

A G E N D A

16 December 2010
at Council Chamber, County Hall
2.00pm – 4.00pm

The GNDP officers pre-meeting will take place from 1.00pm until 2.00pm in Mezz 2 at County Hall

Page No

The County Council members pre-meeting will take place in Derrick Murphy's office on 5th floor from 1.30 until 2.00pm

Tea and coffee will be served outside of the Council Chamber (under the marble map) from 1.30pm

Please note - The Greater Norwich Housing Partnership members are attending the meeting in relation to item 6

- 1 To receive declarations of interest under Procedural Rule no 8
- 2 Confirmation of Chair and Vice-chair following Daniel Cox's departure
- 3 Apologies for absence and welcome new members
- 4 Minutes of meeting held on 23 September 2010
- 5 Viability study – confidential
presentation on study by Charles Trustram Eve, GVA Grimley
- 6 Local Investment Plan Programme - confidential
– sign-off the document for submission to the HCA
- 7 Design Review Panel –
an overview of the role and function of the panel
- 8 Joint Core Strategy –
update on the Examination in Public and next steps
- 9 Discussion on the transparency of the GNDP Policy Group meetings

10

Date of next meeting 2 - 4pm: 24 March 2011

Dates for meetings in 2011

23 June 2011

22 September 2011

15 December 2011

Community Infrastructure Levy : Next Steps

Report by the GNDP Directors

Summary

This report updates the GNDP Policy group on the progress of the Community Infrastructure Levy

Recommendation

The GNDP Policy Group is recommended:

- a. To note the final report of Viability Advice on CIL/Tariff for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk
- b. To agree that further work is undertaken by the GNDP:
 - o To determine the most effective mechanism for collaboration by GNDP local authorities in developing charging schedules and coordinating decisions on spending priorities
 - o To develop a more detailed timetable and resource plan (for approval by GNDP Directors) to prepare for a consultation on a charging schedule
 - o To develop a funding strategy taking account of other streams
- c. To consider a more detailed progress update at a meeting in early 2011.

1. Summary

- 1.1 The area has a significant infrastructure challenge to deliver the required level of growth. GNDP has already done a considerable amount of background work on infrastructure needs- through the Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study 2009 and is progressing delivery and funding priorities through the Local Investment Plan and Programme. Whilst the GNDP local authorities have been reasonably successful in securing contributions from developers through s.106 agreements, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) legislation provides a more effective approach to maximising developer contributions.
- 1.2 In March 2010 the GNDP Policy Group resolved to agree that further work be undertaken on CIL or a tariff based approach to developer contributions for infrastructure. Following this the Partnership commissioned GVA Grimley to undertake a study 'Viability Advice on CIL/ Tariff for Greater Norwich'.

2. Viability Advice on a CIL/ Tariff for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk GVA Grimley, December 2010

2.1 The key sections to read are: Section 4 – The Viability of CIL and Section 7: Conclusions and Recommendations. Some key headlines are picked out below:

- The viability assessment for residential developments shows that the suggested CIL chargeable in the area would ensure that **at least** 20% of Affordable Housing would be delivered in all locations (i.e. most locations can deliver more affordable housing, as well as the suggested CIL) This level is the worst case scenario as it assumes no NAHP grant; however there is every chance that housing support will continue even though it was reduced in the CSR in November 2010. This means the level of affordable housing could increase accordingly in such situations.
- The GVA Grimley Study makes the following recommendations
 - i. Adopt a CIL based on Normal Market conditions without NAHP grant
 - ii. Adopt and operate the CIL based on defined Market Values Areas
 - iii. Establish an early CIL charges review in 2014/15
 - iv. Provide clarity and certainty over in-kind contributions in lieu of CIL
 - v. Adopt the Joint Committee or Delivery Vehicle model approach to the organisation of CIL
 - vi. Establish a programme of CIL profile raising to improve clarity, confidence and coherence

3. Policy implications

3.1 The CIL regulations 2010 (which will have some minor amendment by April 2011) set out a clear process for developing and adopting a charging schedule. Viability is one important consideration in this process as the regulations require the level of CIL to be viable for the majority of sites. However there are also other factors which may affect the level at which CIL should be set in across the three local authorities. For example as part of this process it will be important to consider how the level of CIL may influence policy aspirations e.g. not discouraging development of constrained or difficult sites, achieving regeneration benefits etc. These aspects can be taken into account in the next stages of work.

4. Next steps

4.1 The GNDP team will continue to work in determining the CIL rates using the evidence from the GVA Grimley Viability Study and the infrastructure planning as set out in the LIPP (The Local Investment Plan and Programme).

4.2 This will involve preparing a draft charging schedule as per the CIL regulations and guidance. CIL will be an optional new charge which local authorities will be empowered *but not required* to charge on most types of new development in their area. Local authorities will be able to bring charging schedules into effect. CIL can only be introduced where there is an approved Core Strategy in place (or in

conjunction with the preparation of a core strategy). For Greater Norwich, the earliest that CIL could be introduced would be December 2011, if the JCS is found to be sound, and is formally adopted by the respective local planning authorities although preparatory work would need to be undertaken before then to allow CIL to be implemented as soon as possible after that.

- 4.3 CIL is not the only funding source available to the GNDP partners and it will be important to develop a comprehensive funding strategy to maximise the benefits across the area. This will involve a parallel piece of work that will also be required to consider options for collection, monitoring and managing the CIL once it is introduced.

4.4 Draft CIL timetable

CIL – process to adoption and draft timetable	
Preparation of charging schedule	January 2011 – March 2011
GNDP Policy Group sign-off	24 March 2011
Full Council sign-off	Dates to be determined – late March
Public consultation	4 April 2011– 27 May 2011
Publication	20 June 2011 – 15 July 2011
Submission and notification of examination	29 July 2011
Pre-hearing meeting	w/c 26 September 2011
Examination	31 October 2011
Adoption	December 2011

5. Recommendation / Action Required

GNDP Policy Group is recommended:

- a. To note the final report of Viability Advice on CIL/Tariff for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk
- b. To agree that further work is undertaken by the GNDP:
 - o To determine the most effective mechanism for collaboration by GNDP local authorities in developing charging schedules and coordinating decisions on spending priorities
 - o To develop a more detailed timetable and resource plan (for approval by GNDP Directors) to prepare for a consultation on a charging schedule
 - o To develop a funding strategy taking account of other streams
- c. To consider a more detailed progress update at a meeting in early 2011.

Final draft report:

Viability advice on CIL/ Tariff for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk

Commercial and in confidence

Will be made available on www.gndp.org.uk when final report is received from consultants

Report to GNDP Policy Group – 16 December 2010

Local Investment Plan and Programme update

1. Summary

- 1.1 The Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP) is the tool that the GNDP is developing as the implementation plan for the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, the Greater Norwich Housing Strategy and the Greater Norwich Economic Strategy. Version 1.2 (dated 8 October 2010) has been submitted as part of the Evidence Base for the Examination in Public of the Joint Core Strategy, and as such is in the public domain. This was shared with Members as a background paper to the GNDP Policy Group on 23 September 2010.
- 1.2 The LIPP is an iterative document that is updated regularly as new information becomes available and as housing and employment sites come forward.
- 1.3 The HCA have agreed that it is acceptable for the Partnership to submit their priorities across three areas:
 - Infrastructure projects
 - Regeneration and growth projects (including economic development)
 - Affordable housing (put forward by the GNHP)
- 1.4 The City Council Cabinet has approved the projects going forward in the City Package.

2. Recommendations

GNDP Policy Group is recommended:

- a. To note the project prioritisation of projects within the Local Investment Plan and Programme
- b. Authority be delegated to GNDP Directors. In discussion with Portfolio Holders to agree the final version of the LIPP to be submitted to the HCA.
- c. For Broadland and South Norfolk Councils to consider the projects in the spatial packages relating to those Districts following prioritisation by Officers.

3. Next steps

- 3.1 The LIPP has been Peer Reviewed by the HCA and the Partnership has received positive feedback about the document. When the Viability Study is completed, the

LIPP will be updated to incorporate some of the findings from that study, as suggested in the Peer Review.

- 3.2 The LIPP will be submitted to the HCA at the end of the year in time for it to be considered by the HCA in their January Peer Review.
- 3.3 When we receive feedback from the HCA about the funding allocation the GNDP team will reevaluate the prioritised projects in discussion with Members and the HCA to agree a formal funding agreement.
- 3.4 Governance is expected to come under the current GNDP arrangements. Responsibility for overseeing the programme and monitoring the LIPP sits with the GNDP and GNHP Policy Groups. The Terms of Reference for the Partnership is being revised to account for this responsibility.

Confidential. Version submitted to the Inspectors undertaking the Examination of the Joint Core Strategy is available at <http://www.gndp.org.uk/downloads/EIP-85-DRAFT-LIPP-101008-v1.2.pdf>. Version 2 of the LIPP will be published on www.gndp.org.uk following the HCA Peer Review in January

Overview of the role and function of the GNDP Design Review Panel

Summary

At the September Policy Group Meeting some members asked for an opportunity to review and discuss the role and function of the GNDP Design Review Panel.

Panel members, promoters, observers and local planning authorities that have taken part in the meetings so far have been asked to comment on whether they think a) the Design Review Panel is useful and b) if they have suggestion to improve the way the panel works. All comments which were received have been included in Appendix 1.

All comments received have been discussed with Andrew Savage the chair of the Design Review Panel. Some suggestions will involve an amendment to the Terms of Reference; some will be dealt with by the chair at the panel meetings. The current Terms of Reference for the Design Review Panel has been included in Appendix 2 of this report.

1. Background

- 1.1. The Greater Norwich Design Review Panel was set up in July 2010. Six schemes have been review by the panel to date.

Panel members have been invited to join the panel on the basis of their personal expertise.

Each meeting involves around 8 panel members out of the pool of 21 panel members we have, 18 of the 21 panel members have been involved in one or more of the meetings so far. Members are selected for each meeting based on the skills needed to review a particular scheme.

2. Role, Function and Cost of the Design Review Panel

- 2.1. The Design Review Panel provides expert advice to the GNDP and the constituent Local Planning Authorities (LPA) on the quality of development proposals.

The panel covers schemes across the whole of the GNDP area; the LPA will refer schemes to the Panel for review.

Scheme are normally brought to review at pre-application stage so there is more scope to influence the outcomes, when there is enough graphical material to convey the design content and when the scheme promoters are confident about the quality of the proposals to advocate it to the panel.

The LPA case officer is invited to attend each panel meeting and they are asked to highlight any key issues for consideration, answer any questions from the panel and point out any discrepancies or inaccuracies in the presentation from the promoter.

The panel members are not paid, there is no charge for the venue and no

refreshments are provided. The only cost to the GNDDP or constituent LPAs is in officer time.

- 2.2. The panel has an advisory role and the panels comments can be a material consideration in reaching planning decisions.

3. **Reasons for the report**

- 3.1. At the September Policy Group Meeting some members asked for an opportunity to review and discuss the role and function of the Panel.

The panel has now been running for 6 months and this is an ideal time to review the way the panel is working and amend the terms of reference where necessary.

4. **Summary of Feedback**

- 4.1. Panel members, promoters, observers and local planning authorities that have taken part in the meetings so far have been asked to comment on whether they think a) the Design Review Panel is useful and b) if they have suggestion to improve the way the panel works.

All comments which were received have been included in Appendix 1.

- 4.2. : Comments were received back from 9 panel members, 3 promoters and 2 planning authority representatives. The responses were broadly positive and majority suggested the panel was of use.

Some of the common observations:

1. *The Panel performs a useful function providing independent and expert design advice to the LPAs.*
2. *There is not enough time to review some of the larger more complex schemes. Therefore discussion can be a little rushed.*
3. *Logistical issues regarding the room set up and size.*
4. *Concerns around the note recording the views of the Panel being too cautious and leaving room for uncertainty.*
5. *It is important to get scheme to the design review panel at an early 'conceptual' stage.*
6. *The case officer from the LPA should always be given the opportunity following the presentation to point out discrepancies and inaccuracies.*

7. **Proposed reforms**

In response to the suggestions above the following actions and changes to the terms of reference are recommended:

1. ***There is not enough time to review some of the larger more complex schemes. Therefore discussion can be a little rushed at times.***

Action: Change to the Terms of Reference - Meetings will be extended by half an hour giving the chair the flexibility of allowing additional time for certain discussions where they are needed.

2. Logistical issues regarding the room set up and size.

Action: Panel member's chairs will be cleared out of the room and observers will sit at the back of the room allowing more space.

3. Concerns around the note being too cautious and leaving room for uncertainty.

Action: The chair will address this issue in the meeting, spending more time summing up the meeting and ensuring the main points have been noted.

4. It is important to get scheme to the design review panel at an early 'conceptual' stage.

Action: LPAs will be encouraged more strongly to persuade promoters to submit their schemes for review at an earlier stage.

5. The case officer from the LPA should always be given the opportunity following the presentation to point out discrepancies and inaccuracies.

Action: Addition to the Terms of Reference - The chair will always ensure the case officer is given the opportunity to speak following the presentation.

Recommendation / Action Required

1. Endorse the continuing GNDP support for the Design Review Panel
2. Approve the list of reforms and changes to the terms of reference in section 7.

Appendices

1. Appendix 1 – Full list of feedback
2. Appendix 2 – Design Review Panel Current Terms of Reference

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Name	Telephone Number	Email address
Ben Webster	01603 212518	Ben.webster@norwich.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 and ask for _____ or textphone 0344 800 8011 and we will do our best to help.

Appendix 1 - PANEL COMMENTS

Alan Cole:

My comments on the review panel meeting that I have attended is it has allowed external interested persons to collectively inform and respond to applications or concepts that were being considered for future planning application in the GNDP area. Apart from the Anglia Square application I believe them to have generally been concepts/master plans which we have been able to comment upon and will be interested to see how actual applications come forward as a result of these informed consultation meetings.

Although I could not attend because of being conflicted the Anglia Square application meeting was well received by the applicants who took on board comments made by the panel in order to improve their planning application. I believe that the GNDP review panel is able to bring forward and influence applications and potential applications by adding a degree of external market factors and in some cases just plain common sense to the consideration proposals that have been put forward. Therefore in my opinion the panel is both useful and has the potential to influence and give guidance to creating a pleasant community in which to live and work.

With limited experience of the panel meetings to date I find it difficult to suggest ways to improve how the panel works.

I trust the above is of assistance in your consideration and review of the GNDP review panel.

Matt Wood:

Thoughts on the Panel:

1) I have certainly enjoyed taking part, and am more than happy to continue doing so. As to its 'usefulness' I think that it is for others to say. If the Panel's purpose is to promote better design then I guess only the District Development Controls could say whether or not it was useful.

2) In my view our comments in the form of the letters have been rather brief and in some cases over-cautious. Specifically, the Anglia Square scheme I thought was very poor in design terms, and a number of Panel Members made that point, but the letter only referred to a 'lack of style and variety'.

