwich urban area. The settlement hierarchy is being reviewed. A revised approach will be set out in the public consultation expected early 2009. RBC	None
7388 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	Some of the service villages are poorly served by road and public transport and these constraints can be overcome to allocating more of the growth to those well served in these areas such as Tasburgh which will also benefit from growth at Long Stratton and vice versa Long Stratton if Tasburgh takes growth.	The scale of development in Service Villages will need to take into account the available infrastructure and the potential for improvement, including proposed improvements related to growth options. (SM)	No change.
7079 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	Comment	No constraints to level of development envisaged for Ditchingham	Noted RBC	None
7482 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	No comment	None (SM)	No change.
7014 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Comment	List of protected sites in the vicinity of identified Service Villages.	Noted. 'Environmental Assets' are protected under Policy17. These sites will be taken into account as part of the Site Specific Policies DPDs and identified on the accompanying Proposals Maps where appropriate. (SM)	No change.
6971 - Nethergate Farms [6920]	Comment	The constraints to development in the right place in most rural villages are few. Proper consideration must be given to environmental and landscape issues, along with the integration of the development into the community but the Strategy should allow the merits of each proposal to be considered on the basis of their merits, alongside criteria which allow the sustainability and community benefits to be assessed.	Comments noted. Issues of environmental impact, community cohesion and developer contributions are cover by other JCS policies. (SM)	No change.
7158 - Mr Chris Mutten [6926] 7336 - Mr Chris Mutten [6926]	Comment	(1) Suggests Reedham is suitable for more growth that suggested by Policy 8 'Service Villages'. (2) Proposes a particular site in Reedham. (3) Options for small-scale employment growth appear to be too limited in the rural areas re. PPS 7 paragraph 4. Would support a policy to allow for small-scale (employment) growth in villages other than Key Service Centres.	(1) Noted, to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy. (2) Noted, site will need to be proposed through the Site Specific Policies DPD. (3) Policies 8 'Service Villages' and 9 'Other Villages' both make provision for small-scale employment and service development appropriate to these settlements and the surrounding areas. However further clarification could be given in Policy 15. (DSW/SM)	Role, function and capacity of Reedham to be considered through a review of the Settlement Hierarchy. Consider revising Policy 15 'The Economy' to better reflect the needs of smaller settlements/rural areas.

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q28 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
7493 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232]	Comment	Impact on landscape character, environment, ecology Requiring landscape appraisals for major developments Requiring a higher level of sustainability, lower carbon emissions	These requirements are broadly covered by Policy 13, 'Reducing Environmental Impact', which applies to all development (SM)	No change
6925 - Trowse Primary School (Mr James Macdonald) [7608]	Comment	Constraints affecting Trowse provided.	Constraints noted and will be considered when deciding on levels of growth and at later detailed site specific stages RBC	None
7224 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Salhouse is a Conservation Area and is adjacent to the Broads Authority jurisdiction. Any development must be sympathetic to these.	Noted. The GNDDP is aware of the need to protect the environmental assets of the area - as set out in the JCS consultation document. RBC	None
7164 - Mr G Mackintosh [8284]	Comment	(1) Barford should be designated a "Service Village" and not an "Other Village". (2) Policy 8 'Service Villages', first paragraph should be revised to add references to growth in relation to capacity and lack of impact on environmental assets.	(1) To be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy. (2) Noted, further consideration needs to be given to the level of development proposed for Service Villages. (DSW/SM)	(1) The role, function and capacity of Barford to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy. (2) Consideration be given to a more flexible wording regarding the overall amount of development suitable of Service Villages.
7098 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	Comment	Several of the proposed development areas contain sites of archaeological importance. Impact of development on these sites will require mitigation in the form of preservation by record or preservation in situ.	The GNDDP are aware of the need to liaise with Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (and other relevant organisations e.g. English Heritage) with regard to sites of archaeological importance in development areas. Further discussions with these organisations will take place during decision making process RBC	None.
6881 - South Walsham Parish Council (Mrs P James) [4399]	Comment	There are several sites suitable for development - already identified on the site specific map.	Thank you for suggesting potential development sites to the GNDDP. The Joint Core Strategy is not intending to allocate specific sites for development - this will be done through the Site Specific Policies & Allocations DPDs and in Area Action Plans. Your suggestions will be kept on file for consideration at the appropriate stage. In the meantime it is suggested that you consider making representations on other Core Strategy policies that may be relevant to your proposals e.g. Settlement Hierarchy (policies 5-10), growth locations etc. RBC	None
<i>SERVICE VILLAGES - Q29 How could growth in service villages link with your longer term investment strategies?</i>				
7225 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Greater Precept income	Noted.	No change.

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q29 How could growth in service villages link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7351 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552] 7000 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	Comment	Barnham Broom has the services to be classified as a Service Village and could accommodate 10-20 additional dwellings.	Agreed, Barnham Broom should be classified as a Service Village under the Technical Consultation criteria. (SM)	The role, function and capacity of the settlements below Main Town level to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy, incorporating 2009 database of information on parish services, requested from parish clerks.
6926 - Trowse Primary School (Mr James Macdonald) [7608]	Comment	Limited growth would enhance the sustainability of the village school in the future. The current school has really no room for major expansion	Trowse is currently identified as a Norwich Fringe Parish, therefore will be considered as a location for additional housing under Policy 1, taking into account existing infrastructure constraints and the potential address limitations. (SM)	Review the role of Trowse in accommodation part of the non-Growth Location housing in the South Norfolk NPA.
7483 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	No comment	None. (SM)	No change.
7494 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232]	Comment	Dickleburgh could accommodate significantly more development than proposed for a 'Service Village, particularly given its proximity to Diss.	To be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy; however reliance on proximity to Diss would suggest that locations in the town and villages closer to Diss should be considered first.	The role, function and capacity of Dickleburgh to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
6865 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	Any increase in wastewater treatment capacity would be funded through the water industry's regulatory process (see water cycle study for details)	Coordination with the investment programmes of utility providers is covered by Policy 19 'Implementation and Monitoring'. (SM)	No change.
7181 - Hopkins Homes Ltd (Mr Chris Smith) [7104]	Comment	Dickleburgh should be classified as a Key Service Centre and could accommodate significantly more development than proposed.	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. (DSW)	The role, function and capacity of Dickleburgh to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
6973 - Nethergate Farms [6920]	Comment	Lack of opportunities for small-scale developments in Service Villages and smaller communities will limit housing delivery, particularly in the short term.	The Strategy proposes a mix of large-scale Growth Locations, plus opportunities for small/medium sites across Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. The role of Service Villages and other settlements to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy. (SM)	Consider the role of Service Villages and other settlements as part of a review of the Settlement
6963 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	Policy 8: Service Villages - (Q29) Integrate longer term investment strategies with the major growth locations and elevate settlements where such growth is planned.	Noted. The distribution of growth will be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. DSW	None
7636 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	Re the proposed eco-community, exclude Rackheath from the "Service Villages" list and replace with generic statement referring to new district centres in growth locations.	Agreed, there is a need to avoid the confusion of identifying Rackheath as both as 'Service Village' and part of the NE Norwich growth location. (DSW/SM)	Revise the Submission version of the Joint Core Strategy to identify Rackheath as part of the locations for growth in the Norwich Policy Area.
7748 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	No links	Noted. (SM)	No change.
7389 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	We will make available brownfield land in Tasburgh for housing and employment development.	Sites will be considered as part of the Site Specific Policies DPD in the context of the JCS. (SM)	No change.

OTHER PLACES - Q30 Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>OTHER PLACES - Q30 Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?</i>				
7484 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	No comment	None. (SM)	No change.
6902 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	Comment	Objects to Wroxham as a Service Centre Objects to high scale of growth proposed for Wroxham	Both points will be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. DSW	Re-examine Wroxham as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
7835 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]	Comment	Policy 9: Wicklewood should be redefined as a Policy 8 Service Village	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. DSW	Re-examine position of Wicklewood as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
7667 - Mr J Spinks [7685]	Comment	Policy 9 should include Brampton.	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. DSW	Re-examine Brampton as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
7809 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	Comment	2 sites suggested - East of Dussindale Drive and W of Great Plumstead Hospital	Site details noted, the site needs to be promoted at site-specific stages of the local development plan process	None
6976 - Philip Hendry & Sons (Mr Nicholas Hendry) [7647]	Comment	Policy 8 - Other Villages: Requests Foulsham's redesignation as a Policy 9 Service Village. Service Villages proposed new housing totals could be raised to up to 30 dwellings in exceptional circumstances.	Both points to be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. DSW	Re-examine Foulsham and numbers of dwellings in each category as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
7592 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Exception policies should seek to give the same level of protection to biodiversity as in other developments. There have been at least two cases in Norfolk last year where permission was ought to build on County Wildlife Sites under exception policy	Noted. Policy 17 'Environmental Assets' applies to all types of development. Any allocations or criteria based policies for exceptions site housing will be set out in Site Specific Policies and/or Development Control Policies	No change.
7033 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment	(1) Confusion caused by Easton being both a Growth Location and an 'Other Village'. (2) Support Easton as a growth location to support Easton College, the food-hub concept and increased sustainability of the village. (3) Policy 1 should refer to Costessey/Easton as part of the Norwich Fringe.	(1) Agreed, Easton to appear in only one category. (2) Support noted, issues to be taken into account as part of the production of a favoured option for Growth Locations. (3) Development at Easton is separated from the built-up area of Norwich by the A47 Southern Bypass, Royal Norfolk Showground and areas of open countryside.	Consider the role of Easton as part of the Growth Locations for the area. Delete Easton from Policy 9 'Other Villages' if it remains a Growth Location.
7226 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Comment	Policy 11 'The Broads' needs to be strengthened in relation to the large-scale development proposed in close proximity to the Broads (e.g. Rackheath), which will increase the pressure for leisure activities etc.	Consideration of the impact of large-scale development on the Broads is part of the Appropriate Assessment of the JCS. (SM)	No change.

OTHER PLACES - Q30 Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7001 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	Comment	Related to a response to Q29 which states that Barnham Broom has the facilities which would make it a Service Village and can accommodate 10-20 dwellings.	Agreed, Barnham Broom should be classified as a Service Village under the Technical Consultation criteria. (SM)	The role, function and capacity of the settlements below Main Town level to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy, incorporating 2009 database of information on parish services, requested from parish clerks.
6916 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	Comment	Consideration needs to be given to the protection of community centres and village halls as cultural venues and the promotion of similar new facilities as part new developments.	Agreed that community centres and village halls can form an important venue for arts/culture for local communities.	Add 'community buildings' to the list of potentially acceptable development in Policy 10 'The Countryside'. Amend Policy 18 'Communities and Culture to 'Leisure - Existing facilities, including community centres and village halls, protected and enhanced'.
6964 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	Promotes the redevelopment/intensification of existing employment uses to improve job provision with little additional infrastructure, including Buxton Road, Frettenham.	The site needs to be promoted at site-specific stages of the local development plan process. (TH)	No change.
7352 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]	Comment	Objects to designation of Barnham Broom.	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.	Re-examine Barnham Broom as part of Settlement Hierarchy
7293 - Brampton Parish Council (Mrs M Whiley) [1783]	Comment	Requests Brampton to be included in Policy 9	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. DSW	Consider as part of proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.
7246 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8193]	Comment	Policy 9: Objects to Hempnall's inclusion as an Other Village Consider proposed site for the development of 39-45 dwellings.	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.	Re-examine Hempnall as part of Settlement Hierarchy review. Keep site details on file until appropriate stage of Site Specifics DPD
7853 - Woodbastwick Parish Council (Mrs Pauline James) [4401]	Comment	Support, particularly for the opportunity to provide exceptions site affordable housing in Other Villages.	DSW Support noted. (SM)	No change.
7080 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	Comment	Policies 8 and 9 (Q30) - Supports the allocation of land for housing and employment in the smaller villages to avoid social polarisation, allow for market housing to generate affordable housing and other community benefits and to support local services and the rural economy.	Noted. DSW	None.
7780 - Frettenham Against Development (Robert & Cynthia Forster) [7701]	Comment	Frettenham is not a sustainable location for new development, therefore endorse its inclusion as an 'Other Village'	Support noted. The role and function of Frettenham to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy. (SM)	The role and function of Frettenham to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

OTHER PLACES - Q30 Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7848 - Sir Philip Dowson [7707]	Comment	Policy 9 excludes many small villages that will suffer socially as a result. Revise policy to provide for very small scale development.	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. Definition of precise extent of development boundaries will be done via the Site Specific DPD	Re-examine smaller villages as part of settlement hierarchy
7390 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Comment	No as these areas tend to have a high landscape and biodiversity value and are not sustainable.	Areas of high landscape value and biodiversity are protected under Policy 17 'Environmental Assets'. The sustainability of further development in particular settlements to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy. (SM)	Consider the sustainability of further development in particular settlements as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
7089 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	Comment	Yes, provided the development boundaries are reviewed regularly to ensure the villages are allowed to breathe and not stagnate.	Development Boundaries will be drawn up as part of the Site Specific Policies DPD, and both the Boundaries and the overall Settlement Hierarchy will be subject to periodic review. (SM)	No change.

OTHER PLACES - Q30 Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7660 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]

Comment
 Policy 9 - Impact on the Trunk Road network of development in Other Villages will be minimal.

Policy 10 - HA will need to be made aware of development in the Countryside that will affect the Trunk Road Network.

Policy 11 - Concerned that growth in the Broads area may affect the A47

Policy 12 - General support, as this will concentrate development, facilitating sustainable transport modes - however will need to be aware of growth in centres which may have a truck road impact.

Policy 13 - Welcomes the focus on minimising the needs to travel and NATS hierarchy.

Policy 14 - concern that developments put forward to meet the overall housing target demonstrate how they will work in transport terms and what mitigation measures are needed.

Policy 15 - HA will expect transport evidence to support proposals which have an impact on the Trunk Road network, including Broadland Business Park, NRP, Longwater and Wymondham.

Policy 16 - Policy does not specify where improvements to the A47 are required and the impact varies between options. Re. A47 improvement at Burlingham, cannot see how this is critical to the main proposals in the JCS, but questions how much development can be accommodated at Acle prior to any improvement.

Policy 17 - does not directly affect the Trunk Road network.

Policy 18 - HA recognises that stronger, cohesive communities can reduce the need to travel.

Policy 19 - Need a monitoring process that includes the following elements to allow HA assess the effects on the Trunk Road network/infrastructure: Establish Objectives; Define Policies; Set Targets; Measure Indicators.

Comment
 Policy 9: Hainford should be a redefined as a Policy 8 Service Village

Comment
 Supports the approach in Policies 9, 10 & 11, particularly the opportunity to provide affordable housing on exceptions sites in Policy 10.

Policy 9 - response noted.

Policy 10 - response noted, the issue is a detailed matter that will need to be addressed in site specific development plan documents.

Policy 11 - The Broads Authority Executive Area is not part of this Joint Core Strategy and therefore the JCS does not influence development within the Broads area.

Policy 12 - support noted. Access arrangement to the trunk road network is a matter for site specific development plan documents.

Policy 13 - support noted.

Policy 14 - response noted, could add text to the reasoned justification to address concerns.

Policy 15 - response noted, could add text to the reasoned justification to address concerns.

Policy 16 - agree that the dualling of the A47 between Blofield and North Burlingham is not critical to the delivery of the growth agenda for the NPA. However disagree that the dualling is critical to the development at Acle. The scale of development is modest and reflects its status as a key service centre because of the level of services and facilities in the village.

Policy 17 - response noted.

Policy 18 - response noted.

Policy 19 - response noted

(TH)

Policy 14 - amend reasoned justification to address concerns

Policy 15 - amend reasoned justification to address concerns

(TH)

Re-examine Hainford as part of the settlement heirarchy review

No change.

7783 - E A Property (Mr Alan Jones) [7703]

7852 - Upton with Fishley Parish Council (Mrs P James) [4400]

OTHER PLACES - Q30 Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7717 - Timewell [8209]	Comment	<p>Policy 9 Other Villages: Should be more flexible and split into two parts to deal respectively with settlements in the Norwich Policy Area and the Rural Policy Area to reflect their spatial differences, differing impacts of their proximities to Norwich and abilities to contribute towards meeting differing overall housing growth targets.</p> <p>Policy 9: The designation of Little Melton should be amended to reflect its position as part of a proposed major growth location.</p>	<p>Both points to be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.</p> <p>Final decision of location of major growth areas still to be made.</p> <p>DSW</p>	Re-examine Little Melton as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
7784 - Mr Terry Davies [7132]	Comment	<p>Support - particularly for the recognition that small-scale commercial development, farm diversification, home working etc. can be appropriate in the Countryside.</p> <p>Policy 15 - support, particularly re. tourism, leisure and culture.</p> <p>Will be identifying potential sites at a later date.</p>	Support noted. Particular sites will be considered through the Site Specific Policies DPDs and Area Action Plans.	No change.
7015 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Comment	List of protected sites in the vicinity of Othyer Villages and The Broads.	Noted. 'Environmental Assets' are protected under Policy17. These sites will be taken into account as part of the Site Specific Policies DPDs and identified on the accompanying Proposals Maps where appropriate. (SM)	No change.
7495 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232] 7749 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022] 7806 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029] 6828 - Beighton Parish Council (Mrs Pauline James) [4398] 7832 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 7606 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675] 7547 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223] 7687 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	Comment	Yes	Noted RBC	None
7356 - Bramerton Parish Council (Mr B Ansell) [1975]	Comment	Supports provisions for small scale mixed use live/work developments in villages such as Bramerton designated as "The Countryside".	Noted. Already provided for by Policy 10. DSW	None
6914 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027]	Comment	<p>Agrees settlement hierarchy in principle.</p> <p>Policy 9: Inconsistent to classify Little Melton here as well as a major growth location.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>To be resolved as part of production of submission version of the JCS.</p> <p>DSW</p>	Re-examine Little Melton as part of Settlement Hierarchy review

OTHER PLACES - Q30 Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7637 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Comment	<p>Reviews the Policies 13-19 in relation to the Rackheath Eco-community proposal.</p> <p>Policy 13 - strongly support. Policy 14 - agree 40% is appropriate starting point for determining affordable housing provision, taking into account economic viability. Policy 15 - support, but should emphasise public transport access to key employment sites. Policy 16 - support (inc innovative use of rail, NNDR, improved public transport capacity, encouraging walking & cycling etc.). Policy 18 - particularly welcome coordinated multi-agency/spatial planning approach to infrastructure provision. Policy 19 - Support, but Rackheath Eco-community will go further in terms of supporting community development. Welcome the inclusion of viability assessment in the CIL mechanism. Phrase 'accredited participatory design process' needs to be clarified.</p>	Overall support noted. Include in the reasoned justification to Policy 19 an example(s) of an 'accredited participatory design process'. (SM)	Include in the reasoned justification to Policy 19 an example(s) of an 'accredited participatory design process'.
7649 - Cemex [8191]	Comment	<p>Policy 9: Should include Kirby Cane as an "Other Village".</p> <p>Consider CEMEX proposed site for development. Policy 10: Support Consider CEMEX site at Bawburgh for water sports or leisure related activities.</p>	<p>The OS 1:50000 Landranger map names the village divided by the Ellingham and Kirby Cane parish boundary as Kirby Row, as referred to in Policy 9. As the parish is named Kirby Cane, refer to the village as "Ellingham/Kirby Cane (Kirby Row)".</p> <p>To consider the two site suggestions as part of the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>Note the support for policies 10 & 11</p> <p>DSW</p>	Re-examine Kirby Cane as part of Settlement Hierarchy review. Keep details of site suggestions on file until required as part of the Site Specific DPD.
7676 - Wortwell Parish Council (Mrs J Pearce) [2076]	Comment	Objects to Wortwell's designation in "The Countryside" and requests designation as Policy 9 "Other Village".	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. DSW	Re-examine Wortwell as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
7450 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	No objection to the approach being taken and support a general policy for protection of the environmental quality and character of the Broads.	Support noted. (SM)	No change.
7781 - Geldeston Parish Council (Ms D Adams) [2004]	Comment	Considers approach to provisions for development in "Other Villages" and "The Countryside" too restrictive to allow for the development of viable, vibrant and mixed communities.	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. DSW	Consider as part of settlement hierarchy review.

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action****8. Area-wide policies (policies about topics)****AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?**

7524 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]	Comment	<p>Policy14 (and other unspecified area wide policies) should be determined on a site by site basis</p> <p>Promotes site at Blofield, argues for amendment to settlement boundary and increase in indicative allocation scale to 100 to 200</p> <p>Supports option 3 because there is more non location specific development proposed in Broadland [RB]</p>
7833 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	<p>Should include a policy on health and well being and promote health impact assessments. [RB]</p>
6917 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	Comment	<p>Policy 15 the policy is generally supported. [RB]</p> <p>Policy 18 there is a need for performance spaces in larger settlements to be protected or enhanced in order to maintain the vibrancy of local cultural activity [RB]</p>

the JCS is not site specific, and it is inappropriate to attempt such a degree of refinement in the proportion of affordable housing sought. It is important, however, that the policy and supporting text for affordable housing recognise that different sites may raise specific issues which need to be taken into account, particularly in terms of their viability.

A relatively small allocation was proposed in the identified key service centres close to Norwich (unless selected for major growth) as it was concluded that major development could more sustainably be accommodated in the identified growth locations. However, in line with other suggested policy changes, it should be indicated that this is a scale of the allocation and needed a rather than the total number of dwellings expected, and a slightly larger development may be considered where it could clearly demonstrate it would support or enhance local services and sustainability.

The question of the precise delineation of a settlement boundary is a matter for the site specific allocations DPD While health and well being of a important, it is impossible to include a specific policy on every issue which is important, and health and well being are referred to in a policy 18. However, given the importance of health and well being, it would be reasonable to promote the use of Health Impact Assessments where appropriate by at least requiring a screening process to be undertaken in respect of all major developments (say 100 houses or equivalent)

the sentiment is accepted. Policy 18 should be recast to require a positive contribution from all significant development to the themes listed [RB]

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

Include in an appropriate policy (implementation or design, for example) a requirement for all major developments to undertake a screening process to consider whether a full Health Impact Assessment is needed. [RB]

redraft policy 18 to include a more positive contribution from new development to meeting these objectives [RB]

Representations

7155 - Pegasus Planning Group
(Ms Clare Fairweather) [4249]

Nature Representation Summary

Comment [relates to major locations for growth in Norwich policy area] express support for the principle of self-containment for major developments within the Norwich policy area and the NNDR as a key element of transport infrastructure. This will dramatically change the accessibility of Thorpe Marriott. Promote a site adjacent to Thorpe Marriott at Breck Farm Lane. This area would be linked to potential employment at Norwich international Airport by the NNDR. Support option 3 as it promotes a higher level of provision in non location specific fringe sites within Broadland. Intermediate sites such as of this will help delivery since they are not subject to the same inherent delays as a major sites. The significance of the NNDR is underlined by Norfolk County Council's major scheme business case in support of the proposal. The Employment Growth and Sites and Premises Study has confirmed the importance of Norwich International Airport as a location for a major new employment area.

With regard to the total scale of housing proposed, although the JCS is intended to meet the requirements set out in the adopted East of England Plan, it should have regard to the prospect of its review, which would imply the need for at least 15% increase in housing provision. This is essential for the JCS to be sufficiently robust.

The representation goes on to supply details of the development proposed, of up to 1500 dwellings, but may be less if the development includes community or education facilities or an element of employment development. [RB]

Council's Assessment

The merits of this site will need to be considered, though at 1500 dwellings it is large to be considered as one of the non location a specific smaller sites, and if the view of the partnership is that it represents an appropriate option, it should be specifically named. In considering potential locations for development, the north west was not strongly supported at the issues and options stage, either by respondents to the full consultation document or those replying to the house to house summary leaflet. The location is not considered to perform particularly well in terms of public transport potential, access to a range of existing strategic employment locations, and indications from the earlier stages of the water cycle study suggested there are major constraints within the existing sewerage system in Norwich. Furthermore, in view of the significant employment potential at Longwater, and the additional attraction of the hospital, there is some concern that the development in the north west could give rise to significant cross valley traffic in an area where the NNDR cannot provide a suitable route.

With regard to the question of robustness, in the light of the prospect of an increased requirement through the review of East of England Plan, the distribution across the East of England of any such growth, is, as yet, unknown. The JCS includes some elements of flexibility. Firstly the scale of development proposed in the northeast is expected to rise from 7000 to 10,000 after 2026. The expectation of 7000 being developed in this area between now and 2026 takes account of past experience in terms of realistic rates of development. The overall rate of development implied by the current East of England Plan is a significant increase on previous experience, but if the rate of development is increased further through the review process, it must be concluded that previous rates of development have not reached the limit of what the market can deliver, and therefore the 3000 additional dwellings in the north east could be brought forward. Secondly, the scale of development currently being provided for overall, and identified for individual locations, is not a ceiling, but a floor. It may be that as site specific work progresses capacities in some of these locations may exceed the numbers currently planned. Looking further ahead, the GNDP has committed to a study looking at how large scale growth could be accommodated in the future, and looking at the potential for a major new settlement in comparison to expansion of the existing built form. The outcome of this study could form the basis of an early review of the JCS if that is necessitated by the review of the East of England Plan. Finally, it is difficult at this stage to predict the scale of allocation needed, as, in the meantime, as well as the current stock of planning

Action

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

permissions, new ones will have been granted, a number of which will be on windfall sites which are not taken into

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7104 - Shelter (Norfolk) (Mr Christopher Spencer) [7654]

Comment - policy 14 - Shelter does not believe this will meet housing requirements in full, particularly in relation to affordable housing. The policy does not acknowledge the Regional Spatial Strategy target of 35% affordable housing. The target for the JCS, which should recognise current identified need, should be set at 45% and included in policy. Furthermore the policy should include the tenure split set out in the regional spatial strategy (65% of affordable housing should be social rented) [RB]

account in the current calculations. [RB]

It is true that the level of affordable housing should be set out in a development plan document and subject to scrutiny through a public examination. The target level based on the housing market assessment undertaken for the GNDP is defined in paragraph 8.6 at 40%, and the threshold for qualifying sites is described as five units or more. It must be recognised that this assessment has a shelf life of only a few years, compared to the length of time covered by the JCS, therefore the inclusion of such figures would need to be caveated in such a way that they could be varied should subsequent research demonstrate a different requirement. A caveat is also required to allow for a different outcome where the viability of a particular development can be shown to be threatened by the normal expectation for onsite provision of affordable housing. This however would apply whether the figures were in policy or in supporting text and there is no reason why the should not be in policy, subject to appropriate caveats

Include in policy the current expectation in terms of threshold, proportion of affordable housing and tenure mix, with suitable caveats regarding the proportion of affordable housing and tenure mix. [RB]

Similarly, current conclusions about the appropriate tenure split could be referred to.

In both cases, however, local evidence rather than the regional spatial strategy should be the basis for text in the JCS

These caveats are essential as the "shelf life" of current housing market evidence is much shorter than that of the JCS, and updates to the housing market assessment may imply a different approach in future. [RB]

7525 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]

Comment policy 7 [check - should be covered in key service centres policy] - support Blofield as a key service centre but the scale of the allocation should be increased in line with other key service centres. [RB]

a relatively small allocation was proposed in the identified key service centres close to Norwich (unless selected for major growth) as it was concluded that major development could more sustainably be accommodated in the identified growth locations. However, in line with other suggested policy changes, it should be indicated that this is a scale of the allocation needed rather than the total number of dwellings expected, and a slightly larger development may be considered where it could clearly demonstrate it would support or enhance local services and sustainability. [RB]

No fundamental change, but reword the policy and supporting text for key service centres to say that the scale of development indicated is a scale of allocation, and a floor rather than a ceiling, and that slightly larger developments may be considered acceptable where they can clearly demonstrate that they will support or improve local services and sustainability. [RB]

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7205 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 7247 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8193]	Comment	policy 13 is unreasonable in requiring all new housing to match current housing corporation requirements under the code for sustainable homes. A more flexible approach is needed. [RB]	the code for sustainable homes is essentially flexible, though it does require specific measures as regards energy and water efficiency. The Housing Corporation requirement at the time of drafting was code level three. This will become mandatory for all new houses built from 2010 onwards, rising to code level 4 by 2013. In addition, the Planning and Energy Act 2008 permits local planning authorities to require levels of energy efficiency beyond the current building regulations and a proportion of locally generated energy, subject to requirements being reasonable. The renewable energy study commissioned by GNDP will give guidance, and it is likely that this policy will need to be recast, but not in a way which accepts a less energy efficient outcome. [RB]	recast the aspects of policy 13 concerned with energy efficiency and local energy generation in the light of the renewable energy study. [RB]
7244 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	Comment	The key diagram implies new employment development in the vicinity of the airport lies entirely south of the northern distributor road [RB]	the key diagram is diagrammatic, and is intended to indicate broad locations only. The extent of any allocation will be determined through the Broadland site specific allocations DPD. However the key diagram should avoid creating the impression of undue precision [RB]	Revise the key diagram to avoid the impression of undue precision [RB]
6907 - Greenhouse Trust (Mr Richard Bickle) [919]	Comment	very disappointed there is no firm target for carbon emission reductions. The representation goes on to suggest ways in which this might be brought about including consideration of the establishment of an energy supply company. [RB]	the GNDP has commissioned a report into the potential for locally generated energy, and this will enable the introduction of more explicit policies [RB]	amend or redraft the policy on climate change in the light of the conclusions from the renewable energy study [RB]
7607 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]	Comment	policy 15 economy - makes no reference to construction or environmental specialisms as potential economic growth areas Policy 16 transport- needs more innovative approaches to commuting [RB]	there is a risk that the final JCS becomes cumbersome if all areas of activity are specifically mentioned, but in view of the significance of construction in terms of future employment, and the need constantly to improve the area's environmental credentials, a reference to construction and environmental specialisms would be appropriate With regard to the transport innovations suggested, it is agreed that improvements to the cycling network in the Norwich area are needed, but these will be delivered through the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy implementation plan. The other suggestion of "mini" park and ride sites is unlikely to be successful without a critical mass to justify frequent bus services, if the "mini sites" were located outside the current limits of the scheme. Noted [RB]	amend the supporting text to the policy on the economy to refer to the significance of construction and environmental specialisms.
7103 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) (Mr Martin C Davidson) [2592]	Comment	[relates to areas for major growth] supports allocation at north east of urban extension [RB]		no change necessary [RB]

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7776 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	Policy 14 sets out a scale of requirements which assumes current commitments will come forward. In the meantime, economic circumstances have changed which makes are fallout rate of at least 30% likely. To overcome this additional greenfield sites should be	Economic circumstances have indeed changed, but increasing greenfield allocations does not appear a logical response to the failure of market demand, and it does not appear a suitable strategy to achieve long term sustainability. If existing sites do not come forward efforts will need to be made to bring them forward, even if this may require looking again at current planning obligations and conditions to see whether these can be restructured in a way which makes the development more viable, or through seeking to improve viability for example by seeking other sources of finance, such as Homes and Communities Agency support. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
7265 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	<p>policy 13 support</p> <p>Policy 14 requirements for affordable housing, quantity and tenure split should be considered on site by site basis</p> <p>Policy 15 support the policy and comment that economic potential depends on improved connectivity</p> <p>Policy 16 support this policy - believe the site at George Lane, Loddon complies</p> <p>Policy 17 support this policy - believe the site at George Lane, Loddon complies</p> <p>Policy 18 support this policy - believe the site at George Lane, Loddon complies- will contribute to meet the needs of the community including reasonable contributions to community facilities. [RB]</p>	<p>The wide level of support is noted. The selection of sites, including consideration of the site promoted will be undertaken through the site specific allocations DPD for South Norfolk.</p> <p>The level of Affordable housing being sought across the plan area needs to be set out in the JCS. As the JCS is not site specific, it cannot take account of the circumstances pertaining to a particular site. It is important however that the policy on affordable housing includes caveats to enable site specific viability issues to be addressed. [RB]</p>	no change needed [RB]
7571 - Norfolk Cricket Board (Mr Kieron Tuck) [2960]	Comment	policy 18 general support but major developments should include cricket pitches [RB]	while it is a reasonable to require appropriate levels of open space, and this should include cricket, seeking to single out one sport within a joint core strategy would amount to excessive detail. [RB]	while it is excessively detailed to specify the needs of an individual sport in the core strategy, policy 18 should be more explicit about the need for additional facilities to meet local standards to be defined in subsequent DPDs and based on local audits [RB]
7099 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	Comment	Policy 17 - several proposed development areas contain sites of archaeological importance which will need to be preserved in situ or by recording [RB]	Noted - the policy and its supporting text acknowledge archaeology as an environmental asset to be valued and protected. The details of recording or preservation in situ will need to be covered at the site specific allocations stage. [RB]	No change needed [RB]

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

Representations**Nature Representation Summary**

7750 - Kimberley & Carleton
Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R
L Gladden) [2022]

Commen
t Long Stratton should be a new town [RB]

7705 - Trustees of Beston Estate
(Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]

Commen
t There is a risk that housing land supply it will be restricted
in the early years because of the timescale involved in
bringing forward major sites. The representor's site in the
north east, together with that owned by the County
Council involve few owners and few technical issues and
could be brought forward early [RB]

Council's Assessment

noted -however major expansion of Long Stratton would
necessitate significant enhancement to local services, and
in view of the prevailing traffic situation, a by pass.
Dialogue is currently ongoing with the promoters of sites in
Long Stratton to ascertain whether any development
funded bypass is feasible. In any event, the Regional
Spatial Strategy confirms that most Norwich policy area
development should be focused around Norwich, and while
Long Stratton may have a place to play in
accommodating the development, it should not be seen as
the main focal point for Norwich policy area growth. [RB]

it is true that there is inevitably a lead in time before large
scale developments can be brought forward. This will in
part be addressed through the non location specific
allowance in Broadland and South Norfolk. In coming to a
view on the favoured option, members will want to
consider a strategy which includes a range of scales of
development in particular locations in order to assist early
delivery and flexibility. However the land in question
clearly forms part of the major growth proposed in the
north east, and there will undoubtedly be some common
infrastructure required to serve future development in the
area collectively, for example high school provision, public
transport priorities, green infrastructure, and possibly
decentralized energy generation. These factors will need to
be taken into account in a comprehensive approach to
planning the area, through an area action plan. [RB]

Action

In selecting the favoured strategy
for the Norwich policy area,
members will need to take into
account a range of criteria
including access to employment,
access by non car modes,
environmental considerations and
infrastructure implications,
including cost and deliverability,
alongside significant local
considerations. The reduced need
for allocations at a 2008 base
date, compared with a 2006 base
date, will also be a significant
factor. Together, these may point
to an outcome which varies from
all the consultation options. [RB]
no change required [RB]

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7337 - Mr Chris Mutten [6926]

Comment
Policy 14 - contends that the scale of allocation indicated within the rural part of Broadland will not achieve the 1130 indicated in the table setting out housing provision. Promotes a site at Reedham, and argues that the village could accommodate more than the 20 dwellings set out in policy 8.

