

Greater Norwich Development Partnership

Joint Core Strategy for
Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk

Summary of issues raised:
Regulation 25 Public Consultation

2 March 2009 – 12 June 2009

Jobs, homes, prosperity for local people



NORWICH
City Council



Norfolk County Council

Using this document

The Joint Core Strategy was the subject of a Regulation 25 public consultation between 2 March 2009 and 12 June 2009. The responses received to this consultation are shown on the following pages as detailed below:

Content	Page numbers
Representations, their summaries and assessments, and the suggested actions for the Joint Core Strategy	2 - 396
Summary of representations, suggested actions, and actual actions taken for the Joint Core Strategy	397 - 584

Respondents to the consultations may find details of any action taken with regard to the Joint Core Strategy in response to their representations by checking the details of their representation and GNDP suggested actions in the representations summaries in pages 2 – 396, and then cross-referencing with the summaries of actual actions taken shown in pages 397 – 584.

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

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25

Public Participation Report

5. Spatial vision (Q1)

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5. Spatial vision (Q1)				
<i>(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</i>				
10412 - Honingham Thorpe Farms Limited [8296]	Comment	JCS does not address rural employment or economy sufficiently and needs to take account of the Taylor Review. No mention is made to the importance of agriculture and land-based industries to the rural economy. Specific wording amendments recommended for vision re support and growth of agricultural sector	Comments noted	Consider incorporating specific wording amendments to vision re support and growth of agricultural sector
10405 - Easton College [3570]	Comment	Given the importance of agriculture to Norfolk and the significant rural area covered by the JCS, greater policy provision for supporting the rural economy and land-based industries is required. Recommend specific wording in vision re promoting agriculture	Comments noted	Consider adding further wording in vision re promoting agriculture
10263 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson)	Comment	Welcomes reference in the Vision to all villages being allowed some development to help make small communities more sustainable, and supporting local shops and businesses. Development in smaller villages could also help to reduce 'urban sprawl' on the periphery of Norwich with places like Costessey are now suffering, with resulting changes to the character and identity of the places in which we live. To reduce the use of private cars more seriously, need greater emphasis on making rural communities more sustainable by providing housing to increase the potential viability of village shops, post offices, pubs and other businesses as well as rural bus routes.	Comments noted and accepted. Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to identify the scale and distribution of new development in villages. This pattern of growth is seen by the GNDP as necessary to support and sustain local services in rural areas. [PR]	No change.
11025 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	Comment	Supports Poringland as Key Service Centre but the strategy does not reflect the potential for Poringland to accommodate growth in the Plan period and beyond.	Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to identify the scale and distribution of new development in villages. This pattern of growth is seen by the GNDP as necessary to support and sustain local services in rural areas. [PR]	No change.
10065 - The Greetham Trustees [7606]	Comment	Objective 4 comments that it should be emphasise the need to reinforce the more limited services that are available in smaller rural settlements such as the service villages and the other villages. Objective 6 comments that service villages and other villages should also be central to the aim to make sure that people have ready access to services, encouraging innovative approaches to supporting rural service	Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to identify the scale and distribution of new development in villages. This pattern of growth is seen by the GNDP as necessary to support and sustain local services in rural areas. [PR]	Ensure revised policy reinforces services in smaller settlements, and peoples' access to them.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11019 - Norwich Chamber Council (Mr Don Pearson) [8371]	Comment	Comments that the strategy is for the benefit of the whole of Norfolk, not just Norwich. This essential for growth in the region, not just about job creation, but putting in the infrastructure which will enable that growth	Comments noted and welcomed.	No change
8321 - Mr Geoffrey Loades	Comment	Comment that there should be a further objective, recognising that growth in villages will help to sustain	Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to identify the scale and distribution of new development in villages. This pattern of growth is seen by the GNDP as necessary to support and sustain local services in rural areas. [PR]	No change.
8627 - University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]	Comment	Vision (under communities, deprivation, regeneration) needs to refer to the role of UEA as the sole provider of higher education in the area.	Other city institutions also provide for higher education in Norwich, although the UEA is by far the dominant provider. Accept the strategy should refer to the need for investment in higher education, including UEA.	Amend text in vision, objective 7 and strategic policy to refer to the need for investment in higher education, including UEA.
10249 - Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260]	Comment	Section 4 Spatial Portrait: 4.2 Natural Environment, landscape and diversity A brief outline of the region's rich geodiversity is missing from this spatial portrait. The word geology does occur once, but rather inappropriately. Geodiversity is also missing from the title. Objective 8: Geodiversity is missing from this objective. Suggests that the next to last sentence be amended to "Biodiversity, geodiversity and locally ..."	Comments noted and accepted.	Spatial Portrait, para. 4.2 'Natural Environment, landscape and diversity'. Amend to include a brief outline of the region's rich geodiversity, correcting the way in which 'geology' is referred to . Add 'Geodiversity' to the title. Objective 8: revise next to last sentence to read "Biodiversity, geodiversity and locally ..."
9667 - Mr Quinton Biddle [8166]	Comment	Concern that objective 10 will not be met and that traffic on Salhouse Rd will increase considerably once the NDR and new housing is built.	The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy	No change
9064 - Mr Alex Kuhn [8106]	Comment	Objects to the scale of growth, especially in the green belt. Main road need improving around Norwich and could not cope with traffic from more housing. New development would lead to ecological and environmental damage, and add to global warming.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. The implementation plan for the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy includes the NDR as well as significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich. These are critical parts of the infrastructure needed to deliver the strategy as a whole. The strategy already emphasises how it must help to deliver more sustainable communities, and which help to address climate change. All new homes must be carbon neutral by 2016, and the strategy requires high standards of design for new development - especially major growth areas. There is no formal 'green belt' policy in the area. [PR]	No change.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
9745 - Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155]	Comment	Important not to lose Norfolk identity with countryside covered by concrete and housing. Very proud of "being Norfolk" and different.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. Strategic policies on design and sustainability, aim to reflect the advice and guidance of CABE on major growth and striving for local distinctiveness. [PR]	No change.
9814 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509]	Comment	EEDA reminds the GNDP of the requirement for the JCS to conform to national planning policy, particularly PPS1 and PPS12, and to adopted regional plans. Previous comments on the core strategy in September 2008 remain extant. In commenting on these latest changes EEDA have focussed on Policy 5 regarding locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy	Comments noted	See response to policy 5
10144 - R Smith [8243]	Comment	Supports the spatial vision in principle but it does not differentiate between those key service centres within the Norwich Policy Area which will be contributing to the proposed new homes on smaller sites and those further afield.	Comment accepted. Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to identify the scale and distribution of new development in villages. This pattern of growth is seen by the GNDP as necessary to support and sustain local services in rural areas. [PR]	Ensure revised policies is clear about the strategic criteria to be used in deciding how and where new homes on smaller sites will be determined.
8064 - Miss Janet Saunders	Comment	Until there is a viable alternative to cars, parking and the road network need improving.	The strategy proposes attractive measures designed to give people alternatives to cars, where this is practicable. The strategy already recognises that some people, especially in rural areas will still need to use their cars.	No change
10712 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Comment	Object to potential "regeneration" of well laid out estates and built for replacement by poor quality overly dense housing with no pavements. Insufficient consultation on	Comments noted. The plan deals with strategic issues and does not include the level of detail suggested by the comments. Regeneration generally refers to the redevelopment of brownfield sites where present uses have ceased, though it could apply to improvements to existing housing estates. High density development, such as on many of the existing housing estates in Norwich, enable large areas within residential areas to be open spaces for a variety of neighbourhood uses. Shared surfaces on new housing development are not directly promoted through this plan, though this is promoted by government policies in areas where roads are designed to minimise vehicle speeds.	No change to plan
10906 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Comment	Consider the spatial vision and objectives appropriate and achievable within the plan period. It is essential that to deliver major growth areas and the strategy itself, major infrastructure and unlocking of ownership constraints are needed required. These aspects are not demonstrated in the strategy (answers to other questions elaborate).	General support is welcomed, However, the GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. This work is not yet complete and will not have been apparent from the consultation document. [PR]	No change.
9980 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	Comment	Whilst not objecting to the principles of the preferred option in terms of the general distribution of development, we feel that the balance between the growth in the NPA and the rural area under provides for the rural area, and that this should be adjusted accordingly.	Comments noted. The requirement for the minimum number of dwellings in the Norwich Policy Area is set by the adopted regional plan and can not be amended in this	No change to plan

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9060 - Chenery Drive Residents Association (Mr R. Craggs) [3412]	Comment	Objects to the scale of growth.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. [PR]	No change
11036 - Norwich Design Quality Panel (The Manager) [8375]	Comment	No clear vision for the kind and type of places for JCS area, but only concerned with infrastructure capacities . Instead generic phrases which are culled from Government policy without specificity for our sub region.Quality of design is not an explicit aspiration of the JCS, is subsidiary to other issues.	Comments noted.	Ensure importance of high quality design is emphasised more fully in the vision and throughout the
9086 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Comment	Opportunity to set out what sort of place the Joint Authorities are trying to create (or conserve) appears to have been lost sight of, and that policies and programmes seem to be determining the Vision. Support objectives, but description also relates to policies and programmes. Greater clarity on relationship to Broads needed and greater emphasis (throughout the document) on protection and enhancement of the environment as a pre-requisite for growth	Comments noted	Consider amendments to vision and objectives to give gretaer focus on what type of place the plan seeks to create/enhance. Consider general rewording re Broads and greater emphasis on environmental protection
8108 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	Comment	Objection casts doubt on climate change projections. The emphasis on affordable housing leads to low quality environments.	The strategy has an important role to adapt and mitigate to the effects of climate change. Official national and international scientific research and monitoring on climate change requires action to address this. [PR]	No change

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10380 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]

Comment
1. Spatial Portrait should cover key physical, social and economic characteristics of the area, including opportunities and constraints.

2. The spatial vision is a fundamental element of the DPD, reflecting local ambitions and aspirations, and providing the underpinning for the subsequent objectives and policies. We note the reference to Sustainable Community Strategies as evidence to this. Encourage clearer elaboration of links to other strategies, eg Norfolk Local Transport Plan, NATS, the Economic Strategy for greater Norwich, and the Broads Plan.

3. Welcome prominence given to climate change, sustainability and quality of life in your document. Elsewhere in our representations we identify opportunities to strengthen the link between sustainable transport, carbon reduction, accessibility and health, and the role of 'greater Norwich' as the focus for sustainable growth, and question whether the economic vision could also be strengthened.

4. The north east of Norwich is identified for the largest growth allocation, and you may want to incorporate some elements of the emerging vision for the Rackheath eco-town within your DPD and embed an expectation that this location should serve as an exemplar for sustainable growth.

5. To avoid repetition of subsequent policy, some of the more detailed content, for example relating to the rural area, could be omitted.

6. Is Spatial planning objective 1 a spatial planning objective? Consider an order of objectives which best reflects the overarching spatial vision and key social, economic and environmental drivers.

Comments noted

Consider amendments to take account of GO East comments on:
1. Content of portrait
2. Links to other plans
3. Links between carbon reduction and 4. transport and strengthening of economic vision
clearer reference to eco town potential
reduce detail of vision eg on rural areas
4. Reference to ecotown potential
5. Avoiding repetition

11097 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]

Comment
Supports the spatial vision and objectives in principle but to deliver the strategy and the growth it is essential to deliver major infrastructure and unlock ownership constraints required. the strategy does not show how this will be done.

The GNPD is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. this work has not yet been completed. [PR]

To develop and update section on delivery.

9848 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]

Comment
Supports the Spatial Vision as a coherent and cohesive vision for the Greater Norwich area, reinforcing the existing strengths and qualities of the area and seeking to deliver significant new housing growth in the most sustainable manner, with recognition that Hethersett is identified as a sustainable location for growth within the Norwich Policy Area for strategic (major) growth as well

Comments on the vision, and proposed distribution of growth are noted and welcomed.

No change.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8342 - Age Concern Norwich (Phil Wells) [7957]	Comment	No reference in the strategy to the needs of an ageing population, whose needs also have to be met (health, access to local services) to ensure a functioning community.	Accept objection. The GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs, and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the	Ensure the vision, objectives and relevant policies are specific about the needs of an ageing population. Ensure the implementation plan is also
7910 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] 7922 - mr paul newson [7812]	Comment	General comment	Comment noted [PR]	No change
9056 - Mrs CA Gilson [8102]	Comment	Objects on the basis that land in the area is already designated as green belt. the countryside should be protected from development for agriculture or green space. Questions the need for the level of growth.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. Major growth areas are intended to avoid the most fertile and versatile agricultural land in the area. No part of the plan area is protected by a formal 'green belt' policy.	No change
10700 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Comment	General support, however advise need to amend wording of following objectives: 8 to "The use of previously developed land, with appropriate remediation where necessary, will be prioritised to minimise the loss of agricultural land and the countryside". This reflects the aims of the Planning Policy Statement 23 10 should refer to waste water infrastructure etc as well as transport infrastructure Also suggest that greater emphasis could be placed upon protecting, enhancing and importantly preventing deterioration of the aquatic environment, a requirement of the Water Framework Directive.	Comments noted	Consider amendments to objectives to reflect EA advice
9654 - Ms E Riches [8165]	Comment	Comments on objectives concerning: 1. availability of funding to support growth 2. potential increase in unemployment resulting from growth 3. insufficient detail on Long Stratton	Comments noted. 1. The funding to support the growth will come from the private sector and from government, including agencies such as the NHS. 2. Employment and housing need is calculated to provide a balance - in recent years employment generation in the area has been extremely successful 3 and 4. This is a strategic plan. Further detail re Long Stratton will be in the South Norfolk site allocation plan	No change to plan
9074 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	Comment	Pages 16-18 are bland (no further details given)	Unclear objection - no GNDP response possible. The final version of the strategy is being substantially edited to	No change

make sure it is clear, concise and can be understood by a wide range of readers. [PR]

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
10682 - Ms Natalie Beal [8349]	Comment	There is no mention of car sharing as an important way to address single occupancy car use - especially taking into account the increase in rail fares for example.	This is a detailed initiative that spatial planning cannot control in itself. The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. [PR]	No change.
9470 - Louisa Young [8135]	Comment	Wants to improve Norwich's public transport and reduce its costs. Also need better access to health services in North Norwich; need local shops so people don't have to use cars to get to supermarkets. Insist that provision for schools, parks and socialising for young people is built in to any development. Housing should be carbon neutral and affordable NOT more executive monsters.	The strategy already emphasises how it must help to deliver more sustainable communities, and which help to address climate change. The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. The GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. [PR]	No change.
10209 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	Comment	Does not believe that area needs as many homes as proposed. 16000 would be more acceptable and Wymondham should have only 1000 new homes otherwise the whole character of the area will be	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. The proposed scale and distribution of growth, including Wymondham, is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk.	No change.
10245 - Mrs Angela Garner [8258]	Comment	The slogan "jobs, homes, prosperity for local people" is criticised because without jobs the homes will not be sold and the prosperity will be for landowners and builders only. Following the consultation the objector feels anger and hopelessness towards local government.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. The economic strategy for the GNDP area is based on developing the strength of the area's economic sectors (taking account of the current recession) and aims to increase jobs at all levels. The proposed scale and distribution of growth is the favoured GNDP option of all councils who are partners in the GNDP. [PR]	No change.
10281 - Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrold)	Comment	The strategy has an emphasis on accommodating growth and "roads and drains infrastructure" rather than from a place shaping/local identity focus. This will lead to problems in the long term. The strategy should identify "what sort of place do we want Norwich to be in the future?" â€¢ JCS lacks "local distinctiveness" needs a greater	Comments accepted. However, since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to develop strategic policies on design and sustainability, which aim to reflect the advice and guidance of CABE on major growth. In addition, the proposed scale and distribution of growth is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character	Ensure in editing, that the strategy succinctly and directly identifies what sort of place Norwich will be in the future, rather than being led by infrastructure proposals.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8866 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	Comment	Need to provide new homes before tackling employment and transportation problems. Would be better to improve the lives of existing residents before growing the area.	Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to develop strategic policies on design and sustainability, which aim to reflect the advice and guidance of CABA on major growth. The GNDD is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs, including the development of new homes and jobs, and the needs of existing communities, and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. [PR]	No change.
10529 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Object	Local roads/infrastructure will not cope, with the city spoiled by congestion and swamped insufficient car. Health care which is already lacking will be further	The GNDD is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. In addition, the transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy as a whole. [PR] To consider further	No change.
8327 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	Object	Suggested amendments so zero carbon will be the MINIMUM standard..., Objective 11: needs more emphasis on information and communications technology.		
10298 - Mrs LISA Ford [8282]	Object	Wants to keep Hethersett as a village with its natural green spaces and its sufficient current amenities. Growth strategy cannot keep 'adding' to existing villages without spoiling them - this is not fair on current residents.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth, including Hethersett, is the favoured GNDD option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk. [PR]	No change.
10310 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Object	CPRE Norfolk cannot support the proposals because of the considerable and irretrievable loss of countryside that will result. Rather, there is a need to extend the timescales for target numbers of housing and level of economic growth; improve the prospects for affordable housing and the effective use of land; re-cast the spatial strategy to make better links between housing and employment; and to develop a transport strategy that reduces the use of the car, and with it congestion and	Objection noted. The targets for house building are set out in the adopted regional plan - this plan must show how they can be achieved as sustainably as possible. The plan seeks to promote brownfield development and colocation of employment and housing as far as possible and promotes affordable housing. The transport strategy seeks to promote modal shift to reduce CO2 emissions.	No change to plan
10553 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Object	No to any further building of roads and houses.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy as a whole. [PR]	No change.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8444 - Ian Harris [8007]	Object	A large scale growth agenda which includes new road building conflicts with requirements for sustainable communities and the need to address climate change.	<p>The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England.</p> <p>The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy as a whole.</p>	No change
9282 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Object	Objects to the scale of growth.	<p>The strategy already emphasises how it must help to deliver more sustainable communities, and which help to address climate change. [PR]</p> <p>The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. [PR]</p>	No change.
8929 - Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079]	Object	Objects to large scale development at Wymondham.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth, including Wymondham, is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk.	No change
8377 - M Harrold [7966]	Object	New housing development should not be limited at Aylsham solely due to the capacity of the sewage treatment works. This ought to be capable of being resolved.	There strategy wording needs to be clarified as soon as the Water Cycle Study is completed,	Amend text as soon as the Water Cycle Study stage 2b is
8338 - e buitenhuis [7951]	Object	Objects to NDR. Public funding should improve public transport, while new roads should be funded by private firms. Living and working should be designed so they are close to each other (walking/cycling distance).	<p>The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy as a whole.</p> <p>The strategy already requires growth to be based on developing attractive alternatives to the car, wherever</p>	No change
9222 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	Object	Too much growth, need for affordable housing for local people who need it now, not enough emphasis on local facilities and investment in public transport	<p>The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England.</p> <p>The strategy already includes a requirement for a substantial proportion of affordable housing, infrastructure and investment in public transport.</p>	No change.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8945 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	Object	Objects to the level of growth, the NDR, and wants better public transport, walking and cycling.	<p>The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England.</p> <p>The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy as a whole.</p> <p>The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. [PR]</p>	No change
9027 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Object	Development should aim to be carbon neutral, but standards should be realistic and viable. New development should not be based around private cars.	<p>The strategy already emphasises how it must help to deliver more sustainable communities, and which help to address climate change. The Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulations will require new housing development to be carbon neutral by 2016.</p> <p>The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. [PR]</p>	No change.
10842 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Object	Approve of many elements of vision. Applaud the prominence given to 'Climate change and sustainability' but question how the strategy lives up to these aspirations. Need more emphasis on promoting equality and public transport.	Objection noted. Vision and strategy place considerable emphasis on public transport.	Consider greater emphasis on promotion of equality in vision.
10080 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	Object	Objects very strongly to large scale "development" in the county. It will increase traffic and destroy a tranquil rural environment which is much appreciated by most who live here. This "growth" is destruction on a big scale.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. The proposed scale and distribution of growth is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk. Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to develop strategic policies on design and sustainability, which aim to reflect the advice and guidance of CABE on major growth. [PR]	No change.
8198 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	Object	General objection	Objection noted [PR]	No change
8869 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	Object	Objects to restrictions on the limited scale of new development in service villages, like Tasburgh, which is on an important road (A140) and is therefore a sustainable location.	<p>The proposed scale and distribution of growth, including Tasburgh, is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk.</p> <p>Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to identify the scale and distribution of new development in villages. This pattern of growth is seen by the GNDP as necessary to support and</p>	No change

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9321 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	Object	Too many houses, not enough jobs, not sustainable.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. Estimates for jobs growth is based on detailed studies of the potential of different economic sectors in the area. The basis of the strategy is to promote regeneration, development and growth that are as sustainable as possible. [PR]	No change
11040 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	Object	With regard to climate change/sustainability/provision of facilities etc. the general aim is supported but to achieve developments they have to be viable and a balanced approach is required here to avoid stifling development.	Objection is noted. Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to develop strategic policies on infrastructure, sustainability, and energy efficiency/renewable energy. [PR]	Development of the strategy needs to made sure policy requirements are viable, and
9719 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	Object	You describe utopia. Why should all this new development achieve that?	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. [PR]	No change.
8831 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	Object	There should be more development in Norwich and maybe Wymondahm, but not Hethersett.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk. The pattern of development also recognises the constraints in urban Norwich from the physical, community, environmental and historic environment characteristics. More intensive development at present would lead to conflicts with other priorities such as the protection of parks and other urban green space, and employment land. [PR]	No change.
8256 - R Barker [6805]	Object	Objects to development at Long Stratton.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth, including Long Stratton, is the favoured GNDP option, and which also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk. [PR]	No change
7944 - Colin Mould [7809]	Object	Insufficient attention given to infrastructure	The GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy.	No change
9559 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	Object	As previous correspondence states, it is considered an over development of the area.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk. [PR]	No change.
8938 - Miss Marguerite Finn	Object	Objects to the level of growth because it is unrealistic and unsustainable - the recession will make creation of new jobs more difficult. the strategy should concentrate on what is here at the moment. Local and national public transport needs to be improved. Objects to the NDR because it will lead to to more, and faster traffic, adding to pollution.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy as a whole.	No change.

The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. [PR]

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8734 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]	Object	Objects to even modest development in service villages unless these can be accommodated within development boundaries, and without harming the character of the village.	Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to identify the scale and distribution of new development in villages. This pattern of growth is seen by the GNDP as necessary to support and sustain local services in rural areas.	No change
9259 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	Object	Objects to the NDR, as people will continue to drive into Norwich to work, causing congestion.	The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy	No change.
8312 - Marion Amos [7919]	Object	Objects to NDR due to lack of funds, and contradicts other parts of the strategy.	The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy	No change.
10647 - Ms Lucy Hall [8295]	Object	Objects to Objective 10 and Objective 11. because there is no incentive for people to get out of their cars, especially if they live ten miles out of Norwich. Without a long term vision for a post-car city objective 9 will not be met (to minimise the contributors to climate change).	Objections and comments noted. However, The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. In addition, the strategy already emphasises how it must help to deliver more sustainable communities, and which help to address climate change. [PR]	No change.
9542 - Mr R Harris [8146]	Object	<p>The area (assumed to be the growth triangle) is too large and lacks open space. This area is a lung of fresh air to Norwich.</p> <p>I object to the NDR route, which is only to increase the housing yet no indication of access to the present road system.</p> <p>This rate of loss of greenfield land is not sustainable and more thought is needed across the UK about ways to contribute to the preservation of the countryside & wellbeing of the whole of the UK. 100,000 new people moving to the area is completely unacceptable for Norwich and Norfolk.</p> <p>Norfolk's part to play in the wellbeing of the UK (summarised as follows):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. food supplier for the nation 2. tourism and quality of the countryside/historic environment 3. within the next 50 years higher sea levels due to climate change will reduce the areas of land in the county. 4. Water supply will be restricted and therefore a limit on the population increase will have to be imposed. 	<p>In general terms, the scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England.</p> <p>Objection to the NDR is noted but the transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy as a whole.</p> <p>No major development is planned on the best and most versatile agricultural land, though there is a substantial area of major growth on greenfield land. Significantly more development on brownfield land than presently proposed would lead to major conflicts with other priority areas of policy such as protecting employment land, urban open space and the historic urban environment.</p> <p>In general terms the strategy already emphasises how it must help to deliver more sustainable communities, and which help to address climate change.</p> <p>Furthermore, the GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs, including water supply and sewerage, and this will form part of a comprehensive</p>	No change.

implementation plan for the strategy. Anglian Water state that with the planned growth there would be sufficient supply of water. [PR]

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8397 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]	Object	Concerned about the scale of growth, which is not wanted, is based on out of date forecasts, and would affect quality of life in the county.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. [PR]	No change
8891 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Object	The planned growth is incompatible with reducing the effects of climate change. This scale of 'urbanisation' will affect tranquility and rurality.	The strategy already emphasises how it must help to deliver more sustainable communities, and which help to address climate change. [PR]	No change.
8957 - MR Richard Edwards	Object	Objects to the scale of growth and the NDR which will not reduce climate change.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy as a whole.	No change.
8441 - Dr Tim Rayner [8006]	Object	Proposals for large scale growth and building new roads do not support sustainable communities and contradict requirements for sustainability and addressing climate change.	The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. [PR] The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy as a whole. The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England.	No change
8707 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Object	Poor consultation on new town proposal in South Norfolk. Also objects to inadequate consideration of modest growth in small villages. More needed on green links.	The strategy already emphasises how it must help to deliver more sustainable communities, and which help to address climate change. [PR] The 'major new town' proposal at Mangreen, Swainsthorpe and Swardeston has been removed from this joint core strategy. Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to identify the scale and distribution of new development in villages. This pattern of growth is seen by the GNDP as necessary to support and	No change.

sustain local services in rural areas.

The strategy already refers extensively to green links, as part of a strategic approach to green infrastructure and, in Norwich, to the green grid. [PR]

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9184 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	The last bullet on travel is very old-fashioned. The priority has to be non-car forms of transport, supported by development to facilitate non-car access.	Unfortunately it is not clear which part of the vision these comments relate to. However, the strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. Whilst major growth areas will be based on high quality, viable and attractive public transport, there will still be people living and working in rural communities who will continue to rely on their cars. [PR]	No change.
10335 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	Object	Questions where the evidence is for the need for such a large number of new houses. Brownfield sites should be used.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. The use of brownfield land is at a level that avoids significant conflicts with other priorities in the urban area, such as retaining land for jobs, open space and significant historic character. [PR]	No change.
9339 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Object	Objects to the level of growth forced upon the region by people who do not understand the area. The number of jobs and need of housing are hypothetical in the current recession.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. Estimates for jobs growth is based on detailed studies of the potential of different economic sectors in the area. [PR]	No change
11081 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	Object	Laudable aspirations re deprivation, zero carbon development and green links, but concerns about the overall vision: 1. Greenhouse gas emissions from transport are not addressed 2. Spatial strategy promotes decentralisation and outer orbital northern road opens up land for car-based development 3. JCS is transport-infrastructure-led and does not promote modal shift 4. Growth and roads conflict with other Spatial Planning Objectives viz. healthy and active lifestyles (Obj 3), protection of the natural, built and historic environment (Obj 8), minimisation of climate change (Obj 9), reduce the need to travel (Obj 11). Recommend wording changes to bullet point 3 and objective 10	Objection noted. The strategy attempts to promote road improvements to enable improvements to public transport on radial routes into Norwich, thereby promoting modal shift. See transport questions for further detail.	Consider suggested amendments to vision.
9347 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	Object	The over development of business parks to the east of city (including Postwick) will need a structural makeover	Objection noted.	No change

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9284 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Object	Objects to major development near Catton, Sprowston, Beeston St. Andrews. Disappointed there is no further cultural development proposed. Concerned that there is more funding for education, care services and public transport and police.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth is the favoured GNDP option, including Broadland. The strategy for major growth to the north east of Norwich is being developed in more detail, and this is analysing valuable wildlife habitats and environmental assets. The GNDP is already carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. [PR]	No change.
8350 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	Object	Objects on grounds of unachievable and unaffordable growth plans, especially during a recession.	The GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. The effects of the recession do not diminish the need for jobs and homes, but do affect their timing. This is being taken into account when revising forecasts of housing and jobs	No change.
7991 - Michael Gotts [7844]	Object	Growth is unwanted and will spoil Norfolk.	[PR] The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England.	No change
10800 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Object	Aware that objectives not ranked, but vital considered in correct order for all new growth areas: a) Sustainably accessible jobs b) High speed broadband c) Affordable public transport (bus and rail) and cycling and walking facilities d) Car-sharing e) Important that car use is not made too convenient	Objection noted re ordering of objectives and promotion of sustainable new settlements.	Consider reordering objectives
9376 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	Object	Too many houses in growth triangle, which will change and spoil Norwich. concerned there will be no green belt between Dussingdale and Thorpe End.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth is the favoured GNDP option and has been the subject of detailed debate by the different councils. Masterplanning for the growth triangle will also include important green infrastructure and green spaces, though not undeveloped land in the way described. [PR]	No change
9894 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	Object	The proposed development in the Old Catton/Sprowston/Thorpe are is far too big. Objects to the strategy to build a bypass and extending the urban area up to the new road, resulting in destruction of green areas. The transport links to Norwich, such as Salhouse Road, Plumstead Road, Wroxham Road and Blue Boar Lane need improving. The quality of life of those living in this area will be adversely affected to a huge degree.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth, including the growth triangle, is the favoured GNDP option. The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England.	No change.
7957 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Object	Growth at Long Stratton would encourage commuting into Norwich.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth includes Long Stratton and is the favoured GNDP option, and which also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk.	No change

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9509 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]

Object There wont be enough investment to create or attract 35,000 jobs to the area. A11 and A47 need dualling, and improved rail links.