3) On Anglia Square and Kerrison Road I think an hour was insufficient to review properly the design. I think both would have benefited from an hour and a half slot, or perhaps from the presentation being circulated in advance. I personally would be happy to spend three rather than two hours on each pair of reviews, it's effectively a half-day exercise for me anyway, once travel is taken into account.

David Grech:

I found the panels I attended both interesting and worthwhile, though really the proof of effectiveness of the panel will be if it can influence the designers and persuade them of the merits of revising their proposals. It is therefore necessary to get schemes to the panel at a

stage where there is enough information available to enable a full understanding to be obtained, but also before everything is cast in stone and no one wants to make any substantive changes.

Janet Jury:

As to a) and b), as a panel member it seems to function well (although the rooms are at times a little small). Most telling will be feedback from the LPA officers and the applicants presumably?

John Long

Some initial thoughts, having been on both sides of the table:

Panel Member commenting on a scheme:

Having a little more information on schemes up front would be useful, provided that it was focussed information and that as a Panel member we have set aside sufficient time to digest the information. The discussion part of the session I attended was a little rushed because the presentation was very thorough. I thought that we were getting into some of the real design issues as the discussion was brought to a close.

Perhaps a little more discussion time would have been better. I wonder whether trying to squeeze two major schemes into one afternoon might be a little too much.

In conclusion:

- A) the Panel is a useful stage in the design evolution process
- B) Perhaps not trying to squeeze too much into the sessions would allow more time for debate. Also, ensuring the Council's planners attend; are well briefed; and participate, even if to comment on the Panel's comments should be encouraged. They will know better than anyone what the Council Members view will be on proposals, which may be different to the Panels'. As a developer, we need to know what these differences are. After all the Panel will not be determining the planning application,

Sarah Long

I am sure we will all have a few thoughts. I wonder about arranging a quick meeting with Panel members to air/discuss them - from which a series of notes/points could be taken? A useful 'check' on progress/interaction between the members too - given that we don't see each other frequently.

Mine are along the lines of:

- The nature/scale of projects we see - so easy to start straying into Planning Policy which is beyond our remit. Likewise we need to be very clear about what we are being asked to comment given the range of proposals.
- We also need a good balance of Panel members to presenters/observers. At the Panel on Thurs there were more of the latter than the former - which creates a strange balance that can affect the responses.

- having Planning Case Officers/ward members present only seems valid to me if they can engage in a meaningful way - rather than seeming reluctant to be at forthcoming.
- Physically - the panel need to be able to be aware of each other - with the observers maybe sitting to one side/in a distinct group? I have a feeling that it can affect the dynamic of a discussion to have everyone dotted about a space - with non-contributors sitting silent in the midst of what needs to be a lively session.
- having some schemes returning to the Panel over a period of time would be useful - so that we can inform the strategic as well as design stages of any project. Reference the Carrow Park project of last week.
- Timing - I wonder what the others think - would be happy to switch to a lunchtime - or 1st thing in the morning, to minimise intrusion to a working day?

Anthony Hudson

Having now been on both sides I have the following comments..

1. I don't think that 1 hour is sufficient to review a large scheme and suggest this be extended to 1.5 hours since there is not time for a proper interrogation.
2. Often questions on clarification actually are comments and wonder whether this is a useful section of enquiry or whether we should go straight into comments and questions.

Jason Bill

- a] I think the panel has the *potential* to be useful, however it is a little meaningless when Planners do not have to have regard to the comments;
- b] submissions could be better presented, to make better use of the panel members time.

Specifically, for the November panel, it was rather unfortunate the very weak proposals from the Ingleton Wood scheme took 18 minutes of the presentation, whilst Anthony Hudson was only provided a couple of minutes. Although, it is perhaps less of an issue as there is little doubt in the capability of Hudson Architect's to make a sensible contribution to the quality of Architecture in Norwich.

With regard to the second presentation, better guidance should really have been given the Ben Webster, as although it was interesting to learn about the Dereham Road bus rapid transit proposals, it was difficult to understand exactly what the panel were supposed to be critiquing, as there was nothing material put forward to comment on the 'Design Quality'.

Lucy Hall

- a) The Design Review Panel is not as useful as it might be because:
 - i) There is not enough time to consider and respond to each presentation;
 - ii) We seem to have lost sight of the CABE Building for Life standards;
 - iii) The panel is perhaps too late in the process, so that a lot of design work has already been done and the promoter is necessarily defensive - the review should be collaborative;

iv) The DRP is not as transparent as it could be.

b) Suggestions for dealing with these issues:

i) Extend each review to an hour and a half; ask panel members to make their comments afterwards by email; ask the promoter not to respond to every comment but rather to note comments;

ii) Restructure the panel so that we go through each of the 20 Building For Life criteria; ask the promoter to provide a written or verbal response to each of the criteria;

iii) Organise the panel earlier in the design process; review the site, not the finished plans for the buildings;

iv) If panel members submitted comments by email, these could be published online;

I hope these comments are helpful. Generally I think the DRP is more useful than not having it at all, but in its current form it feels close to being a rubber stamp exercise. I am also doubtful about whether the outcome can be summed up by the chair - sometimes panel members disagree with one another. Either the panel needs to be in agreement about what it is aiming for, or comments should be posted on an individual basis.

PLANNING OFFICERS

Rob Parkinson, Norwich City Council

Thanks for the opportunity to offer feedback. I would like to make a few observations from the point of view of a planning officer dealing with the proposals:

1) There is not enough time for each discussion - The GNDP panel is only looking at the largest or most significant proposals in the area and yet have even less time for presenting and getting meaningful feedback than did smaller schemes at the Norwich panel. This leads to presentations being rushed and the feedback being in the form of statements, not allowing a meaningful discussion with our so-called experts. This is particularly frustrating if it takes 10-15 minutes for the preliminaries to get underway and then only 40-45 minutes after that. At least give the applicant the hour they think they are going to get. I think applicants should have up to 45 minutes to present and 45 mins discussion after that.

2) There is a confusion over the design stage that schemes should be seen - The Panel should really be a discussion forum if we are trying to get schemes reviewed at an early 'conceptual' stage to make the best of a situation / opportunity site. Whether this is something that Officers should be updated on to bring schemes to the Panel earlier, I don't know.

3) The Panel's word should not be gospel - too often schemes are amended after the meeting without being discussed with Officers first. It should be made clear through the Chairman that the Panel is a consultee as much as every other body is, and changes to design could have implications in other respects, or not even best reflect the local situation. If changes are considered desirable by applicants, they should be discussed with officers first. This should be reiterated in the meeting minutes.

4) The minutes of the meetings have not been as detailed as officers believe they should be, leaving too much room for uncertainty. It is important to ensure that minutes are as accurate as possible. It would be helpful if the draft minutes could be seen by officers first.

I hope this helps to continue the good work of the Panel to date!

Sorry to raise another issue but one more thing occurred to me this morning.

The case officer should be given an opportunity after the presentation and before the Panel questions to point out any discrepancies or inaccuracies in the presentation by the applicant, and explain how the scheme might also relate to sites or other issues elsewhere. Then, questions from the Panel should also be allowed to be put to the case officer too.

One example of this problem is that the NCFC presentation only briefly mentioned a 10-storey tower block in the middle of the site. In fact it would be 11.5 storeys, and the brief info presented made little mention of it at all. I would have liked to raise this afterwards (at the time, time constraints and strong chairmanship prevented this), because it's an important issue that would have benefited from proper discussion.

Cally Smith, Broads Authority

We have discussed this internally and the comments of the BA are as follows:

- The DRP is useful, however for it to be meaningful and to give the applicant a definite steer on where to go with their scheme after the meeting it would be far more beneficial if all concerned could be provided with detailed plans of the scheme some days prior to the meeting so that we have some idea of our thoughts and questions prior to the presentation. This is esp important as time is short for the Q + A session.
- It is important that the DRP are involved at an early stage in scheme than some we have seen ie before scheme is set
- More time should be allocated to looking at the bigger schemes than to some of the smaller ones. We felt that the time given to the recent Ingleton Wood scheme was short, given the size of the scheme and all its implications for the area. There is a concern that unless sufficient time is given it will become just a box ticking exercise for the applicant.
- It would be useful for there to be opportunity for LPA planners to advise which policies will apply and a prelim commentary on policy aspirations

DEVELOPERS

Philip Atkinson, Lanpro

In respect to your e-mail I can confirm that I thought the Panel meeting attended was very useful in formulating the final scheme for the Deal Ground and May Gurney sites.

I also thought the members were well informed, clearly well educated and had the best interests of the City at heart – as such I wouldn't change a thing.

Good luck for the future and keep up the good work.

John Long, Bidwells

Developer presenting a scheme:

We found the discussion useful as a starting point. It was early in the design process for us, so maybe difficult for the Panel to have much detail to comment upon. Hopefully we were able to show the background to where we had got to and that the masterplan was based on a comprehensive investigation of the local area and not just arrived at 'out of the blue'.

We also appreciated the comments from Panel members, which we will take on board as we develop the masterplan. We were a little concerned overhearing the (observing) Councillor afterwards suggesting that the whole thing was a waste of time. We didn't think so.

I think the chairman did we'll to keep the Panel from getting to involved in the fundamental aspects of the proposal, i.e. total numbers and broad location issues. I suspect we could have spent the entire session on this, rather than focus on the masterplan/design issues.

I think that if we present to the Panel again with more detail, we'll be able to have a more in-depth discussion on the design aspects as we would have moved that much further forward. I also think it would help if we were able to give more information to the Panel prior to the meeting.

Our presentation went on a little too long perhaps, which limited the amount of useful discussion. Perhaps for other events, presenters need to be encouraged to keep to their allotted time, or more time is given over to the discussion.

If we have a concern, its that we get a steer from the Panel on masterplan/design matters that we follow through and it isn't supported by the Council, so I think it is essential that the Council's Planning Officers attend the meetings. For the Hethersett one, I think the Planners were very careful about what they said because the local Councillor was in attendance, which perhaps limited the response that we might usefully have had from the officers. I got the impression that he was concerned that by commenting on the scheme, he was in someway supportive of it.

Anthony Hudson, Hudson Architects

Having now been on both sides I have the following comments..

1. I don't think that 1 hour is sufficient to review a large scheme and suggest this be extended to 1.5 hours since there is not time for a proper interrogation.
2. Often questions on clarification actually are comments and wonder whether this is a useful section of enquiry or whether we should go straight into comments and questions.

Appendix 2 – Design Review Panel Current Terms of Reference

1. Purpose

1.1. The Panel will provide expert advice to the Greater Norwich Development Partnership and its constituent Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) on the quality of development proposals.

1.2. The value of design review is widely acknowledged. Design review works because it:

- Gives decision makers confidence that they have had the best possible independent advice on design quality;
- Offers support and encouragement for good design;
- Identifies weak and inappropriate schemes at an early stage, when radical design changes can be made with relatively little waste of time and effort;
- Can bring a breadth and depth of experience beyond that of the project team or planning authority;
- Offers expert views on complex issues such as sustainability;
- Puts schemes in perspective and sees the bigger picture;
- Can question the design brief or site assumptions; and
- Offers opportunities to those observing design reviews for continued learning, particularly on how to assess schemes for good design.

2. Remit

2.1. The panel will cover schemes across the whole GNDP area (Norwich City, Broadland DC, South Norfolk DC and part of Broads Authority). LPAs (including the County Council) will refer schemes to the Panel for review. When there is insufficient time to review all the schemes that have been submitted then the following criteria will help to decide which schemes are reviewed:

- Size (bigger site area and larger quantity of accommodation generally leads to higher impact)
- Site sensitivity (if the development has an impact on sites that have been designated as having special landscape, wildlife or historic environment value)
- Local authority (including the County Council) is the client for the project (independent review is especially useful where a local authority is developing property and its impartiality could be questioned)
- Innovation (schemes that are trying to introduce design approaches or technologies that have not been attempted in the area and LPAs will be helped by the opinion of panel members who have experience of them being used elsewhere).

2.2. Schemes will be referred to the panel by the relevant LPA (including the County Council). Each LPA has nominated a person to submit schemes. They are Phil Courtier (Broadland DC), Ben Webster (Norwich CC), Paul Witham (South Norfolk DC), Cally Smith (Broads Authority), Heidi Thompson (Norfolk CC). If there are more schemes to review than time allows, the nominated representatives will agree on the basis of the criteria above which schemes the panel will review.

- 2.3.** A forward agenda for the Panel will be maintained by the GNDP support officer (Helen Lambert). The forward agenda will be the subject of discussion at monthly Placemaking Group meetings and with nominated LPA representatives.
- 2.4.** The nominated officer will invite the scheme promoter to attend and the GNDP support officer will supply details of the venue and timings. Panel members are sent a location plan and description by the GNDP before the meetings so that they have an opportunity to visit the site if they can.
- 2.5.** The Panel Chairman and members could request that schemes are referred to the Panel, but the decision about whether this happens will rest with the group of nominated LPA officers.
- 2.6.** The appropriate moment to review a scheme will be when:
- It is at pre-application stage so there is more scope to influence the outcome and avoid costly late alterations to the plans and when there will be no adverse effect on performance indicators for speed of determination.
 - When there is sufficient graphical material to convey the design content.
 - When the scheme promoters are sufficiently confident about the quality of their proposal to advocate it to the Panel.
- 2.7.** If the scheme develops further, possibly in response to the Panel's comment, there could be scope for a scheme to be reviewed for a second or even third time. Repeat reviews should concentrate on the changes made to the scheme since the previous review and any later reviews should generally look at matters of detail, implementation and maintenance rather than the principles of the development.
- 2.8.** Inspire East run a regional panel and CABI run a national panel. It is important not to have multiple reviews by different panels to avoid confusion and waste of time. A local panel has the benefit of detailed knowledge of the Norwich area and therefore schemes will normally only be reviewed by the local panel rather than CABI or Inspire East. However, CABI runs specific eco-town and schools panels, which will give an expert commentary in addition to the view of the local panel.

3. Membership and attendance

- 3.1.** Each meeting will involve around eight members (including the chair), selected from a pool of approximately 20 panel members. The aim will be to have at least two members representing each area of expertise so that a substitute is available when a member cannot participate due to a conflict of interest. The members will be selected for each meeting based on the skills needed to review particular schemes. Panel members will normally belong to the panel for 3 years. Panel members will not be paid.
- 3.2.** Panel members will be invited to join on the basis of their personal expertise and commitment rather than as representatives of organisations. The Panel's comments need to be informed by a broad understanding of how to create good quality places. Therefore the Panel needs a spread of expertise beyond traditional built environment design professions to include skills such as community development, ecology, energy use, disabled access, health, transport, hydrology and drainage. There is a possibility

that members of the Inspire East panel could serve on the Greater Norwich Panel at no cost to the GNDP.

