

Greater Norwich Local Plan Progress Report November 14th 2016 – Correction and Supplementary Note

Paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4 of the Progress Report being considered by members today state:

7.3 Members views on the issues raised in the Issues Paper, in the context of the outcome of the stakeholder workshops, are welcomed.

7.4 A particular issue raised at the September GNDP Board related to whether the Norwich Policy Area should be retained in the GNLP. It is proposed that this issue should be addressed through a specific report to be considered by the GNDP Board in January 2017 and subsequently by the relevant panels/committees at the three authorities.

Correction: Replace “addressed” in 7.4 with “investigated”.

Feedback from the Stakeholder Forums

The Issues Paper for the Stakeholder Workshops referred to in section 7 of the report covered policy approaches to managing the distribution of growth across the three districts, including consideration of whether the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) should be retained in the GNLP.

As the absence of a direct reference to the NPA in paragraph 7.2 and Appendix 8 of the November 14th 2016 GNLP Progress Report shows, there was very limited direct debate concerning the NPA itself at the forums. However, as the first bullet point of paragraph 7.2 of the report states, there was considerable discussion on the linked issue of the merits of concentration or dispersal of development. There were arguments both for more dispersal of growth and for continuing to concentrate the majority of growth around Norwich. Many felt that the plan should promote a balanced mix of both, with local employment opportunities.

Potential NPA criteria for the January report

Potential criteria for the January report to assess the NPA are:

Economic development; Infrastructure provision; Meeting housing needs; The strategic role of the NPA given that the GNLP includes site allocations; Land supply; Housing delivery; Accessing funding; Assessing windfall planning applications; NPA boundaries if retained.

Members’ views on whether these are the appropriate criteria for the report are welcomed.