Estimates for jobs growth is based on detailed studies of the potential of different economic sectors in the area. The current recession may change the timing of job creation and investment, but growth is based on the underlying strengths of different sectors.

No change.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

11140 - JB Planning Associates
(Mr John Boyd) [6979]

Object Overall support to the spatial vision and objectives.

Wymondham - endorse Wymondham as a location for major development, as a sustainable location for new growth that has good local facilities and public transport links. Scope to improve Wymondham's sustainability by improving public transport, local facilities and local employment.

Noted synergies between growth at Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford, which could jointly fund improvements to public transport along the A11 corridor, and reduce private car use.

Wymondham is a far more sustainable location for development than Long Stratton. Suggests reallocating some growth from Long Stratton to Wymondham.

Long Stratton - concerned that level of growth is for the single aim of funding a bypass for the town. Consider this is contrary to objective 4. Long Stratton does not have the local facilities or public transport connections to sustain such a high level of growth. As a settlement, it compares unfavourably with Wymondham, which has been allocated only a slightly higher level of growth, at 2,200 new dwellings. Further to this, the Regional Plan identifies Wymondham as a location for high-tech employment development and rail-related uses, whilst Long Stratton, as an isolated village, is not mentioned. August 2008 Reg 25 consultation noted that only 20-50 new homes could be accommodated in Long Stratton if the bypass were not to be delivered. The comparative levels of development therefore seem to be in conflict with the Regional Plan; if this is the case, the Core Strategy could be found unsound at examination. We are also concerned that there is also less scope for this development to improve facilities in Long Stratton, as there will be little money available after the cost of the bypass and other essential infrastructure have been accounted for. Concerned that increasing housing and reducing local congestion on would lead to unsustainable commuting to Norwich and increase in car traffic.

the objector's extensive comments regarding the scale and distribution of growth in places, especially in south Norfolk have been extensive considered by local councils. Notwithstanding the points made by the objector, the proposed scale and distribution of growth is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk. [PR]

No change

Objective 5 also notes the parts of the Norwich Policy Area which will be locations for major employment development. These do not include

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Long Stratton. The proposed level of development at Long Stratton is inconsistent with Objectives 9, 10 and 11. This would be an unsustainable form of development, which would result in a significant increase in traffic, and carbon emissions.		
8043 - Shane Hull [7857]	Object	Objects to large scale growth at Hethersett	The proposed scale and distribution of growth including Hethersett, is the favoured GNDP option, and which also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk. [PR]	No change
9420 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	Object	See Comments at Q28	See Comments at Q28	See Q28
8136 - Mr Alan Fairweather [7889]	Object	Insufficient attention to infrastructure.	The GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. [PR]	No change
9911 - Miss Lynda Edwards	Object	Norwich will become too big, causing too many problems with unemployment and too much pressure on essential services.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England. The GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. Estimates for jobs growth is based on detailed studies of the potential of different economic sectors in the area. The basis of the strategy is to promote regeneration, development and growth that are as sustainable as	No change.
8694 - mrs jane fischl [8031]	Object	Objects to the amount of proposed growth and considers there will not be enough jobs. Also feels that money should be spent of public transport, cycling and sustainable city centre development rather than	The GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs, and detailed forecasts on jobs (taking account of the recession). This will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy.	No change.
			The strategy already emphasises how it must help to deliver more sustainable communities, including the city centre.	
8462 - Mr C Skeels [8016]	Object	Agrees in general but too much growth is planned at Wymondham.	The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars The proposed scale and distribution of growth, including Wymondham, is the favoured GNDP option, and which also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in	No change

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10448 - Mr David Smith [8309]	Object	Objects to all of it - this will change Norfolk for ever.	The scale of new housing growth is the minimum to be provided in the area and is required by the regional spatial strategy, based on population forecasts for the east of England.	No change.
8584 - Mr M Read [8024]	Object	The growth proposals will result in high density housing with insufficient parking, producing slums of the future. Only brownfield land should be built on, using existing infrastructure.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk. [PR] General objections noted. Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to develop strategic policies on design and sustainability, which aim to reflect the advice and guidance of CAGE on major growth. The capacity of the urban area for new development is heavily constrained by a complex combination of historic environments, valuable parks and other urban green space, and the need to protect employment land from competing uses (like housing). Significantly more brownfield development would only be possible at present by eroding into these, with significant adverse impacts on the environment, communities and overall policy objectives. [PR]	No change.
10576 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	Objector has answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.	Objections noted.	
9693 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	Object	Insufficient thought and planning has gone into allocation of housing at Long Stratton. The only thought is it will provide a bypass. There are no new planned employment areas, so new residents will mainly have to commute to Norwich which goes against policy of reducing car journeys. If many of the planned houses are occupied by elderly people retiring to Norfolk this will put pressure on health and social services.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth, including Long Stratton, is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk.	No change.
8704 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Object	Objects to too much development on prime agricultural land. Further comment about a gypsy and traveller site in Spooner Row.	No major growth would be on grade 1 agricultural land (the highest quality and the most versatile). Comments about gypsy and traveller site is not relevant to this plan (refer to South Norfolk Council, gypsy & traveller development plan document)	No change
9954 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Object	Agree with the vast majority, but object to reference to improving road network and feel there is not enough emphasis on promoting modal shift. Suggest specific rewording of objectives to promote sustainable modes of transport.	Objection noted. The strategy promotes modal shift. To achieve this, it will be necessary to free up roadspace on radial routes to Norwich for sustainable transport improvements through some road building.	Consider suggested amendments to wording of objectives.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9907 - Christopher Webb [8019]	Object	Objects to the proposed Norwich Northern Distributor Road, because it would increase carbon emissions at a time when it is imperative that carbon emissions are drastically reduced.	The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy as a whole. The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. The strategy already emphasises how it must help to deliver more sustainable communities, and which help to address climate change.	No change.
9788 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Object	Object to spatial strategy which does not allocate sufficient development to rural locations and focuses too much development on Cringleford. Previous development has led to urbanisation in Cringleford and has not brought sufficient benefits through section 106 agreements. We anticipate that there will be significant environmental impacts and restrictions in the area suggested for development. We would not consider any new development without a full environmental appraisal by an independent environmental consultant. We would expect to be involved in the tendering process and selection of the consultant.	The strategy identifies Cringleford as an area for growth as it is on the edge of the urban area and has good public transport links, with the potential for further improvement and good access to employment. Focussing significant development in more isolated locations would be likely to make the plan unsound as it would generate greater need to travel and therefore be unsustainable. The strategy sets out the social and environmental infrastructure requirements to serve new development, such as the need for green infrastructure. Subsequent plans will give more detail concerning any potential development at Cringleford. The detail of any planning application will be dealt with at the planning application stage. Further parish council will be welcomed. The legislation covering the need for EIA is set nationally and will be considered when any planning application is received. If needed, an EIA must be submitted by a developer to support their planning application.	No change to plan
10165 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]	Object	Object as strategic sites noted in the County's emerging MWDF Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPDs are not accounted for the spatial vision and vision does not comply to PPS 12. Spatial objectives do not seek to protect sites of strategic rail network for transporting goods, thus reducing pressure on the strategic road	Objection noted.	Consider need for vision cover minerals and waste sites and to further promote rail freight.
8486 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Object	General objection. Specifically objects to major development at Colney/Cringleford. Objects to objective 11 as it is impossible to build such large scale growth and also reduce the need to travel.	General objection noted. The proposed scale and distribution of growth, including Colney/Cringleford, is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk. The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. [PR]	No change.
8337 - Mr Geoffrey Loades	Object	Insufficient attention given to the opportunity to develop villages and market towns, to sustain them.	Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to identify the scale and distribution of new development in villages. This pattern of growth is seen by the GNDP as necessary to support and sustain local services in rural areas. [PR]	No further change needed.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10784 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Claburn) [8360]	Object	<p>Considers it is vital spatail objectives are considered in the correct order:</p> <p>a) In every new growth area an appropriate number of jobs must also be created within walking/cycling distance of the new houses as well as all of the necessary services to ensure that it is not necessary to travel unsustainably</p> <p>b) All new growth areas must have high speed broadband installed as standard to enable homeworking and e-activities/services rather than travel</p> <p>c) New growth areas must have convenient and affordable public transport (bus and rail) and cycling and walking facilities incorporated into them so sustainable travel is possible and encouraged when habits are being formed</p> <p>d) Car-sharing needs to be properly promoted in each area to ensure that any car journeys that are made have a high occupancy (this needs to be monitored)</p> <p>e) It is important that car use is not made too convenient otherwise it will be chosen and then congestion will</p>	<p>Comments noted and are to be considered further. Other than car-sharing, the other points referred to in the representation are addressed in the strategy. However, the respondent makes an important comment about the order in which they should be considered in policy development, and taking forward major projects (especially growth locations). [PR]</p>	<p>To consider the ordering of objectives, possibly as a sequential approach to sustainable communities in greater Norwich.</p>
8630 - Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030]	Object	<p>Scale of growth is disproportionate to the size of the city. Need more emphasis on affordable housing, better public transport, cycling and walking, and jobs near peoples' homes. The NDR seems contrary to these principles.</p>	<p>The proposed scale and distribution of growth is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk.</p> <p>The strategy is already based on providing a significant proportion of affordable housing, ensuring the opportunity for new jobs to be close to new growth areas, to promote attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable.</p> <p>The transportation package that comprises the NDR and significant improvements to public transport and the local road network in Norwich is identified as critical infrastructure to enable the implementation of the strategy as a whole. [PR]</p>	<p>No change</p>
8062 - Mr Terence George Stanford [7873]	Object	<p>General objection</p>	<p>Objection noted [PR]</p>	<p>No change</p>
8638 - The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]	Object	<p>Comments refer to resource and waste management: this is a conspicuous omission from the vision but included in objective 9</p>	<p>Objection accepted.</p>	<p>Amend text of the vision to refer to waste management</p>
8605 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]	Support	<p>General support, and concern about provision for jobs and infrastructure.</p>	<p>General support welcomed. The GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. This work, together with extensive analysis of the potnetial for jobs growth (taking account of the current recession) is reflected in the strategy.</p>	<p>No change</p>

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10815 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	Support	Support vision and objectives. Detailed assessment provided of how development to the north east of Wymondham could meet the vision and objectives of the plan.	Support noted. The comments seek to justify the identification of a specific development area and how the backers of development in that area could meet the plan's vision and objectives. Whilst the commentary is noted, this is a strategic plan which identifies broad areas of growth without identifying specific sites. This will be dealt with in subsequent plans.	No change to plan.
7994 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	Support	Insufficient attention given to infrastructure	The GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. [PR]	No change
8173 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	Support	Objects to further development at Hethel Engineering Centre	Hethel is identified in the regional spatial strategy as a strategic location to develop jobs, and is a regionally important centre for motor sports engineering. [PR]	No change
9265 - Mrs Gray [5927] 8053 - Mrs Charlotte Wootten [7861] 8078 - Mr S Buller [7879] 8083 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	Support	General support	Support welcomed	No change
8411 - Ed King [7965] 9140 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] 9755 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184] 10060 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] 10070 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10157 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] 10258 - The Theatres Trust (Ms 11109 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Support	General support for the promotion of zero carbon development. However, as zero carbon development has not yet been defined, suggest amendment from "zero carbon development will be the standard" the words "to be achieved" should be replaced by "if this can be achieved in a cost efficient manner".	Welcome general support. Text later in the plan makes it clear that the national definition of zero carbon development, when clarified, will be used locally.	Consider recommended amendment to the wording of vision concerning zero carbon development.
10752 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048]	Support	Supports the vision which recognises communities' spiritual needs in the area. This will need to be reflected in the detailed policies including Policy 18 in order to deliver community infrastructure including new Places of Worship.	Support welcomed and detailed comments noted for amendment. [PR]	Amend policy 18 to ensure community infrastructure includes new Places of Worship

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9860 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Support	Support the spatial vision for the Joint Core Strategy Area. Support Wymondham as a main town, being a sustainable location for further development, owing to the excellent range of services and facilities and good accessibility by public transport. Support Hingham and Poringland / Framingham Earl as Key Service Centres as they both benefit from a range	Support welcomed. [PR]	No change.
8260 - Miss Claire Yaxley [7908]	Support	General support, including emphasis on tackling climate change, and comment that growth should be based on reducing the need to travel	Support welcomed. The strategy is based on reducing travel demand, and developing attractive alternatives to	No change
9865 - Hill Residential [8215] 10867 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] 10878 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Support	Support vision and objectives and proposed locations for growth. These reflect the requirements of PPS3 and the East of England Plan to the effect that the Norwich area has the potential to develop further as a major focus for long term economic development and growth. Specific named locations for growth can help to achieve the vision and objectives of the plan.	Support noted	No change to plan
10632 - Ms Jane Chittenden	Support	In the vision for the future, would like to see more emphasis on alternatives to car travel - eg local rail, trams, exploiting under-used existing infrastructure where possible; controlled and coordinated by a single integrated transport authority.	Comments welcomed and noted. The strategy is already based on providing attractive and viable public transport alternatives to private cars wherever practicable. Some of the comments are outside the scope of the joint core strategy, but more relevant to the local transport plan.	No change.
10995 - Mrs S Plaw [8370]	Support	General support although concern at choice of Service Villages and their level of growth.	The proposed scale and distribution of growth is the favoured GNDP option, and also reflects the pattern and character of settlements in south Norfolk. Since the publication of the public consultation draft further work has been carried out to identify the scale and distribution of new development in villages. This pattern of growth is seen by the GNDP as necessary to support and sustain local services in rural areas. [PR]	No further change beyond current editing.
8803 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	Support	General support but question how realistic the proposals are given the current economic climate.	Support welcome. The forecasts for new homes and jobs do take account of the current recession, but the timing of when the growth will take place is under constant	No change.
8148 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	Support	Support and general comments	Support welcomed and general comments noted. [PR]	No change

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10727 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Support	General support	Support welcomed	None
11125 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]				
10504 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]				
11070 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535]				
10758 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]				
10972 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]				
10393 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294]				
10425 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]				
10476 - Mr I T Smith [8310]				
10652 - Jim Smith (Mr Jim Smith) [8342]				
10658 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348]				
10924 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]				

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9213 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8560 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 9144 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 9870 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] 10044 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 8222 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	Support	General support	Support welcomed	No change to plan
10010 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] 8387 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] 9923 - John Heaser [7015] 9094 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 9024 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] 8962 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]				
8512 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 7985 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843] 8082 - Mr S Buller [7879] 8262 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8536 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 8616 - Kay Eke [8025] 8615 - Thorpe St Andrew Town Council (Mr Steven Ford) [8027] 8617 - Thorpe St Andrew Town Council (Mr Steven Ford) [8027] 8649 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8673 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] 9668 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 8723 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8768 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]				
8969 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9096 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111] 9461 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134] 9479 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139] 9536 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149] 9585 - Mr Ashley Catton [8157] 9594 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162]				

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9947 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd [8222] 9987 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10021 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10097 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] 10122 - Mr David Nichols [8242] 10172 - Commercial Land [8246] 8288 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	Support	General support. Queries which side of the A11 employment will be at Wymondham, and requests that the 'Wymondham/all corridor' is defined more clearly.	Support welcome. Clarify text.	Amend descriptions in the text regarding: a) which side of the A11 employment will be at Wymondham; and b) clearer definition of 'Wymondham/A11 corridor'.
10358 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	Support	Support in principle although the vision is aspirational thinking towards an ideal concept and doubts it is achievable. No apparent regard to cost which, at a time of long-term economic uncertainty, adds further to the doubt that such ambitious plans are practicable.	General support is welcomed. With regard to costs, the GNDP is carrying out significant work on infrastructure needs and costs and this will form part of a comprehensive implementation plan for the strategy. The implementation plan, and forecasts for new housing and jobs, do take account of the current economic climate and the impact for the time it may take to meet these	No change.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Decision on (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?
Consider amendments to objectives to reflect EA advice.

Amend text as soon as the Water Cycle Study stage 2b is completed.

Amend text in vision, objective 7 and strategic policy to refer to the need for investment in higher education, including UEA.

Consider greater emphasis on promotion of equality in vision.

Amend descriptions in the text regarding:
a) which side of the A11 employment will be at Wymondham; and
b) clearer definition of 'Wymondham/A11 corridor'.

Ensure in editing, that the strategy succinctly and directly identifies what sort of place Norwich will be in the future, rather than being led by infrastructure proposals.

Consider suggested amendments to vision.

See Q28

Ensure revised policies is clear about the strategic criteria to be used in deciding how and where new homes on smaller sites will be determined.

Spatial Portrait, para. 4.2 'Natural Environment, landscape and diversity'. Amend to include a brief outline of the region's rich geodiversity, correcting the way in which 'geology' is referred to . Add 'Geodiversity' to the title.

Objective 8: revise next to last sentence to read "Biodiversity, geodiversity and locally ..."

To consider the ordering of objectives, possibly as a sequential approach to sustainable communities in greater Norwich.

Consider reordering objectives

To develop and update section on delivery.

Amend policy 18 to ensure community infrastructure includes new Places of Worship.

Ensure importance of high quality design is emphasised more fully in the vision and throughout the plan.

Consider amendments to vision and objectives to give greater focus on what type of place the plan seeks to create/enhance.

Consider general rewording re Broads and greater emphasis on environmental protection

Consider adding further wording in vision re promoting agriculture

Ensure revised policy reinforces services in smaller settlements, and peoples' access to them.

Consider incorporating specific wording amendments to vision re support and growth of agricultural sector.

See response to policy 5.

Consider need for vision cover minerals and waste sites and to further promote rail freight.

Ensure the vision, objectives and relevant policies are specific about the needs of an ageing population. Ensure the implementation plan is also specific about these needs.

Amend text of the vision to refer to waste management.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Consider amendments to take account of GO East comments on:

1. Content of portrait
2. Links to other plans
3. Links between carbon reduction and 4. transport and strengthening of economic vision
clearer reference to eco town potential
reduce detail of vision eg on rural areas
4. Reference to ecotown potential
5. Avoiding repetition
6. Ordering of objectives

Development of the strategy needs to made sure policy requirements are viable, and based on evidence.

Consider recommended amendment to the wording of vision concerning zero carbon development.

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6. Spatial Strategy (Q2)				
<i>(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</i>				
8628 - University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]	Comment	There is no mention of the Colney Lane Bus Link	This is a strategic document which does not set out the detail of all transport schemes. The potential for a colney bus link will be considered through other documents,	No change to plan
11098 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] 10907 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Comment	Essential supporting infrastructure such as green infrastructure, schools, emergency services and health care will also be required. Concern about NNDR funding as JCS cannot rely on development areas in other parts of the GNDP funding NNDR when they do not have the same effect on capacity as development in the North East. Further detail is needed on how much water supply and sewage disposal upgrades/ facilities will cost. Concern that the A47 has yet to be assessed in the terms of capacity against the anticipated growth- need to complete this assessment prior to allocations being determined to understand impact on proposed growth options.	Comment noted. Other infrastructural requirements are listed elsewhere in the plan. Further detail on the A47 and water is being produced as part of the evidence base.	Ensure plan takes account of the findings of the Water Cycle Study and transport requirements are set out in NATS.
10601 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	Comment	Critical to take account of likely timing of infrastructure e.g. employment developments such as at airport are reliant on major infrastructure so unlikely to be available in the short to medium term.	Comment noted. The Implementation section will identify what infrastructure is required and when it is required.	No change to plan
8109 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	Comment	Housing developments need to address current problems such as lack of outdoor space, adequately sized garages and a minimum of two off road parking spaces for every household. Existing estate roads are cluttered with on road car parking.	Noted. Policies covering these issues will be in the Development Management plans for each district.	No change to plan
10381 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Comment	In addition to road based schemes which the GNDP considers will be required to enable certain locations to come forward for development, early recognition of the role of sustainable transport in delivering growth would be helpful. Reference to Bus Rapid Transport at policies 2, 3 and 4 suggest that this might also be regarded as either critical or essential infrastructure.	Noted.	Consider including BRT in list of critical infrastructure
10701 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Comment	Water companies can advise on water supply and sewage disposal requirements. Should be studied through WCS.	Comment noted.	Include more detail on water infrastructure requirements reflecting the findings of the Water Cycle Study.

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9743 - Great Yarmouth Borough Council (Mr David Glason) [6974]	Comment	Council welcomes proposals; however there is concern that these plans may generate an adverse impact in the Great Yarmouth area as they could be seen to be in competition. The plans may undermine the extensive efforts to regenerate brownfield riverside sites in the heart of the town. The Council needs to be re-assured that the specific challenges facing Great Yarmouth will continue to be recognised and responded to through appropriate and timely interventions and assistance designed to support and facilitate its own development	The infrastructure is needed to support the growth required by the adopted East of England Plan. Insufficient brownfield sites are available to meet this scale of growth. Growth of greater Norwich's economy should be taken account of by Great Yarmouth to ensure that the benefits of that growth are shared.	No change to plan
9669 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	Comment	The small amount of B road upgrading and the lack of attention to traffic flow analysis may contribute to future problems.	Traffic flow analysis informs transport policy.	No change to plan
9655 - Ms E Riches [8165]	Comment	Bypass at Long Stratton should be funded by government- not through restricting services that would otherwise have been provided for (through developer	The A140 is no longer a trunk road and therefore can not be funded by the Highways Agency.	No change to plan
9087 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Comment	Green infrastructure provision must be considered on a strategic scale and not just in terms of individual developments and reference should be made to recreational infrastructure.	The plan refers both to the need for strategic green infrastructure and for recreational space.	No change to plan
8871 - ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620]	Comment	Need junction improvements at A140/A47	Agreed - junction improvements will be required to support development	No change to plan
9637 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Comment	It appears that the strategy is dependent on investment for supporting infrastructure by various utilities and without this it will be unlikely to meet RSS targets. This suggests that the GNPD are unable to put forward any realistic delivery vehicle in support of its favoured growth options at this time. This document does not take into consideration comments made by technical consultees and as such proves that there is insufficient evidence base on which to justify its favoured growth option. There is no justification for 1,800 homes at Long Stratton simply for a bypass. The strategy is car based and will only increase traffic and congestion on the A140.	Noted. The Implementation section of the plan covers delivery of infrastructure, though it is accepted that further consideration should be given to a delivery vehicle. Opposition to growth at Long Stratton noted.	Consider delivery vehicle to ensure implementation of the plan.
9471 - Louisa Young [8135]	Comment	Need for stronger emphasis on green infrastructure, schools, emergency services, healthcare and affordable housing.	Noted. All of these issues are covered in the plan. The need for a greater emphasis on health facilities is agreed.	Ensure plan gives greater emphasis to health facilities.
10246 - Mrs Angela Garner [8258]	Comment	Lack of communication between planning, health, education and transport. Hospital is full, care in the community is a disaster, the walk-in centre with excellent parking is moving to the mall (is the transport strategy not to keep cars out of the city) and villages such as Cringleford have no public transport in the evening or on Sundays.	The purpose of this plan is to ensure co-ordination between various service providers and thus to promote increased access to services and enable provision to be made to serve growth.	No change to plan
8708 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Comment	Funding gap between requirements and funds needs addressing as does timing of infrastructure	Comment noted. The Implementation section of the plan deals with infrastructure delivery.	No change to plan

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9342 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Comment	Difficulty will be getting it in place in the right order with little inconvenience. Doubt right amount of public transport, small convenience shops, medical centre and schools will be provided.	Noted. The Implementation policy aims to ensure that infrastructure is provided at the appropriate time to serve new development.	No change to plan
9537 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149]	Object	No. Not all infrastructure will be relevant to smaller scale developments.	Noted. This issue will be addressed in the plan when the evidence base on infrastructure need is complete.	Ensure issue of infrastructure requirements from small scale development is addressed.
7946 - Colin Mould [7809] 7986 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843] 8079 - Mr S Buller [7879] 8263 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8289 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915] 8487 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] 9462 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134] 10123 - Mr David Nichols [8242]	Object	Need to improve road and rail links to the rest of the county and Europe by dualling the A11 and A47, improve Norwich to London and Norwich to Midlands rail link and have rapid bus lanes into Norwich.	The plan supports the suggested transport improvements.	No change to plan
9480 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]	Object	Have you thought about enough schools?	Yes, childrens services are providing appropriate	No change to plan
9955 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Object	The list of major road schemes ignores the vast majority of the vision and is incompatible with sustainable development. There is no logic for the need for the road schemes since there is a need to manage travel behaviour and the demand for transport and make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Schemes to increase road capacity are at odds with this so the NDR, A47 junction improvements and Long Stratton bypass should not be mentioned. The critical infrastructure requirements should be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ Efficient and adequate water supply and sewage disposal â€¢ Efficient and adequate transport networks â€¢ Green infrastructure â€¢ Schools â€¢ Health facilities â€¢ Provision for emergency services â€¢ Adequate affordable housing 	Objection and infrastructure recommendations noted. The NDR and the junction improvements on the A47 will give road space over to public transport to enable	Consider clearer reference to water requirements.
8328 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	Object	No initiatives shown how to reduce water usage and sewage generation. If the NNDR falls, the whole spatial strategy has nowhere to go. Is it not dependant upon unitary council?	Policy 13 covers water efficiency, though it is accepted that it is necessary to cover this issue in more detail. The NNDR is a key issue for the plan. The strategy is not dependent on the local government review.	Ensure the issues of water efficiency and sewerage are covered in more detail.
10577 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	Please go to Question 28	See question 28	See question 28

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10071 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10879 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Object	Recognise NNDR has been identified as a significant part of NATS and funding from Regional Funding Allocation gives greater degree of certainty over its delivery. However even with the absence of the NNDR, the North East is the most sustainable location for growth in the area and offers a unique opportunity to facilitate significant improvements to the transport network in Norwich. It is suggested that paragraph 6.2 is amended to include bullet point that refers to new rail halts that utilise the existing capacity of the Bittern Line and to the inner link road (which will carry orbital movement from Broadland Business Park in the south through to Wroxham Road). The potential for tram/train transit opportunities should be fully explored.	Comments noted.	Consider including reference to rail halts, tram train potential and inner link road
10311 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Object	The infrastructure proposed is dictating the spatial strategy and the location of development rather than serving it e.g. NNDR, Long Stratton bypass. NATS requires urgent review to refocus priorities on a high grade, efficient public transport system which would link settlements with the city centre and major employment locations. The level of growth also places further pressure on water resource and treatment in the country which is barely touched upon in the proposed	The strategy promotes a balanced transport policy and prioritises improvements to public transport. A Water Cycle Study has identified the water infrastructure required to support growth and further detail on this issue will be incorporated in the plan when that study is complete.	Incorporate findings of Water Cycle Study in the plan.
10166 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]	Object	The critical infrastructure requirements do not take account of existing assets within the plan area. The long term protection an enhancement of the area's intermodal materials handling facilities will aid in the achievement of the development objectives.	Noted.	Consider including the long term protection an enhancement of the area's intermodal materials handling facilities through the plan.
9028 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] 9924 - John Heaser [7015] 8631 - Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030]	Object	Insufficient emphasis on public transport, the rail network and safe walking/cycling routes (both urban and rural) - need for off road, safe cycle paths.	The strategy seeks to promote a balanced transport policy, with road improvements enabling public transport improvements. The strategy promotes walking and cycling. More detail will be set out in subsequent plans.	No change to plan
8650 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8674 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]				
9349 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	Object	Need to address traffic problems at Thorpe/Postwick business areas.	Noted. The plan promotes road improvements at the Postwick hub.	No change to plan.
10554 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Object	Maintain and improve what already exists.	The infrastructure required is necessary to enable the growth required in the East of England Plan.	No change to plan
9895 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	Object	The NDR is in the wrong place. It seems to me that the intention is fill in behind it, creating one huge 'new' city. This development will be detrimental to those living in Old Catton/Sprowston/Thorpe area.	Substantial development is required to meet the housing need set out in the East of England Plan. A large urban extension has been identified as the most appropriate way to meet the majority of the housing need in Broadland. The plan requires development to be built to high standards and to provide the services it needs to reduce negative impact on existing development.	No change to plan
10530 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Object	This critical infrastructure just feeds large numbers of	Objection noted. New road provision is intended free up	No change to plan

vehicles on to already crowded roads.

road space for public transport improvements.