Policy 15 - the regulation 25 document is much less supportive than the earlier issues and options document as regards support for small scale rural enterprise. National policy advises that LDD's should encourage some limited development in or next to rural settlements not designated as service centres to promote local employment and community strength. [RB]

Subsequent monitoring has shown the scale of housing provision required to meet the East of England Plan in the rural area fell between 2006 and 2008. The scale of development indicated in various rural settlements in Broadland is at or about the level needed to meet the RSS requirements, depending on whether an allocation can be made at Aylsham. However, the policies for service villages and other villages should indicate that the scale of housing development shown is an allocation, not a total, and is a floor, not a ceiling. Some additional wording to the policy to indicate a degree of flexibility where a development can demonstrate it will improve or support local services may also be appropriate.

Policies 8, 9 and 10, covering service villages, other villages and the countryside all include references to accommodating small-scale employment/business, and in the case of the countryside identifying farm diversification, home working, commercial enterprises with a rural justification, limited leisure and tourism. Policy 5, which refers to locations for major change in development in the Norwich policy area states that all growth locations will be planned to include local services including small-scale employment opportunities. Policy 6, covering main towns considers small scale employment, though mainly based on existing employment areas. Policy 7 covering key service centres talks of promoting local employment opportunities [RB]

Amend the wording of policies for service villages and other villages to indicate that the broad scale of development identified is a scale of allocation, and to indicate that a development exceeding the indicative amount could be accepted where it demonstrably supports and enhances a local facilities and sustainability.

As regards employment, it would be helpful for policies 6 and 7 to be more explicit requiring site specific allocations documents to ensure that sufficient undeveloped land identified for employment purposes remains, or to make additional allocations where necessary. Apart from that, policies appear appropriate. [RB]

6974 - Nethergate Farms [6920]

Comment
(relates to spatial hierarchy and overall approach to development in rural settlements) below the level of the main towns, there is a need to promote more rural employment, to avoid the need for rural residents to commute, and contribute to the sustainability of rural areas. The plan exhibits an excessive urban concentration around Norwich. Without a different approach it will fail to address the issues of rural isolation, and fail to offer support to existing rural services or any prospect for their enhancement. [RB]

The plan seeks to promote rural employment at all levels of the hierarchy at a scale appropriate to the needs of the settlement. At the issues and options stage there was considerable support for a policy promoting employment in rural settlements, and the policies relating to key service centres could be examined, and if necessary amended, to ensure that sufficient land was allocated for employment purposes. However it is fair to point out that the East of England Plan promotes an essentially urban led approach, with a headline figure of 33,000 out of 37,500 houses, 2001 to 2021, being within the Norwich policy area, and a significant departure from this would raise issues of conformity and possible unsoundness. However, there has been considerable support for a more flexible approach to the settlements hierarchy below the level of the main towns and this should be reexamined provided it does not compromise the overall strategy. [RB]

Reexamine the settlement hierarchy, particularly at the level of smaller settlements to see if additional flexibility can be built in without compromising the overall strategy of the plan, and reexamine the position in the key service centres to ensure that there are sufficient allocations for employment purposes. [RB]

7850 - Sport England (East Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986]

Comment
policy 18 - requires a clearer definition of "culture and leisure" [RB]

Policy needs clarification , and to be made more explicit

Redraft policy to be more explicit [RB]

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7666 - Ifield Estates Limited (Mr Edward Olley) [4160]	Comment	- policy 15 - support policy which seeks to develop the local economy in a sustainable manner and develop its job growth potential. Promote a site adjacent to Broadland Business Park, between the business park and proposed route of the NNDR. This will improve the supply of high quality office space, which is in short supply within the Norwich area office market. The location is well related to the proposed major urban extension to the north east of the built-up area, and to potential transport improvements. The representation supports options 1, 2 and 3, since all identified the Broadland Business Park area as a strategic employment location, and the north east as a major housing location. [RB]	The support is noted. Broadland Business Park is identified in the Regional spatial strategy as a strategic employment location. However, Members will need to consider in the light of further evidence and consultation responses whether to select one of the options consulted upon, or develop a further option to take forward. [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]
7854 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	Comment	Wymondham Town Council have concerns about the prospect of major development in the town. Believe previously developed land should be used first, then the resultant residual requirement spread evenly. Concern over environment of the town. Believe an area action plan is needed before allocations are made rather than an application led approach [RB]	Taking the plan area as a whole, and the Norwich policy area in particular, large scale greenfield allocations are unavoidable. It makes sense to focus these where facilities and services are available, or can be made available, rather than an even spread which would be likely to strain facilities in many places, but may not offer the critical mass to resolve the resultant problems. The JCS will not allocate sites -- this will need to be undertaken through a separate site specific allocations DPD or area action plan. The JCS will, however, need to establish the broad distribution of development, and can only do this on the basis of the best information available. [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]
7016 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934] 7496 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232] 7090 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805] 7391 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 7353 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552] 7002 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	Comment	these representations agree that the area wide policies will deliver the vision and objectives [RB]	noted [RB]	no change required [RB]
7485 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] 7638 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7593 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] 7527 - National Trust (Ms Sian Derbyshire) [7567]	Comment	support policy 17. Policy16 implies that all the transport interventions listed will contribute to meeting all the environmental objectives listed. This is not the case, for instance the promotion of Norwich International Airport is unlikely to reduce the contribution to climate change. It may achieve other benefits. Likewise, road schemes will only contribute towards mitigating climate change in combination with other measures or where they can be demonstrated to relieve congestion. The wording of the policy should be amended to clarify. [RB]	agreed [RB]	review the wording of policy 16 to clarify. [RB]
7847 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]	Comment	Policy13 - oppose extensive greenfield allocations Policy 14 - the definition of the Norwich policy area is at odds with the regional spatial strategy Policy 16 - Long Stratton should not be a key part of the strategy as the bypass delivery is uncertain [RB]	The large greenfield allocations are in the Norwich policy area, primarily. The scale of housing required in the Norwich policy area to meet the regional spatial strategy makes some major greenfield allocations unavoidable, even though the starting point was to accommodate as much in the built up area of Norwich as feasible. The regional spatial strategy states that the precise boundaries of the Norwich policy area should be determined through the local development framework but should be broadly based on that in the previous Norfolk structure plan (policy NR1). The NPA boundary proposed follows closely on that in the previous structure plan with a minor amendment only at Salhouse. It is clear that a bypass at Long Stratton would need to be development funded, and discussions with the promoters of development at Long Stratton continue to assess whether an appropriate solution can be found, and delivered by an acceptable level of development. [RB]	The only issue here which might require reconsideration concerns the significance of Long Stratton in the favoured strategy. This will need to follow on discussions concerning the feasibility of a developer funded bypass. In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]
7292 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] 7229 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232]	Comment	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]	The study suggests that 250 hectares of employment land will be needed, but this includes some currently identified. It is not necessarily a requirement for the nett addition to the available employment land. The study also confirms that the existing strategic employment sites are likely to be the most appropriate available, but suggests that the Airport would be an ideal location for a new strategic employment location (confirming the East of England Plan's support) and suggesting it as a potential aviation related business park (Para. 23.5.2). In terms of its general suitability for development, the north west is not considered to perform particularly well in terms of public transport potential and indications from the earlier stages of the water cycle study suggested there are major constraints within the existing sewerage system in Norwich. [RB]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

7149 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]

Comment
Policy 14 delegates a decision on the affordable housing in developments to a non statutory housing needs assessment. It should be based on a strategic housing market assessment (looking at the whole housing market) and requires that the proportion of affordable housing sought should be set out in a development plan document.

Representation supports north east urban extension, but points out market circumstances are liable to change over the period which may mean the nature and amount of affordable housing needs to reflect changing reality. Representor wishes to work with GNDP to achieve suitable outcome. [RB]

Policy 14, and parts of the supporting text, are badly worded in that the proportion of affordable housing sought, which is a set out in paragraph 8.6, is derived from a housing market assessment, which did look at needs arising across the entire range of tenures. This should be corrected. The proportion of affordable housing sought is set out in the plan, but could be added to the policy, rather than being exclusively in supporting text. However, one of the inherent difficulties is that a housing market assessment has a short "shelf life" of around five or six years, compared with the longer span of a development plan document. This means that in the life of the DPD, there are likely to be one or more refreshes of the housing market assessment, and any reference in policy will need to have appropriate caveats. Furthermore, given that the JCS will not be site specific, and therefore cannot take into account the circumstances surrounding particular sites, caveats would also need to be built in to cover viability issues arising from particular circumstances. [RB]

Correct references to the housing needs assessment, ensuring it is clear that the assessment undertaken looked at the entire housing market, and include in policy 14 a reference to the percentage of affordable housing to be sought on the basis of the most recent assessment, but with caveats that future assessments may indicate a variation from this, and also that particular site circumstances may require some variation. [RB]

7451 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]

Comment
Policy 13 - first sentence this policy should be amended to refer to water efficiency as well as energy efficiency.

the second bullet point should "enhance biodiversity" as well as protect it

Third bullet point should refer to water efficiency

Sixth bullet point should include a reference to the use of sustainable drainage systems

Policy 16 the reference to environmental conditions being improved should be clarified. The NDR will improve conditions for people, but not necessarily wider environmental considerations

Policy 17 first bullet point should seek only long-term enhancement of the status quo and should not refer to "maintenance" of the status quo [RB]

The points in relation to policies 13 and 16 are accepted The point in relation to policy 17 is understood, but this aspect of the policy is specifically concerned with where new development will be directed, and in some instances maintenance may be the best that can be achieved. [RB]

Amend policies 13 and 16 as suggested but no change required to policy 17 [RB]

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7160 - Pegasus Planning Group (Ms Clare Fairweather) [4249]
7709 - Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement [8170]

Comment
The representation promotes an area for development on the A11 corridor at Cringleford. This would include employment and housing, with the housing linked to a strategic employment location. The housing could be a specific allocation or could be included within the non location specific 2000 houses assigned to the South Norfolk Norwich policy area. The representation contends this area would make use of a good public transport corridor and be well linked to a range of strategic employment locations. The representation argues this is consistent with all the options outlined in the consultation document, though more readily in association with options 1 and 2 given the focus on the A11 corridor.

With regard to the total scale of housing proposed, although the JCS is intended to meet the requirements set out in the adopted East of England Plan, it should have regard to the prospect of its review, which would imply the need for at least 15% increase in housing provision. This is essential for the JCS to be sufficiently robust. [RB]

Clearly, access to public transport corridors and strategic employment locations are relevant factors in selecting locations for residential development. Similarly, the ability to help bring forward strategic employment proposals will be a factor, and members will want to consider whether large-scale development would be appropriate in this location. This could be through a specific reference in the JCS, or through the site specific allocations work.

With regard to the question of robustness, in the light of the prospect of an increased requirement through the review of East of England Plan, the distribution across the East of England of any such growth is, as yet, unknown. The JCS includes some elements of flexibility. Firstly the scale of development proposed in the north east is expected to rise from 7000 to 10,000 after 2026. The expectation of 7000 being developed in this area between now and 2026 takes account of past experience in terms of realistic rates of development. The overall rate of development implied by the current East of England Plan is a significant increase on previous experience, but if the rate of development is increased further through the review process, it must be concluded that previous rates of development have not reached the limit of what the market can deliver, and therefore the 3000 additional dwellings in the north east could be brought forward. Secondly, the scale of development currently being provided for overall, and identified for individual locations, is not a ceiling, but a floor. It may be that as site specific work progresses capacities in some of these locations may exceed the numbers currently planned. Looking further ahead, the GNPD has committed to a study looking at how large scale growth could be accommodated in the future, and looking at the potential for a major new settlement in comparison to expansion of the existing built form. The outcome of this study could form the basis of an early review of the JCS if that is necessitated by the review of the East of England Plan. Finally, it is difficult at this stage to predict the scale of allocation needed, as, in the meantime, as well as the current stock of planning permissions, new ones will have been granted, a number of which will be on windfall sites which are not taken into account in the current calculations. [RB]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

7569 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]
7072 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]

Comment
"secured by design" should be a requirement, not a recommendation [RB]

"secured by design" is a voluntary code which developers have the discretion to use. It would be unreasonable to impose this as a requirement. [RB]

no change needed [RB]

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7192 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]	Comment	<p>A number of area-wide policies do not accord with and do not add any local dimension</p> <p>Policy 15 needs to be amended to refer to the job growth for the entire plan period up to 2026. Do not believe that the strategy as drafted will meet the fourth bullet point of policy 15 because of its reliance on existing strategic employment sites. [RB]</p>	<p>the economic growth and sites and premises study broadly supports the existing sites currently identified, and also supports the expansion of employment opportunities near the Airport as well as suggesting the expansion of the site at Hethel. It is true that some of the existing strategic sites (Longwater, Broadland Business Park, Norwich Research Park) suffer from constraints, but it is likely that comparable investment would be needed to bring forward a new strategic location. Policy 15, or other policies need to be amended to give an idea of the scale of allocation proposed in different places. [RB]</p>	<p>amend policy 15, or other policies to include an indication of the scale of allocation proposed in different places. [RB]</p>
6965 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Comment	<p>broadly the policies are supported, but more emphasis should be given to supporting small enterprises in policy 15 - representor supports a site at Frettenham [RB]</p>	<p>at the issues and option stage there was considerable support for a policy promoting employment in rural settlements, and the policy could be recast, or amendments made to the policies for key service centres and main towns to ensure that sufficient land was allocated for employment purposes. In the current settlement hierarchy, however, Frettenham is an "other village" where the policy (policy 9) promotes small-scale business and services only. Even outside villages however policy 10 supports a range of commercial activities considered appropriate to the countryside [RB]</p>	<p>Reexamine policies for main towns to include a requirement to ensure there is a reasonable availability of land in each for local employment. This may not necessitate an additional allocation if sufficient land on existing identified sites is judged to be available. For key service centres, included a reference in policy to support for local employment, and in supporting text an expectation that site specific documents will include an examination of local employment opportunities, and make appropriate allocations where necessary [RB] No change needed [RB]</p>
7034 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Comment	<p>Many area-wide policies do not accord with the requirements of PPS 12 and add no local dimension</p>	<p>There are no examples given and it is difficult to respond [RB]</p>	
7807 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	<p>Thge objectives will be met as far as Long Stratton is concerned provided any growth in housing is accompanied by corresponding employmernt growth, otherwise commuting will result</p>	<p>The options which include growth at Long Stratton do refer to additional local employment growth too. This will need to be part of the package.</p>	<p>In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]</p>

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

7162 - Taylor Wimpey (Mr Colum Fitzsimons) [7258]

Comment [Locations for development In the Norwich policy area] - the representation supports the aim to achieve a degree of self-containment, and expresses a preference for options 1 and 2 as being the most sustainable, linking housing to strategic employment sites. The main objection levelled at option 3 in this representation is that the key diagram, reflecting the smaller allocation in the west, compared with the other options, appears to indicate any growth in the west being focused on Easton rather than Costessey. The representation supports a site at Lodge Farm and believes it could contribute to the necessary improvements to Longwater junction, by making land available. The Lodge Farm area is seen as being a sustainable option. The representation argues that ease of delivery will be a critical factor in delivering the strategy and the site promoted could come forward quickly, without the delays inherent in bringing forward new settlements or large scale urban extensions. At previous local plan inquiries, inspectors have supported Lodge Farm as a sustainable location, and the same principles of sustainability should apply in the present instance. This is based on the potential to use a well defined public transport corridor and other local infrastructure. Accommodating development inside the Longwater junction would minimise pressure on it. On the basis of the key diagram, the representors could not support option 3.
 Housing

With regard to the total scale of housing proposed, although the JCS is intended to meet the requirements set out in the adopted East of England Plan, it should have regard to the prospect of its review, which would imply the need for at least 15% increase in housing provision. This is essential for the JCS to be sufficiently

With regard to the question of robustness, in the light of the prospect of an increased requirement through the review of East of England Plan, the distribution across the East of England of any such growth, is, as yet, unknown. The JCS includes some elements of flexibility. Firstly the scale of development proposed in the north east is expected to rise from 7000 to 10,000 after 2026. The expectation of 7000 being developed in this area between now and 2026 takes account of past experience in terms of realistic rates of development. The overall rate of development implied by the current East of England Plan is a significant increase on previous experience, but if the rate of development is increased further through the review process, it must be concluded that previous rates of development have not reached the limit of what the market can deliver, and therefore the 3000 additional dwellings in the north east could be brought forward. Secondly, the scale of development currently being provided for overall, and identified for individual locations, is not a ceiling, but a floor. It may be that as site specific work progresses capacities in some of these locations may exceed the numbers currently planned. Looking further ahead, the GNPD has committed to a study looking at how large scale growth could be accommodated in the future, and looking at the potential for a major new settlement in comparison to expansion of the existing built form. The outcome of this study could form the basis of an early review of the JCS if that is necessitated by the review of the East of England Plan. Finally, it is difficult at this stage to predict the scale of allocation needed, as, in the meantime, as well as the current stock of planning permissions, new ones will have been granted, a number of which will be on windfall sites which are not taken into account in the current calculations. [RB]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

7193 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]

Comment Promotes a site for major employment at Harford, and suggests this can assist in delivering wider green infrastructure by helping with the delivery of the River Yare Parkway [RB]

Noted - the study undertaken by Arups looking at economic growth and employment sites concluded that the sites currently identified, together with a new major employment site in the vicinity of Norwich international Airport remain appropriate. It is not clear that an additional major employment site in this area is required, but members will need to consider this in the context of agreeing an overall spatial strategy for the Norwich policy

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may

IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7513 - Alex and Peter Valori / Faircloth and Baker [7209]	Comment	<p>Concerned that the introduction of CIL will kill off any prospect of development particularly in the current economic climate</p> <p>Opposed to a uniform rate - believe that this will result in the promotion of Greenfield sites ahead of previously developed land.</p> <p>CIL should not be considered for funding utilities where funds are derived through asset management plans or primary care which is based on a commercial model. [RB]</p>	<p>The current work being undertaken on infrastructure needs and funding, led by EDAW is also specifically charged with looking at commercial viability, to avoid any risk of CIL being set at a level which would stifle development. The study is also likely to recommend on whether there should be a differential rate for previously-developed land, though the argument against this is that not all previously-developed land has comparable extraordinary costs, and the impact of such costs, where they arise, is it better met through an approach which takes into account viability on the site by site basis</p> <p>It is agreed that CIL should not be used where there is mainstream funding, and the implementation strategy will need to be considered at an examination alongside the joint core strategy [RB]</p>	<p>The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate [RB]</p>
6866 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Comment	<p>Provision of strategic infrastructure (in this case water infrastructure) is critical, and the cost and e.g. should take account of predictability and sustainability in its provision.the policy hints at this but could be more specific. [RB]</p>	<p>It is not immediately apparent how the policy could be made more specific, but the implementation strategy, informed by the work currently being undertaken by EDAW will be crucial.The implementation strategy will need to be considered at a public examination alongside the joint core strategy. [RB]</p>	<p>The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any funds, but it is recommended that interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at the heart of the process. Similarly, utility providers will need to be engaged in the process of determining investment priorities for the future development of the area. [RB]</p>
7206 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 7248 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8193]	Comment	<p>Support the idea of CIL in principle as it will provide certainty and ensure contributions from a wider range of developments, but important that there is transparency in the way the contribution sought is derived, and avoidance of double counting between CIL and S 106</p>	<p>Agreed -the implementation strategy will need to be tested at the public examination alongside the joint core strategy [RB]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>

IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7315 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Comment	<p>generally support the approach to implementation, but it is important that the management of any funds derived is subject to appropriate governance and accountability, and this is currently complicated by the debate on local government reorganisation.</p> <p>Concern about the prospect of a uniform CIL and that this could have an impact on the potential for redevelopment of previously-developed land</p> <p>Would like to see more emphasis on biodiversity and green infrastructure [RB]</p>	<p>The general support is a welcome. Agree that the mechanism for spending the proceeds of developer contributions and setting priorities needs to be transparent. The draft policy suggests that this should be through a published Integrated Development Programme, and the supporting text suggests spending decisions on strategic infrastructure will need to be made by a group set up by the GNDP. Others have mentioned how critical it is that infrastructure providers are appropriately involved in setting priorities, and this clearly is desirable, but increases of the challenge of ensuring democratic accountability. The draft policy and supporting text are intended to strike this balance, and appear broadly reasonable, but the policy and supporting text will need to be revised following the conclusion of the current study being undertaken by EDAW, and any emerging government guidance on CIL. The guidance to date certainly seems to be that local strategic partnerships have a key role.</p> <p>The policy is more about the mechanism for securing infrastructure rather than the type of infrastructure to be provided but green infrastructure is part of the work currently being undertaken by EDAW, and the policies describing proposals for specific places and the policy on environmental assets all acknowledge the significance of green infrastructure [RB]</p> <p>Noted [RB]</p>	<p>The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any funds, but it is recommended that interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at the heart of the process. Similarly, utility providers will need to be engaged in the process of determining investment priorities for the future development of the area. [RB]</p>
7017 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934] 7851 - Sport England (East Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986] 7035 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750] 7392 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 7354 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552] 7003 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	Comment	<p>generally agree. Qualifying comments include: need for realism in assessment of developer contributions: believe a scheme promoted at Easton could promote sustainability through the inclusion of local facilities: support for inclusion of sports facilities, and offer of assistance in assessing need. [RB]</p>		No specific change required [RB]
7245 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681] 7706 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691] 7486 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] 7548 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223] 7639 - Barratt Strategic/Manor				

IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7808 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	Broad support for approach but only if a decision to precede on the favoured option follows guarantee that funding will definitely be available. [RB]	While the representation describes a situation many would regard as highly desirable, it is difficult in practice, since much infrastructure is provided through specific funding mechanisms which often lie outside the planning process. For example, strategic water and power infrastructure is provided through asset management plans which will undergo a number of review periods during the life of the plan. In some instances, for example enlargement of sewage treatment works, discharge consents from the Environment Agency may be required, and dependent on processes within the Environment Agency. The best that can be achieved is the commitment of the necessary agencies to the provision of infrastructure through an agreed implementation strategy. This will need to be tested at examination alongside the joint core strategy. [RB]	No specific change required [RB]
7751 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Comment	funding should be focused on the creation of a new town at Long Stratton with very little development elsewhere	the East of England Plan, policy NR 1, clearly directs the joint core strategy towards an urban focused approach, based on Norwich as the key driver of the local economy. A strategy of focusing almost all development on Long Stratton would be likely to raise issues of conformity. Some development at Long Stratton may however be appropriate. The representation is directed towards the selection of an option rather than the specific issue of	no specific changes needed in relation to this representation [RB]
7570 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7073 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	Police requirements should be included within a CIL [RB]	The current study being undertaken by EDAW includes community safety. The outcome of this study may well suggest that CIL should be used to contribute to meeting the needs of the police. However it is important to recognize that CIL is not a substitute for mainstream funding, and where this takes account of population growth it is important to avoid a double count. [RB]	The policy on implementation will need to be revisited in the light of the outcome of the more detailed work currently being undertaken by EDAW, and also in the light of any emerging government guidance on CIL [RB]

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7195 - South Norfolk Council (Mr Keith Mitchell) [7659]

Comment [policy 14] the overall percentage of affordable housing sought on mixed tenure sites should be more clearly evidenced. The representation points out it is derived from the housing need and stock condition study used as the evidence base for the housing market assessment, but notes that the proportion sought is rounded

The representation contends the proportion sought should be expressed as "a minimum of 40%"

Expresses strong reservations about the proposed a method for calculating a commuted sum, when on-site provision is deemed inappropriate. Also suggests that such offsite provision should clearly be expressed as a last resort.

The representation also argues that "exceptions sites" should not necessarily require an explicit assessment, but that the district-wide housing needs evidence, combined with waiting list evidence should be sufficient.

"exceptions sites" should also be considered in settlements which have not been categorized as "service villages" or "other villages" in the JCS [RB]

It is likely that the format of the pre submission publication, and the submission document will be different from the consultation documents published to date. These are likely to follow a landscape format, so that a column alongside the text can be used to give brief references to relevant evidence.

It should be clear that the target percentage is 40%, but it is unreasonable to express this as a fixed minimum, as government guidance requires viability to be taken into account. This is important, since, if a site would be rendered unviable by the imposition of a 40% affordable housing quota, the site will not proceed, and no affordable housing will be achieved. The current document states "...40% affordable housing will be sought on all qualifying sites". This appears to be clear.

The alternative formula suggested for calculating the value of a commuted sum, where on-site provision is unrealistic, appears reasonable.

The supporting text to policy 14 acknowledges that a commuted sum may need to be accepted in place of onsite provision "in some instances providing 40% affordable housing on sites will not be viable.....". However, it also says "where developers, as a last resort, seek the affordable housing contribution off site..." This latter phrase could be expressed more clearly along the lines of " where the local planning authority and developer agree, as a last resort, that the housing contribution should be provided off site....."

Government guidance on "exceptions sites" in planning policy statement 3, para 30, states that rural exception sites should "address the needs of the local community by accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection". The supporting text could be amended to express this objective, rather than prescribe a precise method.

The supporting text to policy 14 states that exception site allocations will be considered in settlements classified as "other villages" or above whilst applications arising from specific local needs assessments will also be considered in these settlements, and in other locations in if appropriate. This means that in a defined village, local planning authorities may consider an allocation for an exception site, but does not preclude the possibility of an exception site being identified elsewhere as a result of locally identified need. Policy 10 (the countryside) also makes it clear that exceptions sites may be considered in settlements not classified as "other villages" or above

Amend the supporting text to policy 14 in respect of the calculation of commuted sums where on-site provision is unrealistic.

Amend the supporting text to policy 14 to make it clear that off site provision will only be acceptable where both the local planning authority and developer agree that on site provision is not viable.