- 3.3.** Candidates for membership and chairmanship of the Panel will be invited to express an interest by letter. A news release will be issued by the GNDP inviting expressions of interest. A list proposing a Chairman and members of the Panel will be produced by Andrew Gregory, Sandra Eastaugh and Ben Webster for agreement by GNDP Directors.
- 3.4.** It is important that the Panel's impartiality is not impugned by actual or perceived conflicts of interest. A separate policy document is available that explains how conflicts of interest will be avoided.

4. Conduct of meetings

- 4.1.** Schemes are normally presented by the lead designer of the scheme. The planning consultant and scheme client are also encouraged to attend.
- 4.2.** Although it is best for scheme promoters to attend panel meetings to present their schemes so that they can answer the Panel's questions and hear the Panel's response, in exceptional circumstances where an LPA considers that it is vital for a scheme to be reviewed and the scheme promoter has declined the invitation to attend, the LPA case officer will present the scheme. The scheme promoter will be informed and the invitation to attend as participant or observer will be repeated.
- 4.3.** The development management case officer and their internal design advisor are encouraged to attend to a) highlight any key issues for consideration by the panel; b) listen to the Panel's deliberations; and c) answer questions from the panel. The panel cannot ask the LPA for their view on the merits of the scheme.
- 4.4.** The following categories of elected members are encouraged to attend as observers: design and historic environment champion, ward member, portfolio holder, planning committee chairman, parish council representative.
- 4.5.** Attending a panel meeting can be a useful way for officers and members to learn how to critically appraise the design merits of development proposals.
- 4.6.** The GNDP officer that supports the Placemaking Group will also attend meetings to ensure the event runs smoothly and to record the Panel's views.
- 4.7.** Members of the public will not be allowed to attend on the basis that meetings should not be overwhelmed by a large number of people, some of whom may not accept limitations on their observer status, which would make meetings less intimate and creative.
- 4.8.** The normal schedule for a meeting reviewing two schemes in two hours would be:
 - Admin & conflicts of interest declaration (5 mins)
 - Welcome presenters (Chair identifies who are panel members, who supports the panel and who are observers) (5 mins)

- Presentation by scheme promotor (20 mins)
- Panel questions (5 mins)
- Panel comments (20 mins)
- Chair's summing up (5 mins)
- Move to neighbouring room (5 mins) for second scheme and repeat sequence of actions.

4.9. The Chair should clearly structure the discussion by starting with macro issues (e.g. siting, layout and landscape impact) through to more detailed considerations (e.g. energy technologies, parking arrangements). Where predominantly residential developments are being reviewed it would be helpful to structure the discussion according to the Building for Life assessment method. A structured discussion will make it easier to produce a coherent report of the meeting.

5. Frequency and timing of meetings

5.1. There will be ten meetings each year, held every five weeks. The meetings will be held between 3pm and 5pm. Each meeting will review up to two schemes, therefore up to 20 schemes will be reviewed each year. An entire meeting could be devoted to a single scheme if it is especially complicated.

5.2. The meetings will normally be held at Dragonfly House (Broads Authority offices). Where a meeting is devoted to schemes that are distant from Norwich the meeting could be held at venues close to the site in Long Stratton, Wymondham, Aylsham, Wroxham or Acle. The venue will ideally have two rooms so that the presentation material for each can be installed before the panel meeting.

6. Status of the Panel

6.1. The panel has an *advisory* role. It will be a non-statutory consultee in the planning process and the panel's comments can be a material consideration in reaching planning decisions.

7. Reporting the views of the Panel

7.1. The view of the panel is summarised by the chair during the meeting. That view is written up by the GNDP support officer in a letter to the scheme promotor. The letter is checked and signed off by the Chairman. Comments will not be attributed to individuals. A copy of the final letter is provided to the LPA. The content of the letter will then be discussed by the LPA and scheme promotor at their next meeting.

7.2. The panel's comment letters will be available on the GNDP website. The panel's view will be referred to in committee reports although it will be made clear if and how the scheme has changed since review.

7.3. An annual review of the Panel's activities will be produced that will look at each scheme the Panel has reviewed and explain what influence the Panel's views had on the evolution of the scheme.

6 April 2010

Based on a report approved by the GNDP Policy Group 25 March 2010

Joint Core Strategy : Next Steps

Report by the GNDP Directors

Summary

This report updates the GNDP Policy group on the progress of the Joint Core Strategy

Recommendation

Members are recommended

- 1) to note the progress made to date through the examination process and the Inspectors Agenda for the final day of the hearing.
- 2) to note the Inspectors' question and the GNDP's response on the flexibility and contingency in relation to delivery of growth in the north east.
- 3) to note the Schedule of Minor Changes and Soundness Changes as submitted to the examination process.

1. Background

- 1.1. This report updates members on progress made on the joint core strategy following the Examination in Public that commenced on 9 November 2010, at the time of writing a final day is scheduled for 9 December 2010.
- 1.2. A number of key documents submitted during the examination are included in this report for Members information.

2. The Examination in Public

2.1. The Inspectors' Agenda for 9 December

The Inspectors produced the attached Agenda and Appendices for the final day of the examination Appendix 1. The agenda includes the inspectors' preliminary conclusion on two areas of the JCS, Affordable Housing and Energy and Water. The GNDP responded to these at the hearing.

An update on the outcome of the meeting will be prepared after the hearing has taken place.

2.2. Response to the Inspectors specific question on flexibility within the JCS

During the examination the Inspectors asked the GNDP a specific question regarding the flexibility of the JCS and its ability to deliver growth in the north east in the early years of the plan.

In order to prepare a written response for the Inspectors the officers met with a number of the relevant parties involved in the north east, including agents, landowners and the Highways Agency, to develop revised wording to explain the flexibility within the JCS as attached Appendix 2. This was submitted to the inspectors with an accompanying statement to justify and explain why the GNDP

believes the strategy is sufficiently flexible.

The wording makes it clear that Postwick junction improvements can be funded and delivered as a separate scheme and Postwick junction is not necessarily dependent on DfT funding. With Postwick hub in place development of at least 1,600 dwellings and strategic employment development can proceed.

It also confirms that Broadland DC will recommence preparation of an AAP that will examine the scale and nature of growth that is appropriate before the NDR is delivered. Beyond that threshold the NDR would be required, or if it is clear the NDR will not happen then a full review of the JCS will be triggered.

2.3. **Minor Changes Schedule and Soundness Schedule**

During the examination the Inspectors in consultation with the GNDP made various suggestions on changes to the JCS policies and supporting text that would assist in making the strategy 'sound'. These suggestions have been added to the Minor Changes Schedule and the Soundness Changes Schedule. A copy of both schedules is attached of information.

3. **Next Steps : Inspectors report**

- 3.1. Following the examination the Inspector will decide whether or not the plan is 'sound'. In this decision the Inspector will take into account the representations received and consider the plan against the tests of soundness

If the plan is found 'sound' it may still be subject to any minor changes as may be detailed in the Inspector's Binding Report. The Councils will be bound by these changes and must incorporate them into the document prior to adoption. The Councils do not have to adopt the DPD but the submission and the Inspectors' Report would be material considerations. If the Inspector finds the plan 'unsound' the Councils will have to undertake the preparation of the plan again.

The Inspectors report will be sent to the GNDP a few weeks after the close of the examination hearings. At the time of writing the Inspectors have not indicated the date for this, but the Planning Inspectorate guidance says this should be issued within 8 weeks of the close of the examination.

The Inspectors draft report that will be sent to the GNDP to check for factual errors, a response is due within two weeks. The Inspectors will then formally issue their Report on the submitted JCS.

It is intended that the GNDP Policy group should consider the Inspectors' final report to ensure an agreed co-ordinated response. On adoption the Councils will produce an adoption statement that will be advertised in the local press and the adopted document, sustainability appraisal, and adoption statement will be available for inspection at the Councils' offices.

4. **Resource Implications**

Costs of preparing the JCS are shared by the three local planning authorities. This report has no additional direct financial implications beyond existing budgets.

5. **Other Implications**

Legal Implications : Primary legislation requires local planning authorities to prepare a Local Development Framework.

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) : The submitted JCS has been subject to an EqIA.

Communications : In accordance with normal practice, a press release will be issued after this meeting

Any other implications : Officers have considered all the implications which members should be aware of. Apart from those listed in the report (above), there are no other implications to take into account.

6. **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

No implications.

7. **Risk Implications/Assessment**

All options carry risks. The recommendation minimises these.

8. **Alternative Options**

None

9. **Conclusion**

The Examination in Public will be complete by the time of the GNDP Policy group meeting. The next milestone is the receipt of the Inspectors Report.

Recommendation / Action Required

Members are recommended

- 1) to note the progress made to date through the examination process and the Inspectors Agenda for the final day of the hearing.
- 2) to note the Inspectors' question and the GNDP's response on the flexibility and contingency in relation to delivery of growth in the north east.
- 3) to note the Schedule of Soundness Changes as submitted to the examination process.

Appendices

1. Appendix 1 – The Inspectors Agenda and Appendices for the additional Hearing Day held on 9 December 2010
2. Appendix 2 – The GNDP response (reference RF117) to the Inspectors question (reference RF75)
3. Appendix 3 – Soundness Changes Schedule (reference RF115)

Background papers - Minor Changes Schedule (reference RF116) available from the GNDP web-site or on request

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Name	Telephone Number	Email address
Sandra Eastaugh	01603 638302	s.eastaugh@gndp.org.uk
Phil Morris	01603 638306	phil.morris@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 and ask for Susan Farrell or textphone 0344 800 8011 and we will do our best to help.

Inspectors Notes for the Additional Hearing Day: 9 December 2010

Examination of the JCS for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk

Agenda

- 1 To discuss the issue carried over from Matter 3B on 17 November concerning the North East Growth Triangle [see Appendix 1 below]
- 2 Taking stock concerning GNDP's proposed 'plan B', concerning development that would be possible in advance of construction of the Northern Distributor Road [See document GNDP document RF97]
- 3 Taking stock concerning the soundness of the Focussed Changes to policy 4 on Affordable Housing [See the Inspectors' preliminary conclusions at Appendix 2 below]
- 4 Taking stock concerning JCS policy 3 [See the Inspectors' preliminary conclusions at Appendix 3 below]
- 5 Taking stock concerning GNDP's proposed new diagrams RF 25A (Proposed Green infrastructure Network) and RF25B (Biodiversity Enhancement Areas). Where are these from and, since they have not been seen before, do they require advertisement?
- 6 Taking stock with regard to GNDP's schedules of soundness-related changes and minor changes
- 7 Any other outstanding matters

APPENDIX 1

Issue 7 Is there a reasonable prospect of other critical non-transport infrastructure being deliverable by the dates required to permit the annualised build-rate for the growth triangle shown on p111?

Note: *The draft Local Infrastructure Plan and Programme (LIPP) sets out a spatial infrastructure 'package' for the north east growth triangle (see p58-67 of doc EiP85). The LIPP did not originally identify the items of key infrastructure without which the annual growth envisaged at Appendix 6 p111 of the JCS cannot occur. We therefore asked GNDP to do this and additional pages were subsequently provided. We will be seeking to clarify the likely 'effectiveness' of the growth triangle in terms of its ability to permit growth to occur on the scale and within the timescales set out at p111 of the JCS.*

[First contribution from GNDP and then other participants in any order]

APPENDIX 2

Affordable Housing – Inspectors’ Preliminary Conclusions

1 Need

1.1 Dealing first with need, it is clear that there are substantial methodological difficulties in projecting need over the timeframe of the JCS to 2026. However, in our view the method adopted by GNDP (drawing upon national best practice and extrapolating from the SHMA) has produced an adequately robust measure of need for AH. The Focussed Changes quantify this at about 11,860 during the period 2008-26, which equates to about 33% of the total JCS housing provision over that timeframe. However, since there was a sizeable backlog at 2008 and it is considered necessary to deal with this as soon as possible, the need is said to be front-loaded, thus amounting to about 43% of annualised provision ‘in the short term’. For the same reason the split between social rented and intermediate tenures, which is about 60/40% over the period as whole, is estimated (in the short term) to be 85/15%.

1.2 Is it reasonable and equitable to base the policy on this front-loaded approach? What is the end date of the ‘short term’? How/when would the implied scaling down of the overall percentage of AH and (within that) the reduced percentage of social rented housing/increased percentage of intermediate housing be dealt with/brought into effect in policy terms?

2 Proposed proportions and thresholds

2.1 The DJD study modelled over 25,000 residual land valuations using a wide range of inputs including a variety of AH thresholds and tenure splits and ranges of assumptions about factors such as build costs and average sales values. The latter covered market conditions in ‘peak’ [2007], ‘trough’ [2009] and ‘current’ [early summer 2010] scenarios, a range of densities and site sizes, and the availability or otherwise of grant.

2.2 Not surprisingly, the sales values seen at the lowest points of the market in 2008-09 make a large proportion of modelled scenarios unviable, regardless of the AH target or other inputs. However, the DJD report finds that, at 40% non-grant aided AH provision, viable schemes fall into the range of 30% to 47% (the former at ‘peak-trough’ conditions and the latter at ‘current-peak’ conditions). It concludes that this demonstrates that a ‘significant proportion’ of the no-grant outcomes are viable. DJD has also made a post-study estimate that 44% of scenarios would be viable based on slightly improved new build values since the study (ie mid to late 2010) and comments that sales values ‘may’ increase even further over the course of the study period, if other factors do not change materially. However, it is currently unclear whether or not the generally upward trend since the trough will continue, become stalled, or be thrown into reverse. [The monthly house-price index appears to have fallen in October and November.] It is also unknown whether or when, after the present ‘period of austerity’, property market conditions will return to the ‘peak’ which, in itself, may perhaps be regarded as representing the unsustainable high-point of a boom.

2.3 Grant-aided scenarios increase the proportions of viable schemes quite substantially, but it is unclear (post-Spending Review) to what extent grant-aid will continue and whether or not other sources of social housing funding may or may not replace it. It certainly appears unlikely that such funds will be available on such a scale as to contribute very far towards

enabling the substantially increased scale of AH provision that the JCS envisages. In our view it would be unsound to place much weight on substantial grant-aid being available.

Tapering

2.4 The study finds that a 40% target is not currently achievable for schemes down to the submitted JCS threshold of 5 but that 'phasing it in' from 5 to 15 units improves viability considerably. The DJD methodology for this phasing 'is similar to' the proposed change to policy 4 (ie 20% for schemes of 5-9 and 30% for schemes of 10-15).