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9504 - South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142]

Object There are major infrastructure implications for any development of the Deal Ground and Utilities sites. It would be unlikely that developers could fund it alone.

Noted. The site specific needs at this site will be addressed in the Norwich Site Allocation plan.

No change to plan.

11082 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]

Object Concern that JCS is being driven by road infrastructure projects in particular north east which will bolster case for NDR. Major new road building is incompatible with sustainable development, increase car dependency and CO2, will lead to further decentralisation of actives and takes away funding from sustainable transport and community infrastructure. The NDR does not provide a good fit with emerging spatial patterns, will encourage car travel and increase CO2 emissions. Building a dual carriage bypass at Long Stratton is not justified and Long Stratton is unsuitable for major development as is largely reliant on car use. Alternatives- NATS must be reviewed in line with the RSS to provide a high quality public transport system with cross-city links, new local access roads should be provided on a scale commensurate with servicing new development and supporting green travel modes. The road infrastructure is unsound as it is inconsistent with national policies, is not in general conformity with the RSS, there is a lack of justification/evidence for road schemes, alternative transport options have not been tested and there is no guarantee that the projects are deliverable. NDR, A47 improvements and Long Stratton bypass should be deleted and replaced with a public transport system to included BRT, with cross-city links for connecting the different parts of the NPA and enhancements to the local rail network.

Objection noted. The road improvements are intended to free up space for public transport improvements, therefore showing conformity with national and regional policy. Cross city BRT is promoted through the plan and further work on rail capacity is to be undertaken to infrom policy. For further detail on these issues, see responses to

See response to transport policy

11141 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]

Object Concerned that developer contributions at Long Stratton will primarily be required to fund the bypass and not local facilities that the development will require. The allocation at Long Stratton is based on insufficient evidence and the single issue of a bypass must be kept in perspective with regards to the Core Strategies aims and objectives. Long Stratton is an unsustainable settlement with poor public transport and limited facilities. It is not suitable for the proposed level of development. There appears to be a significant degree of uncertainty around the level of growth required to fund a bypass, the availability of funding to pay for it up from and the effect that the cost of the bypass will have on the availability of developer contributions to fund local facilities such as affordable housing. Should the Core Strategy progress on this basis,

Objection to growth at Long Stratton and view that this would make the Core Strategy unsound noted.

Take account of view that growth at Long Stratton would make the strategy unsound.

it would not be based on credible or robust evidence base and would be found unsound.

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8398 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978] 10449 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10477 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	Opposed to large scale development. It will result in more crime and will destroy the feeling of living in a safe rural community with a sense of belonging.	Large scale development is needed to meet the growth required by the East of England plan. This plan attempts to ensure that the growth creates vibrant new communities with the facilities to enable a sense of community to be created.	No change to plan
10264 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068] 8054 - Mrs Charlotte Wootten [7861] 8137 - Mr Alan Fairweather [7889]	Object	NNDR needs to be dualled and/or links up with both ends of the A47. Not linking it may result in increased traffic.	NNDR is proposed as a dual carriageway. The link to the west was carefully considered but rejected by the county council on environmental grounds, as it would have to cross the nationally designated environmental asset of the Wensum Valley.	No change to plan
8454 - Mr Peter Sergeant [7993] 8832 - Mr John Nelson [8064]				
8902 - Old Catton Parish Council (Mrs S Barber) [1816] 9561 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	Object	The NDR has limited value as it will not be easily accessed locally. There may be more traffic passing through Old Catton with new homes to the north of Norwich and through Drayton, Costessey and Taverham.	The strategy is designed to reduce traffic in the suburbs and improve public transport.	No change to plan
10843 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Object	Given the stated need for a modal shift away from car use, it is surprising that 2 out of 3 critical infrastructure requirements are to do with upgrading the road network. Improvements to Water Supply touches on an issue which if an environmentally responsible path was pursued, could well act as a brake on development.	Objection noted. The road projects are intended to free up space for public transport improvements. The Water Cycle Study is covering water infrastructure requirements and will inform the plan.	Ensure the findings of the Water Cycle Study inform the plan.
9543 - Mr R Harris [8146]	Object	Increasing population does not answer problems of deprivation in Norwich or rural areas- this has to be dealt with via increased investment by public utilities and local government with Government grants. Education is a priority so that the high tech industry at Colney and UEA can be expanded. A higher wage structure is required in agriculture and there needs to be a restriction on second homes. Small industries should be encouraged to support the local village and the young village residents. Sites need to be provided for Gypsies and travellers. There should be restriction of legal and illegal immigration.	Issues such as agricultural pay rates, second homes and immigration policy can not be dealt with through this plan as they are matters for national government. The plan covers gipsy and traveller sites and promotes improved education facilities.	No change to plan.

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10728 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Object	Yes	Support noted	No change to plan
8561 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]				
9145 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]				
9871 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]				
11126 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]				
10045 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]				
8223 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]				
10210 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
8804 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]				
10011 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]				
8388 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]				
9095 - Mr John Osborne [7111]				
10505 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]				
8963 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]				
8264 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]				
8412 - Ed King [7965]				
8379 - M Harrold [7966]				
8422 - M Harrold [7966]				
8463 - Mr C Skeels [8016]				
8537 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]				
8724 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]				
8970 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]				
9097 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]				
9141 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]				
9421 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]				
9595 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162]				

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[8184] 9821 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 9988 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10022 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10098 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] 10173 - Commercial Land [8246]				
10394 - Acle Parish Council (Ms 9286 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Object	No to NDR and growth areas. North of Norwich is an ancient woodland and park land.	Objection noted. Environmental assets will be incorporated in the green infrastructure as far as possible. Ancient woodland is protected from development.	
8149 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 9511 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Object	The same priorities have been identified before and have not been delivered.	Objection noted. The plan sets out present funding priorities. Many previous priorities have been delivered, some remain as priorities in this plan.	No change to plan
10816 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	Object	There is some doubt over the deliverability of NDR which could frustrate delivery of the north east location. Wymondham is the next most sustainable location and offers a unique opportunity to unlock significant amount of growth early on. Greater use should be made of the rail link Wymondham has with Norwich, Cambridge and	The strategy promotes delivery of the NDR and improved services on the Cambridge line.	No change to plan
10785 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Claburn) [8360] 10801 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Object	It is important to reduce congestion but it is best achieved by reducing the need to travel and to travel more sustainably. Bottlenecks should be addressed after that. Critical infrastructure should include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ High speed broadband for all settlement â€¢ Network of pleasant, convenient, direct and well maintained cycle paths â€¢ Countywide car-sharing scheme â€¢ High Occupancy Vehicle and bus lanes on main routes â€¢ Availability of car clubs. â€¢ Assess potential to reopen railway lines 	Objection noted. The plan promotes sustainable travel and the reduction in the need to travel. Detailed transport schemes will be set out in NATS.	Ensure the plan promotes broadband improvements.
9694 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	Object	Insufficient detail of infrastructure required for 1,800 at Long Stratton e.g sewerage system is inadequate, water pressure is low. Who will pay for these if the developer has to pay for bypass, affordable housing and	The developer will have to provide the infrastructure necessary to enable their development to go ahead, including water infrastructure.	No change to plan
8893 - Hempsall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Object	Infrastructure requirements (e.g. NNDR, Long Stratton bypass) are incompatible with the aspiration to preserve the rural nature of the countryside surrounding Norwich.	Noted. Infrastructure improvements will be necessary to support growth required by the East of England Plan.	No change to plan
9214 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	Object	Whilst the development of transport networks is important, maintaining and improving existing services	Objection noted. The plan covers new development and therefore focuses on the infrastructure required to support	No change to plan

8351 - Alyson Lowe [6992]
 8868 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]
 9075 - Ms R Pickering [8109]

such as sewage/water and healthcare are more immediately important.

that development. Maintenance of existing facilities is the ongoing responsibility of a variety of bodies, though facilities to support new development may benefit existing

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9283 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] 9912 - Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] 10759 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah)	Object	Need more emphasis on hospital/healthcare facilities. Planning for primary and secondary healthcare will be required to meet the needs of the new population. EDAW study has helpful estimates.	Noted.	Include greater emphasis on hospital/healthcare facilities, taking account of the findings of the EDAW study.
8585 - Mr M Read [8024]	Object	Use brownfield sites only	The strategy promotes the use of brownfield sites, but there are insufficient previously developed sites to meet the growth needs.	No change to plan
8445 - Ian Harris [8007]	Object	If people are to live, work and play within walking and cycling distance, why are two out of the three requirements road-related?	A variety of transport solutions, including roads, are required to promote accessibility for all.	No change to plan
10648 - Ms Lucy Hall [8295] 10659 - Mrs Lyn Robertson	Object	NATS is already out of date as produced before large scale house building was proposed. Critical infrastructure needed are water and sewage improvements, rail and light rail, good interchange facilities between bike, car, rail and	A review of NATS is taking place. The plan promotes modal shift and improved interchange facilities	No change to plan
8639 - The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]	Object	Absence of waste management as a critical infrastructure requirement.	Objection noted. A separate waste management plan is being produced by Norfolk County Council	Consider the need for reference to waste management in this plan.
8513 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	Object	There is no detail about how public transport services will be supported with the necessary revenue.	This will be set out in the NATS plan	No change to plan
9260 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	Object	It is not feasible to have rapid bus transit routes as on Newmarket Road. The NDR is only going to serve a small community and will encourage further building along its route	BRT routes may require some road widening in places. The NDR will free up road space for bus priority measures.	No change to plan
8257 - R Barker [6805]	Object	The Issues and Options JCS said that even with a bypass at Long Stratton, transport accessibility is poor. As such the policy for growth is flawed.	Objection noted. The amount of growth identified in Long Stratton would require a bypass to enable its	No change to plan

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9226 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 7958 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 7923 - mr paul newson [7812] 8056 - Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870] 8063 - Mr Terence George Stanford [7873] 8199 - Mr P Anderson [7901] 8313 - Marion Amos [7919] 8958 - MR Richard Edwards [7925] 8339 - e buitenhuis [7951] 8442 - Dr Tim Rayner [8006] 9908 - Christopher Webb [8019] 8697 - mrs jane fischl [8031] 8939 - Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] 8947 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	Object	Over emphasis on new road building. There is no requirement for the NNDR. Instead there should be more emphasis on improving public transport, the rail network and cycle routes/footpaths.	The NNDR is required to enable public transport improvements by freeing up road space for bus, cycle and pedestrian priority. See responses to transport policy for further detail.	No change to plan
9185 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] 9322 - Ms Celia Viner [8123] 9377 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124] 9720 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	Object	What is the definition of 'right'? And 'right' for whom? Incomers? Present incumbents?	The question refers to infrastructure to serve new development. This development will serve both existing local people as household sizes decrease and new residents to the area.	No change to plan.
9789 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Support	Yes. Also need to include that local employers must be involved with infrastructure development, both as employers and service providers to town and rural communities.	Planning can not require development to use local service providers.	No change to plan
11041 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	Support	Subject to ensuring contributions from new developments does not have a material impact on viability and hence deliverability.	Noted. The implementation section covers viability considerations.	No change to plan.
8769 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	Support	If NNDR is built what is the planned course of its route?	Detail of the route is available from the county council	No change to plan
10359 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	Support	The strategy is dependent on significant investment and the government's track record is questionable in this regard. The failure of a single element could result in the collapse of the whole strategy.	Noted. Investment will come from a number of different agencies, from private developers and from the	No change to plan
8619 - Kay Eke [8025]	Support	Agree that any development must be undertaken with full supporting infrastructure.	Support noted	No change to plan

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8174 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 7992 - Michael Gotts [7844] 7995 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851] 8065 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875]	Support	Infrastructure improvements must be completed before new building takes places to avoid exacerbating existing problems.	Infrastructure improvements are phased to be in tandem with new development	
8261 - Miss Claire Yaxley [7908]	Support	Support. NDR is long overdue and will take traffic off smaller roads. Cycling and improved bus routes are an unrealistic alternative.	Support for NDR noted. Promotion of walking and cycling are part of a balanced transport policy.	No change to plan
11110 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Support	Where infrastructure is described as critical, there is a policy requirement to ensure that related development is not permitted to exceed the level which triggers the requirement if that infrastructure has not yet been implemented. A Long Stratton bypass is described appropriately as essential supporting infrastructure.	Support noted.	No change to plan.
8084 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	Support	Adequate drainage systems needed to account for heavy rainfall	Agreed. These will be provided by Anglian Water to serve new development. Significant evidence on water has informed the plan.	Ensure plan includes an infrastructure policy to cover drainage.
10633 - Ms Jane Chittenden	Support	Need specific mention of investment in local rail services linking market towns to Norwich and less dependence on road travel.	Noted. The capacity of local rail services is subject to further investigation. Bus rapid transit is identified as playing a key role in promoting public transport.	No change to plan

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Decision on (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?
Ensure the issues of water efficiency and sewerage are covered in more detail.

Incorporate findings of Water Cycle Study in the plan.

Consider including the long term protection and enhancement of the area's intermodal materials handling facilities through the plan.

Consider including BRT in list of critical infrastructure.

Include greater emphasis on hospital/healthcare facilities, taking account of the findings of the EDAW study.

Consider including reference to rail halts, tram train potential and inner link road.

Ensure plan gives greater emphasis to health facilities.

Ensure the findings of the Water Cycle Study inform the plan.

Ensure plan takes account of the findings of the Water Cycle Study and transport requirements are set out in NATS.

Consider the need for reference to waste management in this plan.

Consider clearer reference to water requirements.

Ensure issue of infrastructure requirements from small scale development is addressed.

Include more detail on water infrastructure requirements reflecting the findings of the Water Cycle Study.

Take account of view that growth at Long Stratton would make the strategy unsound.

See response to transport policy.

Ensure plan includes an infrastructure policy to cover drainage.

Consider delivery vehicle to ensure implementation of the plan.

Ensure the plan promotes broadband improvements.

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7.Policies for Places (Q3 - Q20)				
<i>(Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</i>				
8759 - Ms Sarah Smith [8059]	Comment	Lingwood should remain as a service village. Site specific proposals must accord with the Sustainable Community Strategy	Lingwood is defined as a service village and the JCS must, and does, reflect the sustainable communities strategies of the GNDP authorities. For Lingwood, site-specific proposals are the responsibility of Broadland District Council and are not matters for the JCS. TH	None
11026 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	Comment	Support the hierarchy and the identification of the role of Poringland as a Key Service Centre.	Support noted. TH	None.
10689 - M Elliott [5264]	Comment	Concern at the potential harm new development could have on occupiers of barn conversions. In particular the potential for loss of natural light into already dark interiors and an increased risk of flooding from surface water run	These matters are the domain of site specific development plan documents. TH	None.
10299 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	Comment	Urban fringe development will result in areas such as Bowthorpe spreading out to Colney, with Colney losing its separate identity. The local road network will not cope with the increase in traffic.	Transport and movement are key issues that the JCS looks to address. Accommodating the RSS growth while retaining the distinctive character of settlements is an objective of the JCS and a challenge for the Site Specific Allocations DPD. TH	None.
9909 - Christopher Webb [8019]	Comment	Not able to respond	Noted RBC	None
8873 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	Comment	Settlement hierarchy is too prescriptive. Tasburgh on A140 and close to Long Stratton could take 200.	Settlement hierarchy methodology is being reviewed. The representation acknowledges the suitability of Long Stratton for major development. Tasburgh is within the new methodology as a service village, within the NPA. Site specific DPDs may propose development at Tasburgh, as part of identifying sites to accommodate the 1,800 other sites in the NPA category of the allocation requirement.	None
10145 - R Smith [8243]	Comment	The hierarchy should recognise the key service centres in the Norwich Policy Area. Given the distribution of new homes it would be helpful to distinguish these.	The revised settlement hierarchy does explain that service villages in the NPA may be considered for additional development over and above the 10 to 20 new homes range.TH	None.
9981 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	Comment	Concern that the lower strata does not give enough direction for locating growth. Should reflect the relationship between settlements and acknowledge that short car journeys between these settlements, in order to access services, are potentially sustainable. Excluding on grounds of poor or no public transport will lead to decline in rural settlements.	The lower strata of the settlement hierarchy have been redefined. In addition it is considered that the clustering of settlement in the new methodology covers the point about links between settlements. TH	None
10312 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Comment	Whilst supporting urban concentration concern at the level of Greenfield development being proposed in the favoured option. Welcome the commitment to low numbers in the, although concerned at the favoured option will impact on some villages.	It is not possible to locate the level of housing growth required on brownfield sites only. The JCS maximises the potential for brownfield developments. TH	None.

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10713 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Comment	Do not agree with the Government's forecasts for future housing growth.	The housing requirement figures were tested at the Examination in Public for the East of England Plan. They cannot be amended through the Joint Core Strategy process. TH	
9638 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Comment	Hierarchy should reflect ability to accommodate development in terms of infrastructure capacity and whether economic advantage can be taken of spare capacity. This could result in settlements moving up or down the hierarchy. The hierarchy must be flexible to reflect this.	Consider the new methodology does give more flexibility to the lower strata of the hierarchy. TH	None
8918 - Old Catton Parish Council (Mrs S Barber) [1816]	Comment	Land at BDC0051 should be designated for recreational	Not a JCS issue, representation passed to Broadland District Council as it relates to its site- specific proposals.	Pass rep to BDC
7980 - mr Daniel Yellop [7836]	Comment	Hope there is not a big gap between the amount of development from the NPA to the main towns and service centres.	Consider the hierarchy reflects the provision of services and does offer alternatives in main towns.	None
7959 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Comment	Rather than large development at Main Towns Long Stratton it would better to build smaller numbers of homes in villages in order to protect local services.	The review of the settlement hierarchy recommends a methodology that increases the number of service villages and attributes an appropriate scale of development in the main towns and Long Stratton. TH	None
11061 - Norfolk Association of Architects (Mr Michael Innes) [8378]	Comment	Fundamental opposition to spatial strategy derived from a top down approach. More visionary approach needed - promotes major new town at Acle.	Consider the proposed settlement hierarchy, with its emphasis on Norwich, pays full regard to the East of England Plan. The JCS must be in conformity with the East of England Plan and consider a major new town at Acle would not give this. TH	None.
10997 - Mrs S Plaw [8370]	Object	Service villages. Cannot put 10- 20 new homes in a village without having impact on existing residence, Service villages lack facilities for young people and evening bus services.	The revised methodology for defining service villages takes into account the availability of services and facilities as well as public transport The range of 10 to 20 dwellings is considered an appropriate scale, and has been set to avoid significant adverse impact on existing	None.
9989 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]	Object	Bunwell has sufficient services to be classified as a service village.	The new approach does give Bunwell "service Village" status. TH	None.
8446 - Ian Harris [8007]	Object	The NPA is too broadly defined, and unless public transport and cycle routes are prioritised this will lead to more car journeys.	One of the central aims of the Core Strategy is to locate Greenfield development to locations with good access to Norwich, a range of strategic employment locations and services and where good public transport links exist or can be provided. TH	None
10637 - Mr Alfred Townly [7878]	Object	Hierarchy too focussed on Norwich. This will result in more traffic movements into the city. Needs investment in housing and employment towns such as Acle.	Consider the proposed hierarchy properly reflects the emphasis on urban concentration that is in the RSS. JCS does contain proposals for towns such as Acle, looking to match the scale of development to the size and function of settlements. TH	None.

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8763 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	Object	Insufficient reasons given for the level of growth, GNDP should challenge the growth which help met the duty to minimise climate change.	The total number of new homes needed has been decided through the Regional Spatial Strategy and cannot be amended through the Joint Core Strategy Process. The GNDP authorities made their views known through the RSS process, an opportunity that was also available to members of the public. The RSS and the JCS seek to ensure that development is accommodated in a manner that minimises the impact on climate change. TH	None
8200 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	Object	Settlement hierarchy does not take account of rising sea water levels	The JCS evidence base includes a strategic flood risk assessment. This assessment includes assumptions regarding rises in sea level. At the lower end of the hierarchy the selection of suitable locations will include reference to flooding. TH	None
10450 - Mr David Smith [8309]	Object	It sounds a good idea, but you cannot make more than you have already got.	Comments noted. TH	None.
11083 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	Object	New development should be focussed on city centre and surrounding urban area as this is most sustainable. The urban fringe should not be in same category as city centre as it will result in green field development. Difference between locations in urban fringe and major mixed developments in other locations in NPA is unclear. Suggest: urban area of Norwich small and medium sites in sustainable locations in Costessey, Cringleford, Sprowston, Hellesdon, Drayton, Taverham and Thorpe St Andrew Delete Colney and Trowse as further development would undermine their character and setting Major mixed-use developments in specified locations within NPA Key service centres Service villages Other villages	The JCS seeks to maximise the amount of brown field development in the City of Norwich. The settlement hierarchy locates appropriate scales of development in sustainable locations. The fringe parishes are home to a significant number of people, business and provide links to the city centre and the surrounding area. Given its proximity to employment opportunities and the city centre it is considered appropriate that Trowse is defined in the urban fringe category. The reference to Colney reflects the east of England Plan and existing development proposals in the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. TH	None.
8651 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]	Object	Focus on continued urban development, not expansion of rural villages	The JCS does concentrate major development to either within the urban area of Norwich or as an extension to this urban area. There is also a need to ensure the viability and vitality of rural settlements, and the settlement hierarchy looking to put appropriate scales of developments to settlements in the lower strata of the hierarchy.	None
8488 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Object	Norwich and the fringe already over developed. A mish-mash of housing and too little employment. In adequate public transport.	One of the central aims of the is to locate development to locations with good access to Norwich, a range of strategic employment locations and services and where good public transport links exist or can be provided. TH	None

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9896 - Mr Peter Suton [8219]	Object	Not desirable to locate major development NE of Norwich, the area is already over developed.	The NE Norwich location has emerged from evidence studies that demonstrate it is the best location when considered against other reasonable alternatives. The scale of development has been determined through the RSS and cannot be altered through the JCS process. TH	None
8675 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	Object	Tasburgh should be in the 'other villages' category and larger settlements such as Hempnall should be a service village.	The proposed changes to the settlement hierarchy methodology have redefined many settlements. The number of services and facilities in Tasburgh and Hempnall means they both fall into the 'service village' category.	None
8150 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	Object	The city's mediaeval layout makes cross-city journeys difficult. Adding more development will make transport worse.	The JCS takes account of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy and Policy 16 sets out the strategic principles that will underpin the transport needs arising from the proposed development. Protecting and enhancing the historic core of the city forms an important part of the JCS.	None
10531 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Object	Object to service villages. Road network is inadequate to cope with increased traffic and the local services are disappearing. The development associated with the designation will be detrimental to the landscape and to wildlife.	Consider the settlement hierarchy places levels of development that are appropriate in scale to the settlements in each category. The additional housing has the potential to help bolster local services. Landscape, transport and wildlife considerations will be assessed at the site-specific stage. TH	None.
9186 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	It should be based on non-car travel opportunities	The proposed methodology looks to categorise settlements based on factors such as availability and accessibility to services and facilities. The aim is to locate development in settlements that offer a range of local services that may be accessed by walking, cycling or public transport.	None
9853 - Mr Paul Johnson [8207]	Object	Prefer to see Norfolk remain as undeveloped as possible. Consider Norfolk should have low housing growth that is supported by adequate infrastructure	The total number of new homes needed has been decided through the Regional Spatial Strategy and cannot be amended through the Joint Core Strategy Process. One of the key aspects of the JCS is to establish infrastructure needs and draw up a programme of delivery. TH	None
10817 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	Object	Hierarchy does not reflect the RSS as it fails to give due prominence to Wymondham as a location for major growth. Suggest hierarchy as: Urban area, Wymondham and fringe parishes Major mixed use development in specified locations in NPA Main Towns Key Service Centres Service Villages	The reference to Wymondham in the RSS relates to major employment growth. (Colney/Cringleford, Thorpe St Andrew, Longwater/Costessey are also named alongside Wymondham). Consider Wymondham would figure in the second tier of the hierarchy proposed by the objector, along with locations such as Old Catton, Rackheath, Sprowston. Thorpe St Andrew, Cringleford, Easton Costessey, Hethersett and Long Stratton. TH	None.

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9790 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Object	Strategy should be one of dispersal rather than urban concentration, with more development going to the rural settlements.	Promoting urban concentration reflects the East of England Plan and is considered to be the most sustainable approach to locating major development. Proposed changes to the settlement hierarchy methodology has resulted in more settlements being defined as service villages. This allows for more development in rural	None
9505 - South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142]	Object	Note that the urban fringe is where the JCS looks to focus major development. Implications of defining Trowse as an urban fringe parish is unclear. Trowse is not a parish that forms part of an urban fringe, being separated from the City by rail and river. Note that other villages such as Bixley and Caistor are not designated in the same category as Trowse, leading to the conclusion Trowse will receive development and those others will not.	Consider Trowse to be part of the urban fringe of Norwich. Consider Caistor St Edmund and Bixley are not in the same category, being physically separated from the urban area to a much greater degree than Trowse. TH	None
9757 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184] 10427 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	Object	Object on the grounds of lack of infrastructure	One of the key aspects of the JCS is to establish infrastructure needs and draw up a programme of delivery. TH	
10337 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] 10478 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	There should be no more housing development	The total number of new homes needed has been decided through the Regional Spatial Strategy and cannot be amended through the Joint Core Strategy Process. TH	None
8706 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Object	1,800 houses for small villages are too much.	The settlement hierarchy looks to put appropriate scales of development in each strata of the hierarchy. 1.800 homes will be distributed in other settlements in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area. This includes development in the fringe, in service villages as well as other villages. Therefore it is wrong to suggest the JCS looks to locate 1,800 new homes in what the objector refers to as small villages. TH	None
8315 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922] and not promote urban sprawl 8586 - Mr M Read [8024]	Object	JCS should concentrate development on brownfield sites to accommodate the housing requirement. The size of the	The JCS does look to maximise the use of brownfield sites housing requirement means it cannot all be located on brownfield sites. The evidence base includes the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, which demonstrates this. TH	None
10844 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Object	Generally happy with hierarchy, although urban area of Norwich is too broad. Suggest splitting in two with: A) existing urban area B) urban fringe, both in Norwich and adjacent parishes	Hierarchy reflects the sustainability of locations and consider it appropriate to define the City of Norwich and its urban fringe as sustainable locations for major growth.	
9228 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	Object	Settlements should naturally expand accordingly to local demand not through edicts from above.	The GNDP authorities have a statutory duty to prepare development plans. These development plans must have regard to national and regional planning guidance and policy. Failure to prepare such development plans could see the Secretary of State intervene and impose proposals on the GNDP authorities. TH	None

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7993 - Michael Gotts [7844] 9289 - Ms Jill Loan [8117] 9348 - Mr E Newberry [8120] 9323 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	Object	Not desirable to locate major development NE of Norwich, the area is already over developed.	The NE Norwich location has emerged from evidence studies that demonstrate it is the best location when considered against other reasonable alternatives. The scale of development has been determined through the RSS and cannot be altered through the JCS process. TH	None
9913 - Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] 10555 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Object	Object	Noted RBC	None
9029 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Object	Major development at Long Stratton and Wymondham should be discouraged as they lack an employment base.	Given the context of the numbers of new homes required by the RSS and the settlement pattern in South Norfolk, the level of housing growth in Wymondham and Long Stratton is considered to be of an appropriate scale. Wymondham and Long Stratton do have an employment base. In the case of Wymondham, the town has an existing employment base and has good road and rail links to Norwich and Cambridge. The town is also close to the strategic employment location at Hethel. Development at Long Stratton is dependent on a bypass for the village. TH	None
9350 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	Object	Only if there is sufficient affordable housing.	JCS includes policy that requires a proportion of new housing development to be affordable housing. TH	None
8434 - Helen Baczkowska [8000]	Object	Summary - see rep	The proposed changes to the methodology used to define settlements will look to increase the scope for allowing limited development in smaller settlements. The hierarchy looks to focus development to locations that have existing services and facilities. TH	None
8994 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093] 9001 - Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094] 9005 - Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095] 9009 - Mr Philip Smith [8096] 9016 - Mr Robert Hall [8098]	Object	Lingwood should remain a service village. Sites S39 - 02 & 02a and S39 - 02 are not appropriate for a service	Comment on Lingwood's designation in the hierarchy noted. Site references are not a JCS issue, representations passed to Broadland District Council as it relates to its site- specific proposals. TH	Pass reps to BDC
10082 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	Object	JCS should concentrate development on brownfield sites and not promote urban sprawl	The JCS does look to maximise the use of brownfield sites to accommodate the housing requirement. The size of the housing requirement means it cannot all be located on brownfield sites. The evidence base includes the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, which demonstrates this. TH	
8993 - Mrs J Leggett [5263]	Object	Object to further development in Trowse.	The level of new development for Trowse will be determined through the South Norfolk Site-Specific Development Plan Document. Trowse is identified as part of the Urban Fringe of Norwich and as such could be selected to accommodate further development. Any proposal for new development in Trowse would need to take account of the form and character of the settlement.	None