Amend the supporting text to policy 14 along the lines of government policy on exceptions sites but without specifying the precise method for establishing a

IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7091 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	Comment	CIL is yet another form of taxation and should only be introduced as a last resort. [RB]	final details of CIL have yet to be published. However the intention, to date, is that it should complement rather than duplicate S106 obligations, avoiding "double counting". It has long been accepted that where development undertaken commercially places a burden on publicly funded infrastructure, it should make an appropriate contribution. The alternative would appear to be increasing	no change needed [RB]
7301 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	Comment	Utility providers ensure utility networks in the Greater Norwich area have the capacity to deal with growth outside of the plan area where this is dependent on the same utility networks. [RB]	utility providers, such as energy undertakings and water undertakings have been involved in the preparation of the plan, and were no doubt involved in the preparation of plans for joining areas, and should therefore be fully aware of the implications. The implementation strategy will need to be tested at an independent examination alongside the joint core strategy [RB]	no change needed [RB]
7594 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] 7528 - National Trust (Ms Sian Derbyshire) [7567]	Comment	Green infrastructure is likely to be needed to avoid undue pressure on certain sensitive areas. This may well involve contributions to green infrastructure beyond the boundaries of the plan area. Any implementation programme must involve key delivery partners and the National Trust would wish to be consulted on any proposals linking Norwich to the wider countryside and specifically to any of its sites. If this can be achieved, the organisation may have a role in helping to deliver some of the recreation and biodiversity objectives of the strategy. Green infrastructure Should have an agreed percentage of CIL funds. Mid Bedfordshire Council has developed a costing for green infrastructure based on implementation of the district biodiversity action plan. This approach is commended. [RB]	Green infrastructure will need to be a central part of the implementation strategy. The appropriate assessment currently under way will look at the potential impact of growth within the GNDP area on the most sensitive areas, those with international designations, and will look at potential impacts outside the plan area. The study into infrastructure provision currently being undertaken by EDAW includes green infrastructure. The outcome will need to be reflected in the implementation strategy. [RB]	The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any funds, but it is recommended that interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at the heart of the process. Similarly, utility providers will need to be engaged in the process of determining investment priorities for the future development of the area. [RB]
7256 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	Comment	Broadly agree but important that there is no double count. Some aspects of infrastructure e.g. utilities, are provided through Asset Management Plans governed by regulatory bodies, and others e.g. primary care are essentially private businesses. Important that these are not subsidised through CIL [RB]	Agree.the work being undertaken by EDAW is looking not only at the infrastructure requirements of the area but also funding sources. It is entirely agreed that mainstream funding should be called upon first, before developer contributions.it is true that strategic water infrastructure is funded through asset management plans and not develop the contributions, though the latter may have a role at a more local level. The implementation strategy will need to specify funding sources and will need to be tested at a public examination along with the joint core strategy. [RB]	The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate [RB]

IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7834 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	support in principle but important that infrastructure providers are represented in the process of establishing the relevant elements of CIL and in the integrated development plan/implementation strategy process [RB]	Agree that it is important that infrastructure providers are involved in the development of the implementation strategy. Work on this is currently underway through an infrastructure and funding study being undertaken by EDAW, and this involves dialogue with infrastructure providers. Good practice suggests that bodies represented on local strategic partnerships are at the heart of the implementation process. [RB]	The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at the heart of the process. [RB]
7650 - Cemex [8191]	Comment	[concerned with promotion of sites] promote sites at Kirby Cane and Wymondham (residential) Thorpe St Andrew (mixed-use) and Bawburgh (leisure) [RB]	in all the options considered, Wynmodham and Thorpe St Andrew are potential areas for development, but the precise choice of site will be a matter for the site specific allocations DPD s. In the options consulted on, Kirby Cane is not identified either as a "service village" or "other village", but others have suggested that the settlement hierarchy should be reviewed. In all the options consulted upon, some development was proposed in the west of the Norwich policy area, around Easton/Costessey and in all cases these included a proposal for enhanced recreational facilities in the area including BawburghLakes. The support for this proposal is welcome [RB]	reexamine the settlement hierarchy, and, provided the favoured option includes development at Costessey/Easton, retain the proposal for enhanced recreation facilities including at Bawburgh
7266 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	Broad support for the approach set out, but it is important that mainstream funding is a coordinated so that investment in the infrastructure proceeds in tandem with the development [RB]	Agree that it is important that infrastructure providers are involved in the development of the implementation strategy. Work on this is currently underway through an infrastructure and funding study being undertaken by EDAW, and this involves dialogue with infrastructure providers. Good practice suggests that bodies represented on local strategic partnerships are at the heart of the implementation process. [RB]	The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at the heart of the process. Similarly, utility providers will need to be engaged in the process of determining investment priorities for the future development of the area. [RB]

IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6918 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	Comment	cultural assets do not appear to be included explicitly in the policy or accompanying tables. Either they should be, or it should be made clear that "community to sell it is" includes cultural facilities. National guidance and policy statements fail to give adequate recognition to the significance of cultural facilities. If local planning authorities to follow national policy statements they will have no basis to formulate planning applications related to cultural facilities and theatre. [RB]	agreed. However local planning authorities cannot simply ignore national policy. It should be clarified however that community facilities do include cultural facilities including performance spaces. [RB]	ensure that the policy on community does make clear that this includes cultural facilities.
7150 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Comment	Representation promotes a site within the major urban extension proposed in all options consulted upon to the northeast of the built up area. The representation argues that given the scale of the proposal and likelihood of delivery over a lengthy period, and the need to deliver an integrated and sustainable development, a bespoke approach is required to the planning and delivery of the development. [RB]	Agreed. The draft policy requires all strategic growth locations to be developed through an accredited design process giving local people an opportunity to shape development, and guaranteeing implementation of the whole scheme. If this is applied to the north east, it should ensure an integrated and bespoke outcome as sought by the representation Furthermore, others have argued that the elements of the draft policy seeking to ensure high quality design need to be strengthened, and this should help satisfy the representation [RB]	the policy will need to be revised in the light of the outcome of work currently being undertaken by EDAW, and any emerging government guidance on CIL. Add more specific policy seeking to bring about high quality design
6975 - Nethergate Farms [6920]	Comment	There is a need for a different approach in rural areas, though there is still a need for an emphasis on public transport, and reduced energy consumption in public buildings [RB]	There is nothing to date in government guidance clearly indicating that any CIL should be applied differently in urban and rural areas, though a progress report published in August, 2008 acknowledges that this question has been raised, and the Government undertakes to seek further views on this matter It is agreed that it is desirable to minimize the need to travel, and to promote public transport, but that is achieved through the overall spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy. It has been suggested elsewhere that the settlement hierarchy be reviewed. It is not clear why energy efficiency should be applicable specifically to public buildings, though these should certainly be included in efforts to reduce energy consumption [RB]	No specific changes needed to this policy, though it will need to be reviewed in light of the outcome of the work currently being undertaken by EDAW and also to take account of any emerging government guidance on CIL. This representation also reinforces the case for a review of the settlement hierarchy. [RB]

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Anything else?</i>				
<i>Anything Else?</i>				
6800 - Hethersett Society (Mr G Beckford) [3440]	Comment	<p>(a) Housing figures need to be as up-to-date as possible to take account of infill properties, which continue to be developed/permitted.</p> <p>(b) Support Option 3 as this offers the best opportunity to protect green spaces south of the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass and reduces the potential urbanization of the Norwich to Attleborough corridor. 20-50 under Policy 7 is relatively small in comparison to previous development in Hethersett.</p> <p>(c) Infrastructure needs to be in place in advance of new houses.</p>	<p>a) Housing figures have been updated to 31st March 2008 for the public consultation and may be updated again prior to submission.</p> <p>(b) Support noted.</p> <p>(c) Infrastructure delivery is covered throughout the document and specifically in Section 9 'Implementation and Monitoring'. Further detail will be included in Site Specific policy DPDs and Area Action Plans.</p> <p>(SM)</p>	No change.
7359 - Capital Shopping plc (CSC) [8317]	Comment	<p>(1) Supports Chapter 5 'Spatial Vision' for Norwich city centre, and in particular Objective 5.</p> <p>(2) Supports Chapter 7 including the identification of Norwich city centre as a focus for retail development in Policy 12 'Hierarchy of Centres' and the recognition of a need for further comparison goods floor space in the city centre.</p>	(1 & 2) Noted. (DSW)	No change. (need to reconsider the comparison goods floor space requirements in the light of current economic circumstances??)

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7329 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]

Comment
Concern that Costessey/Easton is too constrained in terms of landscape designations, which protect the setting of the city, to accommodate 1-2,000 dwellings.

This adds weight to the argument that the scale of development proposed for the area is too great and cannot be accommodated without detriment to biodiversity and the setting and context of Norfolk's

The policies to protect these designations are saved in the South Norfolk Local Plan (although not the Norfolk Structure Plan), however the whole process of developing an LDF and JCS requires existing policies to be reassessed in the context of changing circumstances.

Assess the role, function and capacity of Easton/Costessey in developing the favoured option.

The response makes an assumption about the areas which are under consideration to accommodate growth in Easton/Costessey (i.e. between Bowthorpe and the A47 and immediately north of the Dereham Road); however, these are only some of the sites under consideration and the SHLAA will be used help determine whether these locations or other alternatives (e.g. south of Easton) can accommodate the level of growth proposed. The final selection of sites will be made through Site Specific DPDs/Area Action Plans.

Overall housing numbers for the area are set through the RSS process, which was open to public consultation, and the JCS will need to be in conformity with the policies of the RSS. The policies and proposals of the JCS are subject to both Appropriate Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal to assess the impacts of the scale of development in different locations. Other policies of the JCS and subsequent DPDs are designed to ensure that all elements of the infrastructure, including green infrastructure, are delivered in conjunction with new development.

(SM)
Noted (DSW)

The role, function and capacity of Frettenham to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy. Site to be considered through the Site Specific Policies DPD.

6894 - Frettenham Parish Council (Mrs C Broughton) [1796]

Comment
Supports the identification of Frettenham in Policy 9 'Other Villages' and identifies a potential brownfield site at Harbord Road.

Agree that it would be appropriate to include the 40% requirement in Policy 14, but retain the caveat that this may change based on more up-to-date information. Supporting SPD(s) concerning affordable housing/housing mix will also be produced, which would be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Add 40% affordable housing requirement to Policy 14, but retain the caveat that this may change based on more up to date information.

6988 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]

Comment
Percentage of affordable housing should be set in Policy 14 and tested through the DPD process.

6991 - WM Morrison Supermarkets plc [8212]

Comment
support the overarching policies of the draft Core Strategy. In particular they support the broad aims set out in the settlement hierarchy: this gives clear guidance as to the level of services appropriate in different categories of settlements, and also directs growth towards the most sustainable settlements

Noted - your details will be added to the GNDP consultation database so that you are kept informed about subsequent stages
RBC

None

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
6882 - South Walsham Parish Council (Mrs P James) [4399]	Comment	Supports S. Walsham as service village, small scale development and exceptions affordable housing.	Noted. RBC	None
7688 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	Comment	Promotes a site at the Royal Norwich Golf Club, Hellesdon. Supports the inclusion of at least 2,000 dwellings on	Note the general support for the proposed approach, which includes allowances for small and medium size sites in Broadland and South Norfolk. Representation suggests a site that could accommodate part of Broadland smaller sites allowance (Royal Norwich Golf Course). While noting the suggested site, the suitability of this site is a detailed matter for future Site-Specific Development Plan	No change
7674 - Little Plumstead Hospital West (Sec of State Health)	Comment	(a) In order to achieve required levels of completions the strategy should look to distribute growth over a range of large, medium and small sites, particularly given the failure to meet required completions rates up to 31st March 2006. (b) Smaller sites, which can be integrated using spare capacity in existing infrastructure and have shorter lead-in times, will be easier to develop in the short term. Would support Option 3 as having the greatest scope for smaller sites in Broadland, such as Little Plumstead Hospital. (c) Threshold for affordable housing contributions is too low and will hamper small brownfield sites. The East of England Plan seeks 35% affordable housing and this should be the JCS requirement. (d) Consider that Little Plumstead Hospital should have been included as a SHLAA site and puts forward a case for allocating the site, including that less sustainable brownfield sites should be developed ahead of	(a) Housing figures have now been updated to 31st March 2008 and show stronger delivery over the years 2006/07 and 2007/08. As well as the large-scale growth options the strategy incorporates the potential for a range of small/medium sites across Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. (b) Contributions towards infrastructure are likely to be made across the full range of site allocations, potentially via a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (c) Policy 14 makes it clear that where viability is an issue, public subsidy will be sought. RSS Policy H2 makes it clear that DPDs should set local affordable housing targets based on a number of criteria. (d) Comments not directly relevant to the JCS and will be covered in the SHLAA and Site Specific documents. The position of Great and Little Plumstead within the settlement hierarchy will be considered alongside all other parishes. (SM)	Role of Great and Little Plumstead being reviewed as part of overall review of the Settlement

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7310 - Friends Family and Travellers (Planning) (Mr S J Staines) [7224]

Comment (1) Concern that the limit to site size is arbitrary and contrary to Circ. 1/2006.
 (2) Concern that focus on corridors is too limiting, particularly for non-transit sites.
 (3) Concern that specific recognition should be given to the needs of New Travellers.

(1) The limit on site size is not arbitrary. The limit takes account of local experience and site management factors. Supporting text in paragraph 8.9 should be amended to reflect this.

(2) The linkage of sites to corridors is based on the South Norfolk Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) recommended this approach. The GTAA is likely to be reviewed several times within the JCS timescale, therefore the JCS could be amended to take out the reference to corridors, and replace it with reference to the definition of suitable locations being informed by future GTAAs.

(3) While noting the suggestions from the Government Office for the South West it must be remembered that the JCS has to have regard to the East of England Plan. The need for sites for New Travellers should be assessed against detailed Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessments, and the timetable for the JCS does not allow these to be completed prior to submission of the JCS. Therefore suggest the general reference in the final paragraph to Gypsies and Travellers should be expanded to include a reference to New Travellers. (TH)

(1) Amend supporting text, para. 8.9, to reflect that site size is based on local experience and management factors.

(2) Suggested wording " ... Provision will be sought in locations that reflect the findings of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments. Sites should be capable of being served ..."

(3) Amend the final paragraph of Policy 4 to include reference to all elements of the Gypsy and Traveller community, including New Travellers.

7132 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]

Comment Welcome inclusion of NE Norwich as major growth

Noted.
RBC

None.

7116 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]

Comment Modification to growth option 3. Suggest urban extension to S of Norwich up to A47 around Tesco Harford Bridge

Suggestion will be considered as an alternative when developing the 'favoured option'.

Consider suggestion (4500 urban extension south of City to A47 around Harford Bridge Tesco) when developing favoured option.

RBC

6798 - Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd [8210]

Comment Promotes a site at Fengate Lane, Marsham.
 Notes the role of settlements such as Marsham in serving rural communities and delivering sustainable growth.
 Suggests settlement figures should not be expressed as

The role/position of Marsham will be covered in the review of the settlement hierarchy. Note comments on site. The site needs to be promoted at site-specific stages of the local development plan process. (TH)

Review of Settlement Hierarchy.

7505 - Greater Norwich Housing Forum (The Manager) [6743]

Comment JCS represents excellent direction of travel

Noted
RBC

None

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

7615 - Yare Valley Society (Mrs Andrew J Salisbury) [1006]

Comment Detailed suggestions with regard to policy wordings - particularly the inclusion/omission of reference to river valleys.

1st point - The first reference concerns the Broads extending into the City - hence the Wensum is referred to directly.

Include a reference to river valleys within Objective 8.

2nd point - Objective 8 - the GNDP will include a generic reference to river valleys.

3rd point - Policy 17 seeks to protect, maintain and enhance environmental assets which appears to address the concerns raised.

4th & 5th points - suggestions noted. First is considered too detailed for JCS, 2nd requests inclusion of "will not be permitted" which is very absolute - GNDP considers Policy 17 to provide adequate protection. RBC Noted. (DSW)

6827 - Acle Parish Council (The Parish Clerk) [7454]

Comment Some new houses would be welcomed, but provisions for new dwellings at Acle should be limited to 100 - existing services/infrastructure are already over capacity.

Review service provision in Acle and the potential for improvement and review the capacity of Aylsham to accommodate further housing (and therefore the need for Acle to accommodate up to 200 dwellings) once the Water Cycle Study Stage 2B is received.

7343 - Watsons Percy Howes (Mr Andrew Bastin) [4419]

Comment Considers the potential to relocate Norwich International Airport and redevelop the existing Airport site.

Agree with the respondent the opportunity to move Norwich Airport to Wymondham has been lost. (TH)

No change.

7344 - Mr A Shirley [4622]

Comment Number of observations, comments and endorsements on the JCS with particular reference to Ditchingham as a potential area that could accomodate new development.

In response to the points raised under 1 Introduction and 2. Strategy for Growth the GNDP would like to confirm that work on the settlement hierarchy (defintions, levels of growth etc) is ongoing. The GNDP also recognises the important role of market towns in rural areas and the need for policy(ies) to reflect the rural agenda.

Note the points raised.

The GNDP notes the observations made in response to 3. The Spatial Vision.

The GNDP notes many of the observations/endorsements under 4. Policies for Places. Many of the points raised with regard to policy 8 and concerning the Settlement Hierarchy will be re-examined after the Reg25 technical consultation - including potential dwellings in each category. The precise extent of any boundary around Ditchingham (and the assessment/possible allocation of housing sites) will be done through a Site Specific DPD.

The GNDP notes the points made in respect of 5. Housing. The JCS is currently projecting forward to 2026 and will accomodate any additional housing provision from the EoEP review when it itself is reviewed. RBC

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
7041 - Spen Hill Developments Limited [8201]	Comment	(1) The identified retail hierarchy should follow the specific typologies identified by PPS 6 'Planning for town centres'. (2) Land to the south of Park Road, Diss should be	(1) Noted. (2) This issue needs to be considered as part of the Site Specific Policies DPD (DSW)	No change.
7294 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	Comment	Welcomes the recognition that GNDP A11 corridor growth needs to be coordinated with growth at Thetford, Snetterton & Attleborough, as proposed by the Breckland LDF, but raises concerns about (a) the transport network; and (b) energy supply. (c) Seeks clarification as to what is meant by The Brecks having 'further potential' as visitor attractor and whether the impact visitors and recreation has been covered in the JCS Appropriate Assessment.	(a) GNDP is in ongoing dialogue with the Highways Agency about the impact of development on the A11 corridor, no fundamental problems with the level of growth proposed have been raised to date (RD to confirm??). (b) EDF as the local electricity supplier are a consultee on both the Breckland and GNDP Core Strategies and have raised no objection (double check ??) to the GNDP JCS; as such they will need to incorporate the scale of development within their own future plans. PPS1 study to assess the potential for local, renewable energy to meet the needs of new and existing development is also being undertaken. (c) The wording reflects the the fact that the Brecks are part of the wider visitor attraction of the area, the potential impact is being covered by the Appropriate Assessment.	JCS to incorporate policies that seek to maximise local, renewable generation as part of large-scale development based on the outcomes of the PPS1 study. Review wording re. The Brecks in the light of Appropriate Assessment.
7675 - The Fairfield Partnership [6983]	Comment	Site suggestion at Chapel Lane, Wymondham - includes transport & highways overview information.	The Joint Core Strategy is not intending to allocate specific sites for development - this will be done through the Site Specific Policies & Allocations DPDs and in Area Action Plans. Your suggestion will be kept on file for consideration at the appropriate stage. However Wymondham has been included as a location for growth in all three options. RBC	None at this stage

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

7317 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]

Comment
Response regarding the scale of development at NE of Norwich:

(1) Concern that the developers' proposals indicate that one objective (e.g. environmental protection) does not happen at the expense of others (e.g. social and economic progress).

(2) The area shown in the options appears to cover parts of both Options 2 and 3 for Large-scale Growth in the Issues and Options and incorporates the Eco-town proposals, without explicitly stating this.

(3) Raises doubt as to how far environmental assets (e.g. Ancient Woodlands, Historic Parks and Gardens, County Wildlife Sites etc.) will be protected.

(4) No firm commitments were are being made either by the developers or the GNDP re. low/zero carbon buildings.

(5) Concerned that the concept of 'interlocking villages' will produce a less pedestrian orientated pattern of development.

(6) Difficult to understand how 'permeability and community integration across the NNDR' will work in practice.

(7) The idea of 'stepping stones' of reclaimed heathland linking Mousehold to the surrounding countryside is unrealistic.- there is already too much built development between Mousehold and the countryside.

(1) The JCS recognises that a number of factors need to be balanced in order to achieve sustainable development - as the Sustainability Appraisal process clearly demonstrates, economic, social and environmental factors all have a function in creating sustainable developments/communities.

(2) The proposal for NE Norwich does cover elements of both Large-scale Growth Options 2 and 3 from Issues and Options, and follows consideration of the responses to the Issues and Options and other elements of the evidence base for the JCS. Part of this may be delivered as an Eco-town, but this is not a specific JCS proposal.

(3) Development proposals will need to be consistent with the generic policies in the JCS including Policy 17 'Environmental Assets', the issues surrounding specific designations will be dealt with at the Site Specific Policies DPD/Area Action Plan stage.

(4) Agreed, this aspect is not sufficiently robust in this version of the JCS

(5) The series of inter-related villages or quarters would be designed to be walkable local communities (i.e. focussed on a local centre/range of local facilities), with sustainable connections between the villages/quarters promoting cycling, public transport and walking.

(6) The form of development in the NE will need to ensure that the NNDR does not present a barrier to local services, facilities and employment.

(7) The stepping stones reflect the former heathland habitats of the area, connectivity between these areas could be achieved through the management of other green spaces, such as verges.

(SM)

Noted. Sites already identified through the SHLAA and consideration will be given to allocation through the Area Action plan process (TH)

Misunderstanding of the definition of 'affordable housing', otherwise comments noted.

(SM)

7151 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]

Comment
Support for the major urban extension NE of Norwich. Promotes a number of specific sites within this area.

7668 - Mr Mike Walden [7686]

Comment
General comments (in response to the Summer Update 2008) concerning house prices vs. supply and the reasons for the increasing household demand (population demographics and migration) - generally supports growth in Wymondham to help reduce prices.

Concerns that affordable housing just means small and cramped houses, which are still not affordable.

Investigate the potential to enhance the policies regarding low/zero carbon development.

Further consider the characteristics and capacity of the NE Norwich area in developing the favoured option.

No change.

No change.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

7257 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]

Comment

(1) Agree with the major development options set out in para 1.11, but object to the omission of Aylsham from the locations for small-scale development. The omission is based solely on constraints on foul water drainage identified in Stage 2a of the Water Cycle Study, however further investigation should be carried out re the viability of resolving this given the other strengths of Aylsham as a location.

(2) Object to Trowse being shown as a Service Village limited to 10-20 dwellings when its location close to Norwich makes it suitable for higher levels of development.

(1) Agreed, Stage 2B of the Water Cycle Study will be used to reassess the potential of Aylsham. However the limitations at Aylsham STW are more concerned with the granting of consents by the Environment Agency for further discharges, and this has got caught up in a wider review of consents being undertaken by the Agency. To date their advice has been to exercise caution in assuming the problems can easily be overcome. Consideration will also need to be given to the cost of the necessary improvements in relation to the desirability of making further allocations at Aylsham.

(1) Reconsider the scale of allocation that could be made at Aylsham, following stage 2B of the Water Cycle Study.

(2) The role, function and capacity of Trowse to be considered as part of a comprehensive review of the Settlement Hierarchy, with a view to clarifying its positions as 'Norwich Fringe'.

(2) There is confusion between identifying Trowse as part of the Norwich Fringe, which will be a main location for new development, and as a Service Village limited to 10-20 units

6990 - Diocese of Norwich (Venerable Clifford Offer) [7649]

Comment

Concern that property investors will still be able to pay more than local first time buyers.

(SM/RB)
Comments noted. It should be recognised that all additional housing provision will provide valuable accommodation and local planning authorities seek a mix of types/sizes/tenures etc. to reflect local needs, but cannot exercise control over who purchases market properties.

No change.

6892 - Kidner Farming Limited [7550]

Comment

Site suggested to rear of Stoke Holy Cross Primary School and additional details provided.

Site Noted. The Joint Core Strategy is not intending to allocate specific sites for development; this will be done through the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPDs and in Area Action Plans.

Role of Stoke Holy Cross being reviewed as part of overall review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

Position and role of Stoke Holy Cross in accommodating growth will be considered as part of the review of the settlement hierarchy.

RBC/SM

Representations**Nature Representation Summary**

7302 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]

- Comment
- (1) Sets out the background as to how the housing figures for the GNDP area as derived through the RSS process (including the increase for Norwich agreed at the EIP).
 - (2) Notes the increasing reliance on planning gain to provide affordable housing and suggests 30-40% is not achievable given other infrastructure requirements such as the NDR and Long Stratton bypass. Suggests a need to lobby central government to finance affordable housing.
 - (3) Growth at NE Norwich is to bolster the case for the NNDR.
 - (4) Questions the GNDP rolling forward of the high level of growth for another 5 years to 2026.
 - (5) There is a need to reconsider the scale of allocations given the current down turn in the housing market, at least over the next 2-3 years
 - (6) NE Norwich is not well located for access to strategic employment sites and does not make good use of existing infrastructure.
 - (7) The different scales of development at Long Stratton demonstrate that growth is obviously linked to funding the bypass.
 - (8) Consideration of a planning application for 3,000 houses at Wymondham prior to completion of the JCS is 'wrong in principle' and CPRE object to the application on various grounds.
 - (9) There will be little interest in building on brownfield sites if a large volume of greenfield land is allocated.
 - (10) The slowdown in the housing market should be used to increase the aesthetic quality and environmental performance of new dwellings.
 - (11) Need for Central Government to reassess the growth assumptions to 2021 and beyond.

Council's Assessment

- (1) Comments noted. The JCS will need to be in conformity with the RSS as it currently stands.
- (2) Policy 14 'Housing Delivery' clearly states that 'where viability is an issue financial support will be sought via public subsidy', this will include looking at Central Government funding through the HCA.
- (3) The case for the NNDR is not reliant on the further growth at NE Norwich, and would still be pursued even if the NE Norwich growth were not being proposed. However, the NE Norwich growth does require the NNDR.
- (4) In accordance with PPS3, the JCS will need to demonstrate a 15-year supply of housing land from the point of adoption in 2011. Para 5.6 of the East of England Plan states that 'the requirement to assume, in planning for housing delivery after 2021, the continuation of planned annual rates 2001 to 2021 or 2006 to 2021 whichever is higher, provides a consistent approach to achieve this aspect of PPS3'; hence the roll forward of the 2006 to 2021 figures for the GNDP area.
- (5) A slow down in starts and completions over the next 2-3 years is likely, however the JCS is not due to be adopted until 2011 and the allocations cover the period to 2026. Consequently the JCS needs to be fit for purpose when an upturn in the market happens, which could be around the time the document is adopted.
- (6) NE Norwich is well located in terms of access to both the Broadland Business Park and the Airport, both of which are identified as focuses for employment growth in RSS Policy NR1, as well as to Rackheath Industrial Estate. The Location NE of Norwich allows development to make use of existing infrastructure including the Norwich-Sheringham rail line, the good routes to the city centre for high quality public transport.
- (7) Agreed, growth at Long Stratton is clearly linked to the provision of the bypass.
- (8) The planning application is completely separate to the JCS and has to go through a statutory process; any comments on the application should be made direct to South Norfolk Council under the application reference number.
- (9) This is not necessarily borne out by past experience; large greenfield sites with significant infrastructure requirements often have long lead in times and over

Action

- Consider the need to strengthen policies relating to the design quality and environmental performance of new development.
- Fully consider the existing capacity, infrastructure constraints and requirements and environmental impacts of the

recent years the availability of greenfield allocations in
South Norfolk and Broadland has not prevented brownfield

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

7778 - EWS (Mr Graham Smith)
[7699]

Comment

Government policy is to expand rail freight. Local planning policies should thus protect sites for potential rail freight and ex-rail routes with potential for reopening.

development in Norwich City.

(10) Policies 13 'Reducing Environmental Impact' and 17 'Environmental Assets' aim to achieve higher development standards, however these policies may need to be strengthened and more measurable targets included for environmental performance

(11) This issue needs to be pursued through the early review of the RSS

(SM)

Noted. (DSW)

growth locations in devising a Favoured Option.

Suggest Policy16 third bullet point be revised to say, "enhanced and innovative use and re-use of the local rail network including provisions for road/rail interchanges."

Representations

7311 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]

Nature Representation Summary

- Comment
- i) Population growth in line with UK average would produce 260-265,000 not 280,000. Thus reducing growth by a third.
 - ii) House building rate faster than demand (and needs revision due to downturn)
 - iii) Fails to address contradiction between sustainability and suburban/road reliant development
 - iv) Government infrastructure funding is not certain and likely to get worse
 - v) Flats and terraces should be prioritised as more environmentally desirable. Better use of existing stock should be encouraged/part of JCS
 - vi) Large growth locations are assault on areas ecology
 - vii) 'Enhanced environment' is unconvincing with growth planned post 2026
 - viii) Zero carbon development needs greater commitment. Suggest 30% of energy from renewables. Non-biofuel renewables should be chosen option.
 - ix) All development should reduce water consumption to 110l (policy WAT1-Environment Agency)
 - x) Acknowledge loss of water source from agricultural land, increased flood risk from rise in sea levels. Question loss of valuable farmland.
 - xi) Many development areas include protected habitats. Green links/corridors needed but hard to see how this is compatible with scale of development &&& expanded road network
 - xii) Promoting Norwich as retail centre threatens proposed 'new town centres'
 - xiii) Economic importance of small scale manufacturing should be acknowledged
 - xiv) Housing building as economic stimulus is environmentally questionable &&& will result in low skill/service jobs
 - xv) Existing deprived areas should receive greatest benefit from development. Growth agenda should not stop existing problems from being tackled.
 - xvi) Greater economic diversity and self ownership should be encouraged (esp those adding environmental value)
 - xvii) Environmental constraints of development sites preclude deliver of new employment sites
 - xviii) Rail and bus improvements should take priority over road building. Consideration should be given to trams and/or opening up station at Dussindale && Broadland Business Park
 - xix) Appropriate level of investment not possible with cost of NDR. Modal shift not demonstrated. NDR expensive && environmentally destructive && will not reduce carbon.
 - xx) Norwich airport as focus for growth is contradictory from carbon perspective

Council's Assessment

- i) & ii) Housing requirement (and associated forecasts) come from East of England plan House building rate is an estimate and will require close monitoring in order to respond to any significant deviations
- iii) Strategy acknowledges that car use will continue to be mode of travel in the area but wishes to maximise opportunities for non-car travel alternatives
- iv) Government funding has already been forthcoming to help deliver the growth agenda. However it was always envisaged that both public and private sector funds are necessary to deliver the required infrastructure.
- v) The GNDP will be masterplanning the growth locations with a view to maximising the opportunities for renewable energy, efficient use of land, sustainable construction techniques etc. The housing mix and tenure will be informed by an up to date assessment of the needs of the area/population.
- vi) &&&& vii) Growth on the scale envisaged will inevitably have an impact. The GNDP is preparing a green infrastructure strategy, alongside environmental protection policies, to improve existing habitats, create new and to for public access to the natural environment.
- viii) The GNDP will be commissioning a PPS1 renewable energy study to examine the potential in the JCS area and to advise on the options available re: zero carbon development, % renewable energy requirements and the various options/approaches available.
- ix) &&&& x) There will indeed be a loss of some agricultural land as a result of development (although the loss of the highest grade agricultural land has been minimised). The GNDP are working with the Environment Agency and Anglian Water to ensure water resources/quality are sufficient and that new development maximises the opportunity for water efficiency.
- xi) The inclusion of nature conservation areas within growth locations does not mean that they will be built on. Such areas may benefit from improved management as a result (although the sensitivities of each individual site will need to be taken into account). The green infrastructure strategy includes far more initiatives/projects than just green links/corridors.
- xii) The GNDP does not consider the promotion of mixed use developments to be threatened by the continuing promotion of Norwich City Centre as a retail destination. Local centres will provide local services to a limited catchment whilst the City Centre remains important as a regional centre and vital to the Norwich economy.
- xiii) The JCS policy on the economy (15) seeks to promote economic development of all sectors (small &&&& start up businesses are specifically mentioned)
- xiv) The JCS seeks to provide sufficient housing in line with the East of England Plan requirements as well as

Action

Note the points made and seek to take them on board when developing the JCS submission document.

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action**

promoting economic development around several specialist sectors such as the Norwich Research Park/UEA/Norfolk &&&& Norwich University Hospital and Hethel Engineering Centre as well as numerous business and employment parks providing a range of employment opportunities to the area.

xv) The GNDP is still investigating various options regarding developer contributions, S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy - that could be used in deprived areas. There is no suggestion that the growth agenda has or will result in a reduction in initiatives to tackle existing problems

xvi) This is a laudable goal that should indeed be encouraged.

xvii) Whilst the consultation document focusses on residential development it is envisaged to promote mixed use development encompassing employment, retail and services alongside residential areas.

xviii) The GNDP is pursuing a range of transport solutions and is working closely with NATS proposals to maximise non-car modes of travel. Rail options (particularly linked to growth locations) are being investigated.

xix) The investment required to deliver growth comes from a variety of sources which are not necessarily the same as those funding the NDR. NDR is key element of transport infrastructure and planning application will show how environmental issues have been addressed. JCS has a strong commitment to reduce the need to travel and tackle climate change.

xx) Whilst air travel is a significant contributor to CO2 emissions GNDP wishes to provide opportunity for economic growth around an existing airport for airport related uses.

RBC

6893 - Drayton Parish Council
(Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]

Comment: Please provide details of specific developments within 0.5miles of Drayton

The JCS is not proposing to allocate specific sites - this will be done through subsequent documents. Therefore only the details contained in the JCS consultation document are available at present.

None

RBC

6829 - Beighton Parish Council
(Mrs Pauline James) [4398]

Comment: Unable to comment

Noted.

None

RBC

7360 - Coal Authority (Miss Rachel Bust Planning and Local Authority Liaison) [7444]

Comment: No comments

Noted

None

RBC

Anything else?

Anything Else?

Representations

7227 - Salhouse Parish Council
(Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]

Nature Representation Summary

- Comment
1. Concerned that the NPA is a wish-list of parishes for an expansion of the Norwich City boundary.
 2. Concern of the variation in the figures quoted for number of homes needed.
 3. Lack of variation in the Broadland element between the three Growth Options.
 4. Confusion between the settlement hierarchy and the major Growth Locations for parishes which appear to get different outcomes under different policies.
 5. Lack of information on the large new community in the Broadland NPA.
 6. Services in Salhouse 'Service Village' are already under threat and there are a lack of sites for employment opportunities.
 7. Development in the Salhouse area needs to respect the Conservation Area and Broads Authority.

Council's Assessment

1. The Norwich Policy Area is a long-standing approach to co-ordinating the planning of development requirements in the wider Norwich area. It is a planning concept that has no direct relationship with Local Government Review. Salhouse has been included in the Norwich Policy Area, reflecting the fact that one of the major areas for growth in the Strategy falls within Salhouse.
2. Consider paragraph 1.3 and 8.4 give adequate explanation of housing figures.
3. The reasons for the lack of radically different options for Broadland needs to be explained, and a topic paper is being prepared as supporting evidence for the Reg 27 version of the JCS.
4. The settlement hierarchy is under review.
5. The Core Strategy does not give site specific details on the breakdown of the small sites allowance. This will be done in later development plan documents. The allowance is based on evidence from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
6. The strategy aims to promote limited new development in villages with existing facilities/services, partly in order to help retain these services.
7. Agree that any development proposal will have to take account of the conservation area and the impact on the Broads, which will be dealt with as part of the Site Specific Policies DPD. An Appropriate Assessment is being undertaken, which assesses the impact of the scale of development on key internationally recognised sites, including the Broads.