Preliminary conclusions on proportions and thresholds

2.5 For the above reasons we are uncertain that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that 40% is sound, in terms of being reasonably likely to be viable over the lifetime of the plan. We note that even on the DJD report's most optimistic scenario of prices returning at some point to peak levels, a 40% requirement would be more often breached than observed. We have therefore sought more comprehensive evidence of the outputs that would result from the lower percentage scenarios modelled by the DJD report with a view to judging whether there is a more robust alternative percentage. We also note that 40% is more than the quantified need over the whole period, albeit that actual provision would be likely to fall short of 40% due to nil contributions from schemes of 4 or less and smaller contributions from schemes of 5-15 (although this factor may be counterbalanced to some extent by 100% provision in rural exceptions schemes, estimated by GNDP at 1170 over the JCS period, and any other 100% schemes that could be brought forward in various ways through new funding arrangements mentioned in the Spending Review). It is of course always the case that if viability conditions were to improve markedly at such time as national economic conditions improve, a review of the percentage target could be triggered.

2.6 *We note (from new document RF89B) that 30% AH provision would raise viability from 30% to 39% for the 'peak-trough' scenario and from 47% to 60% for the current to peak scenario and wonder whether this points to a more robust measure of soundness which should be incorporated in JCS policy.*

[We also observe that a lower percentage target could possibly enable us to be more supportive of the 'short term' 85/15% tenure split since higher social rented housing is normally a drag on viability compared with a higher proportion of intermediate housing.]

2.7 In our view the tapering provisions in the Focussed Changes are generally sound.

Preliminary views on other factors

2.8 Plainly, the outputs from the modelling are substantially sensitive to variations in the inputs. The study used a notional 1ha site model with a 100% gross/net development area ratio and assumed that this could be applied pro rata to sites of any size and character, rather than collecting data about a range of 'real sites'. It also made standard assumptions about (a) the required uplift in land value (15% above established use value (EUV) for brownfield sites and various multiples of EUV for greenfield sites) and (b) the necessary developer's profit, varying from 17.5% in a strong market to 25% in a weak market. While all

of these inputs are individually debatable, we consider them reasonably robust for the purposes of the study.

2.9 The input figure for future CIL contributions is also pertinent: the study assumes £7000 for each residential unit. This is less than the average that has been required through S106 contributions in the past but nearer to what has been sought for some large schemes recently. Bearing in mind the Local Infrastructure Plan and Programme (LIPP), which identifies additional ranges of items expected to be funded by developers in future, it is feasible that £7000 could prove to be something of an underestimate but in our view the figure is probably robust for present purposes.

2.10 More significant is the modelled assumption concerning building sustainability requirements. The study's base assumption is for private units to comply with current Building Regulations and AH units to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 (CSH3). Sensitivity testing, based on research for DCLG in March 2010, showed that CSH4 is broadly achievable but that CSH5, with 40% AH, could only be achieved in a small number of scenarios. CSH6 (which policy 3 seeks to reach by 2015) was not modelled but would likely make the provision of AH even more rarely achievable if reliance is to continue to be placed on the present mixed funding cross-subsidy model. As acknowledged by GNPD, there is substantial potential clash between the desire to continue using the planning system to produce affordable housing and the cost implications of providing CSH6 housing, especially as zero-carbon housing (under any definition and any form in which it may emerge) will eventually be mandatory under the Building Regulations. We return to this in our consideration of policy 3.

APPENDIX 3

JCS Policy 3 Energy and water – Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions

- 1 Policy 3 aims to maximise the use of low or zero carbon development, subject to environmental constraints. To that end it requires that major developments of over 500 dwellings or 50,000sqm of non residential development must be supplied with all their energy needs from 'dedicated contractually linked decentralised and renewable sources'. Moreover, development below this size must maximise any potential for doing the same and, for any outstanding balance, contribute to a carbon offset fund to make equivalent savings. PPS1 Supplement: *Planning and Climate Change* is generally supportive of local requirements that set a target percentage of the energy to be used in new development coming from 'decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy sources' where (a) this is viable, (b) there is a clear rationale for the target, and (c) it has been properly tested. Where there are particular demonstrable opportunities for increasing the target percentage, such cases should be identified using development area or site specific targets to secure this potential. PPS22: *Renewable Energy (at para 8)* also supports policies in DPDs which require a percentage of the energy to be used in new developments to be derived from on-site renewable energy sources. However, it makes clear that this is subject to viability and that the policy should not be framed in such a way as to place an undue burden on developers, for example by specifying that all of the energy to be used in a development should come from on-site renewable generation.

- 2 The evidence base for this policy is the Sustainable Energy Study for the JCS dated May 2009. This identifies a technical plan-wide renewable energy potential of 129% of the area's current energy consumption. However, this is a 'high level', theoretical study which does not fully consider constraints such as landscape, wildlife habitats and grid connection. In our view it does not provide sufficiently robust evidence to demonstrate that local circumstances exist to justify the mandatory nature of the policy 3 requirements, effectively seeking 100% renewable energy or equivalent compensating carbon offsetting in all cases. This is contrary to national advice in PPS22 and we are not aware of any other local planning authorities seeking to apply a requirement of this kind.
- 3 Although GNDP put forward some changes to policy 3 to (a) bring greater consistency with the terminology employed in the glossary to the PPS1 Supplement and (b) delete the requirement for contractual linking of the energy supplies, we do not consider that these are sufficient to bring policy 3 into line with the approach outlined in PPS1 Supplement. Further change is required to the first two bullet points of policy 3, replacing them by a less mandatory, but still stretching, policy, along the following lines: *Area Action Plans, master planning exercises, or detailed proposals for major developments (minimum 500 dwellings or 50,000 sqm or more of non-residential development), will be required to demonstrate through Sustainable Energy Statements that the scheme is meeting the maximum viable proportion of its energy needs from dedicated, decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources, making the most of any available economies of scale. Sustainable Energy Statements will also be required for smaller developments (minimum 10 dwellings or 1,000sqm of non-residential development), demonstrating that the most practicable contribution from such sources has been identified, taking account of the specific circumstances of the site.*
- 4 Turning to sustainable building construction (bullet points 3 and 4 of policy 3), the PPS1 Supplement states that planning authorities should help to achieve the national timetable for reducing carbon emissions from development and acknowledges that there will be situations where it would be appropriate for authorities to anticipate levels of building sustainability in advance of those set out nationally. However, it advises that proposed local requirements for sustainable buildings must be based on clearly demonstrated local circumstances that both warrant and allow this, such as clear opportunities for significant use of decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy, or circumstances in which without the stated requirement (for example on water efficiency) the development in question would be unacceptable in its location.
- 5 Policy 3 requires all new housing development to reach Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 (CSH4) after adoption of the JCS and CSH6 by 2015, with qualifying non-residential development meeting BREEAM excellent standards after adoption and BREEAM outstanding, or equivalent, from 2015.
- 6 The financial impacts of the JCS requirements on development costs are uncertain. However, they could have a significant impact on such costs, and thereby on the viability of affordable housing. Direct tension could therefore arise between JCS objectives in policies 3 and 4. National policy on the definition of zero-carbon development has yet to emerge and it remains to be seen (a) what form the national

target (to reach the standard by 2016) will take, and (b) what role carbon offsetting may play in this process. In the meantime we consider that there is no firm justification for placing all development in the JCS area on a mandatory faster track in terms of sustainability standards. In our view further change to the third and fourth bullet points of policy 3 is required along the lines set out beneath to reduce their mandatory nature, while still encouraging opportunities to be taken for maximising the use of sustainable construction where the scale or economics of development makes this achievable or other specific circumstances permit it. Thus: *'Development proposals over 10 dwellings or 1000sqm will be required to demonstrate, through the submission of Sustainable Construction Statements, that all viable and practicable steps have been taken to maximise opportunities for sustainable construction.'*

- 7 Looking finally at water-related matters, the JCS area is one of 'water stress', close to internationally protected sites including the Norfolk Broads. These are therefore critical issues. Policy 3 makes all new development dependent on the provision of sufficient water infrastructure and the protection or improvement of water quality. We were impressed that the relevant providers and regulatory bodies are working well together to fulfil their various responsibilities while also meeting the challenging task of providing the infrastructure that will be necessary both to cater for the substantial scale of growth proposed in the JCS and to address the demands of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the Habitats Directive (HD). This will require timely and appropriate investment at a number of waste water treatment works referred to elsewhere in this report and a proposed new interceptor sewer required to serve some of the major growth areas such as the North East Triangle.
- 8 Turning specifically to water usage, abstraction within the River Wensum SAC has given rise to reduced flows and unfavourable conditions and the water providers and regulators therefore intend to reduce abstraction from one of the main sources of supply at Costessey to historic levels. The current plans of Anglian Water Services (AWS) should create sufficient headroom to achieve this by 2015, while headroom and demand forecasts will also be reviewed and reset in 2014. Measures to reduce water use, including metering, will play a part in achieving the objectives of the JCS but policy 3 also proposes the imposition of CSH4 water-related standards on adoption and CHS6 water standards by 2015, including grey water recycling and rainwater harvesting.. While this would have cost implications, we accept that careful husbanding and management of water resources are important to reinforce the actions being taken to address the long-term challenges of the WFD and HD by improving water quality in this particular area. We therefore support this part of policy 3.

**Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk:
 Schedule of retained Focussed Changes and proposed Soundness changes arising from the Examination in Public
 hearings 9 November 2010 – 9 December 2010.**

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/ Policy	Proposed Change	Reason for Change
Retained Focussed Changes				
FC 1	Page 41	Policy 4	<p>In Policy 4, delete:</p> <p>Affordable housing</p> <p>A proportion of affordable housing, including an appropriate tenure-mix, will be required on site in accordance with the most up-to date needs assessment for the plan area, for sites of five or more dwellings (or 0.2 hectares or more). At the adoption of this strategy the target is 40% based on the most recent assessment.</p> <p>In negotiating the proportion and tenure of affordable housing, account will be taken of site characteristics and the economic viability of provision. Where viability is an issue financial support will be sought via public subsidy, such as through the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA).</p> <p>At appropriate settlements, sites that would not normally be released for housing will be considered for schemes that specifically meet an identified local need for affordable homes. Such schemes must ensure that the properties are made available in perpetuity for this purpose.”</p>	<p>To clarify the policy approach, and give more emphasis to the recognition that housing development viability is critical to the delivery of affordable houses on mixed tenure developments, taking into account the study of affordable housing viability undertaken by Drivers Jonas Deloitte. To clarify that where viability of the development is shown to be at risk, negotiations will include consideration of reducing the overall amount of affordable housing sought, and the balance of tenures within the affordable housing to restore the viability of the</p>

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/ Policy	Proposed Change	Reason for Change
			<p>Replace with</p> <p>Affordable housing</p> <p>A proportion of affordable housing, including an appropriate tenure mix, will be sought on all sites for 5 or more dwellings (or 0.2 hectares or more). The proportion of affordable housing, and mix of tenure sought will be based on the most up to date needs assessment for the plan area. At the adoption of this strategy the target proportion to meet the demonstrated housing need is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On sites for 5-9 dwellings (or 0.2 – 0.4 ha), 20% with tenure to be agreed on a site by site basis (numbers rounded, upwards from 0.5) • On sites for 10-15 dwellings (or 0.4 – 0.6 ha), 30% with tenure to be agreed on a site by site basis (numbers rounded, upwards from 0.5) • On sites for 16 dwellings or more (or over 0.6 ha) 40% with approximate 85% social rented and 15% intermediate tenures (numbers rounded, upwards from 0.5) <p>The proportion of affordable housing sought may be reduced and the balance of tenures amended where it can be demonstrated that site characteristics, including infrastructure provision, together with the requirement for affordable housing would render the site unviable in prevailing market conditions, taking account of the availability of public subsidy to support affordable housing.</p> <p>At appropriate settlements, sites that would not normally be released for housing will be considered for schemes that</p>	<p>scheme. To clarify that, as part of the consideration of viability, the potential for public subsidy will be investigated.</p>

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/ Policy	Proposed Change	Reason for Change
			specifically meet an identified local need for affordable homes. Such schemes must ensure that the properties are made available in perpetuity for this purpose.”	
FC 2	Page 44	Policy 4, Supporting text	<p>In paragraph 5.29, delete the following text</p> <p>“In some instances providing 40% affordable housing on-site will not be viable, without public subsidy. In such circumstances a financial contribution, such as a grant from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), will be sought. In order to create mixed communities, affordable housing provided as part of a market development will be expected to be integrated within the site.”</p> <p>Replace with</p> <p>“It is recognised that affordable housing provided through developer contributions in this way is dependent upon the overall viability of development. In some instances providing 40% affordable housing on-site will not be viable, without public subsidy. A study of affordable housing viability has concluded that smaller sites in particular may not be viable if the full 40% target were applied, but that in the market conditions prevailing in mid 2010, the 40% affordable housing target is achievable in a significant number of the scenarios modelled without social housing grant. Where this proves not to be the case financial contribution, such as a grant from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), will be sought. Where it can be demonstrated that the target requirement for affordable housing would make a site unviable in prevailing market conditions, taking into account policy aims relating to the environmental standards of homes,</p>	To take account of the proposed focussed change FC1 and the conclusions of the Assessment of Affordable Housing Viability undertaken by Drivers Jonas Deloitte.