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9562 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	Object	No further development in NW of Norwich	JCS does not propose major development in the NW of Norwich. Such details are a Matter for the Broadland District Council's Site - Specific Documents. TH	None
9753 - MRS JENNIFER HALL [8180]	Object	Strategy should be one of dispersal rather than urban concentration, with more development going to the rural settlements or the creation of a new village	Promoting urban concentration reflects the East of England Plan and is considered to be the most sustainable approach to locating major development. The proposed change to the settlement hierarchy methodology has resulted in more settlements being defined as service villages. This allows for more development in rural settlements. A new settlement was considered as a potential option in the previous Regulation 25, and was not taken forward because of the lack of evidence to support	None
10099 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	Object	Urban fringe development can result in the coalescence of villages on the fringe of the City. Colney for example, could lose its separate identity.	The strategy looks to preserve the identity and local distinctiveness of settlements. TH	None.
8620 - Kay Eke [8025]	Object	JCS should concentrate development on brownfield sites and not promote urban sprawl	The JCS does look to maximise the use of brownfield sites to accommodate the housing requirement. The size of the housing requirement means it cannot all be located on brownfield sites. The evidence base includes the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, which demonstrates this. TH	None
9695 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	Object	Why not have more development in Diss and Harleston where there are more employment opportunities?	The scale of development has to take account of a variety of factors and not just employment opportunities. Given these factors it is considered the JCS proposes an appropriate level of new homes in Diss and Harleston. TH	None
10236 - Mrs M/M Craven/Whattam [8256]	Object	Large developments will do harm to historic settlements, threaten natural habitats, overwhelm infrastructure. Should allow development in smaller settlements to keep them thriving.	The scale of development is set in the RSS and cannot be recalculated through the JCS process. The protection of historic environments, natural habitats and the provision of infrastructure are all addressed in the JCS policies. The revised hierarchy methodology increases the number of smaller settlements that will have a housing allocation. TH	None.
8894 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] 9285 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Object	Level of housing growth in each category is too high and will lead to suburbanisation.	Consider the scale of development proposed is appropriate for each category. The emphasis in the design policy is to ensure high quality design that creates a development with a sense of identity that is distinct to its location. TH	None
7870 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] 7869 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] TH	Object	There should be no more housing development through the Regional Spatial Strategy and cannot be	The total number of new homes needed has been decided amended through the Joint Core Strategy Process.	None
8930 - Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079]	Object	Wymondham should not have further housing.	Given the context of the numbers of new homes required by the RSS and the settlement pattern in South Norfolk, the level of housing growth in Wymondham is considered to be of an appropriate scale. TH	None

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10635 - Mr Alfred Townly [7878]	Object	Hierarchy will create conurbation and too Norwich focussed. Should look to increase investment in rural employment. Thorpe End Garden Village is blighted by traffic. Business Park link road never implemented.	The hierarchy reflects the policy of urban concentration in the RSS. Rural employment is encouraged by the JCS policies. The JCS also includes proposals that would look to address transport issues in the NE quadrant. TH	None.
7947 - Colin Mould [7809] 8138 - Mr Alan Fairweather [7889]	Object	Object on the grounds of lack of infrastructure	One of the key aspects of the JCS is to establish infrastructure needs and draw up a programme of delivery.	None
8874 - mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] 8940 - Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] 9012 - Mr KD White [8097]				
8329 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	Object	Policy 1 does not seem to agree with 'Locations for Major New Development' shown on page 10 of the consultation document.	Consider the two policies to be consistent. Policy 1 refers to the locations for major growth, the hierarchy includes these locations and also contains other areas where smaller scale development will occur TH	None
9379 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	Object	Not desirable to locate major development NE of Norwich, the area is already over developed.	The NE Norwich location has emerged from evidence studies that demonstrate it is the best location when considered against other reasonable alternatives. The scale of development has been determined through the RSS and cannot be altered through the JCS process. TH	None
10012 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] 9447 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	Support	Support	Noted RBC	None

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10046 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 9861 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Support	Support	Noted RBC	None
10211 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
9956 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Bringham) [6903] 9925 - John Heaser [7015] 10506 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] 10066 - The Greetham Trustees [7606] 9822 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 10255 - WM Morrison Supermarkets plc [8212] 9866 - Hill Residential [8215] 9948 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd [8222] 10023 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10061 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] 10072 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10124 - Mr David Nichols [8242] 10158 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] 10174 - Commercial Land [8246]				
10395 - Acle Parish Council (Ms 11042 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	Support	Support	Noted TH	None

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10729 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Support	Support	Support noted TH	None
10360 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]				
9872 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]				
11127 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]				
11142 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]				
10753 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048]				
11071 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535]				
10760 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]				
10660 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348]				
10786 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Claburn) [8360]				
10868 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]				
10880 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]				
10926 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]				
10950 - Mr William E Cooper [8369]				

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9215 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8562 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 9147 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 8224 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	Support	Support	Noted TH	None
8175 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 8805 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] 8352 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 8389 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] 9098 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 8514 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 7987 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843] 7996 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851] 8066 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875] 8080 - Mr S Buller [7879] 8105 - Mr S Buller [7879] 8085 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]				
8110 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8265 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8290 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915] 8413 - Ed King [7965] 8423 - M Harrold [7966] 8380 - Mr M Buckingham [7968] 8437 - J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003] 8464 - Mr C Skeels [8016] 8538 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 9670 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 8725 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8833 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 8971 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9020 - Mr and Mrs Peter Tann [8099] 9099 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111] 9142 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]				

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9481 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139] 9918 - stephen eastwood [7962]	Support	Lingwood should remain as a service village. Site specific proposals must accord with the Sustainable Community Strategy	Lingwood is defined as a service village and the JCS must, and does, reflect the sustainable communities strategies of the GNDP authorities. For Lingwood, site-specific proposals are the responsibility of Broadland District Council and are not matters for the JCS. TH	None.
10974 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	Support	Key service centres are given too much emphasis over the Service Villages.	Consider the type and range of services and facilities in Key Service Centres greatly exceeds the service villages and justifies the higher ranking and larger scale development. TH	None.
Decision on (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Pass reps to BDC				
<i>(Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</i>				
10382 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Comment	Go east comment â€œ Welcome identification of strategic employment sites but would like to see target for employment growth within the NPA quantified. Inclusion of indicative targets would also be helpful in terms of understanding the roles of the locations listed, and related infrastructure â€œ Encourage further consideration to relationship between proposed housing and employment locations e.g. if Rackheath emerges as eco town location suggest some employment to be provided as part of the mixed-use development. This may have implications for scale of growth proposed at Broadland Business Park and Norwich Airport (see also comments on policies 5 and 15) [RB]	It would be helpful to give some idea of the scale of development envisaged at each employment location. Numbers of employees would give an artificial sense of precision, given the wide variations in the density of employment included within different planning use classes, but an indication in terms of hectares would be helpful. Irrespective of the eco status of the proposed development in the Rackheath area, an extension to the employment area here would be well located in relation to a proposed area of housing. In the economic study undertaken by Arup and Oxford Economics, an assumption of up to 50 hectares was included for the Airport. If a separate application is made at Rackheath, it may be sensible to limit the scale of this allocation and retain the allocation at the already established Broadland Business Park. Both were supported by the Arup study, and feature in the east of England plan, but access to the Broadland Business Park is less dependent on completion of the northern distributor road, though it is dependent on resolution of current problems at the Postwick interchange [RB]	In policy 2, or supporting text, give indicative scale of development at each strategic employment location and brief description of type of activity envisaged Include employment allocation at Rackheath, and suggest scale of 30 hectares, rather than 50 hectares for Airport business park development [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10300 - mrs LISA ford [8282]

Comment
 Employment; Locations largely unsustainable, particularly Airport and Hethel - non car access should be the key. Working and living within walking and cycling distance of each other should be the focus.
 Housing; Too much emphasis on numbers are not enough on quality
 Transport; Too much emphasis on road schemes, not enough on public transport. Innovative rail services for example tram train will need to penetrate the city
 The scale of expansion of proposed threatens Norwich's social cohesion. Where homes are provided this should be in tandem with the growth of employment opportunities.

The locations for employment in the Norwich policy area have been selected in large part because of their potential for non car access. The Airport is at the edge of the urban area and, although it would be dependent on the Norwich northern distributor road in some respects, it is relatively close to some deprived parts of the urban area. Hethel has a particular significance in view of the potential to build on the success of the nearby high technology incubator scheme. Major developments, for example that proposed the north east of Norwich likely to incorporate some employment within the development as well as good walking and cycling links to nearby employment areas. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that not everyone will choose to live and work in close proximity and the plan has to recognise this reality.

Review and strengthen the policies on design to give more emphasis to the quality of new development

Reconsider the way transport priorities are expressed to emphasise the linkages between road schemes and public transport schemes

Reexamine policies on social cohesion and community building to strengthen these

The plan focuses on housing numbers as these are critical to ensure soundness. However it is a fair criticism that it does not sufficiently address the question of quality, and the policy references to high quality design need to be strengthened

In reality, the transport schemes, particularly in the Norwich area, should not be seen in isolation but as components of the Norwich area transportation strategy, and thus inextricably interlinked. There will need to be a continued emphasis on both road and public transport schemes.

10608 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]

Comment
 Representation promotes redevelopment of part of Hellesdon golf course, clarifying relationship with area affected by Health and Safety Executive consultation zone. [RB]

The social cohesion is an issue not simply in Norwich, but across the area. There are policy references in policy This relates to a call for sites undertaken as part of the work on the Broadland site specific allocations DPD

No change needed [RB]

7911 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]

Comment
 bus rapid transit to be applauded, but bus fares are exorbitant
 The need for new houses will depend on the success of the local economy - this will be a challenge
 Providing a high quality environment will be the key to attracting employment and delivering the strategy

There is relatively little control over bus fares, where the services are provided commercially. Where significant infrastructure is provided, it may be possible to enter into some more formalised partnership with the bus operator.

Strengthen the policies on design to recognise the importance of the quality of development.

There is a clear linkage between housing and economic development. In the absence of a sufficiently strong economy, it is unlikely that the full level of housing planned will be delivered, but it is the plan's job to ensure an adequate supply of land for housing is available if required.

It is true that a high quality environment is one of the attractions of this area, and it is particularly important given the area's relative remoteness and the limitations of

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
9639 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Comment	Strategy is unproven - no guarantee the spread of the development in South Norfolk will support the levels of infrastructure provision and services likely to be required. No evidence that a new rail halt at Rackheath or Broadland Business Park is feasible or viable - a halt proposed at the business park some time ago remains unimplemented. If there has been further investigation, the timing and means of delivery should be specified. There is no guarantee the investment needed at Rackheath will be made, or that the rail operator sees this as viable, and without this the preferred option cannot be justified. Document needs to define what is meant by "innovative new services" on the Wymondham -- Norwich - Wroxham axis.	Detailed investigation into the need for service provision to support the pattern of development across the plan area, including South Norfolk, is continuing. Although the number of named locations in the South Norfolk is greater than in Broadland, many are in the south west corridor, and may offer the opportunity to share elements of critical infrastructure, e.g. strategic transport investment, utilities, and this approach may also help to smooth out some of the inevitable lead in time associated with development. With specific reference to the rail proposals, the original proposal for a rail halt at Thorpe St Andrew was in association with the Dussindale development, but the business park strengthens the case by making the area a probable destination, as well as the origin of journeys. Increasing the scale of development in the north east generally is likely to add to viability. While it is true that the GNDP have not undertaken a detailed viability study, the proposal for a halt at Rackheath is derived from the concept statement for the eco community, and discussions have been held within the rail industry who have been generally supportive, including the suggestion that, subject to the success of trials elsewhere in the country, the development may lend itself to a tram trains, though the prospect of such a service extending it to Wymondham is more questionable. The reference to "innovative new services" is a commitment to investigate, not a commitment to implement.	Consider the detailed references to "innovative rail services" and include more specific implementation proposals in the light of further work undertaken by EDAA into the infrastructure needs and funding options of the
10406 - Easton College [3570] 10413 - Honingham Thorpe Farms Limited [8296]	Comment	Recommend inclusion of a bullet point in policy to "support for the rural economy and to enable the agricultural industry to innovate, remain competitive and exploit synergies with environmental industries" [RB]	The sentiments are supported, though it will be important that any resultant initiatives genuinely support local agricultural activity and to do not undermine the mainstream locations for employment and retail. [RB]	Add a bullet point to policy 2 along the lines suggested, but with a caveat that resultant initiatives should not undermine mainstream locations for employment and retail provision. [RB]
8782 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	Comment	Cannot comment without knowing the share Breckland, North Norfolk and West Norfolk are taking.	Each district has its own targets, and those of the districts mentioned in the representation are completely additional to those of the plan area	No change needed
8081 - Mr S Buller [7879]	Comment	Support if there are limits on the way the area will be changed	The scale of development we need to accommodate inevitably means of that there will be significant changes to the area.the strategy seeks to minimize the adverse effects of development while maximizing potential benefits	No change needed
8875 - mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	Comment	Challenge the scale and pace of development - is there demonstrable shortage of labour for local jobs	The scale of growth is set in the east of England plan, specifically in terms of housing, but implicitly also in terms of jobs. this is based on the forecasts for the future of the local economy, not simply the need to fill any current job vacancies	No change needed

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

10146 - R Smith [8243]

Nature Representation Summary

Comment
General support, but should indicate that employment development in key service centres and smaller settlements will contribute.

The bullet point relating to the additional 2000 houses on unidentified sites in Broadland is clear that this is a minimum. Other parts of the policy are less clear on this issue, they should be clarified. [RB]

10309 - Wintersgill LLP (Mr Matthew Wintersgill) [8289]

Comment
Representation promotes "The Norfolk Hub", offering some description
 • Concept with details yet to be defined
 • Exact nature of the development should be regarded as flexible at this stage
 • Two related but separate commercial offers - large conferences/events centre and a popular tourist attraction ;potentially an all weather facility to operate as an all year attraction
 • Could therefore provide a sound economic base for a number of other facilities, co-located, including - hotels - restaurants - retail/coffee shops - health club indoor sports -sports facilities such as golf course, shooting and other country pursuits - and housing (for staff, other local people or holiday accommodation) - public transport

Will therefore be a significant generator of revenue, employment and an opportunity to produce an ecologically friendly development

Site promoted at Woodbastwick, extending to 4.21 square kilometres - potentially supports strategy on economy and tourism

Though still at "concept" stage has a potential to be of strategic significance and should be included in joint core strategy so no planning impediment is placed in its way. [RB]

8322 - Mr Geoffrey Loades

Comment
Need a better costing of major new town developments. Experience to date suggests this has not been done causing unnecessary alarm and blight.

Council's Assessment

Policies on the key service centres and service villages do indicate that local employment activity will be supported

There is some inconsistency in the wording of policy 2.

The study undertaken into the potential for conference/concert centres for the area does not support the case for a major new facility -it indicates that the best potential lies in a medium sized facility, best achieved by conversion of existing premises, in the city centre

The remainder of the proposal seems ill defined, and it does not justify any specific policy support [RB]

Action

Rephrase policy 2 to avoid inconsistency, indicating that the total new allocations to be found are expressed as a minimum. [RB]

Include in the culture and communities policy support for concept/conference facilities in the city centre, through the adaptation of St Andrews/Blackfriars Halls

No change needed, though take account of the outcome of the further work by EDAW in defining the development strategy for the submission document

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

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

7981 - mr Daniel Yellop [7836]

Comment
Generally supportive of the new railway station at Rackheath, and assume this is related to the eco development, but believe it can only be justified if the eco development is a larger than currently proposed. Given the scale of the eco proposal it may be more sensible to tailor this to permit use of the existing rail

There is a considerable logic in the representation. However, the strategy is not solely about the eco proposal but about an allocation for 10,000 dwellings and associated other uses in the Sprowston - Rackheath - Old Catton - Thorpe St Andrew area. While a new railway station and the potential for tram trains are an exciting possibility, realistically, the emphasis on the public transport services to this area will be through bus, and the plan proposes significant priorities to enable a bus rapid transit system to operate. It is important therefore that the desire to make the best use of the potential offered by a rail connection does not distort the overall form of the development and make it less effective in other regards, e.g. public transport by bus, and the need to share certain critical strategic infrastructure, which may be better served by keeping the development relatively compact rather than extending it further into the rural area

No change needed

8876 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]

Comment
1800 homes in the Norwich policy area mean there should also be junction improvements along the A140 which is an important corridor for growth

It is not entirely clear whether the 1800 homes proposed on small sites in the South Norfolk part of the NPA or those proposed at Long Stratton. On the assumption it is of the latter, the appendix describing the favoured option does include some reference to the A140, but specifically for public transport priorities at its junction with the A47, and the need for enhancements to the public transport route into the city centre. There are other significant infrastructure requirements associated with the 1800 dwellings at Long Stratton. The package proposed is considered to represent a reasonable assessment of the impact of the proposal

No change needed

10067 - The Greetham Trustees [7606]

Comment
Broadly support, but question the footnote following policy 2 and seek clarity as to where the non location specific 1800 new dwellings (to be accommodated elsewhere in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area) will be located. Promote Spooner Row as a location. It is within the Norwich policy area and offers the scope to provide innovative new rail services [RB]

The precise locations will need to be identified through more detailed local work through the site specific allocations DPD, but criteria for their selection should be added, referring to consideration of the settlement hierarchy and local planning considerations. Spooner Row will need to be considered alongside others. It is not clear how a modest development here could provide innovative rail services, nor what these might be. [RB]

Add to policy 2 a note that allocations to deliver the smaller sites allowance will be in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and local planning considerations. [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9353 - Mr E Newberry [8120] 9722 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	Object	scale of development is excessive and too focused on Norwich. High density development will not leave enough private space leading to social problems	The scale of development, and the broad share to be focused on the Norwich urban area (i.e. within the Norwich policy area) is established by the East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, on the grounds that recent economic difficulties mean it is unlikely to be achieved, nevertheless that is the target the core strategy must achieve, and a failure to make the necessary provision would be likely to render it unsound. Furthermore, the plan looks ahead to 2026, and while current economic difficulties should not be minimised, they are not likely to endure for a comparable length of time. EERA is currently engaged in a review of the East of England Plan, and has been required to look at increasing rates of development even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of allocations in the core strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. Planning to strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimise is land take, particularly in Greenfield areas, and cannot promote "workable" communities with the understandable desire for people to have access to open space. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change needed, other than greater emphasis on the design in the submission of document, including specific policy requirements.
10602 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	Object	<p>Generally support of the conclusions of the Arup study into the potential for economic growth, but believe it relies excessively on existing identified sites to meet the employment needs of the area. Many of these are constrained and therefore difficult to deliver, particularly in the short term.</p> <p>Response goes on to comment on the constraints affecting Norwich Research Park, potential business park at Norwich international Airport, Longwater.</p> <p>Promote additional site at Harford Bridge as a strategic employment location for early delivery. Firm interest from employers and developers demonstrates the site is an area of strong market demand [RB]</p>	<p>The strategic employment locations at Thorpe St Andrew, the Airport, NRP, and Longwater are supported by the East of England Plan. It is acknowledged that there are constraints affecting these at present, but as strategically supported sites, the focus should be on resolving problems rather than abandoning the sites for future development. A strategic employment allocation at Harford would be likely to require significant investment to the road network, including, potentially, improvements to the nearby southern bypass junction [RB]</p>	no change needed [RB]
9791 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] 9472 - Louisa Young [8135] 9754 - MRS JENNIFER HALL [8180]	Object	Challenge the scale and pace of development - is there demonstrable shortage of labour for local jobs	The scale of growth is set in the east of England plan, specifically in terms of housing, but implicitly also in terms of jobs. this is based on the forecasts for the future of the local economy, not simply the need to fill any current job vacancies	No change needed

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

8709 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]

Object In policy 2, second bullet under housing, it states that in South Norfolk allocations number 9000 dwellings in larger developments and an additional 1800 dwellings elsewhere in South Norfolk NPA on small and medium sites. This is different from the table at 1.11 (and that at 8.4, though the latter table was not referred to by the representation), and there is some inconsistency here.

The representation is correct. The 9000 dwellings allocated in South Norfolk NPA include the 1800 on unidentified sites. A number of representations refer to difficulty in understanding clearly the housing targets and the allocations made in response. This is something which needs to be clarified in the submission version. There is an inherent complexity in referring at various points in the plan to the target set out in the East of England Plan, covering the period 2001 to 21, the scale of housing allocations needed to meet this need, and the consequences of the need to plan further ahead than the East of England Plan, at least to 2026.

Reconsider how housing numbers are presented, perhaps using a single comprehensive table and more extensive cross references to it.

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

8201 - Mr P Anderson [7901]
 8314 - Marion Amos [7919]
 8316 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922]
 vacant - no need for more. The plan does not adequately
 8447 - Ian Harris [8007]
 8771 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]

Object Challenge the need for the scale of development proposed - the people of Norfolk do not need all these houses. There are commercial premises in the city

acknowledge the damaging effects of the scale of development proposal on rural and village in areas.

NDR unnecessary - invest instead in mainline rail service to London-it will simply perpetuate a cult of private motoring flying in the face of climate change minimisation. It will also take far too much green field land. Suspicion that the motivation in proposing the road is to promote development. Similarly, promotion of flying will only add to the environmental crisis we face.

The scale of development, and the broad share to be focused on the Norwich urban area (i.e. within the Norwich policy area) is established by the East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, on the grounds that recent economic difficulties mean it is unlikely to be achieved, nevertheless that is the target the core strategy must achieve, and a failure to make the necessary provision would be likely to render it unsound. Furthermore, the plan looks ahead to 2026, and while current economic difficulties should not be minimised, they are not likely to endure for a comparable length of time. EERA is currently engaged in a review of the East of England Plan, and has been required to look at increasing rates of development even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of allocations in the core strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The plan must meet the needs are rising in the Norwich area, not only those arising from the indigenous population. This means accounts must be taken of migration as well as natural change and demographic trends within Norfolk. It should be acknowledged that the scale of development proposed will inevitably mean changes to the character of some of the plan's area, though given the scale of development and needed, the strategy seeks to minimise the adverse impacts and maximize beneficial effects.

The scale of development is largely fixed and cannot be changed, but the spatial portrait and vision should be re-examine to see if they can acknowledge that the scale of development proposed will inevitably result in changes to the character of some parts of the area. Similarly, the submission plan should seek to be clearer about the inter relationships between road schemes, particularly the NDR, and public transport priorities.

The plan includes a reference to the need for improved rail services to London in policy 16. This is not something the GNDP can deliver, but signals an intention to campaign for such improvements when the opportunity arises. The NDR, and other elements of NATS do not seek to address the same transport need, but are focused on the need for transport within the Norwich area including the rural environs of the city, rather than longer distance inter urban transport. The public transport proposals are not simply "tacked on" additions to the road schemes - the two are inextricably linked, though the consultation draft may be deficient in the way it describes this. The NDR has not been defined in order to promote development, but, along with other components of NATS is seen as an essential part of the strategy for dealing with it. The absence of an NDR from the strategy would not have reduced the scale of development required in the area to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan.

The issue of flying is undeniably difficult, but has been addressed at a national level through the government's national review including the South East Region Airport Study. This concluded that Airport capacity should be

increased in the southeast. While this did not specifically propose expansion at Norwich, it acknowledged that the delivery of increased capacity elsewhere in the southeast

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8941 - Miss Marguerite Finn [8087]			would affect the level of aviation at Norwich. Given of the controversy surrounding proposals to increase capacity at major airports in the south east, it would be unrealistic to fail to acknowledge the likelihood of growth in aviation at Norwich International of Airport	
9922 - Ms Pat Brent [8065]	Object	<p>Oppose the scale of growth, sceptical whether employment growth can be achieved. Therefore believe that office space in Norwich is not needed</p> <p>Norwich a retirement destination</p> <p>Investments to be targeted towards local businesses not multinationals/ Tesco "clones"</p> <p>Oppose scale of housing proposed - focus should be on completing existing developments. Not convinced by "eco veneer" applied to the plans. Suggest higher standards for housing</p> <p>Do not believe water utilities in particular can cope</p> <p>Ulterior motives - build NDR -create unitary Norwich -introduce congestion charging</p> <p>Consider introducing trams [RB]</p>	<p>The scale of housing and employment growth is set out in the East of England Plan. While it is undeniable that there is a severe recession, the plan must look ahead to 2026. To fail to plan for the level of growth required would invite objections proposing further land for development and would be likely to result in the strategy being found unsound.</p> <p>The economic study undertaken by Arup concluded that there was scope for significant growth, possibly beyond that being planned for, although it is acknowledged that the national economy has taken a severe downturn since then. However the study identified scope for additional high quality office floorspace in Norwich. There is currently vacant space but this tends to be in older less attractive premises.</p> <p>The retail study undertaken for the GNDP identified significant potential retail growth, but in view of the particularly severe impact of the recession on retail, a cautious of view of the scale of a new floorspace identified should be taken. Within large developments, any retail provision should be included in the master planning process</p> <p>Accept that the consultation draft was insufficiently robust in terms of design, both aesthetic, and in terms of environmental performance. The recently completed a renewable energy study will provide evidence to support policies on renewable energy</p> <p>The plan will need to be accompanied by an implementation strategy identifying additional resources for water supply and sewage disposal. Anglian Water have been involved in a water cycle study to help identify this, and work currently being done by EDAW is intended to quantify the needs across a range of infrastructure, together with potential funding sources to enable an appropriate implementation strategy to be included in the final submission.</p>	<p>Strengthen the plan's content by adding policies on design and climate change.</p> <p>Reconsider the potential scale of new retail provision, taking a cautious view, but including provision for review as the plan is monitored</p> <p>Include implementation strategy, and invite relevant service providers to commit to supporting it [RB]</p>

Trams or light rapid transit has been examined in the past but the conclusion has always been that there is not a sufficient critical mass of passengers

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10237 - Mrs M/M Craven/Whattam [8256]

Object over-reliance on large sites requiring substantial investment threatens deliverability

Although the strategic allocations are, by their nature, large scale, a significant proportion of the total development planned will take place on a smaller sites. Within the Norwich policy area, many of the sites in Norwich are likely to take place on smaller sites, and within Broadland and South Norfolk, there is a global allowance (2,000 and 1,800 respectively) which is likely to be found across a number of smaller allocations. Furthermore, additional development will take place as a consequence of "windfalls" which are not included in the calculations for the scale of allocation needed, but will nonetheless occur. Allocations outside the Norwich policy area, and in the key service centres within it, are likely to consist of sites accommodating tens or hundreds of dwellings rather than the thousands in the strategic sites in the Norwich policy area. From the table at paragraph 8.4 in the public consultation document, the 21,000 new strategic allocations identified in the Norwich policy area (including the global 3,800 likely to occur on a smaller sites, and referred to above) are likely to contribute to a total of 32,851 new dwellings 2008 to 2026.

No change needed

10761 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]

Object question why significant health employment development is expected at UEA/research park [RB]

The expectation is that employment relating to research for example food research, human genome project will continue to be based at Norwich research park. The proximity of Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, and the Spire Hospital lends itself to collaborative research.

No change [RB]/

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9216 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8563 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 9148 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 8225 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	Object	General support, some with specific caveats such as the need for the growth, and the provision of infrastructure (specifically transport infrastructure, including a comprehensive cycle network)	noted	no change [RB]
8176 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 8355 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 9100 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 9351 - Mr Peter Rope [7113] 8425 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] 7948 - Colin Mould [7809] 8515 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 7988 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843] 8106 - Mr S Buller [7879] 8151 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 8266 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8292 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915] 8414 - Ed King [7965] 8465 - Mr C Skeels [8016] 8539 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 9671 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 8726 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8834 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 8972 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9143 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]				
8139 - Mr Alan Fairweather [7889]	Object	Cannot form a conclusion as the view of vision has not been articulated	The vision reflects that of local strategic partnerships, and should not lightly be altered	Reexamine the vision to see if it can be more clearly articulated, but exercise extreme caution to ensure this still ties in with the visions of the L. S. P's

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9758 - Damien van Carrapiett
[8184]
9897 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]

Object Excessive growth proposed for the old Catton/ Thorpe St Andrew/Rackheath/Sprowston triangle. Comment on the quality of the development and the difficulties of securing bus rapid transit [RB]

The need to meet the East of England Plan's housing provision figures means that significant greenfield allocations are needed, even though the starting point of the strategy was to accommodate as much within the urban area as possible, consistent with maintaining its character and avoiding infringing environmental assets. Whether a strategy of dispersal or concentration were to be followed, the scale of greenfield allocations in the Broadland part of the area is likely to be similar. However a strategy of concentration has been followed primarily to facilitate the provision of new high level infrastructure, such as secondary education, and in order to enable the creation of a high quality link suitable for bus rapid transit through the focusing of investment on a public transport corridor which can serve the bulk of the development to be accommodated in Broadland. The north east has consistently been supported by Children's Services. The NDR should not be seen in isolation, but as a part of a strategy which includes not only road building, but also public transport cycling and walking improvements. However the inability of the NDR to connect to the A1067 further reinforces the preference for the north east, particularly in contrast to the north west: otherwise there would be a serious risk of traffic crossing the Wensum valley to access major attractors on the south side such as the hospital, Norwich Research Park, Longwater etc. Likewise the fact that there are a number of radial roads which could more readily accommodate traffic unavoidably displaced by the public transport priorities suggests the north east is the best option available. The north east also has a relatively good access to a range of employment sites including Broadland Business Park, the Airport industrial areas, Rackheath, Salhouse Road, and other areas around the northern ring road. The different characteristics of the settlements and urban fringe in South Norfolk mean a different approach has been adopted there, but collectively the strategy combines a large scale development with a number of more modest developments, an approach broadly supported by the development industry at the issues and options stage.