(TH)

Action

Prepare a Topic Paper to address the lack of variation between the Growth Options shown for Norwich and Broadland.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7836 - Roger Heap [5766]	Comment	Advocates a new settlement to accommodate all of the proposed growth.	<p>The GNPD have not ruled out the contribution a new settlement could make to accommodating future growth requirements. Option three included a new settlement at Mangreen, however this was not of a scale to accommodate all of the future growth. No sites of sufficient size have been put forward to accommodate all of the housing growth and such a strategy would raise significant concerns re. the cost of infrastructure; the ability to create a viable town centre and attract employment; the delays caused by long lead-in times; and continuity in land supply for housing should problems arise with the chosen location etc.</p> <p>Research to be commissioned to test the viability of future growth requirements being met through a new settlement.</p>	No change.
7517 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]	Comment	Suggested development site at Burgh Road, Aylsham	<p>Site details noted, the site needs to be promoted through the Site Specific Policies DPD. Currently no allocations are proposed for Aylsham in light of the early stages of the Water Cycle Study (WCS), but this is to be reconsidered as part of WCS Stage 2B.</p> <p>TH/RB</p>	None (although role of Aylsham to be reconsidered following WCS Satge 2B)
7672 - Little Plumstead Hospital West (Sec of State Health)	Comment	Reclassify Little Plumstead Hospital as part of the Norwich fringe parishes.	<p>Development in Great and Little Plumstead parish, which contains Little Plumstead Hospital, is clearly physically separated from Norwich and the immediately contiguous and suburban parishes that make up the fringe. The parish will therefore be classified in the Settlement hierarchy according to the services present (SM)</p>	No change
6803 - storeys:ssp (Mr Mark Brooker) [7506]	Comment	<p>(1) Policy 8 'Service Villages' should be revised to include Aslacton.</p> <p>(2) Simpson's Maltings should be included within the proposed development boundary.</p>	<p>(1) To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.</p> <p>(2) To be considered in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>(DSW)</p>	Consider the role, function and capacity of Aslacton as part of a review of the Settlement
7176 - Felthorpe Parish Council (Mrs J Marris) [1793]	Comment	Felthorpe should be classified within the "Other Villages" category of the Settlement Hierarchy.	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. (DSW)	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7050 - Mr & Mrs L Dale [6251]	Comment	<p>Funding for infrastructure is unlikely and if not forthcoming should constrain scale of growth in plan. External Connections table 'fails to mention rail capacity constraints. Hethersett should be a Service Village Spatial Objective 10 is meaningless for trunk roads Dualling of A11 not identified as a key dependency. POlICY 2 does not mention enhancements to rail services.</p> <p>Policy 3 would be hindered by city centre congestion. Policy 5 and Policy 13. What will be gained from a design policy? Policy 10. Support reuse of farm buildings. Policy 15. Link CHP with glasshouse horticulture. Support Mangreen as having potential as sustainable community. In the long term there will be a need for a new rail interchange. Support for growth in Long Stratton as it will provide a bypass.</p>	<p>The representation is wide ranging but majors on transportation issues. There is comment that insufficient consideration has been given to rail. The plan does identify where rail can contribute to the strategy and sets a context for enhancement. This is a core strategy and improvement id not fundamental to the delivery of growth although will contribute to the overall strategy. As for suggested specific improvemnts, these may improve the system, but studies and discussions with network rail have not identified specific measures for inclusion in the plan. Similarly dualling of A11 has not been identified as critical to delivery of the plan.</p> <p>No evidence has been put forward to change the position of Hethersett in the settlement Hierarchy.</p> <p>The plan contains policy that promotes renewable energy sources.</p> <p>Support for Option 3 (mangreen) noted.</p> <p>Policy 10 - support noted (RD)</p>	<p>In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.</p> <p>Other comments - no change (RD)</p>
7267 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	Supports the level of development proposed for Loddon and proposes a site for potential allocation.	<p>Support noted. Site already identified through the SHLAA and consideration will be given to its allocation through the South Norfolk Site Specific policies DPD.</p> <p>(SM)</p>	No change.
7509 - Alex and Peter Valori / Faircloth and Baker [7209]	Comment	Promotion of land at Heath Farm ,Thorpe End.	Site details noted, the site needs to be promoted at site-specific stages of the local development plan process	None
7777 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Comment	Wymondham should be allocated a greater number of dwellings than proposed in the Options. Reasons including sustainable location, existing infrastructure, good transport links etc.	<p>Varying scales of development were considered for Wymondham as part of the three options and evidence supporting the JCS indicates that a number of settlements are capable of supporting large-scale development (1,000+ units). There are also concerns that a concentration of development within a few locations within South Norfolk would be detrimental to the character and settlement pattern of the area and to consistent and timely delivery.</p> <p>The representation promotes a particular site, which can be considered as part of the Site Specific DPD/Area Action Plan process, in the context of the JCS.</p> <p>(SM)</p>	Consider the relative merits/implications of alternative patterns and scales of development in developing a
7526 - Ministry of Defence (R M Combes) [1532]	Comment	No specfic comments, but remember MoD needs and possibility that MoD sites may become available for re-development if no longer required.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>RBC</p>	None

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7811 - Mr N J Fox [7705]	Comment	No mention of cost of proposals. Has any consideration been given to infrastructure required?	GNDP has carried a number of study looking at infrastructure requirements and cost associated with development proposals. These are available to view on the GNDP website. More detailed work is being undertaken by EDAW on the basis of the proposed favoured option. Issue of Local Government Reorganisation is a separate process and any views should be sent to the Boundary Commission. RBC/RB	None
7779 - Forestry Commission (Mr S Scott) [910] 6799 - Forestry Commission (Mr S Scott) [910]	Comment	Highlighting issues of interest re: policy on woodlands and related issues such as renewable energy, flood amelioration, green infrastructure and brownfield land.	The GNDP is aware of the importance of trees and woodlands both in a policy context and in terms of its contribution to the landscape and environment of the Plan area, reduce flood risk/contamination and in promoting biodiversity. A Green Infrastructure Strategy and a PPS1 renewable energy study are being prepared to inform the Joint Core Strategy - areas of woodland will no doubt feature in both studies. The GNDP thanks the Forestry Commission for its offer of expertise and looks forward to discussing these points in greater detail at future consultations/workshops etc. RBC	None.
7504 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	Comment	Proposes a site for inclusion in the SHLAA	Noted. Sites already identified through the SHLAA and consideration will be given to allocation through the Site Specific Policies DPD process. (SM)	No change
7810 - Mrs Parson [7704]	Comment	I trust that this merger will not affect our good relationship with Broadland District Council cooperation past and present, and make a less efficient approach with such a large conglomeration in may facets	Local Government Reorganisation is a separate process from the Joint Core Strategy and any views should be sent to the Boundary Commission. RBC	None
6871 - Parish Fields Practice (Ms Simone Johnson) [1191]	Comment	Diss has experienced continued growth. Infrastructure needs to keep pace with growth.	The GNDP is aware of the need to liase closely with service providers to ensure co-ordination of funding and growth strategies. NHS Norfolk will continue to be involved throughout the JCS process so that infrastructure improvements are delivered alongside any additional growth.	None
6903 - Greenhouse Trust (Mr Richard Bickle) [919]	Comment	General support. Concern that more specific targets are needed, e.g. on carbon emission reduction.	Targets are being developed as part of the Monitoring Framework for the JCS, including carbon reduction targets based on the PPS1 renewable energy study. (SM)	On going development of measureable targets for the Monitoring Framework.
6872 - Alex and Peter Valori / Faircloth and Baker [7209]	Comment	Promotion of land at Heath Farm, Thorpe End to link with other developments	Site details noted, the site needs to be promoted at site-specific stages of the local development plan process	None

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7549 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	Comment	Promotion of land in SW Norwich to W of Colney Lane at Cringleford for mixed use, including 2500 dwellings.	Whilst the JCS will not identify specific sites it will include broad locations and numbers. As Norwich Fringe parishes Cringleford and Colney will be considered for development. This suggestion will be considered as part of the process of developing a favoured option. RBC	Consider suggestion as part of deliberations/alternatives leading up to formulation of favoured
7644 - Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd [8210]	Comment	Duplicate of Rep. 6798	Duplicate of Rep. 6798	Duplicate of Rep. 6798
6873 - Anon 2 Anon 2 [7621] 6874 - Anon 3 Anon 3 [7622]	Comment	6874 - unclear 6873 - why bother you will do what you want anyway	GNDP is committed to consultation process and taking views into account as are elected members in each authority. Support welcomed.	None
7425 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Comment	General support. Spatial Vision: Recommend four additional criteria under Climate Change and Sustainability: 1. Water efficiency - include along with energy efficiency; 2. Water Quality - recognising the SACs, SPAs, SSSIs etc. both within the area and downstream; 3. Flood risk- major consideration for new and existing developments, particularly in light of climate change impacts; 4. Biodiversity - reference to improving existing spaces/habitats. Spatial Planning Objectives: Objective 8 recommend sixth sentence to state 'It is a priority to improve these special qualities even more for their own benefit and so that everyone can enjoy them' Objective 9 suggest inclusion of text to cover flood risk e.g. 'appropriate siting, design and layout will be required in new development and mitigation to existing development will be investigated'. 'zero carbon development will investigated' needs strengthening to reflect Government's policy aims.	Spatial Vision: Amend 'Climate Change and Sustainability' element to cover: water efficiency and flood risk as part of bullet one, enhanced biodiversity of existing spaces/habitats under bullet three and add a bullet regarding water quality. Spatial Planning Objectives: Agree suggested changes in relation to Objective 8 and Objective 9.	Amend as Response.
6989 - Diocese of Norwich (Venerable Clifford Offer) [7649]	Comment	(SM) How will communities be created and what role could Church play in what is happening/developing	The GNDP is acutely aware of the need to address community cohesion both within the growth areas and between new and existing populations. Ways of enabling/assisting the integration of communities will be looked at later in the process, including as part of Area Action Plans. Organisations that fulfill a central role within communities e.g. schools, churches could well help with this issue. RB	None at present.

Joint Core Strategy Technical consultation Reg. 25

Public Participation Report

6. Spatial strategy

Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Representations

Action

6. Spatial strategy

Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

7105 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	No change to plan
6927 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	Take account of view of strategic importance for Long Stratton by-pass.
7295 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	Duplicate of Rep. 7294
7550 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	No change.
6966 - Nethergate Farms [6920]	Take account of support for dispersal of development on choosing growth options.
7837 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]	Consider soundness of any proposed strategic options in relation to the RSS.
7849 - Sport England (East Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986]	Consider including formal and informal indoor and outdoor sports facilities in list of essential infrastructure
7756 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	The findings of the studies will inform the infrastructure requirements set out in the Implementation section
7004 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Consider wording in relation to critical and essential infrastructure
7718 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Take account of support for Long Stratton bypass as key infrastructure
7614 - Yare Valley Society (Mrs Andrew J Salisbury) [1006]	No change to plan
7616 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	No change to plan
7249 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	No change to plan. Ensure water issues at Aylsham are investigated further.
7312 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	No change to plan
7640 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Take account for support for growth at Hethersett in choice of options.
7645 - Cemex [8191]	Ensure site information is passed on to relevant officers for site allocation plans.
7183 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]	No change
7133 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	
7274 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	No change to plan
7710 - Poringland Parish Council (Mrs C Milton) [2038]	No change to plan
7712 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Take account of the likely need for improvements to A11 as a result of

Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Representations***Action***

7426 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	No change
7106 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]	
6839 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	
7361 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	
6944 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	
7812 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	
7597 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]	
7230 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	
7689 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	
7455 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	
7529 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	
7330 - North Norfolk District Council (Ms. Jill Fisher) [1570]	No change to plan
7518 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]	No change to plan
7497 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	No change to plan
6977 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	No change to plan
7572 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Consider replacement of references to junction improvements and NDR
7664 - Ifield Estates Limited (Mr Edward Olley) [4160]	No change to plan
6996 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	No change.
7786 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Consider inclusion of leisure facilities in essential infrastructure and take account of views on Long Stratton by-pass
7355 - Bramerton Parish Council (Mr B Ansell) [1975]	No change to plan
7177 - Hopkins Homes Ltd (Mr Chris Smith) [7104]	The strategy will have to take account of delivery issues in identifying the most appropriate locations for development.
7654 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Consider implications for trunk road network in further assessment of objectives
7081 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	No change to plan
7338 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	
6904 - Greenhouse Trust (Mr Richard Bickle) [919]	No change to plan
7346 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]	No change to plan
6838 - Parish Fields Practice (Ms Simone Johnson) [1191]	Ensure the need for health facilities to support growth in Diss is taken account of.
7260 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Consider role of small scale development in contributing to larger scale
7669 - Mr Robert Debbage [6972]	No change to plan

Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Representations**Action**

6919 - Norfolk Environmental Waste Services (Mr David Beadle) [4376]

No change to plan

7608 - Trafford Estate Rackheath [8291]

No change to plan

Decision on Q1. Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Consider including formal and informal indoor and outdoor sports facilities in list of essential infrastructure

General reference to green infrastructure in supporting text to major growth locations policy considered sufficient

Take account of support for dispersal of development on choosing growth options.

There is a need to strike a balance between concentration and dispersal which is considered to be reflected in the favoured option for the submission document

Take account of support for Long Stratton bypass as key infrastructure

Included in supporting the text to major growth locations policy under key dependencies

Consider soundness of any proposed strategic options in relation to the RSS.

Planning inspectorate review helped to reshape favoured option.

Consider inclusion of leisure facilities in essential infrastructure and take account of views on Long Stratton by-pass

Long Stratton by-pass included in supporting text to major growth locations policy. Leisure facilities included in assessment of infrastructure need, but less critical than some other forms of infrastructure

No change to plan. Ensure water issues at Aylsham are investigated further.

Water cycle study stage 2 b has included assessment of Aylsham, and resulted in a proposed allocation

Consider role of small scale development in contributing to larger scale infrastructure.

The infrastructure needs and funding assessment has taken account of the total level of growth. If Community Infrastructure Levy is adopted as proposed by Government, all development will contribute towards infrastructure above a de minimis level

Ensure site information is passed on to relevant officers for site allocation plans.

This has been done

Ensure the need for health facilities to support growth in Diss is taken account of.

NHS Norfolk representation 7829 states that new facilities are being considered, but at the level of development proposed it is unlikely that significant further investment will be needed at Diss

Take account of view of strategic importance for Long Stratton by-pass.

Included in supporting text for major growth locations in Norwich policy area

The strategy will have to take account of delivery issues in identifying the most appropriate locations for development.

Agreed

The findings of the studies will inform the infrastructure requirements set out in the Implementation section

Agreed. EDAW are undertaking a more detailed study of infrastructure needs and funding in 2009, which is taking into account other infrastructure related studies as far as possible including the water cycle study, SFRA etc

Consider wording in relation to critical and essential infrastructure

The reference at paragraph 6.2 in the regulation 25 technical document has been rephrased and a reference to green infrastructure added in the supporting text to the policy on major growth locations in the Norwich policy area

Take account for support for growth at Hethersett in choice of options.

The options for growth in the Norwich policy area have been fully debated following the technical and public regulation 25 consultations, and in the light of the planning inspectorate's advice

Take account of the likely need for improvements to A11 as a result of development.

There is a reference in the supporting text for the major growth locations policy, and in the appendix detailing infrastructure needs

Consider implications for trunk road network in further assessment of objectives

There has been a more detailed subsequent dialogue with the Highways Agency leading towards a common position

Consider replacement of references to junction improvements and NDR

In the pre submission publication document NATS and the NDR are more closely linked. Junction improvements are needed and should be identified as a necessary infrastructure to help guide investment planning. They are therefore included in the appendix detailing infrastructure needs

Q2. CITY CENTRE - Are you aware of any major issues that would prevent delivery of this proposed policy?

Representations***Action******7. Policy for places***

Q2. CITY CENTRE - Are you aware of any major issues that would prevent delivery of this proposed policy?

7313 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Allocate green spaces in other DPDs (MB)
7573 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	No change [RB]
7092 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	
7655 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	no amendment needed to policy [RB]
7598 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]	
7231 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	
7530 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	
7617 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	
6905 - Greenhouse Trust (Mr Richard Bickle) [919]	No change at present
7082 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	
7719 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	
7757 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	
7665 - Ifield Estates Limited (Mr Edward Olley) [4160]	No change to plan
7551 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Amend policy to add focus on safety (MB)
7427 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	No amendment to policy needed
6840 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	
7646 - Cemex [8191]	No change to plan
7005 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	No change needed
7339 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	
7107 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]	
7275 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	
7362 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	
7813 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	
7456 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	
7261 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	
6915 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	No change to plan
6997 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	Amend policy to cover the findings of the concert hall study (MB)

Q2. CITY CENTRE - Are you aware of any major issues that would prevent delivery of this proposed policy?

Representations***Action***

7347 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]	None (MB)
7711 - Poringland Parish Council (Mrs C Milton) [2038]	No change to policies (MB)
7713 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	No change to plan.

Decision on Q2. CITY CENTRE - Are you aware of any major issues that would prevent delivery of Amend policy to cover the findings of the concert hall study (MB)

An appropriate reference has been included in the city centre policy and the supporting text

Allocate green spaces in other DPDs (MB)

No action and needed in relation to the joint core strategy

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

7152 - Norwich Consolidated Charities (Mr S. A. Franklin) [1325]	Consider potential of smaller urban fringe areas in helping to achieve overall growth targets.
7161 - Taylor Wimpey (Mr Colum Fitzsimons) [7258]	
7609 - Trafford Estate Rackheath [8291]	
7207 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	No change to plan
7510 - Alex and Peter Valori / Faircloth and Baker [7209]	Take account of the view that multiple urban fringe sites should be promoted through the strategy
7690 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	No change to plan
7531 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	No action
7316 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	No change to plan
7363 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Consider surface water issues through the plan
6801 - Mrs H Williamson [6288]	Take account of opposition to growth in Hethersett
7303 - Eastern Storage Equipment [8283]	No change to plan. Ensure issue of use of Northumberland Street industrial area is considered through the Norwich Site Allocation Plan.
7083 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	No change to plan
7428 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	No change to plan. Ensure Level 2 SFRA done for Norwich site allocation DPD.
7457 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	No change to plan.
7006 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	No change
7340 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	No change to plan
7498 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	Consider support for growth at Easton Costessey in choice of options.
7599 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]	The amount of investment required in different options will be a key issue for members in choosing the growth option.
7855 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	No change to plan
7296 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	No change to plan

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

7042 - Horsham & Newton St
Faith Parish Council (Mr Michael
Haslam) [7652]

7117 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust
(Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]

6802 - Roger Heap [5766]

7134 - North East Norwich
Landowner and Developer
Consortium [8313]

7814 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]

7677 - Goymour Properties Ltd.
[8271]

7326 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr
Stephen Little) [7197]

6898 - M. Falcon Property
Solutions (Mr Michael Falcon)
[7186]

7348 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]

6945 - Woods Hardwick Planning
(Mr Tim Collie) [7449]

7720 - Kimberley & Carleton
Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R
L Gladden) [2022]

7321 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr
Stephen Little) [7197]

7318 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr
Stephen Little) [7197]

7552 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659
(Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]

7612 - Yare Valley Society (Mrs
Andrew J Salisbury) [1006]

7574 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr
John Hiskett) [953]

7838 - Scott-Brown Partnership
(Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]

7228 - RG Carter Farms and
Drayton Farms Ltd [8232]

7618 - Barratt Strategic/Manor
Farm Rackheath [8224]

7532 - Barratt Strategic/John
Innes Foundation [8223]

7276 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm
Ltd) [2425]

7452 - Hempnall Parish Council
(Mr I J Nelson) [2014]

7651 - Hempnall Parish Council
(Mr I J Nelson) [2014]

7661 - Highways Agency (Mrs
Davina Galloway) [7624]

6998 - Barnham Broom Parish
Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]

7656 - Highways Agency (Mrs
Davina Galloway) [7624]

Action

No change to plan

Further investigate the potential for a rail halt on the Sheringham line to serve any future growth.

No change to plan

Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans.

No change to plan

No change to plan.

No change to plan.

Investigate further with Network Rail if such a station would be acceptable and practicable on the London mainline.

Consider broadband services in Costessey area.

No change to plan

No change to plan.

Take account of constraints in Little Melton and Hethersett area.

Take account of views on growth in Wymondham and the need for any growth to be supported by infrastructural improvements and landscape protection.

Engage police further through JCS to identify best use of existing resources and further infrastructure needs.

Take account of potential threats to the Yare Valley in the choice of options.

No change to plan

No change to plan

No change to plan

Take account of ecotown proposal in considering choice of options

No change to plan

No change to plan.

No change to plan

Ensure further work is undertaken concerning transport improvements required to support growth.

Consider issue of broadband connections.

Ensure highways implications of the choice of options is considered further.

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

7250 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]

7707 - Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement [8170]

7787 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]

7018 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]

7342 - Tasburgh Parish Council (Mrs Julie King) [7053]

7514 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]

6841 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]

6920 - Norfolk Environmental Waste Services (Mr David Beadle) [4376]

7647 - Cemex [8191]

7758 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]

Action

Consier including Trowse in option 1.

Consider option for housing and employment growth at Cringleford.

No change to plan.

Take account of sustainable transport potential at Easton in relation to choice of options.

Take account of services regarded as necesarry to support any growth at Long Stratton.

Ensure Water Cycle Study continues to inform emerging plan.

Take account of water infrastructure issues as required by RSS when choosing

No change to plan

Take account of existing infrastructure and services in making choice of options.

Take account of views on limited services in Hethersett to accommodate growth.

Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

Action

Decision on Q3. FOR OPTION 1 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there

Ensure issue of use of Northumberland Street industrial area is considered through the Norwich Site Allocation Plan.

This is an issue for the site specific allocations development plan document

Take account of constraints in Little Melton and Hethersett area.

The scale of development has been considered following the regulation of 25 technical and public consultation exercises and the assessment by the planning inspectorate. Known constraints have been considered in selecting the strategy for development in the pre submission version

Ensure highways implications of the choice of options is considered further.

Modeling of the proposed option has been undertaken. Various possible strategies were assessed, particularly from a public transport viewpoint

Engage police further through JCS to identify best use of existing resources and further infrastructure needs.

There has been a police input to the work of EDAW to assess infrastructure needs and potential funding, in both the 2007 and 2009 studies

Consider support for growth at Easton Costessey in choice of options.

This area is included in the proposed growth strategy

Investigate further with Network Rail if such a station would be acceptable and practicable on the London mainline.

Dialogue was held with rail interests, but the option in question (Mangreen) has not been included in the proposed strategy

Further investigate the potential for a rail halt on the Sheringham line to serve any future growth.

There has been a dialogue with rail interests. There is a reference in the policy on a major growth in the Norwich policy area

No change to plan. Ensure Level 2 SFRA done for Norwich site allocation DPD.

This is a matter for the site specific allocations development plan document

Consider option for housing and employment growth at Cringleford.

This has been for the considered. Moderate growth at Cringleford is included in the proposed strategy

Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans.

This is included in the policy on major growth locations

Take account of ecotown proposal in considering choice of options

This is included in the policy on major growth locations

Take account of views on limited services in Hethersett to accommodate growth.

The favoured option reduces of growth at Hethersett compared with options 1 and 2 in the technical consultation

Ensure Water Cycle Study continues to inform emerging plan.

The stage 2 b water cycle study has been completed in September, 2009, and an interim version produced in July/August has helped in the final drafting of the pre submission version of the joint core strategy

Consider surface water issues through the plan

There are appropriate references to SUDS, and to the issue of flood probability in the city centre

Take account of services regarded as necessary to support any growth at Long Stratton.

There has been continued dialogue with Children's Services over schools. There were no specific issues raised by NHS Norfolk, who supported the favoured option at the regulation 25 public consultation stage. The stage 2 b water cycle study indicates some capacity limitations at the sewage treatment works

Consider potential of smaller urban fringe areas in helping to achieve overall growth targets.

The proposed strategy includes a total of 3800 dwellings to be found on such sites

The amount of investment required in different options will be a key issue for members in choosing the growth option.

Agreed

Consider issue of broadband connections.

There is a reference to the need for suitable ICT in the access policy in the pre submission version

Take account of water infrastructure issues as required by RSS when choosing options.

The strategy has been guided through its development by the various stages of the water cycle study

Take account of views on growth in Wymondham and the need for any growth to be supported by infrastructural improvements and landscape protection.

There has been detailed consideration of matters such as transport, education, water utilities and historic environment

Consider broadband services in Costessey area.
There is a reference to the need for suitable ICT in the access policy in the pre submission version

Take account of sustainable transport potential at Easton in relation to choice of options.
Easton is included in the proposed strategy for growth in the Norwich policy area

Consier including Trowse in option 1.
Trowse is included as a fringe parish. No specific allocation is proposed, but it may be selected to accommodate some of the non location specific 1800 dwellings assigned to other locations in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area

Take account of existing infrastructure and services in making choice of options.
The infrastructure funding and study undertaken by EDAW has quantified the infrastructure needs. There has been dialogue with NHS Norfolk, Children's Services and other service providers as well as technical studies such as the water cycle study and an examination of the potential for public transport offered by the various options under consideration

Ensure further work is undertaken concerning transport improvements required to support growth.
Further modelling has been undertaken and public transport potential investigated in the development of the proposed option

Take account of opposition to growth in Hetherset
The proposed strategy includes significantly less development at Hetherset compared with options 1 and 2 in the technical consultation

Take account of potential threats to the Yare Valley in the choice of options.
There is a moderate allocation at Cringleford in recognition of the environmental constraints. These considerations are more fully detailed in a topic paper on the spatial strategy.

Take account of the view that multiple urban fringe sites should be promoted though the strategy
The proposed strategy includes a total of 3800 dwellings to be found on such sites

Q4. FOR OPTION 1 - What are the constraints to delivery?

7364 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.
7691 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	No change to plan
7619 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for

Q4. FOR OPTION 1 - What are the constraints to delivery?

Representations***Action***

7043 - Horsham & Newton St Faith Parish Council (Mr Michael Haslam) [7652]	Consider amendment to key diagram to relocate employment symbol to north of
7788 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.
7019 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	No change to plan
7047 - Mr & Mrs L Dale [6251]	Consider further if there is a need for phasing of development sites through the JCS or subsequent plans
7759 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	No change to plan
7208 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.
7232 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	
7533 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	
7678 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	
7815 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	No change to plan
7721 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	No change to plan
7349 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]	None
6978 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Ensure hierarchy policy provides clarity
7196 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
7120 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	No change to plan
6908 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027]	Ensure implementation of plan section includes infrastructure required to support any growth location.
7431 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	No change to plan
6929 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	No change to plan
7084 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	No change to plan
7555 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.
7856 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	No change to plan
7007 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Ensure that the plan takes account of the findings of the evidence base and environmental appraisals so that growth options enhance and promote biodiversity assets locally.
6928 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	No action

Q4. FOR OPTION 1 - What are the constraints to delivery?

Representations

- 6842 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]
- 7575 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]
- 6946 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]
- 7839 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]

- 7184 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]
- 7499 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]
- 7135 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]
- 7458 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]
- 7093 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]
- 7170 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]

Action

- No change to plan at this stage. Incorporate later findings of Water Cycle Study as plan develops
- No change to plan
- Ensure implementation plan takes account of making best use of existing
- In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
- No change to the plan
- No change to plan
- No change to plan
- No change to plan
- Ensure JCS contains a strategic requirement for development to take account of archaeology and subsequent plans provide detailed development management policies.
- No change. Detailed issues of use classes will be resolved in site specific and area action plan DPDs.

Q4. FOR OPTION 1 - What are the constraints to delivery?

Representations**Action**

Decision on Q4. FOR OPTION 1 - What are the constraints to delivery?

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Consider further if there is a need for phasing of development sites through the JCS or subsequent plans

The implementation framework relates infrastructure to phases of development, but the challenge of delivering sufficient dwellings within the plan period means that restraint is not feasible. The trajectory shows the expected rates of the development.

Ensure implementation plan takes account of making best use of existing infrastructure

The infrastructure and funding study undertaken by EDAW is intended to ensure this is achieved

Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.

This is included in the pre submission version of the joint core strategy

Ensure JCS contains a strategic requirement for development to take account of archaeology and subsequent plans provide detailed development management policies.

Subsequent to the technical consultation, policy references to environmental assets have been considerably strengthened and the supporting text to this policy specifically refers to archaeology. There is also a reference in the city centre policy.

Consider amendment to key diagram to relocate employment symbol to north of airport

Key diagram amended

Future drafting of the strategy will contain a framework that identifies necessary infrastructure and funding, when it will need to be in place and the agency responsible for delivery.

This is included in an appendix in the pre-submission version

No change to plan at this stage. Incorporate later findings of Water Cycle Study as plan develops

As the plan has involved it has been informed by the various stages of the water cycle study

No change. Detailed issues of use classes will be resolved in site specific and area action plan DPDs.

Not applicable to joint core strategy

Ensure implementation of plan section includes infrastructure required to support any growth location.

This is included in an appendix in the pre-submission version

Ensure that the plan takes account of the findings of the evidence base and environmental appraisals so that growth options enhance and promote biodiversity assets locally.

The sustainability appraisal report and green infrastructure report have helped to guide the pre-submission version of the plan. The appropriate assessment has considered the impact of policies on environmental sites of international importance, and has resulted in a limited amount of redrafting

Q5. FOR OPTION 1 - What opportunities does this option present?

7123 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust
(Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]

Take account of support for option

7036 - Gerald Eve (M Moss)

Take account of support for the option

7459 - Hethersett Parish Council
(Ian Weetman) [8023]

Take account of identification of local service needs that could be addressed through any development at Hethersett

7620 - Barratt Strategic/Manor
Farm Rackheath [8224]

No change to plan

7857 - Wymondham Town
Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

7185 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr

Take account of employment opportunities in choice of growth options

Q5. FOR OPTION 1 - What opportunities does this option present?

Representations***Action***

7558 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	No change to plan
7059 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	
7020 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Take account of support for option including growth at Easton.
7816 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	No change to plan
7365 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	No change to plan
7268 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Take account of support for options 1 and 2
7789 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	No change to plan
7008 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Ensure subsequent plans take account of specific green infrastructure requirements in different locations.
7576 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	
7692 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans.
7209 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	No change to plan
7233 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	Consider transport implications in choice of options
6843 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report
7297 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	Note Breckland's support for option and associated transport improvements
7722 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Take account of opposition to this option
7679 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	No change to plan
7500 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	Recommendation In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options
7760 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Consider greater focus on growth in Wymondham in choice of options.
6947 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	Consider public transport issues in choice of options
7044 - Horsham & Newton St Faith Parish Council (Mr Michael Haslam) [7652]	Consider amendment to key diagram to move symbol for employment development near the airport to the north
6899 - M. Falcon Property Solutions (Mr Michael Falcon) [7186]	Consider Magreen in choice of growth options
7171 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]	No change to plan
7136 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Consider growth beyond 2026

Q5. FOR OPTION 1 - What opportunities does this option present?

Representations**Action**

7277 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]

No change to plan. Ensure site allocation plan for South Norfolk covers employment allocations at Wymondham.

7434 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]

No change to plan

7534 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]

Consider transport issues in choice of options

Decision on Q5. FOR OPTION 1 - What opportunities does this option present?

Take account of identification of local service needs that could be addressed through any development at Hethersett

Policy on housing delivery includes a reference to the need for housing with care at Hethersett. The bullet points in the policy concerning major growth locations in the Norwich policy area indicate further service needs relevant to Hethersett. Further detail is included in the implementation framework.

Ensure subsequent plans take account of specific green infrastructure requirements in different locations.

This is a matter for subsequent site specific allocations development plan documents or area action plans but there are appropriate references to green infrastructure in the policy on major growth locations in the Norwich policy area and its supporting text, as well as general references in policies dealing with environmental matters

Consider amendment to key diagram to move symbol for employment development near the airport to the north

Key diagram amended

Take account of support for option

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Note Breckland's support for option and associated transport improvements

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans.