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/ Policy	Proposed Change	Reason for Change
			<p>and there are insufficient public funds available to support affordable housing, a reduced proportion of affordable homes and/or an amended mix of tenures will be negotiated. In order to create mixed communities, affordable housing provided as part of a market development will be expected to be integrated within the site.”</p>	
FC 3	Page 44	Policy 4, supporting text	<p>In paragraph 5.28 delete the following</p> <p>“Affordable housing is defined as ‘housing provided for rent, sale or shared equity at prices permanently below the current market rate, which people in housing need are able to afford’. The EEP has a regional target for 35% of all housing to be affordable and recognises higher targets may be required locally. The findings of the most recent housing needs assessment for the three districts indicates that 43% of overall housing need can only be met by affordable housing. Experience locally shows that 40% is the maximum achievable on sites without subsidy, in normal market conditions. A large amount of residential development is expected to take place on smaller sites in both urban and rural locations. If the PPS3 threshold of 15 dwellings were to be applied then a further significant undersupply of affordable dwellings would result. Consequently, in order to make realistic inroads into the identified need and provide affordable housing across a wide range of sites 40% affordable housing will be sought on all sites of 5 units or more.</p> <p>Replace with</p> <p>5.28 Affordable housing is defined as ‘housing provided for rent, sale or shared equity at prices permanently below the current market rate, which people in housing need are able</p>	<p>To take account of the Government’s intended revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy (East of England Plan) and to introduce a plan wide target for the provision of affordable housing into the plan which meets the requirements of PPS3 that the provision of affordable housing should meet the needs of current and future occupiers taking into account the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The requirement that account should be taken of viability and likely levels of finance available is recognised in FC1 and FC2, but in a volatile market, such factors are</p>

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/ Policy	Proposed Change	Reason for Change
			<p>to afford’.</p> <p>5.28A Based on the most recent assessment of housing need, there is a need in the plan area as a whole for about 11,860 affordable homes with approximately 60% of these being social rented, and 40% intermediate tenures from 2008 to 2026. This is derived from the annual net requirement for new affordable houses extrapolated over the plan period, and the backlog existing at the time of the housing needs assessment, with allowance made for the affordable housing provided up to the base date of this strategy. This represents just over 33% of the total housing requirement set out in the table above.</p> <p>5.28B The most recent housing needs assessment for the three districts indicates that, in the short term, 43% of overall housing need can only be met by affordable housing. The policy target of 40% for * affordable housing on qualifying sites takes account of local experience which suggests that 40% is the maximum achievable on sites without subsidy in normal market conditions, the expectation, of the Government’s basic needs assessment model within the Government’s guidance,** that current backlogs will be addressed in the short term, and the fact that not all sites will deliver the target percentage, for example because of viability issues, or previous planning policies in the case of sites with permission at the base date. The assessment of housing need also indicates that the current split of affordable tenures required to meet need in the short term, taking into account the current backlog, is approximately 85% social rented / 15% intermediate tenures, with the greatest need for social rented accommodation related to</p>	<p>hard to quantify in the long term. To take account of the findings of the affordable housing viability study undertaken by Drivers Jonas Deloitte</p> <p>NB Bold amendments made following Focussed Change consultation:</p> <p>*For consistency with the proposed policy taking into account the graduated target on small sites</p> <p>**Correction of wording</p>

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/ Policy	Proposed Change	Reason for Change
			<p>the Norwich urban area. The overall target, policy target, and balance of tenures will be kept under review in the light of updated information on housing need.</p> <p>5.28C A large amount of residential development is expected to take place on smaller sites in both urban and rural locations. If the PPS3 threshold of 15 dwellings were to be applied then a further significant undersupply of affordable dwellings would result. Consequently, in order to make realistic inroads into the identified need and provide affordable housing across a wide range of sites a proportion of affordable housing will be sought on all sites of 5 units or more.”</p>	
FC 4	44	Policy 4, supporting text	At end of Paragraph 5.30 add “On the evidence of recent achievements and the programme schemes in mid 2010, this is likely to produce about 1170 affordable homes between 2008 and 2026, though this is subject to the availability of funding.”	To give an indication of the potential contribution of Exceptions sites to meeting local housing need.
FC 6	44-45	Policy 4, supporting text	<p>a) Delete paragraph 5.32, and replace with</p> <p>“A partial revision to the East of England Plan in 2009 set requirements for the provision of pitches to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in accordance with the requirements of Government Circular 01/2006. The target set was for 58 net additional pitches across the GNDP area to be provided by 2011. Beyond this the East of England Plan set an approach to longer term provision based on extrapolation which equated to a need for an additional 78 pitches between 2012-2026. The targets up to 2011 were broadly supported by the Greater Norwich Development Partnership authorities who considered</p>	To take into account the Government’s intention to abolish the Regional Spatial Strategy, to substitute an appropriate locally supported target, and to indicate a mechanism for updating the target. The intention to abolish the Regional Spatial Strategy makes the explanation in

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/ Policy	Proposed Change	Reason for Change
			<p>them reasonable in the light of the Norfolk wide Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment undertaken in July, 2007. However, beyond 2011 the proposed approach was disputed and the local authorities consider this level of need would be better determined by updated local evidence. It should be noted that a pitch represents a family unit and may therefore accommodate more than one caravan. On average about 1.7 caravans occupy each pitch. Since 2006, 11 pitches have been permitted or completed in Broadland, 14 in South Norfolk and an application for a further 3 is pending in Norwich."</p> <p>b) Delete Paragraph 5.35</p>	Paragraph 5.35 unnecessary.
FC 7	45	Policy 4, Para 5.36	<p>Delete paragraph 5.36, and replace with</p> <p>"There is a large existing site for Travelling Show People in Norwich, which is fully occupied, and local evidence suggests there is a need for further accommodation. Each plot will need to include room for vehicles providing accommodation and also for the maintenance and storage of fairground rides and equipment."</p>	To take into account the Government's intention to abolish the Regional Spatial Strategy, and to substitute an appropriate locally supported target.

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/Policy	Proposed Change	Matter no.
Proposed Soundness Changes				
SC 1	32	Policy 1	<p>Policy changes:</p> <p>a) Remove both instances of the word “significant” from paragraph 1 of column 2 of Policy 1.</p> <p>b) Insert new paragraph 2 in column 2 of policy 1: “Development likely to have any adverse effect on nationally designated sites and species will be assessed in accordance with national policy and legislation.”</p>	8
SC 2	33	5.6	<p>Amend paragraph 5.6 last sentence</p> <p>an ecological network as illustrated by the map on page x which includes:</p> <p>Amend last bullet to “corridors and stepping stones through green infrastructure improvements”</p> <p><i>Add new map Biodiversity Enhancement Areas (RF25a)</i></p>	8
SC 3	34	5.8	<p>a) Delete word “significant” from last sentence.</p> <p>b) Insert new sentence at end of paragraph 5.8.</p> <p>“These internationally designated sites are protected under the Habitats Regulations. To reflect the findings of the Habitats Regulation Assessment of the JCS, the policy places a particular focus on their protection in relation to water quality, water resource and visitor pressures.”</p>	8

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/Policy	Proposed Change	Matter no.
SC 4	34 and 35	Additional paragraph following 5.8	<p>Insert paragraph after 5.8 to refer to Green Infrastructure map.</p> <p>“A proposed green infrastructure network (see map) for the whole Greater Norwich area has been identified to inform more detailed policies elsewhere in LDFs and the green infrastructure priority areas supporting growth locations set out on page 69.”</p> <p>Delete diagram on page 35 and insert new diagram to replace it: <i>Proposed Green Infrastructure Network (RF25b)</i></p>	8
SC 5	37	Paragraph 5.12	Amend the sentence beginning “Initially” to read: At least a “silver standard” will be expected. Though achieving the highest level is not a policy requirement, it is anticipated that over time an increasing proportion of development will achieve the “gold standard”	8
SC 6	39	Paragraph 5.16	<p>For clarity</p> <p>a) After the word “contributions” insert “through Section 106”</p> <p>b) Insert new sentence at end of paragraph 5.16 “In the circumstances where viability is a concern in relation to the energy policy requirements, applicants will need to demonstrate this through “open book accounting” similar to that set out for affordable housing.”</p>	8
SC 7	38	Policy 3	<p>Policy changes:</p> <p>Make soundness related changes to policy 3</p> <p>First paragraph:</p> <p>Replace “renewable energy” with “decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy”</p>	

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/Policy	Proposed Change	Matter no.
			<p>Bullet point 1;</p> <p>Replace “dedicated, contractually linked renewable sources” with “dedicated decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources”</p> <p>Replace “renewable energy infrastructure” with “decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure”</p> <p>Bullet point 2:</p> <p>Replace “renewable sources” with “decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources”</p>	
SC 8	42	Policy 4	<p>a) Amend last sentence of final paragraph from: “These will be located on sites within the Norwich urban area, or if sites within the urban area cannot be identified, close to it.” To: “These will be located on sites within the Norwich urban area, or if sites within the urban area cannot be identified, with easy access to it.”</p> <p>b) Add additional paragraph at end of Policy 4 to read: “The Government has signalled its intention to revoke the Regional Spatial Strategy. When this is enacted new targets for permanent residential and transit pitches for the period after 2011 will be set, based on local evidence.”</p>	FC 5 not proceeded with but current status of RSS still necessitate s amendmen t
SC 9	49	5.44	Add sentence: “The corridor currently protected (100m either side of the centre line of the current scheme) and the associated Postwick Hub will be shown on the Broadland District Council adopted Proposals Map”	1b
SC 10	56	Add to 2 nd bullet relating to employment locations (i.e. UEA/ NRP)	Add text: “In view of the specific nature of the employment sought in this location, including the need to dovetail with the aims of significant and diverse existing institutions, detailed proposals will be developed through the preparation of development plan documents”	EIP79

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/Policy	Proposed Change	Matter no.
SC 11	57	New paragraph after 6.5	<p>Insert new paragraph after paragraph 6.5 to explain the means of providing for the smaller sites allowance to say,</p> <p>“The smaller sites allowance is intended to provide a balance between site sizes and locations to encourage flexibility and the shorter term delivery of new housing. The locations of the smaller sites will be decided in accordance with the settlement hierarchy defined in paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3. The smaller sites will be less than the 1000 dwellings or more identified at strategic growth locations, and will reflect the scales of development provided for at each level of the settlement hierarchy described in policies 12, 14, 15 and 16. The allocations will be dependent upon the availability and suitability of sites proposed through the Site Specific Policies and Allocations Development Plan Document production process, and will reflect the form, character and services capacities of each locality. “</p>	10
SC 12	62	Policy 10, Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle	<p>Amend second sentence of first paragraph to read:</p> <p>“Delivery of the growth triangle in its entirety is dependent on the implementation of the Northern Distributor Road. “</p>	GNDP response (RF97) to Inspectors question (RF75)
SC 13	63	Policy 10, Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle bullet 2	<p>Amend 2nd bullet from “a district centre based around an accessible ‘high street’ and including a new library, education and health facilities. The development will also require new local centres”</p> <p>To</p> <p>“a district centre based around an accessible ‘high street’ and including a new library, education and health facilities. This may be provided by building on the proposed centre at Blue Boar Lane or by the creation of a second district centre elsewhere in the Growth Triangle. The development will also require new local centres”.</p>	6

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/Policy	Proposed Change	Matter no.
SC 14	63	Policy 10, Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle	<p>Insert additional sentence into final paragraph of column 2 to read:</p> <p>“A single co-ordinated approach will be required across the whole area. <i>This will be provided through the preparation of an Area Action Plan (or any future equivalent process)</i>. More detailed masterplanning will be required for each quarter.”</p>	GNDP response (RF97) to Inspectors question (RF75)
SC 15	66-67	Paragraph 6.18	<p>Amend paragraph from:</p> <p>“To implement the JCS significant highway improvements are required at the Longwater (A1074), Thickthorn (A11) and Harford (A140) junctions on the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass. Completion of the Northern Distributor Road and improvements to Postwick junction are a fundamental requirement for growth and the implementation of the remainder of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy including public transport enhancements. Completion of a bypass is a pre-requisite for the scale of growth identified in Long Stratton.”</p> <p>To:</p> <p>“To implement the JCS significant highway improvements are required at the Longwater (A1074), Thickthorn (A11) and Harford (A140) junctions on the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass. Completion of the Northern Distributor Road <i>is fundamental to the full implementation of this Joint Core Strategy. In particular it is necessary to allow significant development in the growth triangle and the full implementation of the remainder of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy. The completion of appropriate improvements at Postwick junction would allow for some development in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle in advance of the NDR (see supporting text for Policy 20)</i>. Completion of a bypass is a pre-requisite for the scale of growth identified in Long Stratton.”</p>	GNDP response (RF97) to Inspectors question (RF75)

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/Policy	Proposed Change	Matter no.
SC 16	68	After paragraph 6.23	<p>Add additional new paragraph to supporting text to clarify Policy 10, first paragraph, second sentence</p> <p>The Policy provides for new communities and a wide range of development. Consequently the provision of new services and infrastructure will also have wider benefits for existing communities. The Policy aims in this respect do not require developers to directly fund existing deficiencies</p>	
SC 17	74	Policy 12	Following policy second paragraph reading “Throughout the suburban area and fringe parishes opportunities will be sought:”, insert new bullet point to become the first bullet point to read, “to identify land to contribute towards the smaller sites allowance set out in Policy 9”	10
SC 18	79	Settlement Hierarchy map	Revise Key label “Norwich Urban Area” to read “Norwich Urban Area including urban fringe parishes” and relocate to the head of the settlement hierarchy beneath new heading “ Settlement Hierarchy” with roads and railway symbols moved to form part of general map key, in order to give added clarity to the complete hierarchy	10
SC 19	80	Policy 14	first paragraph/ second line - delete “broadly”	10
SC 20	80	Paragraph 6.43	<p>Amend final sentence to read “The KSCs with more limited services and lacking a secondary school have the lowest housing allocations, i.e. Blofield, Brundall and Hingham.”</p> <p>Add a new paragraph following 6.43 to read, “Where a range is specified, the scale of new development is expected to be within the range. In exceptional circumstances, a range may be exceeded where it can clearly be demonstrated that the resulting development would respect the form and character of the settlement and bring sustainability benefits for the existing population as well as providing for new residents. This might, for example, be through improved local facilities, or connections to them, or through meeting other defined local needs.”</p>	10

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/Policy	Proposed Change	Matter no.
SC 21	81	6.51	<p>Delete the last sentence, “Improvements to sewage treatment works may require phasing.”</p> <p>Revise the fourth sentence to read, “New development of 100-200 dwellings is proposed to 2026 which may require the small scale expansion of all local schools.”</p>	10
SC 22	84	Policy 15	<p>Add footnote (in separate box) as below:</p> <p>“This policy will necessitate a number of changes to the adopted proposals maps for South Norfolk. New settlement limits will be needed for Alburgh, Bergh Apton, Bramerton and Carleton Rode.</p> <p>These will be defined through the preparation of the South Norfolk Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document”</p>	EIP79
SC 23	85	6.58	<p>Last sentence – delete wording “Service villages in the NPA may also be considered for additional allocations” and replace with, “Further allocations may be considered in Service Villages in the NPA “</p>	10
SC 24	86	Policy 16	<p>Add footnote (in separate box) as below:</p> <p>“N. B. This policy will necessitate a number of changes to the adopted proposals maps for Broadland and South Norfolk. New settlement limits will be needed for Aldeby, Burgh St Peter, Caistor St Edmund, Claxton, Colton, Denton, Flordon, Forncett St Mary, Great Melton, Hardwick, Hedenham, Keswick, Ketteringham, Langley Street Marlingford, Shotesham, Starston, Swainsthorpe, Tibenham, Tivetshall St Margaret, Tivetshall St Mary, Toft Monks, and Topcroft Street.</p> <p>These will be defined through the preparation of the South Norfolk Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document</p> <p>A limited number of existing settlement limits shown on the adopted proposals maps for Broadland and South Norfolk will be deleted. This applies to</p>	

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/Policy	Proposed Change	Matter no.
			Felthorpe, Honingham, Upton, Ranworth, Wacton, Weston Longville and Woodbastwick. The policy change making this necessary will take effect on adoption of the Joint Core Strategy”	
SC 25	89	Policy 19, point 3.	Delete text and replace with: The large village and district centres of: Acle, Coltishall, Hethersett, Hingham, Loddon, Long Stratton, Poringland and Reepham, and within the Norwich urban area at Aylsham Road, Drayton Road, Bowthorpe, Dereham Road, Eaton Centre, Earlham House, Larkman centre, Plumstead Road, Old Catton and Dussindale (Thorpe St Andrew). New district centres/high streets to be established at Blue Boar Lane, Sprowston and Hall Road, Norwich. The Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St. Andrew Growth Triangle will be served by a district centre. This may be provided by building on the proposed district centre at Blue Boar Lane or the creation of a second district centre elsewhere in the Triangle as determined through the Area Action Plan for the Growth Triangle.	
SC 26	89	6.74	Add sentence to end of paragraph. “This may be through building on the proposed centre at Blue Boar Lane or the creation of a second district centre elsewhere in the Growth Triangle. This will be determined through the Area Action Plan for the area”.	6
SC 27	90	Policy 20	Replace Policy 20 with the following text:	4 and GNDP response (RF97) to Inspectors question (RF75)

Implementation and Monitoring

Policy 20 applies to the whole strategy area

Policy 20 Implementation

A coordinated approach will be taken to the timely provision and ongoing maintenance of infrastructure, services and facilities to support development.