No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen the policies dealing with the design of new development, and environmental protection. [RB]

There are many attractive aspects of the countryside in the northeast, but this is a quality it shares with much of the countryside surrounding Norwich. Policies in the plan seek to protect environmental assets, including historic park land and other environmental assets. With appropriate masterplanning, these features can be retained and can enhance the quality of the new development needed in the area, but it is accepted that this should be made it more explicit. [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8949 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	Object	<p>object to proposals to extend the Norwich research park - impact on Yare valley.</p> <p>Oppose the scale of development in general -jobs and houses should be located closer together</p> <p>Oppose NDR - emphasis should be on transport reduction</p>	<p>Norwich Research Park is seen as a flagship employment development and critical to the aspiration of attracting a greater number of jobs for highly qualified people, helping to raise the average income levels in the area, and at the same time helping to free up a wider range of jobs for those with intermediate level qualifications</p> <p>The scale of growth in general is a requirement of the East of England plan. Strategic employment locations have been selected in part because of their proximity to residential areas, and have been critically examined in the employment growth and sites and premises study undertaken by Arup and Oxford Economics. This study reaffirmed the significance of NRP, which is well located in relation to the urban area.</p> <p>The NDR should not be seen in isolation, but as a key component in NATS. While it is undeniably a large road scheme, it is also considered critical to the delivery of high quality public transport serving the Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle, and indeed a large part of the northern of an area.</p>	
9506 - South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142]	Object	The status of Trowse is unclear	<p>The note at the foot of page twenty makes it clear that places identified as Norwich fringe parishes will need to be considered for further development to accommodate the unidentified allocations for 2000 dwellings in Broadland and 1800 in South Norfolk. This includes Trowse which is identified as an urban fringe parish in a policy 1. Until more detailed investigation of the potential sites in these parishes has taken place through the site specific allocations development plan document or an area action plan, it is impossible to be specific about the scale of growth likely within any individual fringe parish. The policies of the core strategy are intended to indicate, however, that such parishes would be an appropriate place in principle to accommodate such development subject to site specific considerations. While the uncertainties inherent in a plan making system which relies on a sequence of development plan documents must be acknowledged, it is not possible for the core strategy to go to the level of detail which would have been expected in an old style local plan</p>	No change needed

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

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

10845 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]

Object Norwich Green Party make a number of comments. These include

- â€¢ Oppose the scale of housing
- â€¢ Concern about the more dispersed pattern of growth proposed in the favoured option, particularly in South Norfolk, but note some dispersal along the proposed NDR within Broadland. Concerned that such a strategy will simply result in a suburban sprawl
- â€¢ Argue new homes need to be built to a similar density as inner Norwich urban area with a mixture of terraces or 4/5 storey developments. This could help reduce sprawl, and would not necessarily be appropriate in existing suburban and semirural areas
- â€¢ Acknowledge the approach in Broadland, including the eco town as potentially justifying the creation of new schools and other services
- â€¢ Acknowledge the character of South Norfolk is different, but argue locations proposed here should only be considered after thorough assessment of environmental impact on biodiversity and water supply, and the potential for sustainable transport. Concern over potential impact on Yare valley
- â€¢ Note the reduction by 3000 of the scale of allocations compared to the technical consultation
- â€¢ Believe the scale of development proposed for Norwich is about right
- â€¢ Detailed critical comments about the proposal for development at Cringleford (breach of landscape protection zone) Long Stratton (distance from Norwich and excessively car-based, and local countryside/wildlife sites) Wymondham (clarity over direction of growth, support reduced scale of growth compared to some earlier options, environment to south west of the town. 2008 application by Pelham illustrates the concerns, as evidenced by Natural England's objections, strong local opposition, divisive effect of the railway to the south of the town limiting the scope for coherent development) urban extension of to the northeast of Norwich (inclusion of Old Catton and Thorpe St Andrew seems designed to follow the proposed NDR, concern that the strategy proposes same level of growth irrespective of the eco town status -concept should not be discarded -critical comments about developers submissions for the northeast Norwich [Bidwells and Savills, and eco community proposer's exhibitions])
- â€¢ Need stronger commitment on low carbon energy [RB]

The scale of growth to the planned for is set out in the East of England Plan. Failure to plan for this would invite representations proposing other development sites, and would be likely to result in strategy being found unsound.

The need to meet the East of England Plan's housing provision figures means that significant greenfield allocations are needed, even though the starting point of the strategy was to accommodate as much within the urban area as possible, consistent with maintaining its character and avoiding infringing environmental assets. The strategic housing land availability assessment broadly confirms the assumed capacity of the urban area.

In Broadland, a strategy of concentration has been followed primarily to facilitate the provision of new high level infrastructure, such as secondary education, and in order to enable the creation of a high quality link suitable for bus rapid transit through the focusing of investment on a public transport corridor which can serve the bulk of the development to be accommodated in Broadland. The north east has consistently been supported by Children's Services. The NDR should not be seen in isolation, but as a part of a strategy which includes not only road building, but also public transport cycling and walking improvements. However the inability of the NDR to connect to the A. 1067 further reinforces the preference for the north east, particularly in contrast to the north west: otherwise there would be a serious risk of traffic crossing the Wensum valley to access major attractors on the south side such as the hospital, Norwich Research Park, Longwater etc. Likewise the fact that there are a number of radial roads which could more readily accommodate traffic unavoidably displaced by the public transport priorities suggests the north east is the best option available. The north east also has a relatively good access to a range of employment sites including Broadland Business Park, the Airport industrial areas, Rackheath, Salhouse Road, and other areas around the northern ring road.

The different characteristics of the settlements and urban fringe in South Norfolk mean a different approach has been adopted there, but collectively the strategy combines a large scale development with a number of more modest developments, an approach broadly supported by the development industry at the issues and options stage. Many of the locations can make use of the A. 11 corridor, currently the best performing public transport corridor in the urban area, provided public transport priorities through the Thickthorn interchange can be introduced.

Strengthen design policy, and introduce new policies on local renewable energy, and climate change. [RB]

Long Stratton has been added to the strategy primarily to help resolve local environmental concerns.

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

8401 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]
8719 - Ms K Dunn [8045]
9076 - Ms R Pickering [8109]

Object The full effect of the recession is not known. There may not be a need for so many shops, which may offer sites for residential development. The recession has rendered obsolete all of the targets in the East of England Plan

The precise areas for development will need to take account of environmental concerns and will be determined through site specific allocations development plan documents or area action plans, and master planning process. This will also need to take account of the potential for higher density development in particular locations in order to support public transport. Policies on design could be strengthened

The reduction in scale of allocations between the technical consultation document and the public consultation document is not a consequence of a lower target to 2026, but reflects changing completions and commitments in the intervening period, meaning less is needed in the remainder of the plan period.

The consultation plan did not adequately address the need for low carbon energy, but the conclusion of a renewable energy study will enable more robust policies to be introduced dealing with this issue

The concern over the eco status of the Rackheath proposal is misplaced. There is no intention of abandoning such status. The strategy is simply trying to be clear that this scale of allocation is needed, and the proposed eco status has not given rise to an increase in the allocation.
[RB]

While it is true that the full effects of the recession are still a matter for conjecture, earlier evidence was that the anticipated levels of growth would require significant additional shopping provision. It may well be that this should now be viewed with some caution, but over the longer term, the economy is likely to recover, and, in the case of comparison goods in particular, there remains an emphasis on accommodating these within centres, primarily the city centre in the case of the Norwich area. In the long run, it would therefore be better to plan for a recovery, even if retailing growth is delayed and slower than had earlier been expected, rather than adopting a short term strategy of maximizing housing in areas which would in the longer term be better used to accommodate commercial development. Similar considerations applied to other forms of development, including housing and employment.

Acknowledge the impact of the recession and possible delay in levels of retail growth, but no substantial shift in the pattern of spatial development proposed.

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9513 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Object	The proposal to accommodate so much development in the urban area will exacerbate existing overdevelopment, destroying green areas and straining local services -the delay to the provision of a school at Dussindale is quoted elsewhere in the representation as an example.	The concerns expressed in this representation are appreciated, though other representations support development within the urban area and express more concern about green field developments. The scale of development proposed in Norwich is broadly supported by the strategic housing land availability assessment which examined a number of identified sites, but the identification of these did take account of the need to protect important green spaces. The concern about the need for services to be the expanded where necessary to accommodate the new growth is reasonable, and a commonly expressed concern. Considerable work is being undertaken to assess the infrastructure requirements associated with the planned growth of the area, and means of funding the required investment. In an era of economic difficulties for the building industry, and likely future restraints on public spending, one should not underestimate the challenges that lie ahead in securing appropriate infrastructure in a timely manner, but those difficulties do not constitute a reason not to plan for the scale of growth we are required to meet.	No change needed
9914 - Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] 10313 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] 10692 - Mrs Jacalyn Collins [7797] 10083 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10451 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10479 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	scale of development is excessive and too focused on Norwich. High density development will not leave enough private space leading to social problems	The scale of development, and the broad share to be focused on the Norwich urban area (i.e. within the Norwich policy area) is established by the East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, on the grounds that recent economic difficulties mean it is unlikely to be achieved, nevertheless that is the target the core strategy must achieve, and a failure to make the necessary provision would be likely to render it unsound. Furthermore, the plan looks ahead to 2026, and while current economic difficulties should not be minimised, they are not likely to endure for a comparable length of time. EERA is currently engaged in a review of the East of England Plan, and has been required to look at increasing rates of development even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of allocations in the core strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. Planning to strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimise is land take, particularly in Greenfield areas, and cannot promote "workable" communities with the understandable desire for people to have access to open space. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change needed, other than greater emphasis on the design in the submission of document, including specific policy requirements.
10100 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	Object	Strategy should focus growth within Norwich - Greenfield growth should be focused on a new town at Long Stratton [RB]	The scale of growth required by the East of England Plan necessitates significant greenfield allocations. Focusing all these on one location would inhibit delivery. Long Stratton is not as well related to employment opportunities, a range of services, and the potential for public transport links as other locations [RB]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8356 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	Object	Uncertain as to the full effectiveness of the strategy	Noted	no change needed
9287 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]	Object	In the absence of employment opportunities in Long Stratton, the majority of occupants of the 1800 houses proposed will inevitably have to commute to Norwich. Confirmation is required that the Long Stratton bypass will be dual carriageway. The bypass is needed and should be government funded, not dependent on 1800 houses.	In relation to long Stratton the favoured option does refer to additional local employment opportunities, and at the site specific development plan document level, it is quite possible that the additional employment land will be allocated. The plan does not specify the standard of a Long Stratton bypass - this will need to be subject to assessment by the county council. Clearly any available government funding should be tapped, but it would be wrong for the plan to preclude any contribution from development.	No change needed
10818 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10869 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	Object	Support for the strategy of a mix of locations with differing scales of development proposed, including moderate scale urban extensions which will assist in delivery of development in the short to medium term. Acknowledge additional facilities are needed, but also such extensions should integrate with the existing urban fabric of Norwich and not be physically or socially separated from it. Support the Norwich policy area as the focus for development and further employment development at strategic locations including Longwater. Support for the identification of the Wymondham as a strategic growth location. Promote a specific site in the north east of the town close to existing employment opportunities within Wymondham and Hethel and the Norwich Research Park. The site of measures some 238 hectares and, with other areas has a capacity of some 6500 dwellings and associated infrastructure. Support of the emphasis on the knowledge economy [RB]	Support noted and welcomed. The selection of precise sites for development will be undertaken through the site specific allocations development plan document. The scale of development proposed at Wymondham is considerably less than the claimed capacity of the site advocated in one of the representations. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
11143 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] 10125 - Mr David Nichols [8242] 10579 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] 10787 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] 10802 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Object	These representations make a number of varied points, all referring to their representations under other question numbers [RB]	See the relevant representations [RB]	see the relevant representations [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10714 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Object	scale of development is excessive and/or too focused on Norwich. High density development will not leave enough private space leading to social problems [RB]	The scale of development, and the broad share to be focused on the Norwich urban area (i.e. within the Norwich policy area) is established by the East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, on the grounds that recent economic difficulties mean it is unlikely to be achieved, nevertheless that is the target the core strategy must achieve, and a failure to make the necessary provision would be likely to render it unsound. Furthermore, the plan looks ahead to 2026, and while current economic difficulties should not be minimised, they are not likely to endure for a comparable length of time. EERA is currently engaged in a review of the East of England Plan, and has been required to look at increasing rates of development even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of allocations in the core strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. Planning has to strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimise is land take, particularly in Greenfield areas, and promote workable communities with the understandable desire for people to have access to open space. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment. [RB]	No change needed, other than greater emphasis on the design in the submission of document, including specific policy requirements. [RB]
10338 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	Object	Norwich Airport is not truly international and is already reducing flights City centre offices are already vacant-why build more? [RB]	International flights operate from Norwich Airport, but that is a side issue. The airport's name is "Norwich international Airport" It is acknowledged that there is vacant office space in central Norwich, but this tends to be in the older poorer quality stock. The economic study undertaken by Arup identifies the need/demand for high quality office stock in the central area. [RB]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

8340 - e buitenhuis [7951]
8633 - Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030]
the key. Working and living within walking and cycling
9187 - Widen the Choice Rural
Transport Partnership (Mr Chris

Nature Representation Summary

Object Employment; Locations largely unsustainable, particularly Airport and Hethel - non car access should be cycling distance of each other should be the focus.

Housing; Too much emphasis on numbers are not enough on quality

Transport; Too much emphasis on road schemes, not enough on public transport. Innovative rail services for example tram train will need to penetrate the city

The scale of expansion of proposed threatens Norwich's social cohesion. Where homes are provided this should be in tandem with the growth of employment opportunities.

Council's Assessment

The locations for employment in the Norwich policy area have been selected in large part because of their potential for non car access. The Airport is at the edge of the urban area and, although it would be dependent on the Norwich northern distributor road in some respects, it is relatively close to some deprived parts of the urban area. Hethel has a particular significance in view of the potential to build on the success of the nearby high technology incubator scheme. Major developments, for example that proposed the north east of Norwich likely to incorporate some employment within the development as well as good walking and cycling links to nearby employment areas. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that not everyone will choose to live and work in close proximity and the plan has to recognise this reality.

The plan focuses on housing numbers as these are critical to ensure soundness. However it is a fair criticism that it does not sufficiently address the question of quality, and the policy references to high quality design need to be strengthened

In reality, the transport schemes, particularly in the Norwich area, should not be seen in isolation but as components of the Norwich area transportation strategy, and thus inextricably interlinked. There will need to be a continued emphasis on both road and public transport schemes.

The social cohesion is an issue not simply in Norwich, but across the area. There are policy references in policy

Action

Review and strengthen the policies on design to give more emphasis to the quality of new development

Reconsider the way transport priorities are expressed to emphasise the linkages between road schemes and public transport schemes

Reexamine policies on social cohesion and community building to strengthen these

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10073 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10881 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Object	<p>Broadland Land Trust offer general support, but a number of caveats/comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ The land promoted by the Broadland Land Trust offers advantages, being close to the "underused" Bittern line. Proposed rail halt on the business park provides an opportunity to create a mixed-use centre. The business park could be the focus of a mixed use development, made more viable and developed in connection with a transport interchange â€¢ Land promoted is in close proximity to employment opportunities at the existing business park â€¢ Support the growth of the knowledge economy â€¢ The BLT are promoting approximately 320 hectares of land â€¢ Policy 2 suggests a maximum of 10,700 new dwellings accommodated in this area, other parts of the strategy confirm the area is expected to accommodate a least 10,000 dwellings at 2026.Should be clarified â€¢ Policy 2 should include reference to both rail halts at Broadland Business Park and Rackheath - see response to question 2 <p>Lothbury property trust company also offer support and make similar points about the scale of development in the north east, and rail halts [RB]</p>	<p>General support welcomed. In the area promoted is within that suggested for the area action plan to guide development in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle. The precise disposition of allocations should be made through the area action plan.</p> <p>Policy 2 is dealing with the scale of the allocations to 2026, but it should be clarified that the growth triangle is expected to continue being developed after this date, eventually reaching a total of 10,000 dwellings (and associated infrastructure)</p> <p>For comments relating to rail halts see question two.</p>	<p>Redraft policy 2 to be clear that allocations are a minimum, and that the growth triangle will continue developing after 2026, reaching a total of around 10,000 dwellings [RB]</p>
9030 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Object	<p>Wymondham and Long Stratton lack the employment base to justify strategic housing growth</p>	<p>Wymondham is well located in relation to employment in the town, Hethel, and the NRP. In addition, it is the probable that additional land allocations will be proposed for employment development in Wymondham/ Hethel. Long Stratton is proposed for growth primarily to facilitate the construction of a bypass bringing local environmental benefits. The strategy in the consultation document does however refer to additional local employment opportunities</p>	<p>No change needed</p>

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9229 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]
 9563 - Drayton Parish Council
 (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]
 7960 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett
 [6862]
 7961 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett
 [6862]
 8806 - Marlingford & Colton
 Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)
 [6869]
 7871 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]
 The economy is not likely to support the level of
 7925 - mr paul newson [7812]
 7997 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]
 8055 - timothy watson [7866]
 8086 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]

Object broadly agree the scale of development within Norwich City Council area, to promote urban well-being, and an expansion of higher education, Norwich Research Park, Broadland Business Park and limited extension to Hethel and the Rackheath industrial area, but oppose major new housing growth outside the urban area. Need for food means farmland should be protected. There are a number of existing vacant properties. Development in villages should be limited to infill. If development is needed, eco town may offer the best option, but not linked to the NDR which is a white elephant.

development proposed.
 Respondents specifically question the scale of expansion in Broadland and in South Norfolk, according to their particular perspective.
 employment locations is welcome. The scale of the Scale of development is excessive in relation to water make some assumptions about the level of vacant

8111 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]
 supply
 8959 - MR Richard Edwards
 [7925]
 8406 - paul eldridge [7987]
 8621 - Kay Eke [8025]
 8699 - mrs jane fischl [8031]
 8652 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
 8676 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
 8931 - Miss Rachel Buckenham

The scale of development, and the broad share to be focused on the Norwich urban area (i.e. within the Norwich policy area) is established by the East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, on the grounds that recent economic difficulties mean it is unlikely to be achieved, nevertheless that is the target the core strategy must achieve, and a failure to make the necessary provision would be likely to render it unsound. The scale of development proposed within Norwich is based on an assessment of the capacity of appropriate sites within the urban area (an assessment broadly confirmed by the strategic housing land availability assessment). This however leaves a considerable amount still to find in order to meet the targets in the East of England Plan. The expression of support for many of the strategic

housing provision of figures in the east of England plan

properties necessary for the satisfactory functioning of the market, including allowing the refurbishment of some existing properties. While it is true there are some vacant properties in the area, there is no evidence that this is an abnormal proportion. The strategy focuses as much as possible on sites in the Norwich urban area, consistent with maintaining an acceptable urban environment, in part in order to minimize the take of green field sites.

The eco community proposals at Rackheath are being promoted under the auspices of a separate government programme, although the GNDP has endorsed the proposal as seeking to raise the standards of development in an area where development would be consistent with emerging planning strategy. The criticism of the linkage between the eco community and NDR fails to acknowledge the whole story. In reality, the picture is one of major development to the northeast of Norwich, including an eco community proposal, served by a transportation strategy which includes (among a number of components including public transport improvements) the NDR.

The plan focuses most development on the urban area or locations selected for major growth, but does propose some development in villages. Other respondents have applauded this and indeed suggested that the plan is too restrictive in its approach to development in villages. It is difficult to write a policy which adequately addresses the wide range of circumstances encountered across a considerable variety of rural settlements, and it may be sensible to seek a less mechanistic approach particularly at the lower levels of the settlement hierarchy.

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[8079] 9261 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] 9545 - Mr R Harris [8146]			<p>the potential to grow at least as much as catered for by the strategy. While it is undeniable that the economy nationally has undergone major difficulties in the last year or two, with local effects, and it is uncertain when the country will emerge, the plan seeks to look ahead to 2026, and recovery is likely within this period. It is the plan's job to ensure that there is sufficient land available for housing, employment should it be required. Current uncertainties should not deflect the local planning authorities from making the necessary plans.</p> <p>The overall scale of housing promoted by the East of England Plan took account of a water resources.This was a major area of debate at the Examination in Public.</p>	
9324 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	Object	need for better link from the southern bypass to Norwich research park	Good connections will be important for the success of the NRP. The adopted masterplan includes an access strategy that promotes enhanced public transport access, but also upgrades the road network from the site along the B1108 to the A47. Transport improvements will be required to support growth of the NRP, but the details of these will emerge in work following on from the current masterplan. The delivery plan for the joint core strategy identifies access improvements will be necessary. (RD)	No change (RD)
8587 - Mr M Read [8024]	Object	"roads and infrastructure inadequate -carbon footprint and global warming"	It is not clear whether the comment refers to existing roads and infrastructure, or the additions suggested in the plan, and whether additional roads which the objection seems to support would add to or reduce the area's carbon footprint. As drafted the plan recognises the inadequacy of existing infrastructure including roads, but seeks to espouse a spatial strategy which will facilitate less reliance on the private car	No change needed

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9957 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]
11084 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]

Object Norfolk and Norwich Transport Action Group raise a number of objections including

- â€ Do not support the levels of housing and employment growth identified - particularly greenfields -- inconsistent with environmental protection
- â€ Suggest adoption of RSS brownfield target of 60%
- â€ Propose phasing so that brownfield development comes ahead of Greenfield
- â€ Propose high density housing to reduce car-dependency

Opposed to some employment proposals, specifically

- â€ Significant expansion of office provision in city centre -need balance between housing, commercial, retail and leisure
- â€ Business park associated with the Airport - airport -- related businesses limited given proximity to Stansted
- â€ Extension to Broadland Business Park (including Broadland Gate proposal) - instead suggest expanding employment provision at Rackheath eco town
- â€ Expansion of activity at Hethel-car dependent rural location

Criticise transport infrastructure

- â€ Oppose the NDR, Long Stratton bypass and southern bypass junction improvements for reasons given to question two
- â€ BRT needed before northern distributor road. Otherwise viability of bus and rail will be undermined, if people have a ready car alternative

A number of detailed recommended changes to address these concerns are suggested

Sustrans raise similar concerns about the emphasis on road building and suggest there needs to be a much more significant attempt at moving towards non car modes for local trips. Basel in Switzerland is cited as an example where 75% of all trips are by walking, cycling or public transport. They suggest an alternative policy wording for transport focused on walking, cycling, enhancements to the rail network, enhancements to bus including bus rapid transit, and a road network and parking: policies that discourage unnecessary car use and operates efficiently.

[RB]

The scale of housing and employment growth is set by the East of England Plan. To plan for a lower level would invite representations or appeals proposing other sites, and would be likely to result in the plan being found unsound

Agree the plan should indicate expectations in terms of the share of development to be accommodated on previously-developed land, but this is likely to fall far short of the 60% target in the East of England Plan, given local circumstances. It is likely that the smaller allocations, whether Greenfield or brownfield, will come ahead of the very large strategic allocations, particularly that in the northeast, simply because of the inevitable lead in times associated with a very large development. However, the need to achieve higher levels of growth than have been consistently achieved in the past, for a prolonged period, means that artificial restraint or rationing of development may be impractical.

The employment locations criticized are supported by the East of England Plan. To ignore them would invite criticism that the strategy does not conform with the regional spatial strategy. The opposition to the city centre as an employment location is particularly surprising, given its apparent sustainability.

The suggestion of a specific employment allocation at Rackheath is worth pursuing

The northern distributor road is an integral part of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy which also includes measures to promote public transport, walking and cycling. The NDR is considered essential to create the conditions within the urban area to enable these other modes, including bus rapid transit, to achieve their greatest impact.

Parking policy currently seeks to deter long stay parking in the city centre, while permitting access for commerce. This should be explicitly set out in the access and transportation policy [RB]

Include a specific employment allocation at Rackheath to complement the development proposed there.

Include a reference to parking policies designed to discourage long stay commuting into the city centre, in the policy on access and transportation. [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8489 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Object	<p>Support employment development except for expansion of office provision in city center - need greater variety of employment in the city</p> <p>If more housing is needed, use higher densities and better planning</p>	<p>The study of the local economy and sites and premises undertaken by Arup and Oxford Economics specifically suggests some additional office space in the city centre. Anecdotally one of the difficulties of the local economy is the lack of high quality city centre office space available. National planning policy sees centres as an appropriate location for such uses.</p> <p>A considerable amount of development recently has taken place at high densities, particularly in the city centre. Much of this has taken the form of apartments, and there is a real concern that this sector of the market is becoming saturated. Meeting of the needs of people will mean that much of the development cannot take place at such densities, although it is expected that the major new developments proposed should seek to use land as economically as practical, in part to save greenfield land, but also to enable neighbourhoods to offer residents facilities in walking and cycling distance.</p>	No change needed

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8896 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Object	<p>Oppose the scale of growth and the number of Greenfield sites proposed</p> <p>Believe it is wrong to tie the provision of a Long Stratton bypass to large-scale enabling housing which will negate its benefits, resulting in increased commuting into</p>	<p>The scale of development, and the broad share to be focused on the Norwich urban area (i.e. within the Norwich policy area) is established by the East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, on the grounds that recent economic difficulties mean it is unlikely to be achieved, nevertheless that is the target the core strategy must achieve, and a failure to make the necessary provision would be likely to render it unsound. The scale of development proposed within Norwich is based on an assessment of the capacity of appropriate sites within the urban area (an assessment broadly confirmed by the strategic housing land availability assessment). This however leaves a considerable amount still to find in order to meet the targets in the East of England Plan.</p> <p>In relation to Long Stratton the favoured option does refer to additional local employment opportunities, and at the site specific development plan document level, it is quite possible that the additional employment land will be allocated.</p> <p>The plan does not specify the standard of a Long Stratton bypass - this will need to be subject to assessment by the County Council. Clearly any available government funding should be tapped, but it would be wrong for the plan to preclude any contribution from development. It is true that some increased commuting to Norwich is likely, though improvements on the approaches to the urban area at the southern bypass junction, and the route into the urban area are proposed to make public transport a more attractive option, not only for residents in the Long Stratton area, but also those who elsewhere in the A140 corridor. The primary benefit of the Long Stratton bypass will be in terms of the local environment in the town.</p>	No change needed
9292 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Object	<p>concern about large scale commercially driven development in and around Norwich, and need for spiritual and cultural regeneration, including reference to concert</p>	<p>The scale of development in and around Norwich is largely driven by the need to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan. Much of this will undoubtedly be commercially driven, as the private sector is the primary source of the necessary development. A study into the need for a concert/conference venue in the Norwich area has been undertaken and the outcome of this will need to be more clearly expressed in the pre-submission document. The study suggests that the city centre is the most realistic location for such a facility, and that conversion or adaptation of existing premises may be the most cost effective way of realising this potential. It also suggests that the success of such a venue is likely to be linked to the quality of accommodation for visitors.</p>	<p>Strengthen the cultural policy (policy 18) and incorporate the findings of the concert hall/conference venue study, both in terms of the venue itself and creating the environment likely to support it.</p>

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8390 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] 8381 - M Harrold [7966] 9380 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	Object	over-reliance on large sites requiring substantial investment threatens deliverability	Although the strategic allocations are, by their nature, large scale, a significant proportion of the total development planned will take place on a smaller sites. Within the Norwich policy area, many of the sites in Norwich are likely to take place on smaller sites, and within Broadland and South Norfolk, there is a global allowance (2,000 and 1,800 respectively) which is likely to be found across a number of smaller allocations. Furthermore, additional development will take place as a consequence of "windfalls" which are not included in the calculations for the scale of allocation needed, but will nonetheless occur. Allocations outside the Norwich policy area, and in the key service centres within it, are likely to consist of sites accommodating tens or hundreds of dwellings rather than the thousands in the strategic sites in the Norwich policy area. From the table at paragraph 8.4 in the public consultation document, the 21,000 new strategic allocations identified in the Norwich policy area (including the global 3,800 likely to occur on a smaller sites, and referred to above) are likely to contribute to a total of 32,851 new dwellings 2008 to 2026.	No change needed
9873 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]	Support	Note the report of Matthew Taylor MP into the provision of housing in rural areas. Hope it will be put into practice by implementing the philosophy of developing the countryside proportionally within its existing structures	The Taylor report focuses on promoting rural well-being, but does talk about accepting development in villages based on an understanding of their nature. Nevertheless it seeks to focus development where it can support local services. In response to criticisms made at the technical consultation stage that the settlement hierarchy was too rigid and did not allow account to be taken of local circumstances, it has already been agreed that there should be a reconsideration of the lower levels of the settlement hierarchy. However, the scale of growth required by the East of England Plan, and the likely scale resulting from a review of the East of England Plan mean that there will be very significant growth in the area for some time to come, and it will not be possible to accommodate all this by small-scale in filling within villages. [RB]	Review policies for service villages, other villages and the countryside to avoid undue rigidity and reconsider which villages are most appropriate in each tier, but still based on the existence of a range of services, and sustainable access. [RB]
9423 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	Support	concern expressed about the scale of growth, but provided the scale of growth required is justified, support for this strategy as the best way to deliver	noted	no change needed
10212 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	Support	Number of homes at Wymondham should be limited to 1000 otherwise historic character will be lost [RB]	It is not clear why 1000 dwellings will protect the historic character, but 2200 will not. [RB]	No change [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10730 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] 10361 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] 11128 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 10047 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 11043 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] 9926 - John Heaser [7015] 11027 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] 10507 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] 9448 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134] 10975 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] 9771 - Mr Michael Whalley [8189] 9823 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 9990 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10024 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10159 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] 10175 - Commercial Land [8246] 10396 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] 10428 - Mr J E Youngs [8308] 10610 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] 11072 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] 10062 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232]	Support	General support, some with specific caveats such as the need for the growth, and the provision of infrastructure (specifically transport infrastructure, including a comprehensive cycle network)	noted	no change needed
	Support	Broad support. Policy 2 should be clear that the scale of the allocations made is a minimum. Seeking clarification that small and medium size are expected to deliver ahead of strategic sites Support the principle of providing a new business park associated with the Airport, but should be widened to include uses a benefiting from an Airport location rather than specifically Airport related uses. Should be linked to sustainable transport and connectivity to new/existing residential areas [RB]	Agree the allocations to be made are a minimum. This should be clarified. The East of England Plan identifies the Airport as a strategic employment location suitable for uses benefiting from an airport - related location. It would be appropriate to adopt this phrase, but also to ensure that any genuinely airport related development should be accommodated, if necessary in addition. [RB]	Rephrase policy 2 to ensure consistency and that allocations represent a minimum Make clear that business park at the airport could accommodate uses benefiting from an airport - related location, but that genuinely airport related uses may have a need to be accommodated in addition [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9101 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]	Support	support, some with specific caveats such as the need for the growth, and the provision of infrastructure (specifically transport infrastructure, including a comprehensive cycle network) [RB]	noted [RB]	no change needed [RB]
11112 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Support	In policy 2, second bullet under housing, it states that in South Norfolk allocations number 9000 dwellings in larger developments and an additional 1800 dwellings elsewhere in South Norfolk NPA on small and medium sites. This is different from the table at 1.11 (and that at 8.4, though the latter table was not referred to by the representation), and there is some inconsistency here.	The representation is correct. The 9000 dwellings allocated in South Norfolk NPA include the 1800 on unidentified sites. A number of representations refer to difficulty in understanding clearly the housing targets and the allocations made in response. This is something which needs to be clarified in the submission version. There is an inherent complexity in referring at various points in the plan to the target set out in the East of England Plan, covering the period 2001 to 21, the scale of housing allocations needed to meet this need, and the consequences of the need to plan further ahead than the East of England Plan, at least to 2026.	Reconsider how housing numbers are presented, perhaps using a single comprehensive table and more extensive cross references to it.