Appropriate references are included in the policy on major growth locations in the Norwich policy area where it relates to the north east, and in the supporting text

Consider Mangreen in choice of growth options

This was considered, but Mangreen has not been included in the proposed option in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy

Take account of support for option including growth at Easton.

Easton is included in the proposed option in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy

Take account of support for options 1 and 2

These were considered, but the favoured option differs from all of those in the technical consultation. However it shares a number of the characteristics of option 2

Take account of employment opportunities in choice of growth options

These were a key criterion in the consideration of options and in the selection of the option for inclusion in the pre-submission version

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Action: Consider public transport issues in choice of options

This was a key consideration in selecting locations for major development. Long Stratton is included in the strategy primarily to address local issues. Various assessments of the public transport potential of different locations have been undertaken

Consider growth beyond 2026

The Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle will continue to grow beyond 2026, and there is an appropriate reference to this in the policy on major growth locations and supporting text. The scale of future growth required by the review of the regional spatial strategy is not yet known, but will need to be taken into account in an early review of the JCS. The Greater Norwich Development Partnership has committed to a study into the potential for a new country town to accommodate development which may be required by the review of the RSS, or post 2026 to see if this offers a better alternative than expanding existing settlements

Action: No change to plan. Ensure site allocation pain for South Norfolk covers employment allocations at Wymondham.
Not applicable to the joint core strategy

Take account of opposition to this option
The advantages and disadvantages of the different options and put forward have been considered. The option put forward in the pre-submission version of the JCS differs from all of those in the regulation 25 technical consultation

Consider transport issues in choice of options
Public transport issues in particular have featured in the consideration of options, and modelling has been undertaken in respect of the option to be included in the pre-submission version of the JCS

Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report
The work undertaken for stage 2 A. has been for the developed in the stage 2 B. water cycle study

Consider greater focus on growth in Wymondham in choice of options.
Arguments for and against further growth in Wymondham have been considered and assessed, but the option for inclusion in the pre-submission version of the JCS is based on a more modest allocation than option 1 at the technical consultation stage

Q6. FOR OPTION 1 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

7126 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust No change to plan
(Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]

7790 - Long Stratton Parish No change to plan
Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]

Q6. FOR OPTION 1 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Representations

6909 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027]
 6948 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]
 7021 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]
 7761 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]
 7723 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]
 7062 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]
 7137 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]
 7621 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]
 7577 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]
 7817 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]
 7234 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]
 7460 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]
 7437 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]
 6900 - M. Falcon Property Solutions (Mr Michael Falcon) [7186]
 7045 - Horsham & Newton St Faith Parish Council (Mr Michael Haslam) [7652]
 7366 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]
 6844 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]
 7561 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]
 7693 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]

Action

Take account of opposition to major growth in Little Melton expressed through 2006 Parish Plan.
 Consider Mangreen as one of the options to meet growth requirement.
 Consider growth at Eston as one of the growth options.
 No change to plan. Allocation of specific sites for housing development will be through subsequent Development Plan Documents.
 No action
 No change to plan
 Consider potential for achieving on site provision of services as a key element in choosing appropriate growth options.
 No change to plan
 Ensure co-ordination through the plan between green infrastructure provided by new development and existing projects in South Norfolk.
 No change to plan
 Consider need to amend plan to relocate airport employment area symbol.
 No change to plan
 Ensure there is adequate consultation and agreement on the implementation framework set out in the plan to enable this spatial plan to co-ordinate between agencies and developers.
 Consider Mangreen amongst the options for achieving housing growth targets.
 No change to plan
 No change to plan
 Consider water Cycle Study in choosing growth options.
 No change to plan
 No change

Q6. FOR OPTION 1 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Representations**Action**

Decision on Q6. FOR OPTION 1 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Consider Mangreen as one of the options to meet growth requirement.

This was considered, but Mangreen has not been included in the proposed option in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy

Consider growth at Eston as one of the growth options.

Easton is included as part of the proposed strategy in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy

Ensure there is adequate consultation and agreement on the implementation framework set out in the plan to enable this spatial plan to co-ordinate between agencies and developers.

EDAW have engaged with the providers of infrastructure in the assessment of infrastructure needs and funding which has informed the implementation framework included in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy

Consider potential for achieving on site provision of services as a key element in choosing appropriate growth options.

This has been considered through the work undertaken by EDAW and dialogue with service providers. However service capacity is not the only criterion for selection of the favoured location

Consider need to amend plan to relocate airport employment area symbol.

Key diagram amended

Ensure co-ordination through the plan between green infrastructure provided by new development and existing projects in South Norfolk.

This is reflected in the green infrastructure study and, more particularly in the green infrastructure implementation strategy

Consider Mangreen amongst the options for achieving housing growth targets.

This was considered, but Mangreen has not been included in the proposed option in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy

Take account of opposition to major growth in Little Melton expressed through 2006 Parish Plan.

The strategy included in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy does not propose significant development at Little Melton

Consider water Cycle Study in choosing growth options.

As the JCS has evolved it has taken account of the various stages of the water cycle study

No change to plan. Allocation of specific sites for housing development will be through subsequent Development Plan Documents

Not applicable to joint core strategy

Q7. FOR OPTION 1 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

6980 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Take account of support for focussing growth at Wymondham.
6845 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Ensure WCS completed and informs strategy
7298 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	Take account of growth planned in Breckland in choosing options for growth.
7564 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	No action
7065 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	
7694 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Take account of commitment to support option 1 by Belton Estate in choice of
7791 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Take account of commitment to option 1
7785 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	
7022 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	
7350 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]	
7129 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	
6949 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	
6999 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	

7046 - Horsham & Newton St
Faith Parish Council (Mr Michael
Haslam) [7652]
7600 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr
Peter Martin) [7675]
7235 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard
Atkinson) [7681]
7622 - Barratt Strategic/Manor
Farm Rackheath [8224]
7680 - Goymour Properties Ltd.
[8271]
7138 - North East Norwich
Landowner and Developer
Consortium [8313]

Page 15 of 76

Q7. FOR OPTION 1 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

Representations

7762 - Hopkins Homes Limited
[8247]

7535 - Barratt Strategic/John
Innes Foundation [8223]

7037 - Gerald Eve (M Moss)

7210 - Salhouse Parish Council
(Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]

7724 - Kimberley & Carleton
Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R
L Gladden) [2022]

6910 - Little Melton Parish Council
(Mr R Sinclair) [2027]

7755 - COLNEY PARISH
MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN)
[7978]

7461 - Hethersett Parish Council
(Ian Weetman) [8023]

7440 - Environment Agency
(Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart
Rickards) [1517]

7367 - I E Homes and Property
(Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]

7818 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]

7858 - Wymondham Town
Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]

7578 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr
John Hiskett) [953]

7182 - Marks and Spencer Ltd
(Norwich) (Mr Neil Goldsmith)
[7658]

6906 - Greenhouse Trust (Mr
Richard Bickle) [919]

Action

Take account of support fro grwoth at Wymondham

Take account of support for this option dependent on idenitification of
Colney/Cringleford for growth

Consider site in relation to Area Action plan

Take account of opposition to option 1 in considering choice of options.

Take account of oppositon of these parish councils to option 1.

Ensure the water related evidence base is taken full account of when choosing the
appropraite growth options.

Take account of opposition to option 1.

No change to plan

Consider views of Wymondham Town Council in choice of options for growth

Consider appropriate proportion of new developments to be gievn over to green
infrastructure through this plan.

No action

Take account of reducing the need to tarvel in choosing growth options and support
for some grwoth in smaller villages to support local services.

Q7. FOR OPTION 1 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

Representations

Action

Decision on Q7. FOR OPTION 1 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

Take account of opposition to option 1.

The strategy in the pre-submission version differs from option 1

Take account of reducing the need to travel in choosing growth options and support for some growth in smaller villages to support local services.

The settlement hierarchy review undertaken as part of the preparation of the pre-submission version specifically included an assessment of public transport access to villages. Within the Norwich policy area public transport assessment of various options has been undertaken and modelling has been undertaken on the strategy included in the pre-submission version

Consider views of Wymondham Town Council in choice of options for growth

The strategy included in the pre-submission version includes significantly less growth at Wymondham than option 1 in the technical consultation

Take account of support for growth at Wymondham

The support was considered but has to be balanced against widespread opposition to growth at Wymondham

Take account of opposition to option 1 in considering choice of options.

The strategy in the pre-submission version differs from option 1

Consider appropriate proportion of new developments to be given over to green infrastructure through this plan.

References to green infrastructure have been expanded through the development of stronger policy on environmental protection, and in relation to major growth, appropriate references are included within policies for the city centre, rest of the urban area, and locations for major growth within the Norwich policy area

Take account of support for focussing growth at Wymondham.

The support was considered but has to be balanced against widespread opposition to growth at Wymondham

Ensure WCS completed and informs strategy

The water cycle study was completed in September, 2009, and an interim final report published in July/August, 2009 help to inform the pre-submission version of the JCS. As the plan has evolved it has been informed by the successive stages of the water cycle study

Take account of opposition of these parish councils to option 1.

The strategy in the pre-submission version differs from option 1

Take account of commitment to support option 1 by Belton Estate in choice of options – note typo should refer to Beeston

Beeston, as part of the northeast is in the strategy included in the pre submission version. At the technical consultation stage it was in all options, though all of them prove controversial

Take account of support for this option dependent on identification of Colney/Cringleford for growth

Cringleford was not included in any of the technical consultations, but in response to further assessment, has been included in the strategy in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy

Take account of growth planned in Breckland in choosing options for growth.

The issue surrounding the A11 is noted, but the concentration of development in the A11 corridor has been limited for other reasons. Dialogue has been undertaken with the highways agency in order to reach a common understanding

Consider site in relation to Area Action plan

Not applicable to joint core strategy

Take account of commitment to option 1

The views of Long Stratton parish council are noted, but it is considered that local issues justify the inclusion of Long Stratton in the spatial strategy to be included in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy.

Ensure the water related evidence base is taken full account of when choosing the appropriate growth options.

The water cycle study was completed in September, 2009, and an interim final report published in July/August, 2009 help to inform the pre-submission version of the JCS. As the plan has evolved it has been informed by the successive stages of the water cycle study. The SFRA has also been a significant part of the evidence base.

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

7681 - Goymour Properties Ltd.
[8271]

No action (MB)

7211 - Salhouse Parish Council

No change needed (MB)

(Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	
7368 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	No action (MB)
7327 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	No change (MB)
7429 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	None (MB)
7319 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	No change (MB)
7859 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	No action (MB)
7652 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change needed. (MB)
7662 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Assess need for further consultation with Network Rail. (MB)
7763 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	Take account of existing evidence in choosing growth options.
7462 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	No action (MB)
6846 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	No action (MB)
7579 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	No change needed, though the points made are valid and will need to be taken on board at the site specific/area action plan stage, and in any masterplanning work.

Page 17 of 76

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

7118 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust
(Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]

6950 - Woods Hardwick Planning
(Mr Tim Collie) [7449]

7819 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]

7501 - Mr Martin Green and
Norwich Consolidated Charities
[8244]

7278 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm
Ltd) [2425]

6930 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son
(Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]

7695 - Trustees of Beston Estate
(Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]

7536 - Barratt Strategic/John
Innes Foundation [8223]

7322 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr
Stephen Little) [7197]

7792 - Long Stratton Parish
Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]

7623 - Barratt Strategic/Manor
Farm Rackheath [8224]

7453 - Hempnall Parish Council
(Mr I J Nelson) [2014]

7139 - North East Norwich
Landowner and Developer
Consortium [8313]

7553 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659
(Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]

7023 - Easton College (Ms Sandra
Boston) [3750]

6921 - Norfolk Environmental
Waste Services (Mr David
Beadle) [4376]

7251 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]

7840 - Scott-Brown Partnership
(Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]

7324 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr
Stephen Little) [7197]

7613 - Yare Valley Society (Mrs
Andrew J Salisbury) [1006]

7601 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr
Peter Martin) [7675]

7085 - Hevingham Parish Council
(Mr P Carrick) [1805]

Action

Consider detailed transport requirements for development in the NE through the Area Action Plan and other DPDs. (MB)

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options (MB)

Add a reference to community health services under the "health" bullet points in a policy 18 (MB)

No change required. (MB)

No change to plan

No change necessary

No change (MB)

No change (MB)

No action (MB)

No change needed. (MB)

Consider the need to identify the scope for development beyond 2026 through this document. Consider the potential size of development NE of Norwich within the proposed NNDR through the Area Action Plan and other DPDs. (MB)

Based on more detailed work into infrastructure requirements for the favoured option, should include a reference to the need for additional police infrastructure in major development locations as appropriate (MB)

No action (MB)

Agreed - these should be included in the implementation strategy (MB)

Delete reference to Trowse and as a "service village" and ensure it is retained within the description of Norwich urban fringe parishes in policy 1 or its successor. (MB)

Consider implications for section 106 monies available to support development in Long Stratton.

Take account of potential constraints to growth in Long Stratton.

No action (MB)

No change required (MB)

No change needed (MB)

Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

7725 - Kimberley & Carleton
Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R
L Gladden) [2022]

Action

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Decision on Q8. FOR OPTION 2 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there

Take account of potential constraints to growth in Long Stratton.

Noted there has been considerable dialogue with the promoters of the development at Long Stratton about the viability of development. The high school is understood to be able to cope with a development of 1800 dwellings. The water cycle study stage 2 B. indicates that improvements will be needed to the sewage treatment works and this will involve phasing of development

Based on more detailed work into infrastructure requirements for the favoured option, should include a reference to the need for additional police infrastructure in major development locations as appropriate (MB)

There is a reference in the policy relating to communities and the table in the appendix covering the infrastructure requirements

Agreed - these should be included in the implementation strategy (MB)

Comment refers to waste. There is a reference in the implementation policy. The EDAW study into infrastructure needs and funding has concluded that there is no significant infrastructure need. The need for recycling facilities in the north east and at Wymondham have been added to the supporting text on the policy for strategic growth locations in the Norwich policy area

Assess need for further consultation with Network Rail. (MB)

A dialogue has been undertaken with rail interests relating to the potential for a station at Mangreen and also at the north east. Mangreen is no longer included in the proposed major growth strategy but a reference to the potential for tram train has been added to the supporting text on the policy for strategic growth locations in the Norwich policy area

Consider detailed transport requirements for development in the NE through the Area Action Plan and other DPDs. (MB)

Not applicable to the joint core strategy.

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Add a reference to community health services under the "health" bullet points in a policy 18 (MB)

The policy on communities now refers to the need for community facilities "and services"

Delete reference to Trowse and as a "service village" and ensure it is retained within the description of Norwich urban fringe parishes in policy 1 or its successor. (MB)

This has been clarified in the introductory text for the policies for places chapter

Consider implications for section 106 monies available to support development in Long Stratton.

There has been a dialogue with Children's Services, NHS Norfolk, and the County Council concerning the proposed by pass but the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy is likely to change the mechanism of the developer contributions

Take account of existing evidence in choosing growth options.

A large evidence base has been gathered and has been taken into account, along side the sustainability appraisal and the outcome of consultation exercises

No change needed, though the points made are valid and will need to be taken on board at the site specific/area action plan stage, and in any masterplanning work. (MB)

Not applicable to the joint core strategy

Consider the need to identify the scope for development beyond 2026 through this document. Consider the potential size of development NE of Norwich within the proposed NNDR through the Area Action Plan and other DPDs. (MB)

The growth triangle located to the north east of Norwich is proposed to grow beyond 2026, and this is made clear in the policy on locations for major development in the Norwich policy area, and its supporting text. The scale of the future development required as a result of the review of the East of England plan is not yet clear, and will require an early review of the joint core strategy. The GNDP has committed to a study of the potential of a new country town to accommodate some of this expected growth requirement.

Q9. FOR OPTION 2 - What are the constraints to delivery?

7556 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	The implementation strategy will need to take account of additional demands on police facilities, and indicate an appropriate level of contribution from developer funding to the extent that it is necessary to top up mainstream funding. (MB)
7057 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	
7820 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	No change needed (MB)
7369 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Ensure further dpds and masterplans contain further detail on infrastructure required to support any development in Wymondham (MB)
7580 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Ensure green infrastructure projects take careful account of environmental designations. (MB)
7463 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Design and green infrastructure policies must ensure that any new development takes careful account of its setting and that green spaces are created within and between settlements. (MB)
7696 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. (MB)

Q9. FOR OPTION 2 - What are the constraints to delivery?

Representations

7009 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]

6931 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]

7793 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]
7841 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]

7280 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]

7682 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]

7172 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]

7094 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]

7726 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]

7860 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]

7140 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]

7186 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]

7432 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]

6951 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]

7048 - Mr & Mrs L Dale [6251]

7537 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]

6847 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]

7024 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]

7121 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]

7212 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]

7236 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]

7624 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]

Action

Ensure any development takes careful account of environmental designations and provides links to such sites, if appropriate through more detailed DPDs and masterplans. (MB)

No action (MB)

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

If this is the case, and the final strategy includes development at Long Stratton, it should make it clear that additional employment at Long Stratton is part of the strategy, and appropriate allocations should be made. (MB)

No change required. (MB)

Ensure the Royal Norfolk Golf Club is considered for allocation through later DPDs. (MB)

No change needed (MB)

To be added-check existing references within document (MB)

No change necessary (MB)

Consider sites for development through the South Norfolk Site Allocation Plan. (MB)

Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. (MB)

No change needed (MB)

No change needed. (MB)

No action (MB)

Consider further the need for phasing through subsequent DPDs and masterplans. (MB)

No change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document (MB)

No change needed. (MB)

No action (MB)

No change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document (MB)

Q9. FOR OPTION 2 - What are the constraints to delivery?

Representations**Action**

7764 - Hopkins Homes Limited
[8247]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Decision on Q9. FOR OPTION 2 - What are the constraints to delivery?

Ensure any development takes careful account of environmental designations and provides links to such sites, if appropriate through more detailed DPDs and masterplans. (MB)

This matter will largely be addressed through site specific allocations and DPDs or area action plans, but the context is set by a strengthened policy on environmental protection

No change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document (MB)

An implementation framework is included, based on the most recent work undertaken by EDAW on infrastructure needs and funding (2009)

Ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. (MB)

Appropriate reference is included in the policy on major growth locations in the Norwich policy area and the relevant section of its supporting text

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Ensure green infrastructure projects take careful account of environmental designations. (MB)

This is addressed through an expanded policy on environmental protection, climate change etc, and its supporting text

Ensure further dpds and masterplans contain further detail on infrastructure required to support any development in Wymondham (MB)

Not applicable to the joint core strategy

Action: Consider further the need for phasing through subsequent DPDs and masterplans. (MB)

This matter will need to be considered through site specific allocations development plan documents and area action plans, but the trajectory included in the joint core strategy indicates there is no need for rationing. Phasing however will need to be related to the provision of infrastructure, which is shown in the infrastructure framework in an appendix to the joint core strategy.

Design and green infrastructure policies must ensure that any new development takes careful account of its setting and that green spaces are created within and between settlements. (MB)

This has been taken into account in the drafting of policies on environment and climate change, design, and the major locations for development in the Norwich policy area

The implementation strategy will need to take account of additional demands on police facilities, and indicate an appropriate level of contribution from developer funding to the extent that it is necessary to top up mainstream funding. (MB)

Emergency services have been included in the work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009, and is included in the implementation framework in an appendix to the joint core strategy

Consider sites for development through the South Norfolk Site Allocation Plan. (MB)

Not applicable to the joint core strategy

Ensure the Royal Norfolk Golf Club is considered for allocation through later DPDs. (MB)

This will be a matter for consideration through the Broadland site specific allocations DPD, but would be consistent with the need to accommodate 2000 dwellings within the Broadland fringe parishes or elsewhere within the Norwich policy area

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

If this is the case, and the final strategy includes development at Long Stratton, it should make it clear that additional employment at Long Stratton is part of the strategy, and appropriate allocations should be made. (MB)

The policy on major growth locations in the Norwich policy area includes Long Stratton and includes a reference to the need for expanded local employment facilities. In view of the location of Long Stratton however these are likely to serve a primarily local rather than strategic need and the scale of any allocation has been left to the appropriate site specific allocations development plan document

To be added-check existing references within document (MB)

This representation refers to archaeology. There is an appropriate for reference to archaeology in the supporting text to the environmental assets policy, and in the policy on Norwich city centre. Further detail would be expected to be accommodated in a development control policies development plan document

Q10. FOR OPTION 2 - What opportunities does this option present?

7153 - Norwich Consolidated Charities (Mr S. A. Franklin) [1325]

Review this strategy dependent on regional strategy review. (MB)

7188 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]

Use the findings of the employment study to identify appropriate locations for employment growth and consider further through subsequent dpds (MB)

Page 21 of 76

Q10. FOR OPTION 2 - What opportunities does this option present?

Representations**Action**

7765 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)
7502 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	No action (MB)
7124 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	No change needed (MB)
7213 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	No change required. (MB)
7581 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] 7435 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Ensure that the detailed text supporting the favoured option includes the reference to the need for green infrastructure to the plan from the outset and to embrace a variety of habitats, and to provide alternatives to take pressure off existing valued habitats. (MB)
7683 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	Not applicable (MB)
6952 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	No action (MB)
7026 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Ensure infrastructure needs to serve new development for Hethersett are incorporated in plans. (MB)
7173 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]	No change needed (MB)
7269 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Assess the relative merits of the potential growth options. (MB)
7821 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	No change required. (MB)
6848 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Not applicable (MB)
7727 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	No change needed (MB)
7281 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Consider the need for any further employment allocations in Wymondham through an area action plan or site specific allocations DPD. (MB)
7861 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	No action (MB)
7697 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	No change needed (MB)
7559 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	No change required (MB)
7060 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	
7237 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	No action. (MB)
7538 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	
7625 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	
7464 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Ensure infrastructure needs to serve new development for Hethersett are incorporated in plans. (MB)
7141 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text in all locations where development is expected to continue after 2026. (MB)

Q10. FOR OPTION 2 - What opportunities does this option present?

Representations**Action**

7197 - Persimmon Homes
(Anglia) [2373]

No change necessary (MB)

7794 - Long Stratton Parish
Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]
7370 - I E Homes and Property
(Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]
6932 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son
(Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Decision on Q10. FOR OPTION 2 - What opportunities does this option present?

Use the findings of the employment study to identify appropriate locations for employment growth and consider further through subsequent dpds (MB)

The allocations made in the pre-submission version of the JCS accord with those recommended in the employment growth study

Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text in all locations where development is expected to continue after 2026. (MB)

The only existing allocation where this is planned to happen is in the north east growth triangle. Appropriate references have been included

Ensure that the detailed text supporting the favoured option includes the reference to the need for green infrastructure to the plan from the outset and to embrace a variety of habitats, and to provide alternatives to take pressure off existing valued habitats. (MB)

Appropriate references have been added to the policy on major growth locations in the Norwich policy area, and the strategy for growth in the Norwich policy area, and its supporting text, the policy for Norwich city centre, and the policy for the remainder of the urban area.

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Review this strategy dependent on regional strategy review. (MB)

The scale of future development required as a result of the review of the East of England plan is not yet known. Continuation of development in the north east growth triangle after 2026 will provide for some of this growth, but an early review of the joint core strategy is likely to be needed. The GNDD has already committed to a study of the potential for a new country town to accommodate some of the further development likely to be required.

Assess the relative merits of the potential growth options. (MB)

Considerable debate on potential growth strategies followed the technical consultation. A review of the thinking at that time by the Planning Inspectorate further helped to refine the favoured option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation stage.

Consider the need for any further employment allocations in Wymondham through an area action plan or site specific allocations DPD. (MB)

An allocation is proposed in the policy setting out the strategy for the Norwich policy area, but the precise allocation will need to be defined through a site specific allocations development plan document

Ensure infrastructure needs to serve new development for Hethersett are incorporated in plans. (MB)

The known infrastructure is mentioned in the policy on locations for major growth in the Norwich policy area, and its supporting text, and is itemized in the implementation strategy in an appendix to the joint core strategy

Q11. FOR OPTION 2 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

7698 - Trustees of Beston Estate
(Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]

No change needed (MB)

7729 - Kimberley & Carleton
Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R
L Gladden) [2022]

Not applicable (MB)

7539 - Barratt Strategic/John
Innes Foundation [8223]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Q11. FOR OPTION 2 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Representations

7562 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659
(Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]

7063 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659
(Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]

7582 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr
John Hiskett) [953]

6912 - Little Melton Parish Council
(Mr R Sinclair) [2027]

7822 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]

7438 - Environment Agency
(Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart
Rickards) [1517]

7238 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard
Atkinson) [7681]

7198 - Persimmon Homes
(Anglia) [2373]

6953 - Woods Hardwick Planning
(Mr Tim Collie) [7449]

7795 - Long Stratton Parish
Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]

7465 - Hethersett Parish Council
(Ian Weetman) [8023]

7626 - Barratt Strategic/Manor
Farm Rackheath [8224]

7142 - North East Norwich
Landowner and Developer
Consortium [8313]

7282 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm
Ltd) [2425]

6933 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son
(Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]

7766 - Hopkins Homes Limited
[8247]

6849 - Anglian Water Services
Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]

7371 - I E Homes and Property
(Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]

7127 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust
(Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]

Action

Include police and other emergency services in the development of an implementation of strategy, but seek to utilize mainstream funding as far as

Ensure that the description of the favoured option includes appropriate references to the creation of green infrastructure. (MB)

Not applicable (MB)

No change needed (MB)

No change needed. (MB)

No change necessary (MB)

Wymondham was included in all the options consulted upon, though the scale of allocation varied. In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options, but the merits of Wymondham will need to be considered. (MB)

Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text. (MB)

No action (MB)

No action

No change needed (MB)

Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text in all locations where development is expected to continue after 2026 (MB)

In the light of the Arup study, consider the need for additional allocations for employment purposes, and clarify the scale of any such allocations in the pre submission publication. (MB)

No change needed (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Not applicable (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Ensure the policies governing quality in major developments are sufficiently robust and take account of the need for coordination between developers and/or

Q11. FOR OPTION 2 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Representations**Action**

Decision on Q11. FOR OPTION 2 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text in all locations where development is expected to continue after 2026 (MB)

The only existing allocation where this is planned to happen is in the north east growth triangle. Appropriate references have been included

Include police and other emergency services in the development of an implementation of strategy, but seek to utilize mainstream funding as far as possible. (MB)

Emergency services have been included in the latest work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009 and included in the implementation framework in an appendix to the joint core strategy

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Wymondham was included in all the options consulted upon, though the scale of allocation varied. In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options, but the merits of Wymondham will need to be considered. (MB)

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

In the light of the Arup study, consider the need for additional allocations for employment purposes, and clarify the scale of any such allocations in the pre submission publication. (MB)

The allocations proposed in the pre-submission version of the JCS are guided by the Arup study. In the case of strategic allocations, indicative sizes for respective allocations have been included

Ensure the policies governing quality in major developments are sufficiently robust and take account of the need for coordination between developers and/or landowners. (MB)

Policies on design quality have been considerably strengthened since the technical consultation in the light of widespread concerns of this nature

Clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text. (MB)

This representation of relates to Rackheath. The wording of the policy on major growth locations in the Norwich policy area and the supporting text clarify the scale of development

Ensure that the description of the favoured option includes appropriate references to the creation of green infrastructure. (MB)

Policies on the environment and design have been strengthened, and references to the creation of green infrastructure appear in the policy on environmental assets and its supporting text, the strategy for growth in the Norwich policy area, and policies on the city centre, remainder of the urban area, and the locations for major growth in the Norwich policy area

Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

7796 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

However, a decision on an option will need to be made, and may well need to be made in the absence of complete certainty about funding. The text of the pre submission publication document will need to be more explicit about contingencies (MB)

Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

Representations

7583 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]

7283 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]

6981 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]
7767 - Hopkins Homes Limited

7201 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]
7028 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]
7372 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]
6934 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]
6954 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]
7239 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]
7699 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]
7627 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]
7684 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]

7108 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]
7214 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]
7603 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]

7466 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]

7540 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]

6982 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]

Action

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations, including the potential for green infrastructure, and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation

Whatever option is selected, the scale of employment allocation who should be more clearly indicated. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

No change needed (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)

Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

Representations***Action***

7862 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	No action (MB)
7565 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	No change needed. (MB)
7066 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	
7441 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	No change needed (MB)
7130 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	No change needed. (MB)
7038 - Gerald Eve (M Moss) [7525]	
7143 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer	
7823 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	No change needed. (MB)
6897 - East Carleton Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1997]	No action (MB)
7730 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	
7753 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]	No change needed. (MB)
6911 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. (MB)
6850 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	No change needed. (MB)

Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

Representations

Action

Decision on Q12. FOR OPTION 2 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

However, a decision on an option will need to be made, and may well need to be made in the absence of complete certainty about funding. **The text of the pre submission publication document will need to be more explicit about contingencies** (MB)

This representation relates to Long Stratton. At the time of writing, there remains uncertainty whether the development proposed can fully fund a bypass

Whatever option is selected, the scale of employment allocation should be more clearly indicated. (MB)

The employment applications proposed accord with the evidence from the employment growth study undertaken by Arup dot in the case of strategic allocations the scale of allocation proposed is now made explicit.

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

7842 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310] 7541 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223] 7628 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	depending on the option for growth selected, retain the reference to the need for a Long Stratton bypass [R. B.]
7328 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	no change required [R. B.]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

6922 - Norfolk Environmental Waste Services (Mr David Beadle) [4376]

7584 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]

7430 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]

7797 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]

7345 - Pelham Holdings Ltd [8302]

7252 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]

6935 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]

7700 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]

7685 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]

7331 - North Norfolk District Council (Ms. Jill Fisher) [1570]

6851 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]

7373 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]

7663 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]

7824 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]

7109 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]

Action

agreed - these should be included in the implementation strategy [R. B.]

no change needed, though the points made are valid and will need to be taken on board at the site specific/area action plan stage, and in any masterplanning work. [R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]

delete reference to Trowse and as a "service village" and ensure it is retained within the description of Norwich urban fringe parishes in policy 1 or its successor [R. B.]

No change necessary [R. B.]

no change required [R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]

add a reference to community health services under the "health" bullet points in policy 18 [R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [R B.]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

7119 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]
 7144 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]
 7467 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]
 7284 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]
 7320 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]
 7863 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]
 7768 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]

 7086 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]

 7503 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]

 7602 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]
 7554 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]

 7029 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]
 6955 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]

 7454 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
 7653 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
 7341 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]
 7323 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]
 7731 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]

Action

include references to the ultimate scale of development at particular locations expected to continue growing beyond 2026 within the relevant policies and supporting text [R. B.]

not applicable

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
 [R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
 [R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
 [R B.]

no change required [R. B.]

based on more detailed work into infrastructure requirements for the favoured option, include a reference to the need for additional police infrastructure in major development locations as appropriate [R. B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
 [R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
 [R B.]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
 [R B.]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

7325 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]

7215 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]

Action

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
[R B.]

no change needed [R. B.]

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

Action

Decision on Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]
Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

include references to the ultimate scale of development at particular locations expected to continue growing beyond 2026 within the relevant policies and supporting text [R. B.]

The Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle is the only existing allocation which is intended to continue post 2026. The policy on major growth locations in the Norwich policy area and its supporting text make the ultimate scale of growth proposed clear. It is unclear what the impact of the review of the East of England plan will be, and an early review of the joint core strategy may be necessary. The GNDP has already committed to a study of the potential of a new country town to accommodate some of the future growth needed.

add a reference to community health services under the "health" bullet points in policy 18 [R. B.]

The policy on promoting communities now includes a reference to health facilities "and services"

agreed - these should be included in the implementation strategy [R. B.]

The representation refers to waste. This has been included in the infrastructure needs and funding study undertaken by EDAW in 2009, though they have concluded that no major investment is needed. Within the policy on major growth locations and the Norwich policy area, and its supporting text, there are references to the need for enhanced recycling facilities in the north east and at Wymondham

based on more detailed work into infrastructure requirements for the favoured option, include a reference to the need for additional police infrastructure in major development locations as appropriate [R. B.]

The infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW in 2009 included the emergency services. This is included in the implementation framework in an appendix in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy but could usefully be added to the descriptive text for the relevant locations.