Provision will be achieved through:

- contributions towards strategic infrastructure from all residential and commercial development, made through the introduction of an area wide community infrastructure levy plus appropriate Section 106 contributions for site specific needs. Until such a time as a local CIL is introduced, all contributions will be made through Section 106 in line with current legislation and national policy, including the pooling of contributions.
- maximising mainstream Government funding sources including the Homes and Communities Agency, Local Transport Plan, Growth Point Funding, Regional Funding Allocation and Community Infrastructure Funding and other new funding streams, including European funding sources
- co-ordination with the investment programmes of other public bodies e.g. National Health Service
- capital investment by utilities companies through their asset management plans to their regulator which identify the capital investment required
- innovative approaches to capital investment based on forecast future revenue
- consideration of other potential funding mechanisms

Local Planning Authorities and the County Council will make use, where necessary, of their legal powers to bring about strategically significant development, including compulsory purchase.

Future maintenance of the infrastructure provided will be achieved either through adoption by a public body with maintenance payments, where appropriate, or other secure arrangements such as the establishment of a local infrastructure management body.

Implementation of this Joint Core Strategy will depend on the co-ordinated activities of a number of agencies. It is essential that necessary infrastructure is provided in a timely manner related to the needs of new development. The precise timing will be carried out through reviews of the delivery programme, but the underlying principles will be to provide attractive, sustainable communities, to avoid placing an undue strain on existing services and to ensure that residents of new developments do not form patterns of behaviour which ultimately threaten the viability of new services.

Infrastructure that is essential to secure sustainable development will include:

- appropriate transport infrastructure including the implementation of NATS and the construction of the NDR and improved public transport
- affordable or supported housing
- social infrastructure, including education, healthcare, police and emergency services, community facilities
- local and renewable energy generation
- water conservation measures
- sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)
- strategic sewers
- open space and green infrastructure, including habitat creation, pedestrian and cycle links, allotments, recreation facilities, parks, trees, hedgerows, woodland and landscaping
- utilities, including waste management/ recycling/composting facilities
- street furniture
- public art

The developers of strategic growth areas will be required to enter into an ongoing commitment to support community development to bring about a genuinely sustainable community including fostering the growth of community and voluntary organisations.

7.1 This Joint Core Strategy has been formulated on the basis of implementing the major growth in housing and employment so that they are coordinated with relevant infrastructure, services and facilities. It is not the intention of this JCS to permit housing growth to outstrip and be developed in advance of supporting employment and a full range of hard and soft infrastructure.

7.2 The delivery vehicle for co-ordination, prioritisation and management, including contributions and funds, is the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP). The GNDP will develop and manage a delivery programme supporting the implementation of

this Joint Core Strategy in partnership with stakeholders. The programme will be implemented through the Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP) or any successor delivery plan, and will be regularly updated. The key elements of the programme are set out in the draft Implementation Framework in Appendix 7.

- 7.3 Significant and timely investment will be required to implement the JCS. Developer contributions will be sought through a combination of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and planning obligations. The CIL will apply to both residential and commercial development. Until a locally derived CIL has been implemented local authorities in the Greater Norwich area will continue to use planning obligations through S106, including pooling when appropriate and in accordance with current practice and legislation.
- 7.4 The CIL will be set at a level that does not undermine the viability of development. Studies identify that the cost of required infrastructure is likely to exceed expected income from all sources. The GNDP will address the implications of any funding gap for the infrastructure delivery programme, including prioritisation and seeking additional funding from government. It will seek to maximise investment from mainstream public sector funding and explore innovative ways to fund infrastructure investment. Other funding streams might include:
- The New Homes Bonus
 - Tax Increment Financing (TIF)
 - Regional Growth Fund
- 7.5 It is the GNDP's intention to submit a charging schedule in accordance with the regulations. The GNDP will regularly review the infrastructure needs of this Joint Core Strategy and development values, updating the charging schedule as necessary. Between these reviews, the CIL will be index-linked as set out in the regulations.
- 7.6 The GNDP will expect utility providers to ensure that their asset management plans take full account of the infrastructure needed to accommodate the development proposed in this JCS.

Monitor and Manage

- 7.8 The monitoring framework in Appendix 8 includes performance indicators and targets to assess how the Joint Core Strategy's objectives are being met. Some of these indicators are core output indicators, which the Government require us to collect. The other local indicators have been developed to address matters relevant to this area. Many of the indicators derive from the Sustainability Appraisal.
- 7.9 Contextual indicators are also used. These illustrate wider objectives such as for health and education. A Local Area Agreement has been established in Norfolk and a set of 35 indicators prioritised reflecting the key local concerns relating to the area's well being. These indicators are published separately.
- 7.10 The Greater Norwich Development Partnership will publish an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The AMR is a check on the performance of the Joint Core Strategy and gives the opportunity to adjust policies and review objectives and to revise the Local Development Scheme. The outcomes will inform the need for reviews of the LIPP, this JCS and other Local Development Documents.

Review

- 7.11 The Joint Core Strategy is dependent on significant investment in supporting infrastructure. New development will contribute to this. However, the provision of infrastructure beyond that normally provided as part of the development will need the active co-operation of and investment by other agencies. These include utility companies, health care providers, central and local government, the Highways Agency and rail providers. Every effort will be made to ensure appropriate and timely supporting infrastructure is delivered. In the event of a critical shortfall, the Joint Core Strategy will be reviewed.

Contingency

- 7.12 The GNDP will be working to bring forward all growth proposals and associated infrastructure as early as possible to maximise delivery and flexibility. This will be facilitated by engagement with developers to understand opportunities, overcome constraints and maximise development potential without compromising quality.
- 7.13 There is no phasing of growth in the JCS beyond that imposed by the provision of infrastructure. At the time of adoption the provision of most critical elements of infrastructure is not expected to be a significant constraint. However, there remains some

uncertainty around the timing of the delivery of the Northern Distributor Road (NDR). The NDR is fundamental to overall delivery of housing and employment growth in the Broadland part of the NPA and to significant parts of NATS including high-quality public transport in the northern part of the urban area. At the base date of the JCS there is a significant housing commitment that is unaffected by infrastructure constraints. Delay in delivering the NDR does not prevent JCS provision of housing or employment development within Norwich City or South Norfolk Council areas, or existing housing commitment in Broadland as demonstrated in Appendix 7. Indeed, market pressures are likely to bring forward development in these locations in this scenario. The existing commitment and the range and scale of growth proposals across the JCS area provide significant flexibility to bring forward growth in those locations unaffected by infrastructure constraints.

- 7.14 In late 2010 proposals for Postwick were significantly advanced. The scheme and associated development has planning permission and the design of the layout of the junction has been agreed by the Highways Agency. The Postwick Hub and the Northern Distributor Road are in the DfT Development Pool and the funding decision will be announced by the end of 2011. The NDR will be subject to a separate statutory planning process.
- 7.15 The Postwick Hub can be delivered as a separate scheme and is not necessarily dependent on DfT funding. Contributions from all of the following sources may be used to secure delivery:
- DfT development pool (decision due by end of 2011)
 - Existing Growth Point funding
 - Pooled Section 106 (until replaced by CIL)
 - CIL (expected to be introduced late 2011)
 - Local Authorities' capital funding programmes
 - New Homes Bonus
 - Tax Increment Financing
 - Other funding streams
- 7.16 The existing commitment of 1400 dwellings in the Sprowston Fringe can take place without improvements to Postwick Junction. Subject to acceptable improvements to Postwick Junction (Postwick Hub or a suitable alternative) there is significant potential for further development in the growth triangle before there is confirmation of the timing of delivery of the NDR. The table below summarises the current understanding of this potential.

Location	Level of growth supported by current evidence	Constrained development
Growth Triangle	At least 1600 dwellings (plus 200 exemplar at Rackheath prior to Postwick junction improvements)	New employment allocation at Rackheath
Smaller sites in Broadland NPA	Delivery of the smaller sites allowance will be dealt with on a site by site basis	
Broadland Business Park	Development of existing allocation and new allocation (approx 18ha incl c50,000m2 B1)	
Airport area		New employment allocation

7.17 Broadland District Council is committed to preparing an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the growth triangle. As part of the preparation of this AAP there will be an investigation of the potential to enable further growth over and above that shown in Table 1 above, in advance of confirmation of timing of the NDR. This analysis would need to cover capacity of all local infrastructure (not just road capacity), the implications of particular sites, and the nature of development proposed. It will be essential that the growth is delivered in accordance with the overall strategy, taking into account its wider impact across the Norwich area, including a full range of infrastructure provision, services and high-quality public transport, walking and cycling.

7.18 Development beyond the pre-NDR threshold established through the AAP process will not be possible without a commitment to the NDR. If there is no possibility of the timely construction of the NDR, a complete review of the JCS would be triggered.

Reference	Page No.	Paragraph/Policy	Proposed Change	Matter no.
SC 28	112	Appendix 7	Replace with Appendix 3 of EIP 84, suitably updated with GI projects identified in Policy 10, waste water and police services. Add summary trajectory as in RF26. Revised Appendix on following page.	4

Appendix 7: Implementation Framework and Critical Path

The framework lists infrastructure required to facilitate development promoted in this JCS. It is early work and is not intended to be an exhaustive or precise list of the entire infrastructure that will be needed by 2026. Additional infrastructure will be needed beyond this date, including in the growth triangle where 3,000 dwellings are proposed after 2026. The GNDP will manage a delivery programme supporting the implementation of this Joint Core Strategy. The programme will be developed through the Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP). As decisions are made locally and nationally on prioritisation and funding of infrastructure, the content, phasing and priorities of this list will be amended accordingly. This will happen via the LIPP process which will be subject to regular review.

The definition of the three levels of priority is derived from the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study (INF 1; in particular see Page 194) but expands the Study’s definition to explicitly recognise the differential impact on the overall strategy. Consequently, the categories are:

Priority 1 Infrastructure is fundamental to the strategy or must happen to enable physical growth. It includes key elements of transport, water and electricity infrastructure and green infrastructure requirements from the Habitats Regulation Assessment. Failure to deliver infrastructure that is fundamental to the strategy would have such an impact that it would require the strategy to be reviewed. This particularly applies to the NDR and the associated package of public transport enhancement. The sustainable transport requirements of the strategy and much of the development to the north of the built up area is dependent on these key elements of NATS.

Priority 2 Infrastructure is essential to significant elements of the strategy and required if growth is to be achieved in a timely and sustainable manner. Failure to address these infrastructure requirements is likely to result in the refusal of planning permission for individual growth proposals, particularly in the medium term as pressures build and any existing capacity is used up.

Priority 3 Infrastructure is required to deliver the overall vision for sustainable growth but is unlikely to prevent development in the short to medium term. The overall quality of life in the area is likely to be poorer without this infrastructure. Failure to address these infrastructure requirements is likely to result in the refusal of planning permission for individual growth proposal.

Table 1 shows a housing trajectory extract with Priority one infrastructure constraints. The thresholds indicated mark the point at which we currently have some certainty about the level of growth that can be supported. Depending on site characteristics, the nature of proposed development and other infrastructure constraints, these points may not be absolute barriers to further growth. Moreover some points mark the beginning of phased implementation over a number of years.

Table 2 – Infrastructure Framework shows infrastructure requirements to support growth across the JCS period.

Table 1: Housing Trajectory Extract with Priority 1 Infrastructure

	Short Term							Medium Term							Long Term						Total Units	Ave Build rate				
	2011/12		2012/13	2013/14	2014/15		2015/16		2016/17		2017/18	2018/19		2019/20		2020/21		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24				2024/25	2025/26	
Infrastructure ref		T2a				T5		T14 T17		T1	G16 G17			T3		SP1 T7		U3		U5 U6	SP13					
Rackheath	180		230	230	230		230		230			230	230		230		230	230	230			230	230	3400	227	
Remainder of NE Growth Triangle					125		225		350			350	350		350		350	350	350			350	350	3850	321	
Cumulative total	180		410	640	995		1450		2030			2610	3190		3770		4350		4930	5510	6090		6670	7250	7250	
Norwich City					250		250		250			250	250		250		250	250	250			250	250	3000	250	
Cumulative total					250		500		750			1000	1250		1500		1750		2000	2250	2250		2500	2750	3000	
Long Stratton											50	140		230		230		230	230	230			230	230	1800	250
Cumulative total											50	190		420		650		880	1110	1340			1570	1800	1800	
Wymondham					185		185		185			185	185		185		185	185	185			185	165	2200	183	
Hethersett					50		90		175			175	175		175		100	60						1000	125	
Cringleford					0		50		100			125	125		125		125	125	125			125	50	1200	109	
Cumulative total					235		560		1020			1505	1990		2475		2885		3255	3565	3875		4185	4400	4400	
Easton/Cosstessey					50		90		175			175	175		175		100	60						1000	125	
Cumulative total					50		140		315			490	665		840		940		1000					1000		
Additional Smaller Sites Around Broadland NPA*					170		170		170			170	170		170		170	170	170				170	130	2000	
Sites Around South Norfolk NPA					150		150		150			150	150		150		150	150	150				150	150	1800	
Existing NPA Commitment	1572		1813	1437	943		821		652			449	172												7859	
Cumulative Existing NPA Commitments	1572		3385	4822	5765		6586		7238			7687	7859		7859		7859		7859	7859	7859		7859	7859	15718	
Projected Housing Total	1752		2043	1667	2153		2261		2437			2309	2122		2040		1890	1810	1690	1690			1690	1555	29109	
Cumulative NPA Commitments and Planned	1752		3795	5462	7615		9876		12313			14622	16744		18784		20674		22484	24174	25864		27554	29109		

* Until the NDR is in place the full number of dwellings proposed on smaller sites in Broadland may not be able to be provided. This will depend on individual site circumstances.