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Decision on (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Review and strengthen the policies on design to give more emphasis to the quality of new development.

Reconsider the way transport priorities are expressed to emphasise the linkages between road schemes and public transport schemes.

Reexamine policies on social cohesion and community building to strengthen these.

Redraft policy 2 to be clear that allocations are a minimum, and that the growth triangle will continue developing after 2026, reaching a total of around 10,000 dwellings [RB]

In policy 2, or supporting text, give indicative scale of development at each strategic employment location and brief description of type of activity envisaged.

Include employment allocation at Rackheath, and suggest scale of 30 hectares, rather than 50 hectares for Airport business park development [RB]

Rephrase policy 2 to avoid inconsistency, indicating that the total new allocations to be found are expressed as a minimum. [RB]

Strengthen design policy, and introduce new policies on local renewable energy, and climate change. [RB]

No change needed in relation to the overall scale of development, but re-examine the policies for development in service villages and "other villages" to see if it can be made more responsive to the circumstances of particular villages while still giving a clear overall strategy, and not undermining the fundamental strategy of focusing development where services exist.

Reexamine the vision to see if it can be more clearly articulated, but exercise extreme caution to ensure this still ties in with the visions of the L. S. P's

Review policies for service villages, other villages and the countryside to avoid undue rigidity and reconsider which villages are most appropriate in each tier, but still based on the existence of a range of services, and sustainable access.

Add a bullet point to policy 2 along the lines suggested, but with a caveat that resultant initiatives should not undermine mainstream locations for employment and retail provision. [RB]

Review and strengthen the policies on design to give more emphasis to the quality of new development.

Reconsider the way transport priorities are expressed to emphasise the linkages between road schemes and public transport schemes.

Reexamine policies on social cohesion and community building to strengthen these.

No change needed, though take account of the outcome of the further work by EDAW in defining the development strategy for the submission document

Reconsider how housing numbers are presented, perhaps using a single comprehensive table and more extensive cross references to it.

Strengthen the cultural policy (policy 18) and incorporate the findings of the concert hall/conference venue study, both in terms of the venue itself and creating the environment likely to support it.

Consider the detailed references to "innovative rail services" and include more specific implementation proposals in the light of further work undertaken by EDAW into the infrastructure needs and funding options of the plan.

No change needed, other than greater emphasis on the design in the submission of document, including specific policy requirements.

Reconsider how housing numbers are presented, perhaps using a single comprehensive table and more extensive cross references to it.

Strengthen the policies on design to recognise the importance of the quality of development.

No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen the policies dealing with the design of new development, and environmental protection. [RB]

Acknowledge the impact of the recession and possible delay in levels of retail growth, but no substantial shift in the pattern of spatial development proposed.

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Rephrase policy 2 to ensure consistency and that allocations represent a minimum

Make clear that business park at the airport could accommodate uses benefiting from an airport - related location, but that genuinely airport related uses may have a need to be accommodated in addition [RB]

Add to policy 2 a note that allocations to deliver the smaller sites allowance will be in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and local planning considerations. [RB]

Include in the culture and communities policy support for concept/conference facilities in the city centre, through the adaptation of St Andrews/Blackfriars Halls [RB]

Strengthen the plan's content by adding policies on design and climate change.

Reconsider the potential scale of new retail provision, taking a cautious view, but including provision for review as the plan is monitored

Include implementation strategy, and invite relevant service providers to commit to supporting it [RB]

The scale of development is largely fixed and cannot be changed, but the spatial portrait and vision should be re-examine to see if they can acknowledge that the scale of development proposed will inevitably result in changes to the character of some parts of the area. Similarly, the submission plan should seek to be clearer about the inter relationships between road schemes, particularly the NDR, and public transport priorities.

Include a specific employment allocation at Rackheath to complement the development proposed there.

Include a reference to parking policies designed to discourage long stay commuting into the city centre, in the policy on access and transportation. [RB]

see the relevant representations [RB]

Include in the culture and communities policy support for concept/conference facilities in the city centre, through the adaptation of St Andrews/Blackfriars Halls [RB]

Rephrase policy 2 to ensure consistency and that allocations represent a minimum.

Make clear that business park at the airport could accommodate uses benefiting from an airport - related location, but that genuinely airport related uses may have a need to be accommodated in addition [RB]

The scale of development is largely fixed and cannot be changed, but the spatial portrait and vision should be re-examine to see if they can acknowledge that the scale of development proposed will inevitably result in changes to the character of some parts of the area. Similarly, the submission plan should seek to be clearer about the inter relationships between road schemes, particularly the NDR, and public transport priorities.[RB]

Rephrase policy 2 to avoid inconsistency, indicating that the total new allocations to be found are expressed as a minimum. [RB]

Strengthen design policy, and introduce new policies on local renewable energy, and climate change. [RB]

Add to policy 2 a note that allocations to deliver the smaller sites allowance will be in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and local planning considerations. [RB]

Strengthen the plan's content by adding policies on design and climate change.

Reconsider the potential scale of new retail provision, taking a cautious view, but including provision for review as the plan is monitored

Include implementation strategy, and invite relevant service providers to commit to supporting it [RB]

No change needed in relation to the overall scale of development, but re-examine the policies for development in service villages and "other villages" to see if it can be made more responsive to the circumstances of particular villages while still giving a clear overall strategy, and not undermining the fundamental strategy of focusing development where services exist[RB]

Page 81 of 392

7.Policies for Places (Q3 - Q20)

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Strengthen the policies on design to recognise the importance of the quality of development.

No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen the policies dealing with the design of new development, and environmental protection. [RB]

Include a specific employment allocation at Rackheath to complement the development proposed there.

Include a reference to parking policies designed to discourage long stay commuting into the city centre, in the policy on access and transportation. [RB]

Add a bullet point to policy 2 along the lines suggested, but with a caveat that resultant initiatives should not undermine mainstream locations for employment and retail provision. [RB]

In policy 2, or supporting text, give indicative scale of development at each strategic employment location and brief description of type of activity envisaged

Include employment allocation at Rackheath, and suggest scale of 30 hectares, rather than 50 hectares for Airport business park development [RB]

Reconsider how housing numbers are presented, perhaps using a single comprehensive table and more extensive cross references to it.
[RB]

No change needed, though take account of the outcome of the further work by EDAW in defining the development strategy for the submission document
[RB]

Acknowledge the impact of the recession and possible delay in levels of retail growth, but no substantial shift in the pattern of spatial development proposed.[RB]

Action: Review policies for service villages, other villages and the countryside to avoid undue rigidity and reconsider which villages are most appropriate in each tier, but still based on the existence of a range of services, and sustainable access. [RB]

Action: Reexamine the vision to see if it can be more clearly articulated, but exercise extreme caution to ensure this still ties in with the visions of the L. S. P's.

The study of the local economy and sites and premises undertaken by Arup and Oxford Economics specifically suggests some additional office space in the city centre. Anecdotally one of the difficulties of the local economy is the lack of high quality city centre office space available. National planning policy sees centres as an appropriate location for such uses.

A considerable amount of development recently has taken place at high densities, particularly in the city centre. Much of this has taken the form of apartments, and there is a real concern that this sector of the market is becoming saturated. Meeting of the needs of people will mean that much of the development cannot take place at such densities, although it is expected that the major new developments proposed should seek to use land as economically as practical, in part to save greenfield land, but also to enable neighbourhoods to offer residents facilities in walking and cycling distance.
[RB]

Consider the detailed references to "innovative rail services" and include more specific implementation proposals in the light of further work undertaken by EDAW into the infrastructure needs and funding options of the plan.[RB]

Strengthen the cultural policy (policy 18) and incorporate the findings of the concert hall/conference venue study, both in terms of the venue itself and creating the environment likely to support it.[RB]

Review and strengthen the policies on design to give more emphasis to the quality of new development.

Reconsider the way transport priorities are expressed to emphasise the linkages between road schemes and public transport schemes.

Reexamine policies on social cohesion and community building to strengthen these. [RB]

See the relevant representations [RB]

Redraft policy 2 to be clear that allocations are a minimum, and that the growth triangle will continue developing after 2026, reaching a total of around 10,000 dwellings [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen the policies dealing with the design of new development, and environmental protection. [RB]		
		No change needed in relation to the overall scale of development, but re-examine the policies for development in service villages and "other villages" to see if it can be made more responsive to the circumstances of particular villages while still giving a clear overall strategy, and not undermining the fundamental strategy of focusing development where services exist. [RB]		
		R.D. advice		
		<i>(Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</i>		
10013 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]	Comment	Believe there should be a larger proportion of planned growth to the south of Norwich, more accessible in regional terms [RB]	The strategy has sought to accommodate as much in the urban area as possible consistent with the maintenance of the environmental assets of the urban area. Nevertheless, significant Greenfield allocations are needed. The strategy for identifying these has tried to focus on minimising environmental impact, and selecting locations with good access to employment areas, services and facilities, and good public transport links or the potential for good links to be created. There is a large concentration in the north east in order to recognize the need for some very high level infrastructure to be provided. In the southwest, there are a number of medium sized allocations intended to recognize the character of the settlements involved, but also to assist in deliverability through enabling housing to be delivered in the short and medium term, and spreading the risk associated with any particular development be experiencing difficulties. An excessive focus in one part of the plan area would be likely to affect market deliverability. [RB]	No change [RB]
9640 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Comment	Do not agree - no reasonable alternatives examined - alternative suggestions ignored and no response explaining why the proposal is unacceptable or	a number of alternatives have been examined. At this stage major locations are being selected rather than specific sites. The objectors have been promoting land in	no change needed [RB]

unreasonable. Proposal well related to strategic employment locations. [RB]

the Cringleford/ Hethersett area, and both of these are identified as potential locations, although not necessarily at the scale promoted by the objectors. The scale selected is based on a view of the character of the settlements concerned, as well as the scale of allocation needed to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan [RB]

11099 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]
10908 - Allied London Properties [8367]
Comment
Question the deliverability - all major growth locations have some concerns and there is no contingency or backup sites should one or more of the proposals fail

Representations elsewhere demonstrate strong developer interest in most of the locations. The biggest area of uncertainty concerns the availability of funding for the Norwich Northern Distributor Road, critical to the north east growth triangle. However, this should have secured programme entry by the submission of the core strategy [RB]

No change [RB]

8877 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]
8879 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]
Comment
No comment [RB]

Not applicable [RB]

Not applicable [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

7912 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]
Comment
representation does not address northeast (lack of local knowledge) but supports dedicated cycle routes throughout the urban area and major growth locations (including desired links between Trowse and Thorpe via the Whittingham links [RB]

Policies for the growth locations refer to the need to improve cycling facilities, though away from these implementation will be more challenging. NATS (though not necessarily all dedicated) and this should be more widely disseminated [RB]

Increase illustrative material in the final document including illustrations of walking and cycling networks [RB]

8202 - Mr P Anderson [7901]
8330 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]
Object
Need to identify and exclude floodplains from areas for development,. Rising sea levels will require complete rethink [RB]

Accepted - but this is a matter which will need to be addressed at the site specific stage. In most of the areas selected for growth this should not pose a difficulty, though there are known areas of high of flood probability in central Norwich, and in these areas at the site specific stage more detailed work will need to be done to understand the nature of the flood risk and appropriate protection measures to deal with it. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment undertaken did take into account predicted sea level rises, and climate change. [RB]

No change needed [RB]

9915 - Miss Lynda Edwards
Object
Object to making city too crowded [RB]

The need to meet the East of England Plan's housing provision figures means that significant greenfield allocations are needed, even though the starting point of the strategy was to accommodate as much within the urban area as possible, consistent with maintaining its character and avoiding infringing environmental assets.

The scale of growth to be accommodated in Norwich does take account of the need to protect environmental assets within the urban area. The strategic housing land availability assessment broadly supports of the assumed capacity of the urban area. [RB]

8317 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922]
that they are unsustainable [RB]
Object
No - no reasons offered, other than a general comment

Impossible to respond [RB]

No change needed [RB]

8653 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 9294 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Object	Oppose development on the north side of Norwich -this area has retained most of its unspoilt rural character	The scale of growth requires some greenfield allocations. The strategy has been to accommodate as much within the existing urban area as considered feasible (the strategic housing land availability assessment broadly supports the scale proposed for Norwich). There are attractive rural areas on all sides of Norwich, and while Greenfield allocations should not be likely made, they are unavoidable, and the key will lie in ensuring the quality of the development respects countryside character and incorporates not only good design principles, as far as the built form is concerned, but also enhances local green infrastructure. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
8808 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	Object	Believe Marlingford and Colton should not be within the Norwich policy area [RB]	In terms of its location, the inclusion of the parish within the Norwich policy area does not appear particularly anomalous, -- it borders Easton and Great Melton, and almost has a border with Bawburgh. The nature of the particular settlement has been reflected through its exclusion from those places identified for significant development [RB]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10819 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	Object	Most of the strategy is supported. The exception is Long Stratton due to its poor quality transport links and few local job opportunities. Instead greater emphasis should be given to Wymondham. Representation promotes a site that offers the opportunity to link to strategic transport improvements both existing and potential and, link to existing services, facilities and employment, enhance landscape and integrate it into a new development, assist in the organic growth of Wymondham which has existing strong relationships with Norwich, rather than creating isolated communities. In short Wymondham offers opportunity to develop a significant number of houses in a sustainable manner to the benefit of new and existing residents. [RB]	Comments noted, however there has been a great deal of concern expressed over the impact of large scale development on Wymondham and the scale proposed has been reduced compared with some earlier options largely in response to these concerns. Development is proposed at Long Stratton in order to fund a bypass to bring about local environmental improvements. It will also offer the opportunity for some additional development in the heart of South Norfolk at the most sustainable location in that part of the district. [RB]	no change needed [RB]
8068 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875] 8152 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 9146 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	Object	Roads and public transport already inadequate. School closures associated with the loss of local facilities and increased car travel. Some objectors specifically refer to the need to improve/dual the A140. Others refer to the incomplete NNDR. One representation argues that housing and should not be built a head of road infrastructure and the challenges the emphasis placed on public transport [RB]	The strategy includes proposals for considerable investment in transport, not only the NDR and southern bypass junctions, but also considerable investment in improved public transport. The presence of local facilities, including schools, has been one of the criteria in selecting locations for development, though further work needs to be done to clarify the education arrangements for accommodating the scale of growth proposed in the south west, and at Costessey/ Easton. The scale of growth in the A 140 corridor is considered to justify the building of a Long Stratton bypass, to resolve existing local problems of severance, air-quality and congestion, and more	Clarify the education arrangements to deal with growth in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area [RB]

modest improvements to improve public transport priorities at the southern bypass junction and approaches into Norwich, but dualling of the A140 is not considered justifiable. The reasons for the inability to connect the A1067 and the A47 by the NDR are well documented. This limitation is one of the considerations underlying the selection of the northeast rather than the northwest to accommodate growth in Broadland. Clearly there is a need to coordinate the provision of the developments and infrastructure, including roads but the plan is right to place a considerable emphasis on public transport as part of an overall transportation package [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9031 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Object	All major growth should be within all adjacent to the southern bypass or proposed NDR - development at Long Stratton and Wymondham will inevitably promote car based commuting. [RB]	Given the scale of development to be accommodated, seeking to accommodate all South Norfolk's share within the southern bypass would inevitably infringe local environmental assets including nature conservation sites and the setting of the southern bypass, while affecting the historic setting of Norwich in the landscape. Wymondham has access to a number of strategic employment locations including those within the town, and at Hethel, and offers a range of local services. It also has access to what is currently the best performing public transport corridor (though improvements to access via the Thickthorn junction are needed) and also to rail services to Norwich and Cambridge. Long Stratton has been selected for growth primarily to help alleviate local environmental problems. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
8898 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] 9288 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] 9564 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] 7927 - mr paul newson [7812] 7926 - mr paul newson [7812] 8490 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Object	opposition to the scale of development, particularly green field sites. Specific points raised by objectors include impact on the countryside and villages; the focus of most large growth locations close to Norwich will increase urban sprawl. This is emphasised by Public transport routes which focus on Norwich as a hub. Growth at Long Stratton will impinge heavily on surrounding villages.all development should be on brownfield sites [RB]	the scale of development required, and hence the scale of the allocation needed for both residential and employment purposes is derived from the East of England Plan. It cannot therefore be changed unless evidence can be produced to demonstrate that this scale of growth cannot be achieved without unacceptable consequences, otherwise there would be a risk of unsoundness. While the scale of greenfield development is something the planning authorities should not lightly enter into, in terms of	No change needed [RB]

8588 - Mr M Read [8024]
 8622 - Kay Eke [8025]
 9262 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue
 [8115]
 9381 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]
 9546 - Mr R Harris [8146]
 9723 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson
 [8174]

designations for environmental assets such as nature conservation, cultural and historic assets, agricultural land quality etc these can be largely avoided. The appropriate assessment confirms that international wildlife sites can be adequately protected, and local landscape designations are not supported in national policy as a barrier to development, though the form of development should take the character of the landscape into account. Other resources such as water availability were extensively debated at the east of England plan examination in public. The East of England Plan clearly requires a focus on the Norwich policy area, and realistically, much of the future economic activity of the area will be focused in and around Norwich. Housing locations should be well related to this, and also in locations which can be well served by public transport. It is true that Many public transport routes focus on Norwich as the hub, but this emphasis is inevitable given to the job growth into the area, and the fact that public transport will only operate where there is a critical mass in terms of journey origins and destinations. The major housing growth areas selected have however been chosen in part because of their proximity to services and potential employment. Inevitably, major growth at long Stratton will generate some additional traffic in the locality, but there is no reason to assume this will be excessive, unless there are significant local attractors.

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10636 - Mr Alfred Townly [7878] 10452 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10480 - Mr I T Smith [8310] 10557 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Object	Oppose the scale of development, in particular Greenfield allocations -loss of agricultural capacity and effect on the locality [RB]	<p>The scale of housing and employment growth is set out in the East of England Plan. While it is undeniable that there is a severe recession, the plan must look ahead to 2026. To fail to plan for the level of growth required would invite objections proposing further land for development and would be likely to result in the strategy being found unsound.</p> <p>The strategy has sought to accommodate as much in the urban area as possible consistent with the maintenance of the environmental assets of the urban area. Nevertheless, significant Greenfield allocations are needed. The strategy for identifying these has tried to focus on minimising environmental impact, and selecting locations with good access to employment areas, services and facilities, and good public transport links or the potential for good links to be created. There is a large concentration in the north east in order to recognize the need for some very high level infrastructure to be provided. In the southwest, there are a number of medium sized allocations intended to recognize the character of the settlements involved, but also to assist in deliverability through enabling housing to be</p>	No change needed [RB]

9958 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]
 9792 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]
 9759 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]
 10084 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]
 10533 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]

Object These cross refer to other questions, or decline to comment [RB]

delivered in the short and medium term, and spreading the risk associated with any particular development be experiencing difficulties.

[RB]
 Not applicable [RB]

Not applicable [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10314 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]

Object CPRE, make a number of points
 â€¢ Strategy is Greenfield first - should promote more development in urban areas, and would like to see a scaling down of housing numbers in NPA towns and villages and at Rackheath
 â€¢ Believe housing delivery targets should be slowed down
 â€¢ Oppose the north east growth of triangle concept
 â€¢ Mismatch between north east concentration of housing and the concentration of employment opportunities which tend to lie to the south west
 â€¢ No policy targets for use of previously-developed land

â€¢ The strategy is not Greenfield first. The strategic housing land availability assessment broadly confirms the potential assumed for the City of Norwich
 â€¢ It is acknowledged that it is important that the detailed design of the NDR allows for permeability to access shared facilities.
 â€¢ Whether a strategy of dispersal or concentration were to be followed, the scale of greenfield allocations in the Broadland part of the area is likely to be similar. However a strategy of concentration has been followed primarily to facilitate the provision of new high level infrastructure, such as secondary education, and in order to enable the creation of a high quality link suitable for bus rapid transit through the focusing of investment on a public transport corridor which can serve the bulk of the development to be accommodated in Broadland. The north east has consistently been supported by Children's Services. The NDR should not be seen In isolation, but as a part of a strategy which includes not only road building, but also

No change [RB]

public transport cycling and walking improvements. however the inability of the NDR to connect to the A. 1067 further reinforces the preference for the north east, particularly in contrast to the north west: otherwise there would be a serious risk of traffic crossing the Wensum valley to access major attractors on the south side such as the hospital, Norwich Research Park, Longwater etc. Likewise the fact that there are a number of radial roads which could more readily accommodate traffic unavoidably displaced by the public transport priorities suggests the north east is the best option available. The north east also has a relatively good access to a range of employment sites including Broadland Business Park, the Airport industrial areas, Rackheath, Salhouse Road, and other areas around the northern ring road. The different characteristics of the settlements and urban fringe and South Norfolk mean a different approach has been adopted there, but collectively the strategy combines a large scale development with a number of more modest developments, an approach broadly supported by the development industry at the issues and options stage. ~~â€~~ Agree the strategy should include an expression of the expected share of new development on previously-developed land, but this is likely to be much lower than the East of England Plan's indicative target because of the geography of the area

[RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9268 - Mrs Gray [5927] 8720 - Ms K Dunn [8045] 8932 - Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079] 9325 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	Object	growth at Wymondham excessive - risk of merge with Hethersett -support growth that Norwich but not at Wymondham -wind and should not grow as planned without improved secondary education [RB]	the scale of growth at Wymondham is less to the than in option one, and has been reduced in part to make it easier to assimilate. At this stage, sites have not been selected and there is no indication of any threat to the gap between Wymondham and Hethersett. The strategy includes growth at Norwich consistent with the capacity of the urban area whilst maintaining assets within the urban areas. The need for clarity over secondary education is accepted [RB]	No change to the scale of development, but clarify secondary education
10846 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Object	Norwich Green Party make representations identical in substance to those they made in response to question 4 [RB]	Please see response to Norwich Green Party's representation on question 4 [RB]	Please see response to Norwich Green Party's representation on question 4 [RB]
9514 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Object	the scale of development proposed for the Old Catton etc growth triangle is excessive. Transport infrastructure even with NDR will be inadequate. [RB]	there has been a conscious decision To focus the growth in Broadland (other than that to be accommodated on unidentified small sites) in a single location. This is primarily to facilitate the creation of new strategic	no change needed [RB]

10213 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	Object	Oppose but no reasons given in response to this question [RB]	infrastructure necessary for the scale of development envisaged, in particular secondary schools and public transport priorities in a way that investment can be focused and serve the largest number of new residents. The northeast has been selected ahead of other potential locations for a number of reasons, including public transport potential, advice of children's services, access to a range of strategic employment locations, etc and is supported ahead of alternatives in Broadland by the sustainability appraisal much of the evidence gathered and by much of the responses at the issues and options stage (and also at the issues and options stage for the Broadland core strategy before work commenced on the joint document) The NDR is a part of NATS (and though a critical part is not the entire strategy) significant emphasis on public transport by means of bus rapid transit, and potential use of the rail line are also important aspects of the proposal for this area [RB]	Opposition noted - see respondent's other submissions [RB]
9778 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974] 10339 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	Object	These are mainly concerned with Cringleford Concern that further development of Cringleford will have an impact on traffic - concern that secondary school issues remain unresolved [RB]	Large-scale development anywhere is likely to have some effect on the road network. However Cringleford is on the best performing public transport corridor in the area and is capable of offering a highly effective location to the car. It is accepted that, collectively, the growth proposed in the south west will require significant improvements to the Thickthorn interchange Cringleford also lies close to a major employment area at Norwich Research Park	Opposition noted - see respondent's other submissions [RB] No change [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
8677 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	Object	Appendix 1 (option 1) is more appropriate [RB]	Many of the locations in the favoured option are consistent with those in option 1. The chief differences are the addition of Long Stratton in order to address local environmental issues, and the reduction in the scale of growth in parts of the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area, principally at Hethersett and Wymondham. The favoured option reduces the scale of growth at these locations, but specifically refers to Cringleford which is in the same broad sector and benefits from the same public transport corridor (but without impact on the Thickthorn junction) and offers closer access to the Norwich research park. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
10603 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	Object	Harford Bridge should be shown as a strategic employment location [RB]	The study undertaken by Arup and Oxford Economics, and looking at the economic potential of the area and the	No change [RB]

10101 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	Object	Only sites appropriate appropriate are those in Norwich and Long Stratton [RB]	Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council have made a similar representation in response to other questions - please see these [RB]	No change needed [RB]
9697 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] 7962 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Object	the proposal to more than double the size of a long Stratton in exchange for a bypass is immoral -needed detailed information how this will impact on the town in respect of employment infrastructure schools parking health services etc [RB]	The proposal is intended to deal with widely acknowledged local environmental issues. Long Stratton does have a good range of services and facilities and is considered an inherently suitable location for growth, even though it lies some way from Norwich. Even if not selected for growth associated with the Norwich policy area, it is currently considered to have all the facilities which would be associated with a key service centre. The details in Appendix 0, and which will be incorporated into policy in the final document if this growth option is selected, include references to promotion of additional employment, expansion of the existing secondary school, the need for investment in green infrastructure and public transport improvements on the approaches to Norwich, with improved pedestrian and cycle access from new development to the centre of Long Stratton [RB]	No change needed [RB]
8835 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	Object	Growth of Hethersett excessive [RB]	Hethersett is well located to accommodate development with a good access to local employment areas and lies on a good public transport corridor with potential for improvement. Reducing growth here would necessitate increasing it elsewhere. The scale of growth has been reduced from earlier options considered in response to concerns about its impact on Hethersett [RB]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

11085 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	Object	Concerned about the scale of growth planned, particularly on greenfields, and implications for travel and climate change Need for better distribution of employment and housing, with current strategy having significant employment in the south west and an emphasis on housing in the north east.Linking these areas and by a road would encourage orbital car journeys Oppose designation of a northeast growth triangle to be	The scale of growth is established by the East of England Plan, and the need for Greenfield a locations by limits on the capacity of the urban area to absorb more development. The assumptions have been broadly supported by a strategic housing land availability assessment. The benefit of focusing growth in the north east is the ability to share some high level infrastructure including new high school, and sharing public transport priorities.This will offer a critical mass sufficient to enable bus and rapid	No change [RB]
---	--------	--	---	----------------

built in association with NDR - designation related to boosting the case for NDR

Not necessarily opposed to northeast as location for growth, without NDR - feasible to develop urban extension serviced by dedicated public transport links and a smaller scale highway works. Need further employment in the location to reduce the amount of travel to employment sites elsewhere

Rather than this forming parts of growth triangle, believe more modest urban extension should be complemented by another extension to the east of Broadland Business Park - close to city centre - adjacent to strategic employment site - sufficient land to create green buffer between new development and Great Plumstead-could support enhanced rail services and new halt at Dussindale

Concerned about preferred option for dispersed growth in South Norfolk part of the NPA in terms of public transport, ignoring consultant's report recommending concentration to achieve step change [RB]

8354 - Alyson Lowe [6992]

Object

cannot be certain as to the effectiveness of the strategy

transit

The scale of development in the north east is ultimately derived from the East of England Plan, and has not been artificially created to boost the case for the NDR - this is an established part of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy

There are disadvantages to development at the east -no local facilities in existence, very high quality agricultural land, and the prospect of local traffic using a trunk road.