Q13. FOR OPTION 3 - What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

Action

delete reference to Trowse and as a "service village" and ensure it is retained within the description of Norwich urban fringe parishes in policy 1 or its successor [R. B.]

This has been clarified and Trowse is now referred to as a Norwich fringe parish in the text introducing the policies for places chapter

no change needed, though the points made are valid and will need to be taken on board at the site specific/area action plan stage, and in any masterplanning work. [R. B.]

Not applicable to the joint core strategy

depending on the option for growth selected, retain the reference to the need for a Long Stratton bypass [R. B.]

the reference is retained

Q14. FOR OPTION 3 - What are the constraints to delivery?

7798 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]
7843 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]
6936 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]
7769 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. If this is the case, and the final strategy includes development that Long Stratton, it should make it clear that additional employment at Long Stratton is part of the strategy. [R. B.]

7270 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
[R B.]

7030 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.
[R B.]

7049 - Mr & Mrs L Dale [6251]

Some consideration of phasing should be undertaken but any artificial restraint is unlikely to be justified on the basis of evidence to date [RB]

Q14. FOR OPTION 3 - What are the constraints to delivery?

Representations

7433 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]

7174 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]

7145 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]

7732 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]

7122 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]

7095 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]

7825 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]

7290 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]

6852 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]

7374 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]

7468 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]

7010 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]

7585 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]

7189 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]

7701 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]

7299 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]

6956 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]

7216 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]

7240 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]

7542 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]

7629 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]

7557 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]

Action

Refer to the need for more detailed, level 2, flood risk assessment in the supporting text to the city centre policy [RB]

no change needed [RB]

ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]

no change necessary [RB]

ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]

No change needed [RB]

no change needed [RB]

Indicate the broad scale of allocations to be made at strategic employment locations in the Core Strategy, including Wymondaham [RB]

not applicable [RB]

ensure the pre submission publication plan includes within the description of the strategy clear reference to the need for green infrastructure to be included as an integral part of the strategy [RB]

no change needed [RB]

ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]

seek clarification from the Highways Agency and Breckland District Council what contributions can be expected to improvements to the Thicketthorn junction, from developments elsewhere in the A11 corridor. [RB]

no change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document [RB]

the implementation strategy will need to take account of additional demands on police facilities, and indicate an appropriate level of contribution from developer funding to the extent that it is necessary to top up mainstream funding. The implementation strategy will be tested alongside the Core strategy at the Public

Q14. FOR OPTION 3 - What are the constraints to delivery?

Representations**Action**

Decision on Q14. FOR OPTION 3 - What are the constraints to delivery?

no change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document[RB]

This response relates to emergency services. Emergency services have been taken into account in the latest infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW in 2009 and included in an appendix to the pre-submission of version of the joint core strategy. The Subsequent consultation on a community infrastructure Levy means that submission of a charging schedule will need to be undertaken separately from the joint core strategy, following a period of consultation on the approach to charging.

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]

Appropriate references are included in the policy on major growth locations in the Norwich policy area and its supporting text

Refer to the need for more detailed, level 2, flood risk assessment in the supporting text to the city centre policy [RB]

There is an appropriate reference in the supporting text for the policy on Norwich city centre indicating the need for a level 2 SFRA as part of site specific work

under option 3 it is proposed that the major development at Mangreen will include specific provision for local employment within the development. The strategic employment locations at Thorpe St Andrew, the Airport, NRP, and Longwater are supported by the East of England Plan. It is acknowledged that there are constraints affecting some of these at present, but as strategically supported sites, the focus should be on resolving problems rather than abandoning the sites for future development. A new site in this location would be likely to need significant infrastructure investment.[RB]

This representation sought to promote a strategic employment location at Harford. The allocations proposed in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy are guided by the advice in the economic growth and sites and premises study undertaken by Arup and Oxford economics. A site at Harford is not proposed

Some consideration of phasing should be undertaken but any artificial restraint is unlikely to be justified on the basis of evidence to date [RB]

Although major development may need to be phased according to infrastructure provision, and this is indicated in the implementation of framework, the needed to achieve large scale development within the plan period means that artificial restraint cannot be justified. The trajectory included in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy illustrates this.

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]

The policy on locations for major growth in the Norwich policy area and its supporting text have been amended to include such references

seek clarification from the Highways Agency and Breckland District Council what contributions can be expected to improvements to the Thickthorn junction, from developments elsewhere in the A11 corridor. [RB]

Further dialogue has been undertaken with the highways agency in order to reach an agreed position.

the implementation strategy will need to take account of additional demands on police facilities, and indicate an appropriate

level of contribution from developer funding to the extent that it is necessary to top up mainstream funding. The implementation strategy will be tested alongside the Core strategy at the Public Examination. [RB]

Emergency services have been taken into account in the latest infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW in 2009 and included in an appendix to the pre-submission of version of the joint core strategy. The Subsequent consultation on a community infrastructure Levy means that submission of a charging schedule will need to be undertaken separately from the joint core strategy, following a period of consultation on the approach to charging.

ensure the pre submission publication plan includes within the description of the strategy clear reference to the need for green infrastructure to be included as an integral part of the strategy [RB]

Environmental protection policies have been greatly strengthened, and appropriate references appear in the policy on environmental assets and its supporting text, as well as policies/supporting text relating to the strategy for the Norwich policy area, the city centre, the remainder of the urban area, and locations for major growth within the Norwich area

Indicate the broad scale of allocations to be made at strategic employment locations in the Core Strategy, including Wymondaham [RB]

The scale of allocations at strategic locations, including Wymondham, is now included in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. If this is the case and the final strategy includes development at Long Stratton, it should make it clear that additional employment at Long Stratton is part of the strategy [R B.]

Long Stratton remains one of the locations proposed for major growth in the Norwich policy area. The text in the relevant policy/supporting text indicate that further local employment opportunities will need to be provided. As the inclusion of Long Stratton is primarily intended to achieve local benefits, the employment location is not considered strategic in the context of the Norwich policy area and the scale of the allocation has been left to site specific allocations work

Q15. FOR OPTION 3 - What opportunities does this option present?

7285 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425] No change needed {RB}
7191 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]

Q15. FOR OPTION 3 - What opportunities does this option present?

Representations***Action***

7199 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	no change necessary [RB]
6853 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	not applicable [RB]
7469 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	
7300 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7560 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	no change required [RB]
7061 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	
7217 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	
7826 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	
7733 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	no change needed [RB]
7519 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]	no change needed [RB]
7702 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	no change needed [RB]
7770 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7110 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]	no change needed [RB]
7125 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	no change needed [RB]
7175 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Mr Robert Naylor) [7657]	no change needed [RB]
7586 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	ensure that the detailed text supporting the favoured option includes the reference to the need for green infrastructure to be planned from the outset and to embrace a variety of habitats, and to provide alternatives to take pressure off existing valued habitats. [RB]
7436 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	
7543 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7630 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	
6957 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	clarify ultimate scale of development in the policy and supporting text in all locations where development is expected to continue after 2026. [RB]
7146 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	

Q15. FOR OPTION 3 - What opportunities does this option present?

Representations

7799 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]
7375 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]
6937 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]

Action

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]

Decision on Q15. FOR OPTION 3 - What opportunities does this option present?

no change needed, though more work will be needed on the implementation strategy for the pre submission publication document[RB]

An implementation framework is included as an appendix in the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

[R B.]

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

ensure the final text clarifies that a degree of co-ordination is required across the north east, but that it is likely individual "neighbourhoods" will be developed according to individual detailed master plans. [RB]

An appropriate reference has been included in the policy/supporting text for the locations from major growth in the Norwich policy area

Refer to the need for more detailed, level 2, flood risk assessment in the supporting text to the city centre policy [RB]

An appropriate reference has been added to the supporting text for the city centre policy

Some consideration of phasing should be undertaken but any artificial restraint is unlikely to be justified on the basis of evidence to date [RB]

The implementation framework in an appendix to the pre-submission version of the joint core strategy indicates where phasing may need to be related to infrastructure provision. Other than this the need to achieve a large amount of development within the plan period means that artificial restraint is not feasible, as demonstrated by the trajectory in the pre-submission version

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. If this is the case, and the final strategy includes development that Long Stratton, it should make it clear that additional employment at Long Stratton is part of the strategy. [R. B.]

Long Stratton remains one of the locations proposed for major growth in the Norwich policy area. The text in the relevant policy/supporting text indicate that further local employment opportunities will need to be provided. As the inclusion of Long Stratton is primarily intended to achieve local benefits, the employment location is not considered strategic in the context of the Norwich policy area and the scale of the allocation has been left to site specific allocations work

seek clarification from the Highways Agency and Breckland District Council what contributions can be expected to improvements to the Thickthorn junction, from developments elsewhere in the A11 corridor. [RB]

Further dialogue has been undertaken with the Highways Agency to moved towards an agreed position

the implementation strategy will need to take account of additional demands on police facilities, and indicate an appropriate level of contribution from developer funding to the extent that it is necessary to top up mainstream funding. The implementation strategy will be tested alongside the Core strategy at the Public Examination. [RB]

The work undertaken by EDAW on infrastructure needs and funding in 2009 included the emergency services. Requirements relating to emergency services are set out in the implementation framework in an appendix to the pre-submission version of the joint cost ratatouille

ensure the pre submission publication plan includes within the description of the strategy clear reference to the need for green infrastructure to be included as an integral part of the strategy [RB]

A greatly expanded policy on environmental protection, and the supporting text include references, as do the policies/supporting text for the city centre, rest of the urban area, and major locations for growth in the Norwich policy area, as well as the Norwich area strategy

Indicate the broad scale of allocations to be made at strategic employment locations in the Core Strategy, including Wymondaham [RB]

The scale of strategic employment allocations has been included in the strategy for growth in the Norwich policy area. This includes the scale of the allocations proposed at Wymondaham

Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Representations**Action****Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?**

7111 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7544 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7734 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	not applicable [RB]
7128 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	ensure the policies governing quality in major developments are sufficiently robust and take account of the need for coordination between developers and/or
7827 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	no change needed [RB]
7031 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
6854 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	not applicable [RB]
7470 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	
7703 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	no change needed [RB]
7800 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]
7376 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	
7200 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	Wymondham was included in all the options consulted upon, though the scale of allocation varied. In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options, but the merits of Wymondham will need to be considered.[RB]
7563 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	include police and other emergency services in the development of an implementation of strategy, but seek to utilize mainstream funding as far as
7064 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	

Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Representations

7439 - Environment Agency
(Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart
Rickards) [1517]

6938 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son
(Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]

7241 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard
Atkinson) [7681]

7771 - Hopkins Homes Limited
[8247]

6958 - Woods Hardwick Planning
(Mr Tim Collie) [7449]

7631 - Barratt Strategic/Manor
Farm Rackheath [8224]

7147 - North East Norwich
Landowner and Developer
Consortium [8313]

7286 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm
Ltd) [2425]

7587 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr
John Hiskett) [953]

Action

not applicable [RB]

no change needed [RB]

Ensure Key diagram does not imply undue precision [RB]

not applicable in relation to this option. However, in selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation

no change needed [RB]

in the light of the Arup study, consider the need for additional allocations for employment purposes, and clarify the scale of any such allocations in the pre submission publication [RB]

ensure that the description of the favoured option includes appropriate references to the creation of green infrastructure. [RB]

Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Representations

Action

Decision on Q16. FOR OPTION 3 - How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

However, a decision on an option will need to be made, and may well need to be made in the absence of complete certainty about funding. The text of the pre submission publication document will need to be more explicit about contingencies

[RB]

The pre-submission version does not include explicit text concerning contingencies

Whatever option is selected, the scale of employment allocation should be more clearly indicated.[RB]

The scale of strategic employment allocations has been added to the policy on the strategy for the Norwich policy area and some clarification in the descriptive text relating to some main towns

Q17. FOR OPTION 3 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

7377 - I E Homes and Property
(Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]
6939 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son
(Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]

7735 - Kimberley & Carleton
Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R
L Gladden) [2022]
7112 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]
7782 - Mrs H Williamson [6288]
6901 - M. Falcon Property
Solutions (Mr Michael Falcon)
[7186]
7471 - Hethersett Parish Council
(Ian Weetman) [8023]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]

Q17. FOR OPTION 3 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

Representations

7218 - Salhouse Parish Council
(Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]
7754 - COLNEY PARISH
MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN)
[7978]

7801 - Long Stratton Parish
Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]

7588 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr
John Hiskett) [953]

6896 - Bracon Ash & Hethel
Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett)
[1974]

6984 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]

reduced need for allocations at a 2008
base date, compared with a 2006 base date,
6983 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]
will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which
varies from all the consultation options.[RB]

7032 - Easton College (Ms Sandra
Boston) [3750]

7604 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr
Peter Martin) [7675]

7242 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard
Atkinson) [7681]

7545 - Barratt Strategic/John

7287 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm
Ltd) [2425]

7039 - Gerald Eve (M Moss)
[7525]

7632 - Barratt Strategic/Manor
Farm Rackheath [8224]

7772 - Hopkins Homes Limited

Action

no change needed [RB]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

However, a decision on an option will need to be made, and may well need to be made in the absence of complete certainty about funding. The text of the pre submission publication document will need to be more explicit about contingencies [RB]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations, including the potential for green infrastructure, and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

Whatever option is selected, the scale of employment allocation who should be more clearly indicated.[RB]

Q17. FOR OPTION 3 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

Representations

7202 - Persimmon Homes
(Anglia) [2373]
7131 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust
(Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]
6959 - Woods Hardwick Planning
(Mr Tim Collie) [7449]
7566 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659
(Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]
7067 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659
(Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]
7828 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]
7704 - Trustees of Beston Estate
(Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]
7686 - Goymour Properties Ltd.
[8271]
7148 - North East Norwich
Landowner and Developer
Consortium [8313]

7442 - Environment Agency
(Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart
Rickards) [1517]
6855 - Anglian Water Services
Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]

Action

no change needed [RB]

no change needed [RB]

Q17. FOR OPTION 3 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

Representations**Action**

Decision on Q17. FOR OPTION 3 - Could your organisation commit to support it if it were selected?

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

However, a decision on an option will need to be made, and may well need to be made in the absence of complete certainty about funding. The text of the pre submission publication document will need to be more explicit about contingencies [RB]

The pre-submission version of the JCS does not include text explicitly addressing the question of contingencies

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations, including the potential for green infrastructure, and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.[RB]

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Whatever option is selected, the scale of employment allocation who should be more clearly indicated.[RB]

The scale of strategic employment allocations has been added to the policy on the strategy for the Norwich policy area and some clarification in the descriptive text relating to some main towns

MAIN TOWNS - Q18 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

7736 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R the	no change needed [RB]
7610 - Trafford Estate Rackheath [8291]	no change needed [RB]
7670 - Mr Robert Debbage [6972]	no change needed, though check the wording to ensure the plan is clear [RB]
7443 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	no change needed, though these points will need to be taken into account in more detailed site specific work. [RB]
7288 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	
7378 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	
7864 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	
7648 - Cemex [8191]	
7472 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Not applicable [RB]

MAIN TOWNS - Q18 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

7567 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659
(Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]
7068 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659
(Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]

7708 - Trustees of the Gurloque
Settlement [8170]

7595 - Redenhall with Harleston
Town Council (Mr B Harding)
[2042]

7314 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr
Stephen Little) [7197]

7113 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]
7844 - Scott-Brown Partnership
(Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]
6940 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son
(Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]

7657 - Highways Agency (Mrs
Davina Galloway) [7624]

7829 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]

7589 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr
John Hiskett) [953]
7487 - Saffron Housing Trust
[1232]

6856 - Anglian Water Services
Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]
7254 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]

7515 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]
6992 - Harrold, Holman and

7511 - Alex and Peter Valori /
Faircloth and Baker [7209]

Action

the scale of such requirement will need to be examined through the infrastructure needs and funding study undertaken based around the favoured option, and incorporated in the implementation strategy [RB]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

Further consideration will need to be given at the site specific stage to the identification of the "smaller sites" allowance of 2000. [RB]

Add reference to need to improve leisure facilities at para 7.13 or 7.14[RB]

no change needed [RB]

look again at the critical infrastructure requirements for Diss and Harleston to consider whether adjustments to the housing provision figure should be made. [RB]

ensure that in the favoured option any description of Wymondham as a location for major development includes a reference to the need for local trunk road improvements, and incorporate in implementation strategy.

Reconsider the potential for an allocation at Aylsham depending on the outcome of the water cycle study the stage 2B [RB]

no change needed, subject to the outcome of more detailed work on infrastructure requirements and funding. [RB]

In the favoured option, assuming Wymondham remains a location for major growth, retain the reference to the need for major green infrastructure, but include reference to the " Claylands project". [RB]

reconsider the scale of allocation which could be made at Aylsham, following stage2B of the water cycle study [RB]

no change needed [RB]

MAIN TOWNS - Q18 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations

Action

Decision on MAIN TOWNS - Q18 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there

reconsider the scale of allocation which could be made at Aylsham, following stage2B of the water cycle study [RB]

An allocation at Aylsham has been made subject to resolution of sewage problems

In the favoured option, assuming Wymondham remains a location for major growth, retain the reference to the need for major green infrastructure, but include reference to the "Claylands project". [RB]

The reference to the need for green infrastructure remains, but it is concluded that a specific project is too detailed for inclusion in a joint core strategy. However the green infrastructure strategy and the green infrastructure implementation strategy would provide suitable vehicles to promote the project

no change needed, subject to the outcome of more detailed work on infrastructure requirements and funding. [RB]

The more detailed work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009 has fed into the implementation framework in an appendix to the pre submission version

Add reference to need to improve leisure facilities at para 7.13 or 7.14 [RB]

A reference has been added to the supporting text for the main towns policy concerning Harleston

the scale of such requirement will need to be examined through the infrastructure needs and funding study undertaken based around the favoured option, and incorporated in the implementation strategy [RB]

The more detailed work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009 has fed into the implementation framework in an appendix to the pre submission version

no change needed, though check the wording to ensure the plan is clear [RB]

The representation refers to the 3800 dwellings to be found on smaller sites in the Norwich policy area in south Norfolk and Broadland. In the technical consultation this was included in a table outlining the three different options. In the pre-submission version, the major growth locations policy is simplified, and their reference to smaller sites is in the policy on the strategy for Norwich policy area. This is explicit that these are to be found in the Norwich policy area. There should therefore be no ambiguity with the strategy for meeting the housing need outside the Norwich policy area

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Further consideration will need to be given at the site specific stage to the identification of the "smaller sites" allowance of 2000. [RB]

The allowance is now 3800, not 2000 plus 2000 as in the technical consultation document. However there are references in the policies on the strategy for the Norwich policy area, remainder of the urban area, key service centres and service villages, which should clarify matters

look again at the critical infrastructure requirements for Diss and Harleston to consider whether adjustments to the housing provision figure should be made. [RB]

Further dialogue with children's services on the education situation did not suggest an adjustment within the terms of the overall strategy would be appropriate. Representations from NHS Norfolk have not indicated a problem with the proposed scale of development.

no change needed, though these points will need to be taken into account in more detailed site specific work. [RB]

Not applicable to the joint core strategy

ensure that in the favoured option any description of Wymondham as a location for major development includes a reference to the need for local trunk road improvements, and incorporate in implementation strategy.

There has been for the dialogue with the highways agency to move towards an agreed position. After further consideration, the need for any improvements to the trunk road or access to it may be dependent on the precise location and layout of the development in question.

Reconsider the potential for an allocation at Aylsham depending on the outcome of the water cycle study the stage 2B [RB]

An allocation at Aylsham has been made subject to the resolution of sewage treatment problems

MAIN TOWNS - Q19 What opportunities can growth bring?

7737 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	no change needed [RB]
6857 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	not applicable [RB]
7473 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	
7488 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232]	consider the outcome of stage 2B of the water cycle study and further dialogue with Children's Services and NHS Norfolk to see if an adjustment to the scale of allocation in individual main towns is justified. [RB]
7087 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	
7203 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	
7379 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	
7845 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]	
7178 - Hopkins Homes Ltd (Mr Chris Smith) [7104]	
7773 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	
6993 - Harrold, Holman and Buckingham [8287]	reexamine the potential for an allocation at Aylsham following completion of the stage2B of the water cycle study. [RB]
7444 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	no amendment needed [RB]
7069 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	covered in question 18 [RB]

MAIN TOWNS - Q19 What opportunities can growth bring?

Representations

7596 - Redenhall with Harleston Town Council (Mr B Harding) [2042]
 7114 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]
 7289 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]
 6941 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]
 7865 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]
 7040 - Spen Hill Developments Limited [8201]

Action

consider further the potential for employment growth at Wymondham, and include more explicit guidance on the scale of land allocations for employment throughout the core strategy [RB]

Decision on MAIN TOWNS - Q19 What opportunities can growth bring?

consider further the potential for employment growth at Wymondham, and include more explicit guidance on the scale of land allocations for employment throughout the core strategy [RB]

The scale of strategic allocations has been guided by the economic growth and sites and premises study, and the scale of allocation at strategic locations has been included in the policy on the strategy for the Norwich policy area. This includes Wymondham

reexamine the potential for an allocation at Aylsham following completion of the stage2B of the water cycle study. [RB]

An allocation has been proposed at Aylsham subject to resolution of sewage treatment issues

consider the outcome of stage 2B of the water cycle study and further dialogue with Children's Services and NHS Norfolk to see if an adjustment to the scale of allocation in individual main towns is justified. [RB]

Further dialogue with Children's Services did not indicate a benefit from any adjustments within the parameters of the overall strategy. NHS Norfolk have not raised any issues with the preferred option.

MAIN TOWNS - Q20 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

6942 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]

No change needed [RB/RD]

7489 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232]

transport ; no change needed [RB/RD]

7380 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]

Policy 13 deals with reducing environmental impact, referring to the need for new housing to match current Housing Corporation requirements and non housing development to incorporate some onsite renewable energy generation. In the light of the renewable energy study, this policy should be strengthened and made more explicit. [R B]

7096 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]

no change necessary [R B]

7516 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]
 6994 - Harrold, Holman and Buckingham [8287]

consider an allocation at Aylsham, of about 300 dwellings, subject to the outcome of stage 2B of the water cycle study. [R B]

7445 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]
 6858 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]
 7474 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]

not applicable [R B]

7088 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]

ensure that the implementation strategy takes full account of all "mainstream" funding sources [R B]

7204 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]

no change required [R B]

7774 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]

7738 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]

no change required [R B]

7866 - Wymondham Town
Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]

7011 - Natural England (Ms Helen
Ward) [934] no change needed [R B]

Page 46 of 76

MAIN TOWNS - Q20 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

Representations

Action

Decision on MAIN TOWNS - Q20 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

transport ; no change needed [RB/RD]

No change needed

Policy 13 deals with reducing environmental impact, referring to the need for new housing to match current Housing Corporation requirements and non housing development to incorporate some onsite renewable energy generation. In the light of the renewable energy study, this policy should be strengthened and made more explicit. [R B]
policies on environmental protection and the standards of new building have been considerably developed since the technical consultation

ensure that the implementation strategy takes full account of all "mainstream" funding sources [R B]
The infrastructure need and funding work undertaken by EDAW has taken full account of mainstream funding. This has fed into the implementation framework in an appendix to the pre-submission version

consider an allocation at Aylsham, of about 300 dwellings, subject to the outcome of stage 2B of the water cycle study. [R B]

An allocation has been proposed subject to the resolution of sewage treatment issues

MAIN TOWNS - Q21 How could growth in main towns link with your longer term investment strategies?

7243 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]	consider the potential for an allocation at Aylsham in the light of the water cycle study stage 2B [RB]
6913 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027]	not applicable [RB]
7546 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	no change necessary [RB]
7633 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	
7775 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	
6943 - Thos. Wm. Gaze & Son (Mr Oliver Chapman) [4351]	no change necessary [RB]
7194 - Sainsburys Supermarket Ltd [7040]	no change needed [RB]
6859 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	not applicable [RB]
7475 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	
7490 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232]	reconsider the precise scale of allocation proposed at capital Diss in discussion with service providers and in the light of the water cycle study stage 2B. [RB]
7115 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]	
7846 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]	
7739 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	noted [RB]
7381 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	

Decision on MAIN TOWNS - Q21 How could growth in main towns link with your longer term

reconsider the precise scale of allocation proposed at Diss in discussion with service providers and in the light of the water cycle study stage 2B. [RB]

Further dialogue with Children's Services has not indicated that there would be any benefit resulting from an adjustment of the allocation at Diss consistent with the parameters of the strategy. NHS Norfolk have not indicated any concern with the scale of the allocation in the option proposed for inclusion in the pre-submission version

consider the potential for an allocation at Aylsham in the light of the water cycle study stage 2B [RB]
An allocation has been proposed subject the resolution of sewage treatment issues

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q22 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

7671 - Mr Robert Debbage [6972]	Consider as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.
7262 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	No change.
7714 - Sunguard Homes [8320]	Consider the role/function/constraints/requirements of Long Stratton as a Growth Location, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy not a Growth Location.
7512 - Alex and Peter Valori / Faircloth and Baker [7209]	None

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q22 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations**Action**

7611 - Trafford Estate Rackheath [8291]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) None. 2) None. 3) None. 4) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document . 5) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS. 6) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document . 7) None. 8) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. 9) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. 10) None. 11) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
7332 - North Norfolk District Council (Ms. Jill Fisher) [1570]	No change.
7658 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Review the function/role of Acle as part of the overall review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
7476 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Take account of infrastructure requirements required to serve any growth at
7641 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	No change.
7271 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	
7219 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	Consider the transport improvements necessary to facilitate further growth at Wroxham and that already planned for Hoveton in the North Norfolk Core Strategy and make a specific reference to NATS in Policy 16.
7074 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	Consider the role and function of Ditchingham as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
7382 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Consider the role/function of these settlements in the review of the settlement hierarchy.
7100 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) (Mr Martin C Davidson) [2592]	No change.
7568 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Further clarification of what elements Policing/Crime Prevention may reasonably be covered by developer funding.
7070 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	
6823 - Acle Parish Council (The Parish Clerk) [7454]	Assess the extent of the infrastructure constraints listed and whether they can be addressed by an allocation of 1-200 dwellings and local employment opportunities.
7740 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Consider the role/function/potential of Long Stratton in preparing the Favoured Option and in the review of the settlement hierarchy.
7634 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Issues will be examined as part of preparation of submission version of the JCS.
6867 - Hingham Town Council (Mrs C Edwards) [2017]	Considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS based on responses from the technical consultees.
7605 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]	Consider a reference to enhancing the Park and Ride network in Policy 16 (is Trowse Park and Ride still featured in NATS??).
7306 - DuBrow, R Key and D Hibbet [8286]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS. 2) Consider as part of preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q22 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations***Action***

7446 - Environment Agency
(Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart
Rickards) [1517]

Assess the outcomes of the Water Cycle Strategy on the timing of development in
Key Service Centres and identify any key constraints in the JCS.

7167 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd.
[8203]

1) None.
2) To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS.

6860 - Anglian Water Services
Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]

3) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan
Review the potential for allocations in the context of the Water Cycle Study.

7258 - Persimmon Homes
(Anglia) (Mr Martin C Davidson)
[2592]

Consider the role/function of Brundall, including the potential for larger housing
allocations, in the review of the settlement hierarchy.

7830 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]

No change.

7506 - Carter Jonas (Jenny Page)
[6766]

Consider as part of preparation of submission version of the JCS.

7520 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]

Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS.

7802 - Long Stratton Parish
Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]

Consider the need to identify a specified employment allocation at Long Stratton in
the JCS.

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q22 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Representations**Action**

Decision on KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q22 What additional significant infrastructure requirements

Review the potential for allocations in the context of the Water Cycle Study.

The water cycle study stage 2 B. was received in September

- 1) None.
- 2) To be considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS.
- 3) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document .

The representation concerns a proposed allocation at Framingham Earl/Poringland. An allocation of 100 to 200 welling has been included in the pre-submission version of the JCS. This will need to be further considered through the site specific allocations DPD

Consider the transport improvements necessary to facilitate further growth at Wroxham and that already planned for Hoveton in the North Norfolk Core Strategy and make a specific reference to NATS in Policy 16.

NATS has been more explicitly referred to in the transport policy. The transport issue at Wroxham concerns the limited link to Hoveton. In the absence of such a limiting factor, Wroxham/Hoveton might have been regarded as a main town and received a greater allocation. There is no explicit transport proposals to address this.

Assess the outcomes of the Water Cycle Strategy on the timing of development in Key Service Centres and identify any key constraints in the JCS.

The water cycle study stage 2 B. was received in September. The uncertainties are acknowledged.

Considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS based on responses from the technical consultees.

The representation concerns the capacity of services at Hingham. Consultations with service providers and the water cycle study have not indicated any overriding problems with the the scale of allocation proposed

- 1) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS.
- 2) Consider as part of preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

The representation promotes an allocation at Framingham Earl/ Poringland. An allocation of 100 to 200 dwellings has been included in the pre-submission version

Review the function/role of Acle as part of the overall review of the Settlement Heirarchy.

The settlement hierarchy review focussed on service villages and other villages rather than key service centres. Acle has all the attributes of a key. service centre according to the criteria in the East of England plan. In the varying consultation stages there has been no dissent about the status of Acle, though questions have been raised about the scale of allocation appropriate

Consider the role/function/potential of Long Stratton in preparing the Favoured Option and in the review of the settlement hierarchy.

In the regulation 25 public consultation, the possibility of Long Stratton being treated as a main town was floated, but did not receive significant support. In response its is concluded that any change in status should follow the implementation of planned growth

Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS.

This representation proposes that the scale of allocation proposed at Blofield should be increased because of infrastructure capacity. However although Blofield has a range of facilities, as a key service centre it lacks a high school and is therefore not considered appropriate for a larger allocation when more sustainable locations exist in the Norwich policy area. The pre-submission version does not make any change

Consider a reference to enhancing the Park and Ride network in Policy 16

There is a reference in the policy on access and transportation

Assess the extent of the infrastructure constraints listed and whether they can be addressed by an allocation of 1-200 dwellings and local employment opportunities.

- 1) None.
- 2) None.
- 3) None.
- 4) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document .

Not applicable to the joint core strategy

5) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS.

This representation seeks to confirm that Rackheath is seen as a location for more than 10 to 20 dwellings, resolving the ambiguity because it is described as a service village but also as a growth point. A footnote to the policy on service villages has been added to clarify

6) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document .

Not applicable to the joint core strategy

7) None.

8) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

This representation seeks additional than growth at Spixworth. The settlements hierarchy including service and villages has been reconsidered in light of service provision, but to no change made

9) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

Not applicable to the joint core strategy

10) None.

11) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

Not applicable to the joint core strategy

Consider the role and function of Ditchingham as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

The settlement hierarchy has been reviewed in light of the service provision in various villages. Ditchingham remains a service village

Consider the need to identify a specified employment allocation at Long Stratton in the JCS.

In the policy/supporting text for major growth locations in the Norwich policy area, there is a reference to the need for additional local employment at Long Stratton, but growth at Long Stratton is intended primarily to deal with the local issues, and the employment allocation is not considered strategic. Therefore the scale of allocation has been left to the site specific allocations work. It is understood that there are existing allocations which may be capable of meeting the need

Consider the role/function/constraints/requirements of Long Stratton as a Growth Location, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy not a Growth Location.

There has been considerable debate and discussion about the role of Long Stratton in the light of emerging evidence, sustainability appraisal work and public response since the technical consultation, and it has been concluded that it should remain a location for strategic growth within the Norwich policy area.

Consider as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.

The representation argues that Alington/Yelverton should not be treated as an other village, but should be combined with Bergh Apton and the combined village are treated as a service of village. Following a review of the settlement hierarchy Alington/Yelverton has been categorized as a service village, as has Bergh Apton.

Issues will be examined as part of preparation of submission version of the JCS.

The representation supports Wroxham as a key service centre but argues the position of Rackheath should be clarified. Wroxham remains a key service centre. The position of Rackheath as a major growth location has been clarified

Consider as part of preparation of submission version of the JCS.

The representation argues the allocations in key service centres or should be refined in the light of existing service capacities. Dialogue with Children's Services has not suggested that adjustments within the parameters of the overall strategy would be helpful, and NHS Norfolk have not raised issues regarding the capacity of services. The opportunity has been taken to clarify the position in those locations selected for major growth, and an allocation is now proposed at Poringland/ Framingham Earl

Consider the role/function of these settlements in the review of the settlement hierarchy.