Red – public transport/transport related constraints
 Blue – water related constraints
 Pink – electricity related constraints
 Green – selected green infrastructure projects

Table 2 – Infrastructure Framework

Infrastructure Framework: Priority 1 projects 2008 - 2016
<i>The base date for the Strategy is 2008. This table includes projects from 2008 - 2011 (the adoption of the Strategy) and 2011 - 2016 (the first 5 years of delivery post adoption)</i>

Waste Water							
<i>The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment) and Utilities.</i>							
Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
SP1	Sewerage upgrade - solutions subject to ongoing discussions with Anglian Water	Rackheath	Developer	tba	Developer/ AW provision	2016	Water Cycle Study Stage 2: B
SP3	Whitlingham Upgrade (Option 1)	Whole GNDP area	Anglian Water	42.9	AMP	2016	Water Cycle Study Stage 2: B
SP4	Whitlingham Upgrade (Option 2)	Norwich	Anglian Water	5	AMP	2016	Water Cycle Study Stage 2: B
SP5	Wymondham upgrade (Option 2)	Wymondham	Anglian Water	13.8	AMP	2016	Water Cycle Study Stage 2: B
SP6	Rackheath (Option 2)	Rackheath	Anglian Water	48	AMP	2016	Water Cycle Study Stage 2: B

Potable Water							
Water supply is adequate for growth in the short-term. Supply will require enhancement in the longer term, Anglian Water are committed to finding a solution by 2012. Solutions will be funded through the AMP process.							

Green Infrastructure

The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment) and Utilities.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
GI 15	Enhance public access to Yare Valley and Bawburgh Lakes	Overall scale of growth	Local Authorities/ Developer	tba	Local authority/ Developer contributions	2016	Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan
GI 16	Retention and re-creation of Mousehold Heath to the surrounding countryside	Overall scale of growth in particular Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Local Authorities/ Developer	tba	Local authority/ Developer contributions	2016	Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan
GI 17	Broads Buffer Zone	Overall scale of growth in particular Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Local Authorities/ Developer	tba	Local authority/ Developer contributions	2016	Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Electricity

The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment) and Utilities.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
U1	New primary sub-station on existing site (Hurricane Way)	Expansion of the employment area - airport business park	EDF energy	5.5	70% AMP • 30% Developer contributions	2016	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study 2009

Transportation

The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment) and Utilities.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
T1	Norwich Northern Distributor Road	Overall scale of growth in particular Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle • Broadland: Smaller sites in the NPA (2000 dwellings) • Norwich Area Transportation Strategy including delivery of BRT • Broadland Business Park • Airport employment allocation	Norfolk County Council	106.2	DFT £67.5m • Growth Point • Developer Contributions • Norfolk County Council	2016	NATS
T2a	Postwick Junction improvements	Overall Scale of Growth. Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle • Broadland: Smaller sites in the NPA (2000 dwellings) • Norwich Area Transportation Strategy including delivery of BRT • Broadland Business Park • Airport employment allocation	Norfolk County Council	19	DfT • Growth Point 3.5 • Developer contributions	2016	NATS

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
T2b	Postwick Park and Rice Junction improvements	Overall Scale of Growth. Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle • Broadland: Smaller sites in the NPA (2000 dwellings) • Norwich Area Transportation Strategy including delivery of BRT • Broadland Business Park • Airport employment allocation	Norfolk County Council	6	Developer contributions	2016	NATS
T4 & T17	Thickthorn junction improvement including bus priority and park and ride improvements	Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford Growth Locations	Norfolk County Council/ Highways Agency	30	Developer contributions	2016 (scheme expected to be phased)	NATS
T5	Longwater junction improvements	West Growth Location	Norfolk County Council/ Highways Agency	30	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2016	NATS
T6	Norwich Research Park transport infrastructure phase 1	Norwich Research Park	Norfolk County Council/ Highways Agency	5	Growth Point • Developer contributions	2016	NATS
T7	Grapes Hill bus improvements	Overall Growth	Norfolk County Council	0.18	Growth Point/ EEDA	Delivered	NATS
T7	Bus improvements Newmarket Road	Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford • Norwich Area Transportation Strategy including delivery of BRT	Norfolk County Council	0.4	Growth Point	Delivered	NATS
T7	City Centre bus improvements phase 1	Overall Growth	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	1	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2016	NATS

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
T8	Bus Rapid Transit via Fakenham Road - A1067 - Phase 1	Broadland Fringe Growth (subject to location of growth)	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.5	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2016	NATS
T9	Bus Rapid Transit via Dereham Road - Phase 1	West Growth Location	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	1.25	Growth Point	2010 - 2011	NATS
T10	Bus Rapid Transit via Yarmouth Road - Phase 1	Broadland Business Park Expansion	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.5	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2016	NATS
T11	Bus Rapid Transit via Salhouse Road and Gurney Road - Phase 1	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	1.8	1.8 Eco-community PoD • Developer contributions	2016	NATS
T12	Bus Rapid Transit via Norwich airport A140 to City Centre - Phase 1	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.5	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2011-2016	NATS
T13	Bus priority route via Hethersett Lane/ Hospital/ Norwich Research Park/ University of East Anglia/ City Centre	Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford Growth Location & NRP	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.7	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2016	NATS

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
T14	Bus priority route via B1172 phase 1	Wymondham, Hethersett Growth Location	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	1.7	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2016	NATS
T15	Development Link Broadland Business Park to Salhouse Road	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	Developer Lead	2.5	Developer contributions	2016	NATS
T16	Bus priority - approach to Harford Junction	Long Stratton Growth Location	Norfolk County Council/ Highways Agency	2	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2016	NATS
T18	Pedestrian / Cycle links to Longwater	West Growth Locations	Norfolk County Council	1.5	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2016	NATS
N/A	Lady Julian Bridge	NATS • City Centre	Norwich City Council	2.58	Growth Point • S106 • EEDA	Delivered	NATS
N/A	Barrack Street ring-road improvement works	Overall Growth	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	1.3	Growth Point	Delivered	NATS

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
N/A	St Augustine's Gyratory	Norwich Area Transportation Strategy including delivery of BRT • City Centre bus enhancements	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	3.49	Growth point 2.42 • LTP 1.04 • S106 .03	2010	NATS
	Totals			341.30			

Infrastructure Framework: Priority 1 projects 2016 -2021

The base date for the Strategy is 2008. This table includes projects from 2008 - 2011 (the adoption of the Strategy) and 2011 - 2016 (the first 5 years of delivery post adoption)

Waste Water

The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment) and Utilities

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
SP1	Sewerage upgrade - solutions subject to ongoing discussions with Anglian Water	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	Developer	TBA	Developer/ AW provision	2021	Water Cycle Study Stage 2b
SP2	Sewerage upgrade - solutions subject to ongoing discussions with Anglian Water	Hethersett, Cringleford, Easton/ Costessey	Developer	TBA	Developer/ AW provision	2021	Water Cycle Study Stage 2b
SP7	Whitlingham Upgrade (Option 1)	Whole GNDP area	Anglian Water	14.4	AMP	2021	Water Cycle Study Stage 2b
SP8	Whitlingham Upgrade (Option 2)	Norwich	Anglian Water	0.8	AMP	2021	Water Cycle Study Stage 2b
SP9	Wymondham upgrade (Option 2)	West growth locations	Anglian Water	22.4	AMP	2021	Water Cycle Study Stage 2b

Potable Water

Water supply is adequate for growth in the short-term. Supply will require enhancement in the longer term, Anglian Water are committed to finding a solution by 2012. Solutions will be funded through the AMP process.

Electricity

The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment) and Utilities.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
U2	New primary substation on new site (Norwich Airport north)	Expansion of the employment area - airport business park • Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	EDF energy	6.3	Developer contributions	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
U3	New grid sub-station on existing sites (Norwich East)	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	EDF energy	17	100% AMP	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Green Infrastructure

The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment) and Utilities. All potable water improvements are delivered through the AMP process and are not included in this table.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
GI 15	Enhance public access to Yare Valley and Bawburgh Lakes	Overall scale of growth in particular Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford Growth Locations	Local authorities/ Developers	tba	Local authorities/ Developer contribution	2021	Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan
GI 16	Retention and re-creation of Mousehold Heath to the surrounding countryside	Overall scale of growth in particular Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Local authorities/ Developers	tba	Local authorities/ Developer contribution	2021	Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan
GI 17	Broads Buffer Zone	Overall scale of growth in particular Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Local authorities/ Developers	tba	Local authorities/ Developer contribution	2021	Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Transportation

The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment and Utilities). All potable water improvements are delivered through the AMP process and are not included in this table.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
T3	Long Stratton bypass A140 including improvement at Hempnall cross-roads	Long Stratton Growth Locations	Developer / Norfolk County Council	20	Developer contributions	2021	Developer
T6	Norwich Research Park transport infrastructure phase 2	Norwich Research Park	Norfolk County Council/ Highways Agency	8	Growth Point • Developer contributions	2021	NATS
T7	Bus priority - approach to Harford Junction	Overall Growth	Norfolk County Council	2	Developer contributions	2021	NATS
T7	City Centre bus improvements phase 1	Overall Growth	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.6	Growth Point • LTP • Developer contributions	2021	NATS
T7	City Centre bus improvements phase 2	Overall Growth	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	6	Growth Point • LTP • Developer contributions	2021	NATS
T8	Bus Rapid Transit via Fakenham Road - A1067 - Phase 2	Broadland Fringe Growth	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	5	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2021	NATS
T9	Bus improvements Dereham Road phase 2	West Growth Locations	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.6	Growth Point • Developer contributions	2021	NATS
T10	Bus Rapid Transit via Yarmouth Road - Phase 2	Broadland Business Park Expansion	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	5	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2021	NATS

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
T11	Bus improvements via Salhouse Road and Gurney Road phase 2	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.6	Developer contributions • Rackheath PoD	2021	NATS
T12	Bus Rapid Transit via Norwich airport A140 to City Centre - Phase 2	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	5	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2021	NATS
T15	Development Link Broadland Business Park to Salhouse Road	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.5	Developer contributions	2021	NATS

Totals	122.20
---------------	---------------

Infrastructure Framework: Priority 1 projects 2021 -2026

The base date for the Strategy is 2008. This table includes projects from 2008 - 2011 (the adoption of the Strategy) and 2011 - 2016 (the first 5 years of delivery post adoption)

Waste Water

The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment) and Utilities.

Ref	Scheme	Dependencies	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
SP1	Sewerage upgrade - solutions subject to ongoing discussions with Anglian Water	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	Developer	tba	Developer/ AW provision	2026	Water Cycle Study Stage 2 B
SP2	Sewerage upgrade - solutions subject to ongoing discussions with Anglian Water	Hethersett, Cringleford, Easton/ Costessey	Developer	tba	Developer/ AW provision	2026	Water Cycle Study Stage 2 B
SP10	Whitlingham Upgrade (Option 1)	Whole GNDP area	Anglian Water	4.3	AMP	2026	Water Cycle Study Stage 2 B
SP11	Whitlingham Upgrade (Option 2)	Norwich	Anglian Water	0.4	AMP	2026	Water Cycle Study Stage 2 B
SP12	Wymondham upgrade (Option 2)	West growth locations	Anglian Water	0.5	AMP	2026	Water Cycle Study Stage 2 B
SP13	Sewerage upgrade - solutions subject to ongoing discussions with Anglian Water	Long Stratton	Anglian Water	Tba	AMP	2026	Water Cycle Study Stage 2 B

Potable Water

Water supply is adequate for growth in the short-term. Supply will require enhancement in the longer term, Anglian Water are committed to finding a solution by 2012. Solutions will be funded through the AMP process.

Electricity

The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment) and Utilities.

Ref	Scheme	Dependencies	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
U4	New primary substation on new site (Sprowston / Rackheath)	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrews growth triangle	EDF energy	4.3	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study 2009
U5	Replacement of transformers and switchgear in existing site (Hapton)	Long Stratton	EDF energy	2.53	83% AMP • 17% Developer contributions	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study 2009
U6	Replacement of transformers and switchgear in existing site (Wymondham)	SW Growth location	EDF energy	2.53	67% AMP • 33% Developer contributions	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study 2009

Green Infrastructure

The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment) and Utilities.

Ref	Scheme	Dependencies	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
GI 16	Retention and re-creation of Mousehold Heath to the surrounding countryside	Overall scale of growth in particular Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle		tba		2026	Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Transportation

The table below lists the Priority 1 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Transport, Green Infrastructure (relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment) and Utilities.

Ref	Scheme	Dependencies	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
T7	City Centre bus improvements phase 3	Overall Growth	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	6	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2021 - 2026	NATS
T8	Bus Rapid Transit via Fakenham Road - A1067 - Phase 3	Broadland Fringe Growth	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.5	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2021-2026	NATS
T9	Bus improvements Dereham Road phase 3	West Growth Location	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.6	Growth Point • LTP • Developer contributions	2021 - 2026	NATS
T10	Bus Rapid Transit via Yarmouth Road - Phase 3	Broadland Business Park Expansion	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.5	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2021-2026	NATS
T11	Bus improvements via Salhouse Road and Gurney Road phase 3	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	0.6	Rackheath PoD • Developer contributions	2021 - 2026	NATS
T12	Bus Rapid Transit via Norwich airport A140 to City Centre - Phase 3	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, and Thorpe St Andrew Growth triangle	Norfolk County Council/ Norwich City Council	2.5	Norfolk County Council • DfT • Growth Point • Developer contributions	2021-2026	NATS
Totals				31.26			

Infrastructure Framework: Priority 2 projects 2008-2016

Education

The table below lists the Priority 2 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 3 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 2 are Education, Healthcare and Green Infrastructure

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates	Source
ED3	60 place pre-school	Norwich City	Norfolk County Council	0.54	Developers	2011	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED4	60 place pre-school	Norwich City	Norfolk County Council	0.54	Developers	2016	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Healthcare

The table below lists the Priority 2 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 3 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 2 are Education, Healthcare and Green Infrastructure. The Health Authority will take a flexible approach to the provision of hospital beds. Locations will be determined by the Health Authority at a later date. It is presumed funding will come through the AMP.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates	Source
HC1	GPs Surgery (3 GPs)	Norwich City	Health Authority	1.03	Health Authority	2011	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC2	Dentists surgery (4 Dentists)	Norwich City	Health Authority	1.25	Health Authority	2016	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates	Source
HC6	Expansion of existing facilities (2 GPs and 2 Dentists)	Broadland Elsewhere	Health Authority	0.9	Health Authority	2016	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC12	Expansion of existing facilities (7 GPs and 7 Dentists)	South Norfolk Elsewhere	Health Authority	3.5	Health Authority	2016	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC13	Hospital bed requirements	Overall scale of growth	Health Authority	10	Health Authority	2016	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Green infrastructure

The table below lists the Priority 2 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 3 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 2 are Education, Healthcare and Green Infrastructure. Green infrastructure projects are being assessed following completion of the Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Open space will be planned in relation to each growth location and planned in line with development.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates	Source
N/A	Wensum River Parkway	Overall scale of growth	HEART/ Norwich City Council	0.07	Growth Point	Delivered	Green Infrastructure Steering Group
N/A	Catton Park visitor centre and park improvements	Overall scale of growth	Catton Park Trust/ Norfolk County Council	0.37	Growth Point	Delivered	Green Infrastructure Steering Group
N/A	Whitlingham Country Park Access Improvements	Overall scale of growth	Norfolk County Council	0.12	Growth Point	Delivered	Green Infrastructure Steering Group
N/A	Wooded ridge	Overall scale of growth	Norwich City Council	0.04	Growth Point	Delivered	Green Infrastructure Steering Group