The A11 corridor, inside the southern bypass is currently the best performing public transport corridor in the area, and the development in the south west, although taking the form of medium sized allocations, will be able to share this. It is acknowledged that improvements to the Thickthorn interchange will be needed to create appropriate priorities. The growth proposed in the west will use the Dereham Road corridor, already prioritized for public

not applicable [RB]

No change needed [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

11044 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]
 11144 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]
 10074 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]
 10160 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]

Object

These representations broadly support the strategy, though some particular points are made.
 • Particularly support the northeast as the most sustainable location for an urban extension. Close to urban area and has potential to create self sustaining community. Undertaking a masterplanning exercise and propose to submit more detailed representations at future stages.
 • Support for smaller sites in sustainable locations and

Support noted and welcomed
 In relation to specific points
 • The Blue Boar Lane area has already been subject to a masterplanning exercise, and a resolution to grant planning permission. It remains possible it will not be developed ahead of the area action plan for the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle, but because the policies governing its development a set down in the Broadland Local Plan (2006)

No change needed directly in response to these representations, but consider an allocation of 300 dwellings at Aylsham subject to the resolution of sewage treatment problems, and confirm the status of Trowse as a fringe parish [RB]

10870 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]
 10882 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]

strategic employment allocations at Longwater and Norwich Research Park/UEA
 • Taylor Wimpey developments and Hopkins Homes support the mix of large and small/medium scale development locations to enable delivery. Promote a site at Costessey which is close to public transport, services, and jobs with particular reference to the Longwater strategic employment location
 • Broadland Land Trust broadly agree with the extent of the northeast growth triangle but believe it should be extended to include land to the east of Blue Boar Lane. Agree with the proposition that the wider growth area encompasses the Broadland Business Park, relating this employment area to the proposed growth location. Believe it is the best opportunity for major growth in the Norwich the policy area to link with the existing, planned and potential transport improvements, and connecting existing and new services to benefit existing and new residents. Offers the opportunity to enhance landscape and integrate it with new development, and recognize organic urban growth of Norwich rather than create isolated communities. Offers an opportunity to make the most of the attractions of the Broads and the coast. Have initiated masterplanning process and propose to make more detailed representations at future stages
 • General support but include Aylsham as a main town and Trowse and Blofield in the Norwich policy area
 • General support including identification of Long Stratton

these would not necessarily be negotiable
 • Aylsham is regarded as a main town. In the consultation draft no allocation was proposed in light of the findings of early stages of the water cycle study. However in response to other representations it has been suggested that an allocation, for about 300 dwellings, should be made, but should be conditional upon resolution of the sewage disposal issue. Blofield and Trowse are both in the Norwich policy area. In response to other representations it has been suggested that Trowse should be considered as a fringe parish.

[RB]

9188 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]

Object

The major growth location in the north east is simply there to justify the NDR [RB]

This is untrue. An early study for NATS in the 1990s recommended a northern distributor road, though this was never implemented. Clearly, the presence of a proposed road has had a bearing on the selection of the area proposed for development, not least because it offers scope to increase public transport priorities in the area, but the scale of growth is a result of the east of England plan and was not artificially inflated through the regional planning process in order to justify any particular transport scheme. [RB]

No change needed [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9898 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]

Object

Oppose the proposed scale of development in the north east - is only there to promote the road - object to loss of green fields [RB]

The need to meet the East of England Plan's housing provision figures means that significant greenfield allocations are needed, even though the starting point of the strategy was to accommodate as much within the urban area as possible, consistent with maintaining its character and avoiding infringing environmental assets.

No change [RB]

10788 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360]
10803 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]

Object The strategy is excessively roads based, illustrated by the relative emphasis on the proposals map [RB]

Whether a strategy of dispersal or concentration were to be followed, the scale of greenfield allocations in the Broadland part of the area is likely to be similar. However a strategy of concentration has been followed primarily to facilitate the provision of new high level infrastructure, such as secondary education, and in order to enable the creation of a high quality link suitable for bus rapid transit through the focusing of investment on a public transport corridor which can serve the bulk of the development to be accommodated in Broadland. The north east has consistently been supported by Children's Services. The NDR should not be seen in isolation, but as a part of a strategy which includes not only road building, but also public transport cycling and walking improvements. [RB]

While the sentiment concerning the way infrastructure need is presented is noted, it does not imply any lack of commitment to public transport, walking or cycling. However in many cases, specifically the northern distributor road, this investment is seen as the key to providing scope to improve conditions for non car modes within the urban area. The strategy is closely aligned with the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy. [RB]

No change [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10301 - mrs LISA ford [8282]

Object These are related to Hethersett
 â€¢ Historic village -do not want it suburbanized
 â€¢ Cannot cope with traffic
 â€¢ Loss of quality of life to existing residents

The scale of housing and employment growth is set out in the East of England Plan. While it is undeniable that there is a severe recession, the plan must look ahead to 2026.

No change needed [RB]

[RB]

To fail to plan for the level of growth required would invite objections proposing further land for development and would be likely to result in the strategy being found unsound.

The strategy has sought to accommodate as much in the urban area as possible consistent with the maintenance of the environmental assets of the urban area. Nevertheless, significant Greenfield allocations are needed. The strategy for identifying these has tried to focus on minimising environmental impact, and selecting locations with good access to employment areas, services and facilities, and good public transport links or the potential for good links to be created. There is a large concentration in the north east in order to recognize the need for some very high level infrastructure to be provided. In the southwest, there are a number of medium sized allocations intended to recognize the character of the settlements involved, but also to assist in deliverability through enabling housing to be delivered in the short and medium term, and spreading the risk associated with any particular development be experiencing difficulties. Hethersett has a reasonable range of facilities, and has access to the best performing public transport corridor in the Norwich area, though it is acknowledged that improvements to the Thickthorn junction will be needed for this to serve locations such as Hethersett and Wymondham. The scale of growth proposed at Hethersett has been reduced compared with some of the options in order to minimize the impact on the form and character of the village

The selection of sites for development, to be undertaken through a site specific allocations development plan document, will need to take account of local factors

10611 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]

Support

the areas to the south of the city have already expanded sufficiently - more opportunities to the north and northeast, but not logical to allow proposed route of NNDR to influence the future settlement plans [RB]

Recently there has been considerable growth to the south, but over the longer. Growth has been reasonably balanced as it is in the current strategy. While growth of the northeast is not being proposed to facilitate the NNDR (the overall growth targets are set by the east of England plan) the prospect of major transport infrastructure must play some part in consideration of development patterns.

No change needed [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9483 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]

Support

concerned that in some circumstances development

It is undeniable that this can happen. Considerably more

no change needed [RB]

occurs ahead of infrastructure [RB]

work on implementation is now required of development plan documents, and this will include an implementation strategy which key service providers will need to support. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that even given an indication of willingness to support the strategy from service providers, changing circumstances and budget limitations will from time to time cause difficulties. This, however, does not amount to a justification for failing to plan for future growth. [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10731 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Support	yes - support the major growth locations selected [RB]	support welcomed [RB]	no change needed [RB]
9217 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]				
8564 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]				
10362 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]				
9149 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]				
9874 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]				
11129 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]				
10048 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]				
8226 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]				
8177 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]				
9928 - John Heaser [7015]				
9927 - John Heaser [7015]				
9103 - Mr John Osborne [7111]				
9352 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]				
10508 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]				
10762 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]				
8516 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]				
7989 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843]				
7998 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]				
8107 - Mr S Buller [7879]				
8087 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]				
8112 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8267 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]				
8293 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]				
8415 - Ed King [7965]				
8382 - M Harrold [7966]				
8383 - M Harrold [7966]				
8466 - Mr C Skeels [8016]				
8540 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]				
9672 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]				
8727 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]				
8973 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]				

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

9102 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
 9424 - Swannington with Alderford
 & Little Witchingham Parish
 Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9449 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
 9598 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
 [8162]
 10976 - Howard Birch Associates
 (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
 9824 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]
 9949 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd
 [8222]
 9991 - The Bunwell Partnership
 (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
 10025 - The London Planning
 Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)
 [8230]
 10176 - Commercial Land [8246]

10397 - Acle Parish Council (Ms
 Pauline James) [8294]
 10429 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]
 10662 - Mrs Lyn Robertson
 [8348]
 8325 - Mr Geoffrey Loades

Support

Oppose option three which should be discarded, and
 re-scrutinise jobs and population growth targets [RB]

The selected option will mean discarding those not
 selected. However there is an ongoing review of the East
 of England Plan which is likely to increase rather than
 reduce pressures for development in the area and the core
 strategy will need to include some reference for a
 mechanism to accommodate this growth or undertake an
 early review to do so. The targets remain those in the East
 of England Plan unless it is updated [RB]

No change needed, other than
 excluding the discarded options
 from the final document, but
 consider how to address issues
 arising from the review of the East
 of England Plan [RB]

7949 - Colin Mould [7809]

Support

Essential to curtail a specific supermarket operator from
 destroying community choice and variety. Provision also
 needed for other recreational activities [RB]

The plan proposes local facilities including retail but also
 social facilities in many of the areas proposed for major
 growth. but there are limits on the extent to which planning
 can favour one operator rather than another. [RB]

No change needed [RB]

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Decision on (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth Action: Clarify the education arrangements to deal with growth in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area [RB]		
		Please see response to Norwich Green Party's representation on question 4 [RB]		
		No change needed, other than excluding the discarded options from the final document, but consider how to address issues arising from the review of the East of England Plan [RB]		
		Increase illustrative material in the final document including illustrations of walking and cycling networks [RB]		
		No change needed directly in response to these representations, but consider an allocation of 300 dwellings at Aylsham subject to the resolution of sewage treatment problems, and confirm the status of Trowse as a fringe parish [RB]		
		No change to the scale of development, but clarify secondary education arrangements [RB]		
		Opposition noted - see respondent's other submissions [RB]		
<i>(Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</i>				
10691 - Theatre Royal (Mr Peter Wilson) [54]	Comment	Suggest that Policy 3 be expanded by adding the following bullet point: "strengthening and cohering access to Norwich's cultural assets" and that the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy includes under "For those travelling into the city centre or around the Norwich area", something along the lines of: "We will improve public transport access to Norwich's cultural assets by developing bus routes that link them with the transport hubs, and by strategic development and promotion of the Park and Ride network" The reasoning behind this is that the Cathedrals, the Theatre Royal and other cultural venues attract over 2,000 people each day between them on average. I'm aiming to help more visitors and residents enjoy those cultural assets without using their cars in the city centre. This is particularly relevant in the evenings, when the cultural life of the city is at its busiest.	Suggestions noted.	Consider incorporating suggested amendments.
9477 - Louisa Young [8135]	Comment	No need for housing in the centre of the city. Keep existing and improve walking, cycling and green spaces.	New housing is required in the city to help ensure that it is a vital and vibrant area that does not close down in the evenings and to meet housing need. Green space are protected from development and new housing development will be required to provide new green spaces or improve existing ones - many parts of the riverside walk for example have been provided as part of new	No change to plan

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11100 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	Remain to be convinced this amount of development will be implemented in the timescale, because of the amount of the market made up of flats. Water supply is also an issue but sewerage	The policy is based on housing market research and requires housing development rates slightly below those achieved over the past 5 years. Water supply and sewerage issues are covered by the Water Cycle Study and will be addressed through the plan.	No change to plan
9367 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Comment	Manufacturing completely ignored	Noted. It is unlikely that and new large scale manufacturing would be suitable, or would wish to locate, in the city centre. Service uses predominate in almost all cities in the developed world. The plan does promote the establishment of small sale business units, which might include some manufacturing.	No change to plan
10315 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Comment	The figure for new allocations for Norwich should be increased to take a larger proportion of all build in the NPA. A slowing of housing delivery targets would maximise opportunities for previously developed land as it becomes available.	The strategy focuses as much development on brownfield sites as there is capacity for. After having had extremely high house building rates in recent years (over 1000 in 2007/8) the capacity for redevelopment of brownfield sites will inevitably reduce in the longer term. Nevertheless, the policy requires a minimum of 2750 new dwellings in the city centre from 2008 to 2026	No change to plan
7913 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	Comment	More retail space not a necessity in current conditions. I would like to see more activity spaces available, especially for arts.	Comment noted. The city council is encouraging temporary use of vacant shops for such activities. The policy encourages an increase in arts and cultural uses in the city centre.	No change to plan
10604 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	Comment	Range of sites and locations will be required to meet the employment needs including office development on strategic employment sites.	Noted. The strategy takes account of this. Whilst focussing a significant element of office development in the city centre, it also identifies the need for some office development elsewhere due to the amount of new	No change to plan
10285 - Henderson Retail Warehouse Fund [8270]	Comment	Retain Riverside Retail Park as part of the primary retail area	Comment noted. The retail park was identified as part of the primary retail area under the Replacement Local Plan. The intention was that there should be significant linked trips between the park and the rest of the primary retail area. Evidence in the Grimley's retail study has shown that only 8% of trips to Riverside are linked to trips elsewhere in the primary retail area. Allocation as a primary retail area in the Site Allocation Plan would allow further retail development on the edge of this retail area. This is regarded as inappropriate as opportunities for primary retail expansion exist in the more sustainably located St Stephens area. Reallocation as a secondary retail area would enable more flexibility in uses in the long term.	No change to plan
10909 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Comment	Unsure this amount of development will be implemented in the timescale, because of amount of flats. Water supply is also an issue but sewerage capacity seems an	Housing figures based on assessments of land supply, market and need. Though there are short term issues with sales of flats, the market is predicted to pick up again in the future. Water supply and sewerage capacity are covered in the water Cycle Study and investment will be required by Anglian water.	No change to plan

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10273 - Norwich HEART (Mr Michael Loveday) [960]	Comment	Suggest startegy making best use of city's cultural and historic assets and increasing densities. Could include redevelopment of 'spoiled' areas of the centre which have lost their way (King St to Ber St) in a much more complex and high density way; removal of wasteful traffic related infrastructure and the re-knitting of the urban grain to provide a more coherent urban fabric which responds to the needs for more homes and jobs (Northern City Centre/Inner Ring/Anglia Sq); a coalescent approach to urban fabric, public realm and cultural capital regeneration which allows these elements to work in a more integrated way and accommodate more activity (St Andrews/The Halls/Elm Hill)	Comments noted. The strategy attempts to take just this sort of approach to redevelopment of the city centre. It includes extensive housing development at rates close to those achieved over the last 5 years, whilst balancing this with the need to ensure that the city centre makes the best use of its potential as a highly sustainable employment centre. The strategy also focuses on making the best of the city centre's cultural and historic assets.	Consider amendments to the policy in relation to housing development and greater emphasis on historic and cultural
9290 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Object	Brownfield sites should be developed - not greenfield sites and keep density at a sensible level. Too many new developments are built with not enough space for parking and thereby the quality of life for residents	The strategy promotes the development of brownfield sites, but there are not sufficient sites to meet all employment and housing need, so greenfield development will also be required. Detailed site development policies will be set out in other plans, though this plan does set the requirement for both family housing and higher density residential development in the city centre.	No change to plan
8942 - Miss Marguerite Finn	Object	Norwich is already a city of culture - don't mess with it. Give the City Hall enough money to maintain / set up twinning initiatives. We do not need any more shopping malls - those we have are not full as it is. We have enough good shops in the city - any more would be overkill and would put many existing shops out of business. We have plenty of office space - if properly used and allocated. We have plenty of perfectly acceptable housing stock that can be renovated and let or sold. Use	The policy promotes re-use and conversion of existing buildings where this is appropriate. It is agreed retail forecasts may have to be reconsidered in the light of the present recession.	Consider amendments to retail element of policy.
11086 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	Object	Do not support giving greater priority to employment uses, in particular office development, at the expense of new housing. We wish to see maintained the more balanced approach of a mix of uses of the last 20 years.	Policy requirement for housing continues rate of housing development achieved over last 5 years. Promotion of office development in the most sustainably accessible location in the sub region is appropriate.	No change to plan
8448 - Ian Harris [8007]	Object	This future vision will not be sustainable, because growth cannot be.	Noted. The strategy focuses significant development in the city centre so as to reduce the need to travel by car and thereby promote sustainable growth.	No change to plan
8357 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 8069 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875] 9760 - Damien van Carrapiett	Object	Older buildings need to be improved / replaced as well as new development	Noted. Strategy encourages the reuse and protection of existing buildings where appropriate, particularly historic listed buildings. In some cases it will not be appropriate to re-use buildings of little merit and sites should be comprehensively redeveloped.	No change to plan
7872 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] 8836 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	Object	Build in the city, but not in the countryside. However, there will not be enough capacity in the city to	The priority for development is brownfield sites in the city. meet all needs, so development on greenfield sites around the city will also be necessary.	No change to plan

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7950 - Colin Mould [7809]	Object	Object to the council's auto-phobia particularly in the evening; the charging for parking after 1800, the removal of on the road parking and proliferation of double yellow lines. Control of daytime traffic is essential however.	The balanced transport policy is intended to promote the use of public transport, particularly during the day time and is set out in NATS. Evening parking fees are set by car park owners.	No change to plan.
8775 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	Object	Climate change indicates that a shift away from material growth is essential, towards quite a different future, based on quite different values - if there is to be any worthwhile future at all - and you ignore this.	Both mitigation of and adaptation to climate change is required through the plan and by the planning system as a whole. This will be implemented both through a specific climate change policy and by the overall ethos of the plan which requires all development to be sustainable.	No change to plan
9425 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	Object	See comments at q28	See comments at q28	See comments at q28
8881 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	Object	Strategy will turn our vibrant city into a visitor destination; We need more educational and employment facilities and improved transport from outside areas	The strategy promotes tourism, education, employment and improved public transport.	No change to plan
9565 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	Object	Not applicable to Drayton	Noted	No change to plan
10534 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Object	Development will increase congestion. Buses are not cheap and car use can often be cheaper. Cycling is dangerous and much more thought needs to go in to separate cycle routes.	Noted. The strategy aims to improve public transport services and cycling provision. In recent years traffic entering the city centre has reduced as a result of this strategic approach.	No change to plan
9298 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Object	Why is culture bottom of the list? Support improved public transport improvement of cultural facilities	Support noted. The list is not intended to show priority in any way.	No change to plan
10581 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	Please go to Question 28 for response	See q 28	See q 28
9478 - Mr David Gladwell [8126]	Object	No P+R site on A146 corridor.	This comment is not relevant to this policy. The need for further P+R sites will be considered through NATS.	No change to plan
9411 - Mr David Gladwell [8126]	Object	No mention is made of provision for Angling	Noted. A strategic plan does not cover specific issues such as angling. However, the plan does encourage the extension of the riverside walk to the east of Carrow Bridge, which should benefit anglers.	No change to plan
9189 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	Not enough residential; too much leisure (already too much e.g. Prince of Wales Rd and Riverside); the proposals for sustainable transport access are inadequate. Why in particular should walking and cycling not be for residents?	The residential and leisure requirements were established through evidence based studies. Residential numbers are based on capacity, market assessments and need and are at the same level as has been achieved over the last 5 years. It is not intended that walking and cycling should exclude residents.	Consider rewording in relation to walking and cycling.

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8950 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	Object	Many shops are closing in the City centre, proposals for increasing retail floorspace should be revised downwards. Steps should be taken to improve the range of shops in the City centre, there is a shortage of provision of furniture, electrical and DIY shops. These are currently mostly outside the centre and not accessible by public transport. Support walking and cycling provision but not just for visitors, it should include improvements to commuter routes and replacing routes that have been lost eg Wessex Street. Pedestrian routes must be separate from cycle routes and free from motor vehicles.	Noted. Revised retailing forecasts for the city centre may be commissioned in the medium term to take account of the present recession. There are limited planning powers to control the type of goods shop sell. Walking and cycling links intended to serve both visitors and commuters	Consider amendments to retail and cycling/walking elements of policy and text.
10363 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] 9916 - Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] 7963 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 9793 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] 8153 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 9910 - Christopher Webb [8019] 8589 - Mr M Read [8024] 10102 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] 8491 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Object	Question need for the amount of office development stated. More housing is necessary	The office development figures are based on the new jobs requirement set out in the regional plan (35,000) 2001-2021. Research has shown that 100,000 square metres of better quality offices are required in the city centre, through conversion or new build. Evidence shows that job creation in the early years of the plan has been ahead of earlier projections and at least 100,000 sq metres of offices are likely to be needed. Regular monitoring will be undertaken to assess ongoing need. Housing requirements are based on evidence of capacity and require similar annual completions to the average over the last 5 years.	No change to plan
9164 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	Object	Need for more mixed use. Over emphasis on retail. Need to protect uniqueness of Norwich. Much more housing could be above shops etc. It should not be necessary to use green space, Norwich has some incredibly awful	The plan promotes mixed use development including housing and protection and enhancement of Norwich's distinctiveness through high quality development.	No change to plan
7928 - mr paul newson [7812]	Object	Because no provision is made in the plan for disabled people who cannot use buses, rail, walking, cycling easily	The strategy does not exclude car access to the city centre for those who need it.	No change to plan
9230 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 8057 - Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870] 8113 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888] recession . 9484 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139] 9515 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140] 10340 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	Object	Too much growth will ruin Norfolk	Noted. The strategy attempts to set out the many benefits that can result from development eg improved open spaces and community facilities. The requirement for the growth is set out in the regional plan. It is necessary to ensure that housing and employment can be provided	No change to plan
10558 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Object	Object to promotion of more retailing through policy, vacancies currently high.	Noted. It is agreed that retail prospects for the city centre are uncertain at present and vacancy rates, though well below the national average, have increased recently.	Consider approach to expansion of retailing set out in policy given the fact that the retail assessment was undertaken prior to the 2009
	Object	Recent development has spoilt the historical appeal of Norwich and all in the name of growth and greed.	Objection noted. This policy and the City Centre Conservation Area appraisal attempt to ensure that new development will conserve and enhance the historic	No change to plan

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11114 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Support	Since most of the new Norwich allocation is being targeted at the centre we believe that Policy 3 should be amended to emphasise that when allocating sites for housing development particular attention should be given to those which maximise the provision of affordable	Support noted. The policies for Norwich do not allocate the majority of the new housing growth in the city centre as the 2750 in the policy include existing permissions and allocations.	Clarify houising allocations in Norwich.
10789 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] 10804 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Support	General support but need for improved cross city buses and water buses to reduce use of cars.	Noted. The policy requires improvements to the city centre as a public transport hub. The detail of the strategy will be in NATS.	No change to plan
9263 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	Support	Worried about potential for out of town development in NNDR	The policy and strategy aim to retain the focus on city centre retail development and restrict out of town	No change to plan
8899 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Support	Aspirations are fine. Priority need for affordable housing provided by local authorities and not be linked to planning gain.	Noted. Affordable housing policy provides both for AH through planning gain and by direct provision through new housing assoiation developments.	No change to plan
9899 - Mr Peter Suton [8219]	Support	Generally support this plan but with question need for yet more retail and leisure facilities rather than housing.	Housing, retail and leisure needs set out in the plan are all evidence based. Housing figures are based on capacity, need and market delivery. The figures set out in the plan should lead to a slightly lower annual completions rate in the city centre to that achieved over the last 5 years. It is accepted the present recession may have affected retail need and it may be necessary to reassess need in the	Consider amendments to retail element of policy.
9825 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	Support	Yes, but not at the expense of sustainable communities offering retail facilities (food store) to minimise traffic/congestion	Noted. Strategy provides for convenience goods (foodstores etc) to be provided locally - city centre will provide mainly for comparison goods retailing such as	No change to plan
10075 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	Support	City Centre services and activities will support urban extensions and vice versa.	Support noted	No change to plan
9088 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Support	General support for policy. The Authority would like to see reference to linking along (as well as to) the river corridor and addition of mention of access to and from the water itself. The leisure / recreation importance of local residents and workers of the river and riverside (and other areas of the city centre) should be explicitly recognised. The City Centre Diagram at Appendix 5 should indicate boundary between the Core Strategy area and that of the Broads Authority (i.e. the river edges).	Support welcomed and comments concerning the river and the key diagram noted.	Amend key diagarm to show boundary with Broads and consider more specific reference to the
10612 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	Support	Support the Local strategic Plan and the Northern City Centre Area Plan	Support noted	No change to plan
10763 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Support	Yes: Particular support to open spaces, green linkages and walking and cycling provision.	Support noted	No chnage to plan
8721 - Ms K Dunn [8045] 10663 - Mrs Lyn Robertson	Support	Yes, but the character of the city must be maintained.	Noted. This policy and the design policy require all new development to take account of the character of the city centre and ensure that it contributes to that character. A City Centre Conservation Area Appraisal gives deisgn guidance for different areas of the city centre.	No change to plan

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8934 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	Support	NLA support this policy, especially the initial point about enhancing the hisotirc city. This policy could be clarified and further strengthened by editing this to "protecting and enhancing the historic city, including its built, archaeological and environmental assets"	Support noted	Consider amendment to wording to include archaeology
11045 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	Support	Yes	Support noted	No chnage to plan
10883 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Support	Support promotion as a gateway and to bus rapid transport system to link with new communities with the city centre. Policy should also include a commitment to improve walking and cycling routes linking the city to new and existing communities, strategic employment locations as well as recreational opportunities such as the Broads and the coast. Policy should mention the importance, Park and ride	Support for gateway and BRT noted. Policy does support improved walking and cycling links to and from city centre through green infrasructure and public realm improvements. P+R improvements may be an element of further public trnsnsport improvements to be implemented	No change to plan
10977 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	Support	Yes	Support noted	No chage to plan

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10732 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] 9218 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8565 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 9150 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 9875 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] 9032 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] 8246 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	Support	Yes	Support noted	No change to plan
8178 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 9698 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] 10214 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
8809 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] 9959 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] 10014 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] 9929 - John Heaser [7015] 9104 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 9354 - Mr Peter Rope [7113] 10509 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] 8517 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 7990 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843] 7999 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851] 8088 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]				
8268 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8294 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915] 8467 - Mr C Skeels [8016] 8541 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 8654 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8678 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] 9673 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 8728 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr				

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9343 - Ms Celia Viner [8123] 9450 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134] 9547 - Mr R Harris [8146] 9599 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] 9724 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] 9992 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10026 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10085 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10177 - Commercial Land [8246]				
10430 - Mr J E Youngs [8308] 10820 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	Support	Support a bus rapid transport system to link new communities with the city centre. Policy should mention the importance, success and possible expansion of park and ride facilities in contributing towards reducing congestion in the city centre.	Support noted for bus rapid transport . Agree that further expansion of P+R may be part of further transport improvements. As NATS will deal with transport policy for the city centre, this document refers to NATS.	No change to plan
10847 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Support	General support, but: lack of detail on map makes it difficult to assess where green links will be. leisure areas location fine, although there has been an unfortunate tendency that the late night economy has moved away from the traditional pub and become more concentrated in central urban areas. This has meant many less central communities have lost a focal point while the designated areas themselves are prone to public order problems. happy with the areas designated as 'Areas of change' although we are still keen that the strategy focuses also on maintaining more outlying smaller retail centres 'bus rapid transit network' is to be welcomed, yet we need assurance that both public and private sectors have the commitment to make any new routes/services work	General support noted. Detail of green links and leisure policies will be set through the Site Allocation and Development Management documents. The plan establishes a hierarchy of retail centres which includes local centres to meet local needs. The implementation section of the plan will need to be agreed by all partners to ensure commitment to bus rapid transit system.	No change to plan

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10259 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	Support	Support City Centre as the main focus for retail, leisure, office and cultural development. Town centres should be multi-purpose and succeed through a self-sustaining combination of working, living and leisure. Future leisure, arts and cultural facilities should be located within the town centre and be part of a successful mixed-use environment with visitors enlivening the surrounding area in the evening and providing regular custom for local bars and restaurants outside normal working and shopping hours to support an evening economy.	Support noted	No change to plan
8203 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	Support	General support. Signs of some sectors already declining including the media, Norwich Union only centre use retailing losing out to supermarket saturation and the internet. Need to curb the night time weekend economy and make more use of the market area at night.	General support noted. It is accepted that there is a need to review retail policy in the light of the present recession. Policy provides for focus of late night activities in specific areas to enable containment and effective policing.	Consider amendments to retail element of policy.
9382 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	Support	General support but do not approve of late night leisure area , design of some flats and use of street as a bus station.	General support noted. Concentration of late night uses intended to reduce impact on rest of city centre of such activities. High quality design required by policy. Transport issues to be considered through NATS.	No change to plan
8784 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	Support	But in present economic conditions it may be a long time coming	Noted	No change to plan

Decision on (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?
Consider rewording in relation to walking and cycling.