The representation raises general points about the need for road and public transport improvements in the settlement hierarchy. Public transport was explicitly included in the review of the settlement hierarchy.

Further clarification of what elements Policing/Crime Prevention may reasonably be covered by developer funding.

Policing has been included in the latest work undertaken by EDAW on infrastructure needs and funding which has fed into the implementation strategy in an appendix to the pre-submission version

Consider the role/function of Brundall, including the potential for larger housing allocations, in the review of the settlement hierarchy.

Key service centres were not explicitly included in the settlement hierarchy review, but although Brundall fulfils the criteria, it does not have its own secondary school, and as there are more sustainable locations in the Norwich policy area no additional allocation has been proposed.

KEY SERVICE CENTRES -Q23 What opportunities can growth bring?

Representations***Action******KEY SERVICE CENTRES -Q23 What opportunities can growth bring?***

6861 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Review the opportunities provided by development in the context of the Water Cycle Study.
7168 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	None
7075 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	Consider as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.
7642 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	None
7447 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	No change.
7715 - Sunguard Homes [8320]	Consider the role/function/constraints/requirements of Long Stratton as a Growth Location, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy not a Growth Location.
7263 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	No change.
7259 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) (Mr James Nicholls) [6785]	1) None. 2) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
6869 - Hingham Town Council (Mrs C Edwards) [2017]	No change.
7383 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	
7307 - DuBrow, R Key and D Hibbet [8286]	
7521 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7635 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Consider the role/function of Wroxham in the review of the settlement hierarchy.
7477 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Consider the role/function of Hethersett as a Growth Location in the development of the Favoured Option, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy if not a Growth Location.
7507 - Carter Jonas (Jenny Page) [6766]	1) None. 2) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
6868 - Hingham Town Council (Mrs C Edwards) [2017]	No change.
7803 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	
6825 - Acle Parish Council (The Parish Clerk) [7454]	
7220 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	
7272 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	see rep 7642
7165 - Mr A Semmence [6362]	1) None. 2) & 3) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7101 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) (Mr Martin C Davidson) [2592]	Review the role of the NE in accomodating major growth in developing the Favoured Option.
7741 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Consider the role/function of Long Stratton as a Growth Location in the Favoured Option, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy if not a Growth Location.
7071 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Further clarification of what elements Policing/Crime Prevention may reasonably be covered by developer funding.

KEY SERVICE CENTRES -Q23 What opportunities can growth bring?

Representations

Action

7179 - Hopkins Homes Ltd (Mr Chris Smith) [7104]

Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan

Decision on KEY SERVICE CENTRES -Q23 What opportunities can growth bring?

Consider the role/function of Wroxham in the review of the settlement hierarchy.

Key service centres were not specifically included in the review of settlement hierarchies. Wroxham, taken together with Hoveton has all the attributes of a key service centre, and indeed might have been regarded as a main town on the basis of the level of services. The limiting factor is the restricted road connection between Wroxham and Hoveton. It's status has not been changed.

- 1) None.
- 2) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

Not applicable to the joint core strategy

Review the role of the NE in accomodating major growth in developing the Favoured Option. The growth of triangle to the north east of Norwich has featured in all the options published for consultation and remains in the strategy proposed in the pre-submission version. The topic paper on the spatial strategy helps to explain the thinking

Review the opportunities provided by development in the context of the Water Cycle Study. The various stages of the water cycle study have helped inform the development of the strategy.the stage 2 B study was completed in September, 2009

Consider as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review. The representation concerns Ditchingham. The settlement hierarchy review has taken account of services that access etc.Ditchingham remains categorized as a service village.

- 1) None.
- 2) Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

Not applicable to the joint core strategy

Consider the role/function/constraints/requirements of Long Stratton as a Growth Location, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy not a Growth Location. There has been considerable debate and discussion about the role of Long Stratton in the light of emerging evidence, sustainability appraisal work and public response since the technical consultation, and it has been concluded that it should remain a location for strategic growth within the Norwich policy area

- 1) None.
- 2) & 3) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

The representation supports Hingham as a key service centre but argues for an allocation in excess of 100 dwellings. Although technical evidence and consultations have not revealed major underlying service issues, Hingham is some distance from a secondary school (at Attleborough) and the scale of allocation proposed has not therefore been changed

Consider the role/function of Hethersett as a Growth Location in the development of the Favoured Option, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy if not a Growth Location. Following consideration of the report by the planning inspectorate, and public consultation, as well as technical evidence, Hethersett has been included as a location for strategic growth with an allocation of at least 1000 dwellings.

Consider in the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. Not applicable to the joint core strategy

Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees. The representation promotes a larger allocation at Blofield of 100 to 200 dwellings. Key service centres were not part of the Settlements hierarchy review, but although Blofield meets the requirements for a key service centre, it is some way from a secondary school (at Thorpe St Andrew) and in view of the more sustainable locations in the Norwich policy area the proposed allocation is 50 dwellings (compared with 20-50 dwellings in the technical consultation)

Further clarification of what elements Policing/Crime Prevention may reasonably be covered by developer funding Policing/crime prevention was included in the work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009 which has fed into the implementation framework in an appendix to the pre-submission version

Consider the role/function of Long Stratton as a Growth Location in the Favoured Option, or in the review of the settlement hierarchy if not a Growth Location. There has been considerable debate and discussion about the role of Long Stratton in the light of emerging evidence, sustainability appraisal work and public response since the technical consultation, and it has been concluded that it should remain a location for strategic growth within the Norwich policy area

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q24 What are the contraits to delivering the proposed level of growth anf how

can these be overcome?

7804 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	None at this stage, although decision on how to promote community cohesion/placemaking will be key actions once growth locations decided.
7273 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	No change.
6826 - Acle Parish Council (The Parish Clerk) [7454]	None required
7478 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	
7643 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Duplicate of Rep. 7273.
6862 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report
6870 - Hingham Town Council (Mrs C Edwards) [2017]	None at present. Await decision on level of growth in Town and site specifics DPD.
7448 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees, and as part of the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
7742 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7102 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) (Mr Martin C Davidson) [2592]	None

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q24 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

Representations**Action**

6985 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	1) None. 2) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7522 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]	Consider as part of the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
7508 - Carter Jonas (Jenny Page) [6766]	Noted. Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
6986 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Noted. Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7013 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	Note the detailed list of designated sites provided and further investigate any potential impacts upon them arising as a result consequence of development
7221 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	None
7716 - Sunguard Homes [8320]	None
7097 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	Continue to consult with NLA (& English Heritage) on potential growth locations and site specific proposals.
7169 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	None, prior to publication of SHLAA.
7590 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	None required.
7264 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	No change.
7308 - DuBrow, R Key and D Hibbet [8286]	None required
7384 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	None
6987 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Noted. Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7166 - Mr A Semmence [6362]	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q24 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

Representations

Action

Decision on KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q24 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

1) None.

2) Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

The representation supports Hingham as a key service centre but argues for an allocation in excess of 100 dwellings. Although technical evidence and consultations have not revealed major underlying service issues, Hingham is some distance from a secondary school (at Attleborough) and the scale of allocation proposed has not therefore been changed

Noted. Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

The representation seeks an allocation at Poringland. Following further consideration an allocation of 100 to 200 dwellings is proposed at Poringland/ Framingham Earl

None at present. Await decision on level of growth in Town and site specific DPD.

The representation concerns Hingham. There is no change proposed to the scale of growth

Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

The representation promotes Long Stratton as the focus for all growth. Taking into account technical evidence, public consultation and sustainability appraisal work, although Long Stratton is included as a strategic growth location within the Norwich policy area, the scale of allocation proposed has been set at 1800, rather than seek to create a major town expansion at long Stratton

None, prior to publication of SHLAA.

The representation promotes land at Wroxham. Although others have challenged Wroxham as a key service centre, no change has been proposed.

Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

The representation promotes land at Hingham. Although technical evidence and consultations have not revealed major underlying service issues, Hingham is some distance from a secondary school (at Attleborough) and the scale of allocation proposed has not therefore been changed

None at this stage, although decision on how to promote community cohesion/placemaking will be key actions once growth locations decided.

The policies on design and placemaking have been significantly developed since the consultation stages. The community policy has also been expanded

Noted. Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

The representation promotes an allocation at Poringland/ Framingham/ Earl. An allocation of 100 to 200 dwellings has been proposed,

Refer to Water Cycle Study Stage 2A report

Anglian Water have been fully engaged in the water cycle study. Stage 2 B. report was received in September 2009

Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees, and as part of the preparation of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

The representation is from the environment agency and refers to sewage treatment works capacities at Reepham, Acle and Wroxham. The stage 2 B. water cycle study was received in September, 2009.

Continue to consult with NLA (& English Heritage) on potential growth locations and site specific proposals

A historic character assessment of proposed growth locations has subsequently been undertaken, and has guided policy formulation

Note the detailed list of designated sites provided and further investigate any potential impacts upon them arising as a result consequence of development proposals.

Natural England referred to a number of significant sites. Policies on environmental protection have been strengthened. A number of the sites mentioned are internationally recognised sites and have been subject to a more detailed appraisal through the appropriate assessment.

Noted. Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

The representation promotes Blofield. Although Blofield meets the requirements for key service centre, it is some way from a secondary school (at Thorpe St Andrew), and in view of more sustainable locations within the Norwich policy area, it is not proposed to increase its allocation greatly, although the pre-submission version allocates 50 dwellings are rather than the range of 20 – 50 in the technical consultation

KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q25 How could growth in key service centres link with your longer term investment strategies?

7743 - Kimberley & Carleton
Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R
L Gladden) [2022]
7385 - I E Homes and Property

No change.

(Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]

7805 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029] No change.

7523 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323] Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

6863 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069] No change.

7309 - DuBrow, R Key and D Hibbet [8286] No change.

7479 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] No change.

Decision on KEY SERVICE CENTRES - Q25 How could growth in key service centres link with your longer term investment strategies?

Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

Promotes an allocation of 100 – 200 dwellings in Blofield in line with other key service centres. Although Blofield meets the requirements for key service centre, it is some way from a secondary school (at Thorpe St Andrew), and in view of more sustainable locations within the Norwich policy area, it is not proposed to increase its allocation greatly, although the pre-submission version allocates 50 dwellings are rather than the range of 20 – 50 in the technical consultation

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q26 What additional significant requirements would there be?

7491 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232] The role, function and capacity of Service Villages will be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.

Page 54 of 76

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q26 What additional significant requirements would there be?

Representations

7659 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]
 7744 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]
 6995 - Harrold, Holman and Buckingham [8287]
 6967 - Nethergate Farms [6920]

 6960 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]
 7480 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]
 6879 - South Walsham Parish Council (Mrs P James) [4399]
 7334 - Mr Chris Mutten [6926]

 7156 - Mr Chris Mutten [6926]

 7222 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]
 7831 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]
 6864 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]

 6923 - Trowse Primary School (Mr James Macdonald) [7608]
 7386 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]
 7673 - Little Plumstead Hospital West (Sec of State Health)

 7077 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]

Action

None.

 Consider the role, function and capacity of Long Stratton in developing the favoured option and of the Service Villages in reviewing the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.
 Reconsider the scale of allocation which could be made at Aylsham, following stage 2B of the Water Cycle Study.
 Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

 None.

 No change.

 The role, function and capacity of South Walsham to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.
 Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
 Considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

 No change.

 No change.

 Following a review of the Settlement Hierarchy request further information from Anglian Water as to the wastewater treatment capacity in these locations individually and in combination with other proposed development.
 The role, function and capacity of Trowse to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.
 The role, function and capacity of Service Villages will be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.
 All parishes below Main Town level to be considered in the review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

 Reconsider the restriction of 10-20 units for Service Villages, particularly in the
 None.

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q26 What additional significant requirements would there be?

Representations**Action**

Decision on SERVICE VILLAGES - Q26 What additional significant requirements would there be?

Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

The representation supports Reedham as a service village but argues for an allocation of more than 10 – 20 dwellings. Following the review of the settlement hierarchy, the policy has been worded more flexibly to enable account to be taken of local circumstances, but the fundamental scale of allocations proposed in a service village has not been amended. It is guided by the overall scale of development required in the plan period.

Following a review of the Settlement Hierarchy request further information from Anglian Water as to the wastewater treatment capacity in these locations individually and in combination with other proposed development.

The representation was from Anglian Water who have been fully engaged in the water cycle study. The stage 2 b report was received in September, 2009

The role, function and capacity of Service Villages will be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.

A review of the role, function and capacity of service villages and other villages has been undertaken, and a revised hierarchy is proposed for the pre-submission version, based on the most up to date understanding of services.

All parishes below Main Town level to be considered in the review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

A review of the role, function and capacity of service villages and other villages has been undertaken, and a revised hierarchy is proposed for the pre-submission version, based on the most up to date understanding of services. Key service centres were not included in the review, as the criteria for their selection are relatively clear cut

Reconsider the restriction of 10-20 units for Service Villages, particularly in the NPA.

. Following the review of the settlement hierarchy, the policy has been worded more flexibly to enable account to be taken of local circumstances, but the fundamental scale of allocations proposed in a service village has not been amended. It is guided by the overall scale of development required in the plan period. However, a note has been added at the foot of the service villages policy to indicate that if necessary to meet overall housing requirements the scale of allocation and might be increased.

The role, function and capacity of Trowse to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.

The position of Trowse has been clarified. It is now identified in the preamble to the policies for places section as an urban fringe village

Consider the role, function and capacity of Long Stratton in developing the favoured option and of the Service Villages in reviewing the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.

Following consideration of the technical consultation, and the review by the planning inspectorate, long Stratton was included in the favoured option for the public consultation and is proposed to be retained in the pre-submission version as a location for strategic growth of serving the Norwich policy area. A reappraisal of the settlement hierarchy has been undertaken, subject to the outcome of public consultation.

The role, function and capacity of South Walsham to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.

The settlement hierarchy has been reviewed, and it is proposed that south Walsham remains categorized as a service village

Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

The representation seeks a more flexible approach to the scale of allocation at Reedham. Following a settlement hierarchy review, it is proposed that Reedham remain as a service village. The overall scale of the allocation of proposed at such villages remains at 10 – 20, but the wording of the policy has been amended to allow a little more flexibility to take account of local circumstances.

Considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

This is a duplicate representation relating to Reedham

Reconsider the scale of allocation which could be made at Aylsham, following stage 2B of the Water Cycle Study.

Stage 2 B. of the water cycle study was received in September, 2009. The policy proposed for main towns for the pre-submission version proposes an allocation at Aylsham subject to the resolution of sewage treatment issues

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q27 What opportunities can growth bring?

7745 - Kimberley & Carleton
Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R
L Gladden) [2022]

No change.

7492 - Saffron Housing Trust
[1232]

The role, function and capacity of Service Villages will be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.

6880 - South Walsham Parish
Council (Mrs P James) [4399]

6961 - Woods Hardwick Planning

(Mr Tim Collie) [7449] 6924 - Trowse Primary School (Mr James Macdonald) [7608] 7223 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	
7078 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	None.
7157 - Mr Chris Mutton [6926]	None.
7180 - Hopkins Homes Ltd (Mr Chris Smith) [7104]	Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7163 - Mr G Mackintosh [8284]	1) Consider as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS. 2) Considered as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.
7481 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	No change.
7387 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Consider the number and role of Service Villages as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
6895 - Mr S Smith [8355]	None

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q27 What opportunities can growth bring?

Representations***Action***

6969 - Nethergate Farms [6920]

Consider the role, function and capacity of Service Villages as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy, including whether different approaches are need in the NPA and RA.

7335 - Mr Chris Mutton [6926]

None.

Decision on SERVICE VILLAGES - Q27 What opportunities can growth bring?

Consider the number and role of Service Villages as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

Following the technical consultation, and subject to the consideration of the public consultation a review of the settlement hierarchy has been undertaken below the level of key service centres

The role, function and capacity of Service Villages will be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy following consultation.

Following the technical consultation, and subject to the consideration of the public consultation a review of the settlement hierarchy has been undertaken below the level of key service centres

Consider as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS, based on responses from the technical consultees.

The representation seeks to increase the allocations at Harleston and Diss. There has been for the dialog with children's services of a school capacities.at the regulation of 25 public consultation NHS Norfolk did not indicate any benefit from increasing the allocation, and the proposed application remains the same in both places.

Consider the role, function and capacity of Service Villages as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy, including whether different approaches are need in the NPA and RA.

Following the technical consultation, and subject to the consideration of the public consultation a review of the settlement hierarchy has been undertaken below the level of key service centres. In order to accommodate the larger scale of development in the Norwich policy area, it may be necessary to increase the scale of allocation in some service villages and there is a note to this effect at the foot of the service villages policy. However the policy on the strategy for the Norwich policy area is clear that allocations to deliver the smaller sites in Broadland and South Norfolk will be made in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, and therefore service villages would be considered for increased allocations if necessary after higher order settlements had been considered

1) Consider as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review as part of the production of the submission version of the JCS.

The representation concerned the role of Barford. Following a review of the function and services of villages, it is proposed in the pre-submission version that Barford be included as a service village rather than an other village (as it was in the technical consultation)

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q28 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

6881 - South Walsham Parish Council (Mrs P James) [4399]

None

7388 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]

No change.

7591 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]

No change.

7098 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]

None.

7164 - Mr G Mackintosh [8284]

(1) The role, function and capacity of Barford to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

(2) Consideration be given to a more flexible wording regarding the overall amount of development suitable of Service Villages.

7224 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]

None

7746 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]

No change.

7482 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]

No change.

6925 - Trowse Primary School (Mr James Macdonald) [7608]

None

7255 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]

None

7079 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	None
7158 - Mr Chris Mutton [6926] 7336 - Mr Chris Mutton [6926]	Role, function and capacity of Reedham to be considered through a review of the Settlement Hierarchy. Consider revising Policy 15 'The Economy' to better reflect the needs of smaller settlements/rural areas.
6971 - Nethergate Farms [6920]	No change.
7076 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.
6962 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	To be considered as part of preparation of submission version of JCS.

Page 57 of 76

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q28 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

Representations**Action**

7014 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	No change.
7449 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	No change.
7493 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232]	No change

Decision on SERVICE VILLAGES - Q28 What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

(1) The role, function and capacity of Barford to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

(2) Consideration be given to a more flexible wording regarding the overall amount of development suitable of Service Villages.

Following a review of the settlement hierarchy based on the role and services within villages it is proposed in the pre-submission version that Barford be moved from the other villages category to the service villages category. The policy wording has been amended to increase flexibility to take account of local circumstances

To be considered as part of preparation of submission version of JCS.

The representation sought changes to the wording of policies to allow flexibility between categories within the hierarchy. The policies have been worded to permit some such flexibility, where development would support the necessary additional facilities, and between other villages and service villages. It is unlikely that flexibility higher up the hierarchy would be realistic in view of the expectation that a key service centre has a secondary school as well as a range of other facilities unlikely to be found in many service villages

To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.

The representation concerns Ditchingham. A review of village services and functions has been undertaken. It is proposed that Ditchingham remains as a service village based on this assessment

Role, function and capacity of Reedham to be considered through a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

Following a review of the settlement hierarchy based on village services and functions, it is proposed that Reedham remain as a service village

Consider revising Policy 15 'The Economy' to better reflect the needs of smaller settlements/rural areas.

The policy on the economy has now been expanded to address better the needs of smaller communities

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q29 How could growth in service villages link with your longer term investment strategies?

7483 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	No change.
7494 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232]	The role, function and capacity of Dickleburgh to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
7636 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Revise the Submission version of the Joint Core Strategy to identify Rackheath as part of the locations for growth in the Norwich Policy Area.
6973 - Nethergate Farms [6920]	Consider the role of Service Villages and other settlements as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
6926 - Trowse Primary School (Mr James Macdonald) [7608]	Review the role of Trowse in accommodation part of the non-Growth Location housing in the South Norfolk NPA.
7389 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	No change.
7181 - Hopkins Homes Ltd (Mr Chris Smith) [7104]	The role, function and capacity of Dickleburgh to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
7748 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	No change.
7351 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552] 7000 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	The role, function and capacity of the settlements below Main Town level to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy, incorporating 2009 database of information on parish services, requested from parish clerks.
6865 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	No change.
6963 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	None
7225 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	No change.

SERVICE VILLAGES - Q29 How could growth in service villages link with your longer term investment strategies?

Representations***Action***

Decision on SERVICE VILLAGES - Q29 How could growth in service villages link with your longer

The role, function and capacity of Dickleburgh to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

Following a review of the settlement hierarchy based on village services and functions, it is proposed that Dickleburgh remain as a service village

The role, function and capacity of the settlements below Main Town level to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy, incorporating 2009 database of information on parish services, requested from parish clerks.

A review of the settlement hierarchy based on updated village services and functions has been undertaken. This included service villages and other villages, but not key service centres since the East of England plan gives guidance on the expected nature and level of services, and on this basis there was no case to amend the settlements in the category.

Consider the role of Service Villages and other settlements as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

A review of the settlement hierarchy based on updated village services and functions has been undertaken. This included service villages and other villages, but not key service centres since the East of England plan gives guidance on the expected nature and level of services, and on this basis there was no case to amend the settlements in the category.

Revise the Submission version of the Joint Core Strategy to identify Rackheath as part of the locations for growth in the Norwich Policy Area.

A footnote to the service villages policy has clarified the position in relation to Rackheath

Review the role of Trowse in accommodation part of the non-Growth Location housing in the South Norfolk NPA.

The position of Trowse has been clarified in the preamble to the section of the plan covering policies for places. This confirms it is treated as an urban fringe parish

OTHER PLACES - Q30 Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?

7033 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]	Consider the role of Easton as part of the Growth Locations for the area. Delete Easton from Policy 9 'Other Villages' if it remains a Growth Location.
7356 - Bramerton Parish Council (Mr B Ansell) [1975]	None
7450 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	No change.
7592 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	No change.
7853 - Woodbastwick Parish Council (Mrs Pauline James) [4401]	No change.
7015 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]	No change.
6902 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	Re-examine Wroxham as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
7246 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8193]	Re-examine Hempnall as part of Settlement Hierarchy review. Keep site details on file until appropriate stage of Site Specifics DPD
7649 - Cemex [8191]	Re-examine Kirby Cane as part of Settlement Hierarchy review. Keep details of site suggestions on file until required as part of the Site Specific
7717 - Timewell [8209]	Re-examine Little Melton as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
7352 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]	Re-examine Barnham Broom as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
7676 - Wortwell Parish Council (Mrs J Pearce) [2076]	Re-examine Wortwell as part of Settlement Hierarchy review

OTHER PLACES - Q30 Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?

Representations**Action**

7495 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232]	None
7749 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	
7806 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	
6828 - Beighton Parish Council (Mrs Pauline James) [4398]	
7832 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	
7606 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675]	
7547 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	
7687 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	
7667 - Mr J Spinks [7685]	Re-examine Brampton as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
6914 - Little Melton Parish Council (Mr R Sinclair) [2027]	Re-examine Little Melton as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
7293 - Brampton Parish Council (Mrs M Whiley) [1783]	Consider as part of proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.
7660 - Highways Agency (Mrs Davina Galloway) [7624]	Policy 14 - amend reasoned justification to address concerns Policy 15 - amend reasoned justification to address concerns (TH)
7783 - E A Property (Mr Alan Jones) [7703]	Re-examine Hainford as part of the settlement heirarchy review
7484 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	No change.
7080 - Ditchingham Estate [8337]	None.
6916 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	Add 'community buildings' to the list of potentially acceptable development in Policy 10 'The Countryside'. Amend Policy 18 'Communities and Culture to 'Leisure - Existing facilities, including community centres and village halls, protected and enhanced'.
7784 - Mr Terry Davies [7132]	No change.
7226 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]	No change.
7089 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	No change.
7848 - Sir Philip Dowson [7707]	Re-examine smaller villages as part of settlement hierarchy review
7835 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]	Re-examine position of Wicklewood as part of Settlement Hierarchy review
7637 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]	Include in the reasoned justification to Policy 19 an example(s) of an 'accredited participatory design process'.
7781 - Geldeston Parish Council (Ms D Adams) [2004]	Consider as part of settlement hierarchy review.
7001 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]	The role, function and capacity of the settlements below Main Town level to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy, incorporating 2009 database of information on parish services, requested from parish clerks.
6964 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]	No change.
7852 - Upton with Fishley Parish Council (Mrs P James) [4400]	No change.

OTHER PLACES - Q30 Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?

Representations

Action

7780 - Frettenham Against Development (Robert & Cynthia Forster) [7701]	The role and function of Frettenham to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
7809 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	None
7390 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]	Consider the sustainability of further development in particular settlements as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
6976 - Philip Hendry & Sons (Mr Nicholas Hendry) [7647]	Re-examine Foulsham and numbers of dwellings in each category as part of Settlement Hierarchy review

Decision on OTHER PLACES - Q30 Do you agree with the approach to development in other villages, the countryside and the Broads?

Add 'community buildings' to the list of potentially acceptable development in Policy 10 'The Countryside'.

In some instances this would be acceptable, and could be approved, but on reflection, since such buildings can attract large numbers of visitors, an open ended expression of support within the policy is not considered appropriate

Amend Policy 18 'Communities and Culture to 'Leisure - Existing facilities, including community centres and village halls, protected and enhanced'.

The policy on supporting communities has been considerably expanded, and augmented by a policy on culture, leisure and entertainment. While the wording does not exactly match that requested by the representation, it does seek to maintain and enhance existing cultural assets and leisure facilities, and seeks enhancement of such facilities where development takes place, for a range of activities including performance space.

Consider as part of settlement hierarchy review.

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages.

Re-examine Little Melton as part of Settlement Hierarchy review

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. Little Melton is proposed as a service village (other village in the technical consultation)

Re-examine Hainford as part of the settlement hierarchy review

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. Hainford remains proposed as an other village

Policy 14 - amend reasoned justification to address concerns

Policy 14 related to housing. The representation was from the Highways Agency. Further dialogue has been held to move towards a common position

Policy 15 - amend reasoned justification to address concerns

Policy 15 related to the economy. The representations from the Highways Agency. Further dialogue has been held to move towards a common position

Re-examine Hempnall as part of Settlement Hierarchy review.

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. Hempnall is proposed as a service village (of the village in the technical consultation)

Consider as part of proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. Brampton continues to be proposed as part of the countryside rather than an other village .

Re-examine Kirby Cane as part of Settlement Hierarchy review.

Keep details of site suggestions on file until required as part of the Site Specific DPD.

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. It is proposed that Kirby Cane/ Ellingham be treated as a service village (in the technical consultation, Kirby Row/Ellingham was proposed as an other village

Re-examine Wortwell as part of Settlement Hierarchy review

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. Wortwell is proposed as a service village in the pre submission version

Re-examine smaller villages as part of settlement hierarchy review

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles

and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages.

The role and function of Frettenham to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. Preston and is proposed as an other village in the pre-submission version (no change from the technical consultation)

Re-examine Brampton as part of Settlement Hierarchy review

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. Brampton remains treated as part of the countryside in the pre-submission version (no change)

Re-examine Wroxham as part of Settlement Hierarchy review

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. The review did not extend to key service centres. However, Wroxham has, when taken along with Hoveton, all the attributes of a key service centre, and indeed might have been regarded as a main town apart from the limitation imposed by the restricted connection between the two.

Consider the sustainability of further development in particular settlements as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. It also included an assessment of public transport accessibility.

Re-examine Barnham Broom as part of Settlement Hierarchy review

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. Following the review, it is proposed that Barnham Broom and be categorized as a service village (other village in the technical consultation)

Consider the role of Easton as part of the Growth Locations for the area.

Easton/Costessey is included as one of the proposed locations for major growth to accommodate development in the Norwich policy area

Delete Easton from Policy 9 'Other Villages' if it remains a Growth Location.

Deleted from "other villages"

Include in the reasoned justification to Policy 19 an example(s) of an 'accredited participatory design process'.

The text has been rephrased to refer to a "recognised" design process, and to avoid the suggestion that there is a preconceived list of approved or "accredited" processes

Re-examine position of Wicklewood as part of Settlement Hierarchy review

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. It is proposed that Wicklewood be categorized as a service village (other village in technical consultation)

The role, function and capacity of the settlements below Main Town level to be considered as part of the review of the Settlement Hierarchy, incorporating 2009 database of information on parish services, requested from parish clerks.

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. This benefited from updated information provided by parish councils

Re-examine Foulsham and numbers of dwellings in each category as part of Settlement Hierarchy review

A settlement hierarchy review has been undertaken based on updated information on the services present in villages and an understanding of their roles and functions. This is reflected in the proposed policies for service villages and other villages. It is proposed to categorize Foulsham as a service village (other village in the technical consultation)

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

Representations**Action****8. Area-wide policies (policies about topics)****AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?**

7162 - Taylor Wimpey (Mr Colum Fitzsimons) [7258]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]
7571 - Norfolk Cricket Board (Mr Kieron Tuck) [2960]	while it is excessively detailed to specify the needs of an individual sport in the core strategy, policy 18 should be more explicit about the need for additional facilities to meet local standards to be defined in subsequent DPDs and based on local audits [RB]
7149 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	Correct references to the housing needs assessment, ensuring it is clear that the assessment undertaken looked at the entire housing market, and include in policy 14 a reference to the percentage of affordable housing to be sought on the basis of the most recent assessment, but with caveats that future assessments may indicate a variation from this, and also that particular site circumstances may require some variation. [RB]
7104 - Shelter (Norfolk) (Mr Christopher Spencer) [7654]	Include in policy the current expectation in terms of threshold, proportion of affordable housing and tenure mix, with suitable caveats regarding the proportion of affordable housing and tenure mix. [RB]
7850 - Sport England (East Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986]	Redraft policy to be more explicit [RB]
7705 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]	no change required [RB]
7776 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	No change needed [RB]
6974 - Nethergate Farms [6920]	Reexamine the settlement hierarchy, particularly at the level of smaller settlements to see if additional flexibility can be built in without compromising the overall strategy of the plan, and reexamine the position in the key service centres to ensure that there are sufficient allocations for employment purposes. [RB]
7847 - Scott-Brown Partnership (Mr Steven Scott-Brown) [4310]	The only issue here which might require reconsideration concerns the significance of Long Stratton in the favoured strategy. This will need to follow on discussions concerning the feasibility of a developer funded bypass. In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]
7292 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] 7229 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]
7103 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) (Mr Martin C Davidson) [2592]	no change necessary [RB]
7569 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] 7072 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	no change needed [RB]
7099 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	No change needed [RB]

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

Representations

Action

<p>7337 - Mr Chris Mutten [6926]</p>	<p>Amend the wording of policies for service villages and other villages to indicate that the broad scale of development identified is a scale of allocation, and to indicate that a development exceeding the indicative amount could be accepted where it demonstrably supports and enhances a local facilities and sustainability.</p> <p>As regards employment, it would be helpful for policies 6 and 7 to be more explicit requiring site specific allocations documents to ensure that sufficient undeveloped land identified for employment purposes remains, or to make additional allocations where necessary. Apart from that, policies appear appropriate. [RB]</p>
<p>7016 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934] 7496 - Saffron Housing Trust [1232] 7090 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805] 7391 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973] 7353 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552] 7002 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]</p>	<p>no change required [RB]</p>
<p>7485 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] 7638 - Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224] 7034 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>
<p>7833 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]</p>	<p>Include in an appropriate policy (implementation or design, for example) a requirement for all major developments to undertake a screening process to consider whether a full Health Impact Assessment is needed. [RB]</p>
<p>7205 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 7247 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8193]</p>	<p>recast the aspects of policy 13 concerned with energy efficiency and local energy generation in the light of the renewable energy study. [RB]</p>
<p>7451 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]</p>	<p>Amend policies 13 and 16 as suggested but no change required to policy 17 [RB]</p>
<p>6907 - Greenhouse Trust (Mr Richard Bickle) [919] 7607 - Thurton Parish Council (Mr Peter Martin) [7675] 7666 - Ifield Estates Limited (Mr Edward Olley) [4160]</p>	<p>amend or redraft the policy on climate change in the light of the conclusions from the renewable energy study [RB]</p> <p>amend the supporting text to the policy on the economy to refer to the significance of construction and environmental specialisms. [RB]</p> <p>In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]</p>
<p>7807 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]</p>	<p>In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]</p>
<p>7160 - Pegasus Planning Group (Ms Clare Fairweather) [4249] 7709 - Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement [8170]</p>	<p>In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]</p>

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

Representations

Action

7244 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]

Revise the key diagram to avoid the impression of undue precision [RB]

7192 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]

amend policy 15, or other policies to include an indication of the scale of allocation proposed in different places. [RB]

7593 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]

review the wording of policy 16 to clarify. [RB]

7527 - National Trust (Ms Sian Derbyshire) [7567]

7750 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

6965 - Woods Hardwick Planning (Mr Tim Collie) [7449]

Reexamine policies for main towns to include a requirement to ensure there is a reasonable availability of land in each for local employment. This may not a necessitate an additional allocation if sufficient land on existing identified sites is judged to be available. For key service centres, included a reference in policy to support for local employment, and in supporting text an expectation that site specific documents will include an examination of local employment opportunities, and make appropriate allocations where necessary [RB]

7524 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

7854 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

6917 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]

redraft policy 18 to include a more positive contribution from new development to meeting these objectives [RB]

7155 - Pegasus Planning Group (Ms Clare Fairweather) [4249]

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

7265 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]

no change needed [RB]

7525 - Mr Michael Andrews [8323]

No fundamental change, but reword the policy and supporting text for key service centres to say that the scale of development indicated is a scale of allocation, and a floor rather than a ceiling, and that slightly larger developments may be considered acceptable where they can clearly demonstrate that they will support or improve local services and sustainability. [RB]

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

Representations

Action

Decision on AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and

The only issue here which might require reconsideration concerns the significance of Long Stratton in the favoured strategy. This will need to follow on discussions concerning the feasibility of a developer funded bypass.