GI 1-14	Green infrastructure projects and open space	Overall scale of growth	Various	tba	Local authorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers contributions • Other funding sources to be identified 	2016	Green Infrastructure Steering Group
---------	--	-------------------------	---------	-----	---	------	-------------------------------------

Totals				18.36			
---------------	--	--	--	--------------	--	--	--

Infrastructure Framework: Priority 2 projects 2016-2021

Education

The table below lists the Priority 2 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 3 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 2 are Education, Healthcare and Green Infrastructure

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
ED1	60 place pre-school	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Norfolk County Council	0.54	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED1	60 place pre-school (co- location with community space)	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Norfolk County Council	0.54	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED1	2FE primary with integrated 60 place nursery	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Norfolk County Council	5.14	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED1	2FE primary with integrated 60 place nursery	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Norfolk County Council	5.14	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED5	2FE primary with integrated 60 place nursery	Norwich City	Norfolk County Council	5.14	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED5	2FE primary with integrated 60 place nursery	Norwich City	Norfolk County Council	5.14	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED7	30 place pre-school	Wymondham	Norfolk County Council	0.285	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED7	2FE primary with integrated 60 place nursery	Wymondham	Norfolk County Council	5.14	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED7	60 place pre-school	Hethersett	Norfolk County Council	0.54	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED7	60 place pre-school	Easton	Norfolk County Council	0.54	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
ED9	1400 secondary school with 280 sixth form places co-located with 4 x indoor sports courts phase 1	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Norfolk County Council	26	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED10	Expanded secondary school provision	Wymondham, Hetherset, Cringleford, Costessey / Easton	Norfolk County Council	10	Developer contribution	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study and ongoing assessment of options

Healthcare

The table below lists the Priority 2 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 3 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 2 are Education, Healthcare and Green Infrastructure. The Health Authority will take a flexible approach to the provision of hospital beds. Locations will be determined by the Health Authority at a later date. It is presumed funding will come through the AMP.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
HC3	Expansion of existing facilities (6 GPs and 5 Dentists)	Norwich City	Health Authority	4.5	Health Authority	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC4	Primary Care Centre (5 GPs and 4 Dentists)	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Health Authority	3.35	Health Authority	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC7	Expansion of existing facilities (3 GPs and 2 Dentists)	Wymondham	Health Authority	1.8	Health Authority	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC9	Expansion of existing facilities (1 GP and 1 Dentist)	Hetherset	Health Authority	0.55	Health Authority	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC11	Expansion of existing facilities (1 GP and 1 Dentist)	Easton / Costessey	Health Authority	0.55	Health Authority	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC13	Hospital bed requirements	Overall scale of growth	Health Authority	6	Health Authority	2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Green infrastructure

The table below lists the Priority 2 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 3 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 2 are Education, Healthcare and Green Infrastructure. Green infrastructure projects are being assessed following completion of the Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Open space will be planned in relation to each growth location and planned in line with development.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
GI 1-14	Green infrastructure projects and open space	Overall scale of growth	Various	tba	Local authorities • Developers contributions • Other funding sources to be identified	2021	Green Infrastructure Steering Group

Totals				80.90			
---------------	--	--	--	--------------	--	--	--

Infrastructure Framework: Priority 2 projects 2021-2026

Education

The table below lists the Priority 2 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 3 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 2 are Education, Healthcare and Green Infrastructure.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates	Source
ED2	60 place pre-school	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Norfolk County Council	0.54	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED2	2FE primary with integrated 60 place nursery	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Norfolk County Council	5.14	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED2	2FE primary with integrated 60 place nursery	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Norfolk County Council	5.14	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED6	60 place pre-school co- located with 600sqm combined community centre and library	Norwich City	Norfolk County Council	0.54	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED8	60 place pre-school	Wymondham	Norfolk County Council	0.54	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED8	2FE place primary	Cringleford	Norfolk County Council	2.3	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED8	1 FE place primary	Hetherset	Norfolk County Council	2.3	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED8	60 place pre-school	Long Stratton	Norfolk County Council	0.54	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED9	1400 secondary school with 280 sixth form places co- located with 4 x indoor sports courts phase 2	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Norfolk County Council	13	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates	Source
ED8	2FE primary with integrated 60 place pre-school co- located with combined community centre and library	Long Stratton	Norfolk County Council	5.14	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED8	60 place pre-school	Cringleford	Norfolk County Council	0.54	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED8	1FE primary	Easton	Norfolk County Council	2.5	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
ED10	Expanded secondary school provision	Wymondham, Hetherset, Cringleford, Costessey / Easton, Long Stratton, rest of South Norfolk NPA	Norfolk County Council	10	Developer contribution	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study and ongoing assessment of options

Healthcare

The table below lists the Priority 2 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 3 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 2 are Education, Healthcare and Green Infrastructure. The Health Authority will take a flexible approach to the provision of hospital beds. Locations will be determined by the Health Authority at a later date. It is presumed funding will come through the AMP.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
HC5	Primary Care Centre (5 GPs and 4 Dentists)	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Health Authority	3.35	Health Authority	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC8	Combined surgery (2 GPs and 2 Dentists)	Long Stratton	Health Authority	1.5	Health Authority	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC10	Expansion of existing facilities (1 GP and 1 Dentists)	Cringleford	Health Authority	0.55	Health Authority	2021 - 2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC12	Expansion of existing facilities (1 GP)	South Norfolk Elsewhere	Health Authority	0.6	Health Authority	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
HC13	Hospital bed requirements	Overall scale of growth	Health Authority	12	Health Authority	2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Green infrastructure

The table below lists the Priority 2 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 3 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 1 are Education, Healthcare and Green Infrastructure. Green infrastructure projects are being assessed following completion of the Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Open space will be planned in relation to each growth location and planned in line with development.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
GI 1-14	Green infrastructure projects and open space	Overall scale of growth	Various	tba	Local authorities • Developers contributions • Other funding sources to be identified	2026	Green Infrastructure Steering Group

Totals				66.22			
---------------	--	--	--	--------------	--	--	--

Infrastructure Framework: Priority 3 projects 2008-2016

Community facilities

The table below lists the Priority 3 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 2 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 3 are Community facilities and Community services.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
CF1	Community facilities	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Broadland District Council	0.5	Private companies • Developers • Local authorities	2011-16	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
CF2	Community facilities	Norwich	Norwich City Council	1	Private companies • Developers • Local authorities	2011-16	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
CF3-5	Community facilities	South Norfolk	South Norfolk Council	4	Private companies • Developers • Local authorities	2011-16	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Totals				5.50			
---------------	--	--	--	-------------	--	--	--

Infrastructure Framework: Priority 3 projects 2016-2021

Community facilities

The table below lists the Priority 3 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 2 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 3 are Community facilities and Community services.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
CF1	Community facilities	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Broadland District Council	2	Private companies • Developers • Local authorities	2016 - 2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
CF2	Community facilities	Norwich	Norwich City Council	3.05	Private companies • Developers • Local authorities	2016 - 2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
CF3-5	Community facilities	South Norfolk	South Norfolk Council	3.1	Private companies • Developers • Local authorities	2016 - 2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Community services

The table below lists the Priority 3 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 2 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 3 are Community facilities and Community services.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
CI 12	Fire Service	Overall scale of growth	Norfolk County Council	tba	Norfolk County Council	2016-2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
CI13	Ambulance Service	Overall scale of growth	Norfolk Ambulance Service	tba	Norfolk Ambulance Service	2016-2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
CI 1-11	Police Safer Neighbourhood teams - Broadland (18 officers) • Norwich (22 officers) • South Norfolk (32 officers)	Overall scale of growth	Norfolk Constabulary	5.25	Norfolk Constabulary	2016-2021	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Totals				13.40			
---------------	--	--	--	--------------	--	--	--

Infrastructure Framework: Priority 3 projects 2021-2026

Community facilities

The table below lists the Priority 3 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 2 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 3 are Community facilities and Community services.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
CF 1	Community facilities	Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle	Broadland District Council	2	Private companies • Developers • Local authorities	2021-2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
CF 2	Community facilities	Norwich	Norwich City Council	3.05	Private companies • Developers • Local authorities	2021-2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
CF 3-5	Community facilities	South Norfolk	South Norfolk Council	3.1	Private companies • Developers • Local authorities	2021-2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Community services

The table below lists the Priority 3 infrastructure requirements to deliver the Joint Core Strategy. The 2 categories of infrastructure that are viewed as Priority 3 are Community facilities and Community services.

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
CI 12	Fire Service	Overall scale of growth	Norfolk County Council	TBA	Norfolk County Council	2021-2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study
CI 13	Ambulance Service	Overall scale of growth	Norfolk Ambulance Service	TBA	Norfolk Ambulance Service	2021-2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Ref	Scheme	Required for growth in:	Promoter/ Delivery body	Total Cost £m	Funding sources	Estimated delivery dates by	Source
CI 1-11	Police Safer Neighbourhood teams - Broadland (18 officers) • Norwich (44 officers) • South Norfolk (64 officers)	Overall scale of growth	Norfolk Constabulary	5.25	Norfolk Constabulary	2021 - 2026	Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study

Totals				13.4			
---------------	--	--	--	-------------	--	--	--

REVISION 9 DECEMBER 2010 – TRACKED CHANGES

Amendments to the JCS submission document

Policy 10

Page 62 - para Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle. Amend paragraph as below:

This location will deliver an urban extension extending on both sides of the Northern Distributor Road. Delivery **of the growth triangle in its entirety** is dependent on the implementation of the Northern Distributor Road.

Page 63 - to add in reference to the Area Action Plan (Note – this change was also agreed at the examination with the Inspector)

Amend second paragraph from “A single co-ordinated approach will be required across the whole area. More detailed masterplanning will be required for each quarter to ***A single co-ordinated approach will be required across the whole area. This will be provided through the preparation of an Area Action Plan (or any future equivalent process). More detailed masterplanning will be required for each quarter***”.

Deleted: its

Page 66 and 67 – para 6.18

Original para 6.18

To implement the JCS significant highway improvements are required at the Longwater (A1074), Thickthorn (A11) and Harford (A140) junctions on the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass. Completion of the Northern Distributor Road and improvements to Postwick junction are a fundamental requirement for growth and the implementation of the remainder of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy including public transport enhancements. Completion of a bypass is a pre-requisite for the scale of growth identified in Long Stratton.

Para 6.18 revised as below:

To implement the JCS significant highway improvements are required at the Longwater (A1074), Thickthorn (A11) and Harford (A140) junctions on the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass. Completion of the Northern Distributor Road ***is fundamental to the full implementation of this Joint Core Strategy. In particular it is necessary to allow significant development in the growth triangle and the full implementation of the remainder of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy. The completion of appropriate improvements at Postwick junction would allow for some development in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle in advance of the NDR (see supporting text for Policy 20)***. Completion of a bypass is a pre-requisite for the scale of growth identified in Long Stratton.

Deleted: /

Deleted: to

Deleted: ill

Policy 20 page 63 - new paragraph after paragraph 7.11

Contingency

The GNDP will be working to bring forward all growth proposals and associated infrastructure as early as possible to maximise delivery and flexibility. This will be facilitated by engagement with developers to understand opportunities, overcome constraints and maximise development potential without compromising quality.

There is no phasing of growth in the JCS beyond that imposed by the provision of infrastructure. At the time of adoption the provision of most critical elements of infrastructure is not expected to be a significant constraint.

However, there remains some uncertainty around the timing of the delivery of the Northern Distributor Road (NDR).

The NDR is fundamental to overall delivery of housing and employment growth in the Broadland part of the NPA and to significant parts of NATS including high-quality public transport in the northern part of the urban area.

At the base date of the JCS there is a significant housing commitment that is unaffected by infrastructure constraints. Delay in delivering the NDR does not prevent JCS provision of housing or employment development within Norwich City or South Norfolk Council areas, or existing housing commitment in Broadland as demonstrated in Appendix 7. Indeed, market pressures are likely to bring forward development in these locations in this scenario.

The existing commitment and the range and scale of growth proposals across the JCS area provide significant flexibility to bring forward growth in those locations unaffected by infrastructure constraints.

In late 2010 proposals for Postwick were significantly advanced. The scheme and associated development has planning permission and the design of the layout of the junction has been agreed by the Highways Agency.

The Postwick Hub and the Northern Distributor Road are in the DfT Development Pool and the funding decision will be announced by the end of 2011. The NDR will be subject to a separate statutory planning process.

The Postwick Hub can be delivered as a separate scheme and is not necessarily dependent on DfT funding. Contributions from all of the following sources may be used to secure delivery:

- DfT development pool (decision due by end of 2011)
- Existing Growth Point funding
- Pooled Section 106 (until replaced by CIL)
- CIL (expected to be introduced late 2011)
- Local Authorities' capital funding programmes
- New Homes Bonus

- Tax Increment Financing
- Other funding streams

[The existing commitment of 1400 dwellings in the Sprowston Fringe can take place without improvement to Postwick Junction.](#) Subject to acceptable improvements to Postwick Junction (Postwick Hub or a suitable alternative) there is significant potential for [further](#) development in the growth triangle before there is confirmation of the timing of delivery of the NDR. The table below summarises the current understanding of this potential.

Location	Level of growth supported by current evidence	Constrained development
Growth Triangle	At least 1600 dwellings (plus 200 exemplar at Rackheath prior to Postwick junction improvements)	New employment allocation at Rackheath
Smaller sites in Broadland NPA	Delivery of the smaller sites allowance will be dealt with on a site by site basis	
Broadland Business Park	Development of existing allocation and new allocation (25ha incl c50,000m2 B1)	
Airport area		New employment allocation

Deleted: ¶
Table 1: Housing and Employment development in north east sector assuming that Postwick junction is suitably improved in 2012

Formatted Table

Deleted: Existing commitments¶ ... [1]

Formatted: Font: Bold

Broadland District Council is committed to preparing an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the growth triangle. As part of the preparation of this AAP there will be an investigation of the potential to enable further growth over and above that shown in Table 1 above, in advance of confirmation of timing of the NDR. This analysis would need to cover capacity of all local infrastructure (not just road capacity), the implications of particular sites, and the nature of development proposed. It will be essential that the growth is delivered in accordance with the overall strategy, taking into account its wider impact across the Norwich area, including a full range of infrastructure provision, services and high-quality public transport, walking and cycling.

Development beyond the pre-NDR threshold established through the AAP process will not be possible without a commitment to the NDR. If there is no possibility of the timely construction of the NDR, a complete review of the JCS would be triggered.

Existing commitments

Level of new JCS growth