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed. Long Stratton remains as part of the Strategy to accommodate major development in the the Norwich policy area. Continued discussions support the belief that an appropriate scheme can be provided.

Reexamine policies for main towns to include a requirement to ensure there is a reasonable availability of land in each for local employment. This may not a necessitate an additional allocation if sufficient land on existing identified sites is judged to be available. For key service centres, included a reference in policy to support for local employment, and in supporting text an expectation that site specific documents will include an examination of local employment opportunities, and make appropriate allocations where necessary [RB]

The policy for main towns includes a table indicating whether the existing employment area is considered sufficient, or new allocations needed. The supporting text has been expanded to give more guidance. The policy for key service centres refers to the promotion of local employment opportunities (no change). Additional text has been added relating to subsequent DPDs considering adequacy of land supply to support local employment opportunities

recast the aspects of policy 13 concerned with energy efficiency and local energy generation in the light of the renewable energy study. [RB]

Significant new policy content has been added dealing with local energy generation

Revise the key diagram to avoid the impression of undue precision [RB]

The key diagram has been revised

amend policy 15, or other policies to include an indication of the scale of allocation proposed in different places. [RB]

The policy on the strategy for the Norwich policy area includes reference to the anticipated scale of employment allocation at strategic locations

Amend the wording of policies for service villages and other villages to indicate that the broad scale of development identified is a scale of allocation, and to indicate that a development exceeding the indicative amount could be accepted where it demonstrably supports and enhances a local facilities and sustainability.

The policies have been reworded to indicate a greater degree of flexibility

As regards employment, it would be helpful for policies 6 and 7 to be more explicit requiring site specific allocations documents to ensure that sufficient undeveloped land identified for employment purposes remains, or to make additional allocations where necessary. Apart from that, policies appear appropriate. [RB]

The policy for main towns includes a table indicating whether the existing employment area is considered sufficient, or new allocations needed. The supporting text has been expanded to give more guidance. The policy for key service centres refers to the promotion of local employment opportunities (no change). No additional text has been added relating to local employment opportunities

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

amend the supporting text to the policy on the economy to refer to the significance of construction and environmental specialisms. [RB]

Wording has been amended to refer to environmental specialisms, but though construction is an important aspect of employment, it is viewed as a consequence of growth rather than a policy issue

amend or redraft the policy on climate change in the light of the conclusions from the renewable energy study [RB]

The policy content on climate change has been greatly strengthened with the new policy added

Reexamine the settlement hierarchy, particularly at the level of smaller settlements to see if additional flexibility can be built in without compromising the overall strategy of the plan, and reexamine the position in the key service centres to ensure that there are sufficient allocations for employment purposes. [RB]

Review of the settlement hierarchy below the level of key service centres has been undertaken, based on updated service information and an assessment

of the role and function of villages and their public transport connections.

Include in an appropriate policy (implementation or design, for example) a requirement for all major developments to undertake a screening process to consider whether a full Health Impact Assessment is needed. [RB]

A reference is included in the communities policy

review the wording of policy 16 to clarify. [RB]

The policy on other villages has been reviewed

Page 65 of 76

AREA WIDE POLICIES - Q31 Do you agree these policies will deliver the vision and objectives?

Representations

Action

objectives?

redraft policy 18 to include a more positive contribution from new development to meeting these objectives [RB]

The policies on communities and culture have been greatly expanded with more emphasis on the potential contribution from new development

Include in policy the current expectation in terms of threshold, proportion of affordable housing and tenure mix, with suitable caveats regarding the proportion of affordable housing and tenure mix. [RB]

The current expectation has been added, but with suitable caveats

Redraft policy to be more explicit [RB]

The representation was from sport England and sort more clarification concerning the meaning of "culture and leisure".there's been summary drafting of the policy to aid clarity

Amend policies 13 and 16 as suggested but no change required to policy 17 [RB]

Policy numbers have changed, but references to water efficiency, the enhancement of biodiversity and the need for sustainable drainage systems have been added to the policies dealing with environment and climate change, and energy/water efficiency.The comment on policy 16 (transport in the technical consultation) referred to the need for the wording to be clear that the NDR would improve the environment for people, rather than the environment as a whole. The policy and supporting text and have been significantly rewritten, and it is hoped the ambiguity raised by the Environment Agency has been overcome.

Correct references to the housing needs assessment, ensuring it is clear that the assessment undertaken looked at the entire housing market, and include in policy 14 a reference to the percentage of affordable housing to be sought on the basis of the most recent assessment, but with caveats that future assessments may indicate a variation from this, and also that particular site circumstances may require some variation. [RB]

The text has been extensively reviewed and, and references to relevant the supporting evidence listed alongside it. This refers to the Housing Market Assessment and evidence study. The expected level of affordable housing is included in the policy, with suitable caveats

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options. [RB]

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

No fundamental change, but reword the policy and supporting text for key service centres to say that the scale of development indicated is a scale of allocation, and a floor rather than a ceiling, and that slightly larger developments may be considered acceptable where they can clearly demonstrate that they will support or improve local services and sustainability. [RB]

The policy for key service centres has been reworded slightly.arranges a generally retained, though in the Brundall and Blofield, the range has been taken out, and only the upper end remains.it is no indicated that scale of development is "broadly" as indicated

while it is excessively detailed to specify the needs of an individual sport in the core strategy, policy 18 should be more explicit about the need for additional facilities to meet local standards to be defined in subsequent DPDs and based on local audits [RB]

Policy 18 in the technical consultation dealt with communities and culture. The corresponding policy has been split, and now includes a reference to formal sports

The **IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?**

7150 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]

the policy will need to be revised in the light of the outcome of work currently being undertaken by EDAW, and any emerging government guidance on CIL.

Add more specific policy seeking to bring about high quality design [RB]

7834 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]

The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any funds, but it is recommended that interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at

IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Action

6918 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	ensure that the policy on community does make clear that this includes cultural facilities. [RB]
7570 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	The policy on implementation will need to be revisited in the light of the outcome of the more detailed work currently being undertaken by EDAW, and also in the light of any emerging government guidance on CIL [RB]
7073 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	
7091 - Hevingham Parish Council (Mr P Carrick) [1805]	no change needed [RB]
7256 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate [RB]
7266 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any funds, but it is recommended that interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at the heart of the process. Similarly, utility providers will need to be engaged in the process of determining investment priorities for the future development of the area.
6975 - Nethergate Farms [6920]	No specific changes needed to this policy, though it will need to be reviewed in light of the outcome of the work currently being undertaken by EDAW and also to take account of any emerging government guidance on CIL. This representation also reinforces the case for a review of the settlement hierarchy. [RB]
7193 - Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Paul Brighton) [7118]	In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may
7206 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	No change needed [RB]
7248 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8193]	
7513 - Alex and Peter Valori / Faircloth and Baker [7209]	The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate [RB]
7751 - Kimberley & Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Miss R L Gladden) [2022]	no specific changes needed in relation to this representation [RB]
7808 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	No specific change required [RB]
6866 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. (Mr Gary Parsons) [3069]	The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any funds, but it is recommended that interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at the heart of the process. Similarly, utility providers will need to be engaged in the process of determining investment priorities for the future development of the area.
7195 - South Norfolk Council (Mr Keith Mitchell) [7659]	<p>Amend the supporting text to policy 14 in respect of the calculation of commuted sums where on-site provision is unrealistic.</p> <p>Amend the supporting text to policy 14 to make it clear that off site provision will only be acceptable where both the local planning authority and developer agree that on site provision is not viable.</p> <p>Amend the supporting text to policy 14 along the lines of government policy on exceptions sites but without specifying the precise method for establishing a local need [RB]</p>

IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Action

7017 - Natural England (Ms Helen Ward) [934]
7851 - Sport England (East Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986]

No specific change required [RB]

7035 - Easton College (Ms Sandra Boston) [3750]
7392 - I E Homes and Property (Mr Ed Palmeri) [3973]
7354 - Mr Jim Hamshaw [6552]
7003 - Barnham Broom Parish Council (Mr Jim Hamshaw) [7650]

7245 - CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]
7706 - Trustees of Beston Estate (Mr Michael Dewing) [7691]
7486 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]
7548 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]
7639 - Barratt Strategic/Manor
7315 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]

The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any funds, but it is recommended that interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at the heart of the process. Similarly, utility providers will need to be engaged in the process of determining investment priorities for the future development of the area.

7301 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]

no change needed [RB]

7594 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]
7528 - National Trust (Ms Sian Derbyshire) [7567]

The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any funds, but it is recommended that interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at the heart of the process. Similarly, utility providers will need to be engaged in the process of determining investment priorities for the future development of the area.

7650 - Cemex [8191]

reexamine the settlement hierarchy, and, provided the favoured option includes development at Costessey/Easton, retain the proposal for enhanced recreation facilities including at Bawburgh Lakes [RB]

IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Action

Decision on IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

reexamine the settlement hierarchy, and, provided the favoured option includes development at Costessey/Easton, retain the proposal for enhanced recreation facilities including at Bawburgh Lakes [RB]

The proposal is retained

The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate [RB]

The pre-submission version includes an implementation framework which is based on the latest infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The implementation policy has been amended in the light of the most recent consultation by the Government (July, 2009) on the way in which a Community Infrastructure Levy might operate. From this, it appears that the full Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule would need to be submitted separately from the joint core strategy. This would follow the introduction of the CIL, intended for April, 2010, if it is decided to go down the CIL route.

The policy on implementation will need to be revisited in the light of the outcome of the more detailed work currently being undertaken by EDAW, and also in the light of any emerging government guidance on CIL [RB]

The pre-submission version includes an implementation framework which is based on the latest infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The implementation policy has been amended in the light of the most recent consultation by the Government (July, 2009) on the way in which a Community Infrastructure Levy might operate. From this, it appears that the full Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule would need to be submitted separately from the joint core strategy. This would follow the introduction of the CIL, intended for April, 2010, if it is decided to go down the CIL route.

The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any funds, but it is recommended that interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at the heart of the process. [RB]

The pre-submission version includes an implementation framework which is based on the latest infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The implementation policy has been amended in the light of the most recent consultation by the Government (July, 2009) on the way in which a Community Infrastructure Levy might operate. From this, it appears that the full Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule would need to be submitted separately from the joint core strategy. This would follow the introduction of the CIL, intended for April, 2010, if it is decided to go down the CIL route.

The implementation policy will need to be revisited following the conclusion of the work by EDAW, and in the light of any further guidance emerging from the government on the way CIL might operate. Members will wish to give some thought to be precise mechanism for managing any funds, but it is recommended that interests represented on the local strategic partnerships with an interest in the provision of infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure, should be at the heart of the process. Similarly, utility providers will need to be engaged in the process of determining investment priorities for the future development of the area. [RB]

The pre-submission version includes an implementation framework which is based on the latest infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The implementation policy has been amended in the light of the most recent consultation by the Government (July, 2009) on the way in which a Community Infrastructure Levy might operate. From this, it appears that the full Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule would need to be submitted separately from the joint core strategy. This would follow the introduction of the CIL, intended for April, 2010, if it is decided to go down the CIL route.

In selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

ensure that the policy on community does make clear that this includes cultural facilities. [RB]

The policy has been redrafted and is now entitled communities and culture

the policy will need to be revised in the light of the outcome of work currently being undertaken by EDAW, and any emerging government guidance on CIL.

The pre-submission version includes an implementation framework which is based on the latest infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The implementation policy has been amended in the light of the most recent consultation by the Government (July, 2009) on the way in which a Community Infrastructure Levy might operate. From this, it appears that the full Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule would need to be submitted separately from the joint core strategy. This would follow the introduction of the CIL, intended for April, 2010, if it is decided to go down the CIL route.

Add more specific policy seeking to bring about high quality design [RB]

The policy content concerning design has been considerably strengthened

No specific changes needed to this policy, though it will need to be reviewed in light of the outcome of the work currently being undertaken by EDAW and also to take account of any emerging government guidance on CIL. This representation also reinforces the case for a review of the settlement hierarchy. [RB]

The pre-submission version includes an implementation framework which is based on the latest infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The implementation policy has been amended in the light of the most recent consultation by the Government (July, 2009) on the way in which a Community Infrastructure Levy might operate. From this, it appears that the full Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule would need to be submitted separately from the joint core strategy. This would follow the introduction of the CIL, intended for April, 2010, if it is decided to go down the CIL route. The settlement hierarchy has been reviewed and revised policies are incorporated in the proposed pre submission version

Page 69 of 76

IMPLEMENTATION - Q32 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Action

Amend the supporting text to policy 14 in respect of the calculation of commuted sums where on-site provision is unrealistic.

The supporting text to the housing policy has been redrafted, but it does not include detailed formulae for the calculation of commuted sums, as, on reflection, this is considered excessively detailed for a core strategy, and is something best left to negotiation by the individual local planning authority

Amend the supporting text to policy 14 to make it clear that off site provision will only be acceptable where both the local planning authority and developer agree that on site provision is not viable.

The phraseology has been changed to " in exceptional circumstances where this can clearly be demonstrated to be unfeasible due to site characteristics, affordable housing will be provided off site". This is considered to meet the spirit of the representation

Amend the supporting text to policy 14 along the lines of government policy on exceptions sites but without specifying the precise method for establishing a local need [RB]

The supporting text to the housing policy no longer refers to the need for a specific local needs assessment in the case of exceptions sites.

Representations

Action

Anything else?

Anything Else?

7116 - Tesco Stores Ltd [2400]	Consider suggestion (4500 urban extension south of City to A47 around Harford Bridge Tesco) when developing favoured option.
7343 - Watsons Percy Howes (Mr Andrew Bastin) [4419]	No change.
7310 - Friends Family and Travellers (Planning) (Mr S J Staines) [7224]	(1) Amend supporting text, para. 8.9, to reflect that site size is based on local experience and management factors. (2) Suggested wording " ... Provision will be sought in locations that reflect the findings of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments. Sites should be capable of being served ..." (3) Amend the final paragraph of Policy 4 to include reference to all elements of the Gypsy and Traveller community, including New Travellers.
6800 - Hethersett Society (Mr G Beckford) [3440]	No change.
7505 - Greater Norwich Housing Forum (The Manager) [6743]	None
7344 - Mr A Shirley [4622]	Note the points raised.
7317 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Investigate the potential to enhance the policies regarding low/zero carbon development. Further consider the characteristics and capacity of the NE Norwich area in developing the favoured option.
6892 - Kidner Farming Limited [7550]	Role of Stoke Holy Cross being reviewed as part of overall review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
6990 - Diocese of Norwich (Venerable Clifford Offer) [7649]	No change.
6882 - South Walsham Parish Council (Mrs P James) [4399]	None
7151 - North East Norwich Landowner and Developer Consortium [8313]	No change.
7257 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	(1) Reconsider the scale of allocation that could be made at Aylsham, following stage 2B of the Water Cycle Study. (2) The role, function and capacity of Trowse to be considered as part of a comprehensive review of the Settlement Hierarchy, with a view to clarifying its positions as 'Norwich Fringe'.
7041 - Spen Hill Developments Limited [8201]	No change.
7509 - Alex and Peter Valori / Faircloth and Baker [7209]	None
7779 - Forestry Commission (Mr S Scott) [910]	None.
6799 - Forestry Commission (Mr S Scott) [910]	

Representations

7050 - Mr & Mrs L Dale [6251]

6803 - storeys:ssp (Mr Mark Brooker) [7506]

7668 - Mr Mike Walden [7686]

7777 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]

7359 - Capital Shopping plc (CSC) [8317]

7294 - Breckland District Council (Mrs A. Long) [1554]

7675 - The Fairfield Partnership [6983]

7267 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]

6991 - WM Morrison Supermarkets plc [8212]

7836 - Roger Heap [5766]

6829 - Beighton Parish Council (Mrs Pauline James) [4398]

6871 - Parish Fields Practice (Ms Simone Johnson) [1191]

7811 - Mr N J Fox [7705]

6989 - Diocese of Norwich (Venerable Clifford Offer) [7649]

7778 - EWS (Mr Graham Smith) [7699]

7644 - Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd [8210]

7311 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]

7549 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]

7227 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mr Colin McCormick) [7661]

6872 - Alex and Peter Valori / Faircloth and Baker [7209]

6798 - Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd [8210]

7302 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]

Action

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

Other comments - no change (RD)

Consider the role, function and capacity of Aslacton as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

No change.

Consider the relative merits/implications of alternative patterns and scales of development in developing a favoured option.

No change. (need to reconsider the comparison goods floor space requirements in the light of current economic circumstances??)

JCS to incorporate policies that seek to maximise local, renewable generation as part of large-scale development based on the outcomes of the PPS1 study.

Review wording re. The Brecks in the light of Appropriate Assessment.

None at this stage

No change.

None

No change.

None

None

None

None at present.

Suggest Policy16 third bullet point be revised to say, "enhanced and innovative use and re-use of the local rail network including provisions for road/rail interchanges."

Duplicate of Rep. 6798

Note the points made and seek to take them on board when developing the JCS submission document.

Consider suggestion as part of deliberations/alternatives leading up to formulation of favoured option.

Prepare a Topic Paper to address the lack of variation between the Growth Options shown for Norwich and Broadland.

None

Review of Settlement Hierarchy.

Consider the need to strengthen policies relating to the design quality and environmental performance of new development.

Fully consider the existing capacity, infrastructure constraints and requirements and environmental impacts of the growth locations in devising a Favoured Option.

Representations

Action

7615 - Yare Valley Society (Mrs Andrew J Salisbury) [1006]	Include a reference to river valleys within Objective 8.
6873 - Anon 2 Anon 2 [7621]	None
6874 - Anon 3 Anon 3 [7622]	
7425 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Mr Stuart Rickards) [1517]	Amend as Response.
7688 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	No change
7810 - Mrs Parson [7704]	None
6903 - Greenhouse Trust (Mr Richard Bickle) [919]	On going development of measureable targets for the Monitoring Framework.
7504 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	No change
7526 - Ministry of Defence (R M Combes) [1532]	None
7672 - Little Plumstead Hospital West (Sec of State Health)	No change
7360 - Coal Authority (Miss Rachel Bust Planning and Local Authority Liaison) [7444]	None
7176 - Felthorpe Parish Council (Mrs J Marris) [1793]	To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.
6893 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	None
7132 - Thorpe and Felthorpe Trust (Mr Jerome Mayhew) [6994]	None.
6988 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Add 40% affordable housing requirement to Policy 14, but retain the caveat that this may change based on more up to date information.
6894 - Frettenham Parish Council (Mrs C Broughton) [1796]	The role, function and capacity of Frettenham to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy. Site to be considered through the Site Specific Policies DPD.
7329 - Norwich Green Party (Cllr Stephen Little) [7197]	Assess the role, function and capacity of Easton/Costessey in developing the favoured option.
7517 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]	None (although role of Aylsham to be reconsidered following WCS Satge 2B)
7674 - Little Plumstead Hospital West (Sec of State Health)	Role of Great and Little Plumstead being reviewed as part of overall review of the Settlement Hierarchy.
6827 - Acle Parish Council (The Parish Clerk) [7454]	Review service provision in Acle and the potential for improvement and review the capacity of Aylsham to accommodate further housing (and therefore the need for Acle to accommodate up to 200 dwellings) once the Water Cycle Study Stage 2B is received. (SM)

Representations

Action

Decision on Anything Else?

On going development of measureable targets for the Monitoring Framework.

The monitoring framework now includes targets

Consider the role, function and capacity of Aslacton as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

A review of the settlement hierarchy was undertaken, subject to the outcome of public consultation, and looking at updated information on village services, their form function and public transport connections. In the proposed pre-submission version, Aslacton and Great Moulton a proposed as a service village (Aslacton shown as an other village in the technical consultation)

Investigate the potential to enhance the policies regarding low/zero carbon development.

Policy content has been considerably strengthened

Further consider the characteristics and capacity of the NE Norwich area in developing the favoured option.

Further detail has been added, and the implementation framework contains more explicit infrastructure requirements

No change. (need to reconsider the comparison goods floor space requirements in the light of current economic circumstances??)

In view of the recession, the plan adopts a shorter horizon and reduced expectation for comparison goods floorspace in the pre-submission version

Consider suggestion (4500 urban extension south of City to A47 around Harford Bridge Tesco) when developing favoured option.

Various options for additional locations for growth were considered, but the proposed strategy for strategic growth in the Norwich policy area does not contain a major concentration in the A140 corridor, apart from proposed growth at Long Stratton

Review of Settlement Hierarchy.

A review of the settlement hierarchy was undertaken, subject to the outcome of public consultation, and looking at updated information on village services, their form function and public transport connections.

Review service provision in Acle and the potential for improvement and review the capacity of Aylsham to accommodate further housing (and therefore the need for Acle to accommodate up to 200 dwellings) once the Water Cycle Study Stage 2B is received. (SM)

Acle meets the criteria for key service centre. An allocation is proposed at Aylsham, subjected to resolution of sewage treatment issues. The allocation at Acle has been retained however and is considered consistent with that for comparable key service centers

Role of Stoke Holy Cross being reviewed as part of overall review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

A review of the settlement hierarchy was undertaken, subject to the outcome of public consultation, and looking at updated information on village services, their form function and public transport connections. Stoke Holy Cross is proposed as a service village (no change) but the policy wording has been amended to increase flexibility to allow account to be taken of local circumstances

Add 40% affordable housing requirement to Policy 14, but retain the caveat that this may change based on more up to date information.

Included

The role, function and capacity of Frettenham to be considered as part of a review of the Settlement Hierarchy. Site to be considered through the Site Specific Policies DPD.

A review of the settlement hierarchy was undertaken, subject to the outcome of public consultation, and looking at updated information on village services, their form function and public transport connections. Frettenham is proposed as an other village (no change)

To be considered as part of a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review.

A review of the settlement hierarchy was undertaken, subject to the outcome of public consultation, and looking at updated information on village services, their form function and public transport connections.

Assess the role, function and capacity of Easton/Costessey in developing the favoured option.

Eastham/ Costessey has been included in the proposed locations for major growth in the Norwich policy area

(1) Reconsider the scale of allocation that could be made at Aylsham, following stage 2B of the Water Cycle Study.

An allocation is proposed subject to the resolution of sewage treatment issues

(2) The role, function and capacity of Trowse to be considered as part of a comprehensive review of the Settlement Hierarchy, with a view to clarifying its positions as 'Norwich Fringe'.

The position of Trowse has been clarified. The preamble to the strategy for growth in the Norwich policy area makes clear it is treated as an urban fringe parish

(1) Amend supporting text, para. 8.9, to reflect that site size is based on local experience and management factors.

(2) Suggested wording " ... Provision will be sought in locations that reflect the findings of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments. Sites should be capable of being served ..."

(3) Amend the final paragraph of Policy 4 to include reference to all elements of the Gypsy and Traveller community, including New Travellers.

The policy content for Gypsies and Travellers has been considerably revised

Misunderstanding of the definition of 'affordable housing', otherwise comments noted.

Not applicable

Role of Great and Little Plumstead being reviewed as part of overall review of the Settlement Hierarchy.

A review of the settlement hierarchy was undertaken, subject to the outcome of public consultation, and looking at updated information on village services, their form function and public transport connections. Great and Little Plumstead are proposed as a service of village (no change)

JCS to incorporate policies that seek to maximise local, renewable generation as part of large-scale development based on the outcomes of the PPS1 study.

Policy content on renewable energy has been considerably strengthened

Review wording re. The Brecks in the light of Appropriate Assessment.

Wording the revised to avoid indicating the Brecks could accommodate increased visitor pressure

Prepare a Topic Paper to address the lack of variation between the Growth Options shown for Norwich and Broadland.

Topic paper prepared

Spatial Vision:

Amend 'Climate Change and Sustainability' element to cover: water efficiency and flood risk as part of bullet one, enhanced biodiversity of existing spaces/habitats under bullet three and add a bullet regarding water quality.

Spatial vision has been considerably redrafted, but includes what efficiency, flood-risk, and water quality

Spatial Planning Objectives:

Agree suggested changes in relation to Objective 8 and Objective 9.

The objectives have been redrafted and updated.

Page 74 of 76

Representations

Action

Action: Amend as Response

The policies and objectives have been strengthened to give more emphasis to what efficiency, water quality, flood risks and habitats

In the selecting the favoured strategy for the Norwich policy area, members will need to take into account a range of criteria including access to employment, access by non car modes, environmental considerations and infrastructure implications, including cost and deliverability, alongside significant local considerations. The reduced need for allocations at a 2008 base date, compared with a 2006 base date, will also be a significant factor. Together, these may point to an outcome which varies from all the consultation options.

Other comments - no change
(RD)

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

None (although role of Aylsham to be reconsidered following WCS Satge 2B)
An allocation has been proposed subject to resolution of sewage treatment issues

Include a reference to river valleys within Objective 8.
On reflection, the reference in the objective to locally distinctive landscapes is considered sufficient

Consider suggestion [Promotion of land in SW Norwich to W of Colney Lane at Cringleford for mixed use, including 2500 dwellings.]
as part of deliberations/alternatives leading up to formulation of favoured option.

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed. An allocation of 1000 dwellings is included at Cringleford

Consider the need to strengthen policies relating to the design quality and environmental performance of new development.
A policy content and design has been greatly strengthened

Fully consider the existing capacity, infrastructure constraints and requirements and environmental impacts of the growth locations in devising a Favoured Option.

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Response: i) & ii) Housing requirement (and associated forecasts) come from East of England plan House building rate is an estimate and will require close monitoring in order to respond to any significant deviations

No changes to JCS needed

iii) Strategy acknowledges that car use will continue to be mode of travel in the area but wishes to maximise opportunities for non-car travel alternatives

No change to JCS needed

iv) Government funding has already been forthcoming to help deliver the growth agenda. However it was always envisaged that both public and private sector funds are necessary to deliver the required infrastructure.

No change to JCS needed

v) The GNDP will be masterplanning the growth locations with a view to maximising the opportunities for renewable energy, efficient use of land, sustainable construction techniques etc. The housing mix and tenure will be informed by an up to date assessment of the needs of the area/population.

Design content and policy on renewable energy, building efficiency etc been considerably strengthened. Housing mix and ten your references have suitable caveats about the need for updated information

vi) & vii) Growth on the scale envisaged will inevitably have an impact. The GNDP is preparing a green infrastructure strategy, alongside environmental protection policies, to improve existing habitats, create new and to for public access to the natural environment.

Green infrastructure strategy has been prepared, who and implementation plan is being prepared

viii) The GNDP will be commissioning a PPS1 renewable energy study to examine the potential in the JCS area and to advise on the options available re: zero carbon development, % renewable energy requirements and the various options/approaches

available.

PPS 1 study has been prepared and has informed the policies on renewable energy and building efficiency

ix) & x) There will indeed be a loss of some agricultural land as a result of development (although the loss of the highest grade agricultural land has been minimised). The GNDP are working with the Environment Agency and Anglian Water to ensure water resources/quality are sufficient and that new development maximises the opportunity for water efficiency.

No change to JCS needed

xi) The inclusion of nature conservation areas within growth locations does not mean that they will be built on. Such areas may benefit from improved management as a result (although the sensitivities of each individual site will need to be taken into account). The green infrastructure strategy includes far more initiatives/projects than just green links/corridors.

No change to JCS needed

xii) The GNDP does not consider the promotion of mixed use developments to be threatened by the continuing promotion of Norwich City Centre as a retail destination. Local centres will provide local services to a limited catchment whilst the City Centre remains important as a regional centre and vital to the Norwich economy.

No change to JCS needed

xiii) The JCS policy on the economy (15) seeks to promote economic development of all sectors (small & start up businesses are specifically mentioned)

No change to JCS needed

xiv) The JCS seeks to provide sufficient housing in line with the East of England Plan requirements as well as promoting economic development around several specialist sectors such as the Norwich Research Park/UEA/Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital and Hethel Engineering Centre as well as numerous business and employment parks providing a range of employment opportunities to the area.

No change to JCS needed

xv) The GNDP is still investigating various options regarding developer contributions, S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy - that could be used in deprived areas. There is no suggestion that the growth agenda has or will result in a reduction in initiatives to tackle existing problems

The pre-submission of version includes an implementation framework which has been guided by work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW, and completed in 2009. This takes account of existing infrastructure capacities and deficiencies. In July, 2009 the Government published proposals for a Community Infrastructure Levy. These will mean that, if the authorities decide to go down the CIL route, it will be necessary to prepare and consult on a charging schedule and to submit separately for consideration at a public examination

xvi) This is a laudable goal that should indeed be encouraged.

No change needed to JCS

xvii) Whilst the consultation document focusses on residential development it is envisaged to promote mixed use development encompassing employment, retail and services alongside residential areas.

No change needed to JCS

xviii) The GNDP is pursuing a range of transport solutions and is working closely with NATS proposals to maximise non-car modes of travel. Rail options (particularly linked to growth locations) are being investigated.

No change needed to JCS – NATS is now more prominently referred to, and the potential for tram train to serve Rackheath and the north east are referred to

xix) The investment required to deliver growth comes from a variety of sources which are not necessarily the same as those funding the NDR. NDR is key element of transport infrastructure and planning application will show how environmental issues have been addressed. JCS has a strong commitment to reduce the need to travel and tackle climate change.

No change needed to JCS

xx) Whilst air travel is a significant contributor to CO2 emissions GNDP wishes to provide opportunity for economic growth

Page 75 of 76

Representations

Action

around an existing airport for airport related uses.

No change needed to JCS. The economic growth and sites and premises study undertaken by Arup and Oxford Economics reinforces of the benefits of a new employment focus at the Airport, particularly because of its proximity to a number of deprived neighborhoods

Action: Note the points made and seek to take them on board when developing the JCS submission document

Consider the relative merits/implications of alternative patterns and scales of development in developing a favoured option.

Following consideration of the options after the regulation 25 technical consultation, and emerging evidence base and sustainability appraisal, further work on the emerging option was undertaken and the planning inspectorate invited to comment on the development of the option to date. The advice was considered and the option for inclusion in the regulation 25 public consultation developed.

Suggest Policy16 third bullet point be revised to say, "enhanced and innovative use and re-use of the local rail network

The references to rail in the transport policy have been expanded, but do not imply reopening of former lines or a blanket policy to protect all former rail infrastructure, even when it is technically capable of being reopened. In the absence of a real probability of reopening, such an approach would be an unreasonable sterilization of other opportunities. The transport policy does however explicitly offer support for rail freight opportunities.