Consider amendments to the policy in relation to housing development and greater emphasis on historic and cultural assets.

Consider amendments to retail element of policy.

Clarify housing allocations in Norwich.

Consider amendments to retail element of policy.

Consider amendment to wording to include archaeology.

Consider amendments to retail and cycling/walking elements of policy and text.

Consider approach to expansion of retailing set out in policy given the fact that the retail assessment was undertaken prior to the 2009 recession .

(Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

10634 - Ms Jane Chittenden	Comment	Supports - considers affordable and convenient alternatives to car travel (possibly with integrated light	Support noted and welcomed. Viability, feasibility and cost-effectiveness of light rail systems not yet proven but the strategy's sustainable transport policies would not rule them out.	No change proposed
----------------------------	---------	---	---	--------------------

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8407 - paul eldridge [7987]	Comment	Support proposals with the exception of NNDR	Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the main travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed.
10274 - Norwich HEART (Mr Michael Loveday) [960]	Comment	Acknowledges opportunities for regeneration of urban areas outside the centre to reflect their original function and the need to seek urban/suburban/rural development solutions which more accurately reflect and promote local distinctiveness. Proper recognition of these needs would ease pressure on greenfield sites, reduce the need to travel and therefore reduce the demand for expensive transport (and other) infrastructure .	Noted. We address the issue of sustainable and efficient use of land, good design and local distinctiveness in development in Policy 13 and aim to secure this in the Norwich urban area as elsewhere, although we see no particular need to reiterate these requirements in Policy 4.	No change proposed
9750 - Mr David Holliday [8178]	Comment	Development along/around main roads in Hellesdon area: need to maintain green and natural areas, enhance green linkages along footpath routes, provide frequent and safe crossing points and ensure that more heavily trafficked new roads and associated footways are designed to protect resident's safety and amenity.	Noted. Proposals at a site-specific level are a matter for more detailed DPDs. The strategy seeks to promote design quality, environmental enhancement and highway safety in new development through other policy strands in the document (see e.g. Policies 13, 16, 17).	No change needed
8049 - Mr Keith Jones [7536]	Comment	Particular support for Conservation Area designation at Beeston St Andrew (existing Broadland LP policy)	Noted. Proposals at a site-specific level are a matter for more detailed DPDs. The strategy seeks to promote design quality and environmental enhancement in new development through other policy strands in the document (see e.g. Policies 13, 16, 17).	No change needed
9089 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Comment	Should recognise that joint working with Broads Authority is necessary to achieve some of the objectives listed (Whitlingham links, footpath cycle network, East Norwich to Broads linkage)	We agree that this is the case but the Broads Authority is already recognised as a key partner working alongside the GNDP and a contributor to this Joint Core Strategy. It is more appropriate to include such a reference, if one is needed, in the supporting text to Policy 19 (implementation and monitoring). This policy already acknowledges the need for joint working with a range of public and private sector bodies and agencies in order to ensure effective and co-ordinated delivery of the proposals.	No change proposed
8426 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	Comment	Concern at no mention for additional provision of sport and leisure facilities	We cover the issue of providing for sport and leisure throughout the area in Policy 18 but it may be appropriate for this policy to include a reference to specific sports and leisure provision in the Norwich urban area.	Amend appropriately to refer to Norwich area sports and leisure provision.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10535 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Comment	Most of the green space proposals will need policing which will not be provided.	Not accepted - Policing is in any case not a matter which can directly addressed by a spatial strategy but the Norfolk Police Authority have been closely involved with and have made inputs into its production. The design of individual schemes must incorporate measures to reduce crime and disorder and increase natural surveillance.	No change proposed
8629 - University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]	Comment	Requirement for bus route linking City centre with Thickthorn Park and Ride, N and N Hospital; Research Park and UEA.	We acknowledge the interconnectivity of these facilities and the importance of providing high quality sustainable transport links between them. Promoting good accessibility to the city centre along radial public transport corridors from the urban edge is a priority but intra-urban routes connecting the transport hubs and other employment centres and educational facilities are also important and could usefully be highlighted. This would include the specific routes mentioned in the vicinity of the UEA and NRP, as well as others.	Consider change to the text to add this reference to intra-urban
11032 - Mr Bernard Godding [8372]	Comment	Supports Learning City idea but queries whether learning initiatives will be supported by infrastructure proposals to ensure access to facilities by an ageing population. Also comments that the focus of the strategy is on the central core and that existing longstanding communities (e.g. West Earham, Bowthorpe) would continue to be marginalised in public perception.	Not accepted. Proposals to enhance accessibility and promote sustainable travel choices are intended to extend to all sectors of the population and the learning city initiative will help to promote educational opportunities available to all. The physical regeneration and community regeneration proposals in the strategy are targeted at just the kind of communities mentioned, additionally significant new housing with enhanced community facilities is proposed at Bowthorpe within the housing delivery targets specified at Policy 14.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

8204 - Mr P Anderson [7901]

Comment
Qualified support: sceptical over availability of Government funding to meet cost of further education development, and considers NNDR to be unsustainable in view of declining oil reserves.

We are working closely with a range of public and private sector organisations in an integrated development programme to ensure that suitable funding sources and mechanisms exist (or can be identified) to support the required programme of growth and implement the specific proposals for the Norwich urban area included in the strategy. Although we acknowledge that the current economic downturn has resulted in cuts in public spending in many areas including further and higher education, the Norwich area authorities and their partners remain committed to delivering the long term growth programme for Greater Norwich.

No change proposed.

Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the predominant travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.

9077 - Ms R Pickering [8109]

Comment
Possible need for some shops to be reused as residential dwellings.

This is a detailed issue more appropriate to lower-level policy documents. Although there will be a requirement for additional shopping facilities to serve the needs of an increased population, the urban area regeneration strategy (Policy 4) and promoting more efficient use of land and buildings (Policy 17) would not necessarily rule out re-using redundant shops for housing in appropriate cases.

No change proposed.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8492 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Comment	Sceptical that councils can implement proposals given quality of recently approved development	We are working closely with a range of public and private sector organisations in an integrated development programme to ensure that suitable funding sources and mechanisms exist (or can be identified) to support the required programme of growth and implement the specific proposals for the Norwich urban area in the strategy. Although we acknowledge that the current economic downturn has meant cuts in public spending in many areas, the Norwich area authorities and their partners remain committed to delivering the long term growth programme for Greater Norwich. We acknowledge that design quality of some past schemes may not have met everyone's personal taste or expectations, but both the City Council and the adjoining Councils have succeeded in attracting major new investment to the city centre and other areas within Norwich and this is widely perceived to have delivered real and tangible economic benefits for the city. We are continuing to work hard to deliver big improvements in the design quality of new development. Raising design quality is an imperative of national planning policy and the need for good design is highlighted by policies in both the East of England Plan and this Joint Core Strategy.	No change proposed
10383 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Comment	Broad support but considers there is some overlap between policies 3 and 4: Policy 4 crucial to the delivery of sustainable growth particularly within Broadland. Welcomes proposals for improvement of gateways, green infrastructure provision and improvement of public transport links to major growth and employment areas. Clarification needed re locations to which this policy refers, dwelling numbers, key dependencies and phasing. Reference needed to the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle AAP, and question whether guidance provided here is sufficient.	We welcome GO East's broad support for this policy and will consider the need for more detail in the areas	Consider adding reference to the growth triangle AAP and specific housing numbers and locations.
8343 - Age Concern Norwich (Phil Wells) [7957]	Comment	Unclear whether housing mix will address needs of older people and include local facilities to promote community activity and reduce travel. Rapid transit proposals might reduce accessibility to local bus stops for the elderly. "Slow transit" on other routes required.	We intend that new development promoted through this strategy should be as socially inclusive as possible, supporting and enhancing the quality of life and the well-being of all sectors of a diverse community, but there may be scope within the text to refer more directly to meeting the needs of an aging population (e.g. Policy 18). Care will be taken to address the needs of a growing elderly population and the planning policies in more detailed DPDs would need to be framed to do this effectively. In relation to public transport, the rapid transit corridors are intended to complement rather than replace conventional bus services: there is no intention that accessibility to bus services would be reduced; in fact the reverse is true.	Consider scope for a clearer focus on meeting the needs of the elderly at appropriate points in the text/policies.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8449 - Ian Harris [8007]	Comment	General support for proposals to enhance green travel opportunities but sees proposal to improve "gateways" to Norwich as championing car accessibility to the City - an anachronistic policy.	This was not our intention. Many approaches to Norwich are unsightly and lack visual quality and coherence. Also, most gateways to the city have the potential for enhancement whether the approach is by road, rail, river, footpath or cycleway. The focus is on enhancing the quality of the built and green environment along and around all these gateways and routes rather than on securing ease of access for the motor vehicle.	No change proposed.
10644 - David Morris (Mr David Morris) [8335]	Comment	Welcomes proposal to increase densities - and aspiration to regenerate 'tired' suburbs, provided it is done in a holistic manner to support enterprise and promote mixed sustainable communities. Appropriate and positive policy framework needed for employment areas to ensure swift development of new employment opportunities and stimulate enterprise. Inclusion of housing on existing employment sites where appropriate should be welcomed where it promotes thriving and	Support noted and welcomed. We agree that developing a positive policy framework for employment areas in subsequent DPDs will be essential to deliver the strategy's employment growth proposals sustainably.	No change proposed
9299 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Comment	Support proposals, particular welcome for enhancement of heathland habitats, riverside walks, walking and cycling, improved educational facilities.	Noted	No change proposed
10316 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Object	Supports regeneration of suburbs, improvement of local employment opportunities and protection of landscape settings: keen to see clear separation between urban and rural. Welcomes improvement of pedestrian and cycle links. NNDR will not reduce traffic to residential areas and would increase congestion and car dependency; improvements to local bus services (and rail services	The CPRE's support for the strategy's regeneration, environmental protection and sustainable transport initiatives is noted and welcomed. Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the main travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8455 - Mr Peter Sergeant [7993]	Object	High density suburban development will lead to homogenous urban sprawl incompatible with objectives of improving gateways and enhancing green infrastructure	Characterless urban and suburban sprawl will not be accepted in any new development initiated through this strategy. A step-change in the quality of the built and natural environment of new and existing communities is fundamental to the success of these proposals. We are continuing to work hard to deliver big improvements in the design quality of new development: raising design quality is an imperative of national planning policy and the need for good design is highlighted by policies in both the East of England Plan and this Joint Core Strategy. This will include appropriate design for safety and security to increase natural surveillance and minimise opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour - even in the highest density development.	No change proposed.
9190 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	Support proposals with the exception of NNDR, sceptical about financial commitment to some proposals	Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the main travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed.
10559 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Object	Rural fringes will be ruined by an expansion of Norwich.	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8590 - Mr M Read [8024] 8951 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] more local roads and pedestrian/cycle routes, cf.	Object	NNDR will increase traffic, lead to higher speeds on local feeder roads and reduce accessibility through closure of situation with Southern Bypass	Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the main travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed
10715 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Object	The term "Regeneration and redevelopment opportunities" appears to be a euphemism for wholesale demolition - which would destroy long-established local communities. Potential of these valuable assets should be recognised and a greener strategy would be simply to "spruce up" these areas.	Not accepted. The strategy recognises that physical regeneration may include both refurbishment, selective infill development and indeed "sprucing up", but where the structural condition of the housing stock would perpetuate unhealthy or unsafe living conditions for residents, or where the local environment is unacceptably poor, redevelopment (with care taken to minimise disruption to existing communities) may be the most realistic and	No change proposed
10103 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	Object	Support regeneration of tired areas within Norwich with improved transport links. Smaller settlements should be	Support noted and welcomed. Regeneration proposals are intended to apply to those larger urban and suburban areas in the built-up area with particular identified needs rather than smaller settlements outside it.	No change proposed.
9166 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	Object	Disagree with the transport strategy (no detail/reason	Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the main travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8700 - mrs jane fischl [8031]	Object	Need to focus on City centre not soulless urban sprawl.	Characterless urban and suburban sprawl will not be accepted in any new development initiated through this strategy. A step-change in the quality of the built and natural environment of new and existing communities is fundamental to the success of these proposals. We are continuing to work hard to deliver big improvements in the design quality of new development: raising design quality is an imperative of national planning policy and the need for good design is highlighted by policies in both the East of England Plan and this Joint Core Strategy. This will include appropriate design for safety and security to increase natural surveillance and minimise opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour - even in the highest density development.	No change proposed.
7873 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	Object	Against principle of any new housing or roads - fields, woodland and wildlife should continue to be protected and left alone. This is majority view in Thorpe and Sprowston.	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change
9383 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	Object	Increased density often means increased crime	Characterless urban and suburban sprawl will not be accepted in any new development initiated through this strategy. A step-change in the quality of the built and natural environment of new and existing communities is fundamental to the success of these proposals. We are continuing to work hard to deliver big improvements in the design quality of new development: raising design quality is an imperative of national planning policy and the need for good design is highlighted by policies in both the East of England Plan and this Joint Core Strategy. This will include appropriate design for safety and security to increase natural surveillance and minimise opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour - even in the highest density development.	No change proposed.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9414 - Mr David Gladwell [8126]

Object

No specific mention for popular sport of angling in the strategy; also comments on damaging impact of sewage outfall above Bishop Bridge.

The strategy makes appropriate general provision for outdoor leisure and recreation (which would include angling and other water-based leisure) in the relevant policies, albeit no clear reference in Policy 4. It is not appropriate for a strategic policy document to promote particular sports at this is a matter for more detailed planning documents, specific proposals and recreation management plans: it could also be addressed by the Broads Authority's relevant planning strategies as well as this one. Sewerage provision is a matter for Anglian Water as the relevant utility provider and it is expected that appropriate infrastructure investment will be made alongside new development proposals.

Consider reference to enhancing facilities for water-based recreation and leisure as part of the riverside walks policy.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10884 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]

Object Highlights a number of policy strands which could be promoted and supported through the development of a sustainable urban extension in NE Norwich.

Support the following:

- â€¢ Retention/improvement of local services and consider additional provision in the proposed new development would provide supplementary and accessible amenities to established communities.
- â€¢ Retention/improvement of local jobs which could be enhanced by district and local centre provision in the new community.
- â€¢ Proposals for comprehensive cycle and walking network
- â€¢ The concept of walkable neighbourhoods, promoting accessibility to services and sustainable travel.
- â€¢ The public transport enhancements listed in the policy.

Consider that:

- â€¢ High quality landscape as a setting for the development will enhance the landscape character of the NE fringe of the city and retain and enhance features of landscape/ecological importance.
- â€¢ Development would lead to a shift in the character of existing suburban areas toward a more urban character and change the role of landscape features, responding to new patterns of usage and recreation/leisure demand

Request that policy 4 should include, in addition:

- â€¢ provision for an inner link road in NE Norwich in advance of the NNDR; to promote easier access to P and R and Broadland business park and take pressure off existing routes in the urban area.
- â€¢ acknowledgement of potential to improve and enhance underused Bittern Line to promote more sustainable travel and increase connectivity to and from existing and new communities. Potential for tram/train transit opportunities should be fully explored.
- â€¢ Specific recognition for potential to expand the

We welcome BLT's support for the policy elements highlighted and acknowledge that growth in the NE quadrant would be able to make a substantial contribution to these policy aims. The proposal for an additional link road is currently subject to consultation as part of the emerging masterplan and it would be premature to make specific reference to it in the strategy. We acknowledge the potential of the Bittern Line in helping to encourage more sustainable travel choices and the particular contribution of the growth proposed in the NE quadrant to

Consider more specific reference to local rail enhancements and growth in the knowledge economy locally: no further changes

knowledge economy in the Norwich area (referenced in para 8.13); growth in NE Norwich will contribute towards the diversification of the business economy by e.g. providing space for business start ups, which is

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		complementary to this aspiration.	the knowledge economy.	proposed.
7929 - mr paul newson [7812]	Object	Growth on scale proposed is unnecessary.	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change
8331 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	Object	NNDR and public transport proposals would have little impact on local traffic generated from the school run and the need to combine this with car trips to work	Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the main travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed
9375 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Object	Majority of housing privately owned and generally well maintained. Uncertain where new heathland would come from. Good ideas but sceptical about ability to fund - public unwilling to pay when money so often	We intend that the regeneration initiatives would be targeted in the areas most in need. Creation of heathland habitats as part of the new green infrastructure network is acknowledged to require positive intervention/management. There is no expectation that public would pay directly for all infrastructure- much of this would be levered from developer contributions and	No change proposed.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10582 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	(see Q28) Complete opposition to the entire rationale of the strategy on the grounds that growth, development and excessive urban sprawl have fatally compromised the rural character and heritage of Norfolk and its indigenous population. Consider government targets should be questioned rather than accepted.	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change proposed
9845 - Mr Mike Linley [8200]	Object	Objects to change in status of land at White Horse Lane, Trowse for development given its acknowledged flood vulnerability.	Policy 4 (and the strategy as a whole) does not allocate land for development at a detailed level. The key diagram shows broad locations for development only: the arc shown in the south of the Norwich urban area is indicative of general development potential and not intended to show exact boundaries. Allocation of sites is a matter for more detailed development plan documents which must have due regard to national and regional policies on minimising	No change proposed
11087 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	Object	NNDR unnecessary and would lead to increased traffic flows on radial roads in north Norwich. Proposal conflicts with policy aim for "protection of the landscape setting of the urban area": would cause significant damage to three historic parks contributing to that setting. Support proposals for public transport enhancements although noted that these have no timescale or budget. Prioritising NNDR will entrench car travel behaviour. JCS advocacy of NNDR unsound and contrary to RSS requirement to promote sustainable travel. Policy should delete reference to NNDR. Amendment suggested to add reference to reduction in speeds and additional small scale measures in NATS review.	Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the main travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8358 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	Object	Achievability doubtful in current economic climate: more public transport investment preferable to (and more cost-effective than) NNDR	Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the main travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed.
8810 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	Object	Questions inclusion of parish in "urban" Norwich Policy Area rather than rural area - PCs should have been consulted on their inclusion in NPA.	Noted, but Policy 4 relates to the immediate built up area of Norwich not to the parishes on the fringe of the NPA. The long-established NPA boundaries are intended to reflect the notional sphere of influence of Norwich and the area is not proposed to be wholly "urban"	No change proposed
10454 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10482 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	Refer to present hospital being over capacity and requiring expansion as a result of recent development - also development should be steered away from rural	Policy 4 refers neither to the hospital nor to rural areas but it is acknowledged that growth within the urban area, as elsewhere, must be supported by appropriate new healthcare development. Making primary healthcare provision to serve new growth areas is referred to in Policy 5 and discussed in the commentary in Appendix 0. NHS Norfolk has been closely involved in the development of this strategy and its own development strategy must be aligned closely with the growth proposals.	No change proposed.
8318 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922]	Object	NNDR and its excessive junction infrastructure unnecessary in economic terms and unsustainable	Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the main travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9507 - South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142]	Object	Clarification needed re East Norwich priority sites - does "City Centre to Deal Ground/Utilities" include the DG and U sites or just the corridor leading to them; also what is meant by "physical regeneration"?	We intend that the DG&U sites are included - they are the highest regeneration priorities in this area; however there could be scope to make this clearer. Physical regeneration is intended to refer to the productive reclamation of land for a variety of uses, and to the beneficial redevelopment and refurbishment of the built	Consider scope for possible clarification.
8779 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	Object	Has answered this already	Not a substantive representation: no specific response made (but refer to other question responses).	No change proposed
8901 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] 8883 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] 8943 - Miss Marguerite Finn	Object	No need for large scale new development allocations Emphasis should be on redevelopment of existing sites - should not be tied to large-scale new development; question need to redevelop whole areas rather than reuse existing.	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and not providing for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which uses the least practicable amount of land, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is no easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment. The scale of growth required cannot be accommodated solely on previously developed land.	No change proposed.
9674 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	Object	Wroxham has no identified need for 200 additional homes: only for limited affordable housing (approx 20). Should be reclassified from a key service area [sic] to a	Noted, but this comment is actually responding to Policies 1 and 7. Policy 4 does not apply to Wroxham.	No change proposed.
9264 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	Object	Queries meaning of "tired suburbs". Demolition and rebuilding at higher density a major mistake: would not lead to improved neighbourhoods but the reverse.	The term "tired suburbs" refers to a number of neighbourhoods (mainly, but not exclusively, social/public sector housing), which are reaching the end of their useful lives and have become run down, ageing and in need of physical regeneration. This would be either through improvement and refurbishment or selective redevelopment. Higher density development is not incompatible with improved neighbourhoods and can be secured by application of good design principles. We are continuing to work hard to deliver big improvements in the design quality of new development: raising design quality is an imperative of national planning policy and the need for good design is highlighted by policies in both the East of England Plan and this Joint Core Strategy. This will include appropriate design for safety and security to increase natural surveillance and minimise opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour - even in the highest density development.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
9960 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Object	NNDR not sole means of reducing impact of traffic on residential areas and would be ineffective, request proposal is deleted	Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the main travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed
9566 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	Object	NNDR will not address existing traffic problems.	Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the main travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed
10167 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]	Object	The Deal Ground has major physical/logistical and environmental issues restricting regeneration options without adverse impact on adjacent landowners and business. Development should be limited to conservation and leisure uses.	Not accepted. The Deal Ground has been a major employment-led regeneration priority in East Norwich for many years and this is clear from the existing development plan context for the area. Ongoing studies have acknowledged that major infrastructure investment is necessary to unlock the site for development. The needs of adjacent businesses must be addressed in detailed regeneration proposals, the scope and nature of which are matters for subsequent joint SPD rather than this strategy.	No change proposed.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10848 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Object	Concerned that some of the developments on the urban fringe would lack enough facilities to be self sustaining and would epitomise urban sprawl (cf. Thorpe Marriot and Dussindale). NNDR would not reduce impact of traffic on residential areas and would worsen traffic flows and congestion: absence of an NNDR link between the A1067 and A47 would impact on northern section of outer ring road by forcing detours into City.	Characterless urban and suburban sprawl will not be accepted in any new development initiated through this strategy. A step-change in the quality of the built and natural environment of new and existing communities is fundamental to the success of these proposals and the integration of local employment and services is crucial to the delivery of sustainable urban extensions. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures to enable restraint on traffic elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.	No change proposed
8335 - MR Stephen Graveling [7940]	Object	Not confident that the City Council will improve the areas specified given track record of "terrible work" in city centre and local areas	Norwich City Council is not solely responsible for delivering the strategy's proposals. We are working closely with a range of public and private sector organisations in an integrated development programme to ensure that suitable funding sources and mechanisms exist (or can be identified) to support the required programme of growth and implement the specific proposals for the Norwich urban area in the strategy. Although we acknowledge that the current economic downturn has meant cuts in public spending in many areas, the Norwich area authorities and their partners remain committed to delivering the long term growth programme for Greater Norwich. We acknowledge that design quality of some past schemes may not have met everyone's personal taste or expectations, but both the City Council and the adjoining Councils have succeeded in attracting major new investment to the city centre and other areas within Norwich and this is widely perceived to have delivered real and tangible economic benefits for the city. We are continuing to work hard to deliver big improvements in the design quality of new development. Raising design quality is an imperative of national planning policy and the need for good design is highlighted by policies in both the East of England Plan and this Joint Core Strategy.	No change proposed.
9900 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	Support	Supports, although has specific reservations about the deliverability of area-wide traffic restraint measures and the achievable speed of any bus rapid transit link. Also queries the impact on existing users of proposal for a water-based country park at Bawburgh.	Noted. We acknowledge that the proposals for traffic restraint will require effective co-ordination and funding in the context of the emerging NATS review and local transport plan. The aspiration for a country park at Bawburgh is a long-established proposal in existing plans.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10790 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Claburn) [8360] 10805 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Support	Support but highlight much increased number of single-person households: would welcome development policies which would encourage higher levels of occupancy and reduce the need for new housing	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. We acknowledge the increase in the number of single person households and can see the benefit of any initiative which would reduce the need for new housebuilding. However, falling average household size is a clear social trend and we must plan for housing to meet the needs of the community currently - it is not for the planning system, or this strategy, to directly influence the individual decisions driving this trend.	No change proposed.
9355 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	Support	Support subject to there being sufficient affordable	The delivery of sufficient affordable housing is an essential requirement of the strategy. New housing development will be expected to make adequate provision for affordable housing to meet identified local need consistent with the most up to date evidence, which shows that 43% of current need in the Greater Norwich area can only be met through developing new affordable housing. The East of England Plan already requires at least 35% of new housing to be affordable across the region and we propose that at least 40% of new housing for the Norwich area delivered by this strategy should be affordable (see Policy 14).	No change proposed.
10605 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	Support	Support proposals for regeneration and recognise role of fringe areas in delivering growth agenda, especially in regard to development at Harford Bridges which would increase access to employment, enhance this gateway to city and deliver riverside/river valley walk.	Support noted - although major development in the area described is not part of the favoured growth option at this time.	No change proposed
10733 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] 10754 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048] 10764 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 10978 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] 10664 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] 10821 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10954 - Mr William E Cooper [8369]	Support	Support proposals	Noted	No change proposed
7951 - Colin Mould [7809]	Support	Support. Is frequent user of Marriot's Way and would like to see more of the same.	Noted	No change needed
11046 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	Support	Support proposals	Noted	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10341 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	Support	Supports proposals conditional on better public transport and improved pedestrian access to all of city.	Support noted and welcomed. The strategy's policies aim to secure substantial improvements in these areas.	No change proposed
10871 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	Support	Policy 4's aspiration of enhancing the Dereham Road gateway into Norwich, and securing improvements in public transport, walking and cycling to the Costessey/Longwater area could both be facilitated by an enlargement of the Lodge Farm, Costessey	Noted. However, improvements in sustainable accessibility and the approach to Norwich via the Longwater/A1074 gateway may be assisted by development in a variety of locations but are not necessarily dependent on making a substantial additional	No change proposed
10613 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	Support	Support proposals and welcome their emphasis on green infrastructure, cultural and economic development. Would like to see fixed rail tram system from east to west in city centre.	CCRF's support noted and welcomed. Viability, feasibility and cost-effectiveness of light rail systems not yet proven but the strategy's sustainable transport policies would not rule them out.	No change proposed
10015 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]	Support	Support proposals, although comment that green links and infrastructure must have a meaningful purpose (cross-ref to response on Q25)	Support noted and welcomed. Effective enhancement and new provision of green infrastructure is embedded in the strategy and an essential element of the growth proposals: detailed requirements are assessed in the Green Infrastructure Study.	No change proposed
10086 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10930 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]	Support	Support proposals	Noted	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9219 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8566 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 10364 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] 9151 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 9876 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] 9033 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] 9231 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 8247 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	Support	Support proposals	Noted	No change needed
8179 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 9699 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] 10215 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
8391 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] 9930 - John Heaser [7015] 9107 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 10510 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] 9794 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] 8000 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851] 8089 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]				
8114 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8154 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 8269 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8295 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915] 8416 - Ed King [7965] 8384 - M Harrold [7966] 8468 - Mr C Skeels [8016] 8542 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 8655 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8679 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] 8729 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8785 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]				

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
& Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]				
9451 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134] 9476 - Louisa Young [8135] 9485 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139] 9516 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140] 9600 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] 9725 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] 9761 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184] 9993 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10027 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 7914 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	Support	Reiterates comments in response to Q6: more retail space not seen as a necessity; would welcome more facilities for various community-based creative arts and associated activities (provided either by council or private enterprise); welcomes use of city centre premises for uses other than retail.	Noted: we would hope that the community regeneration and learning city proposals in Policy 4 would provide the basis to encourage such activities and support community participation/cohesion.	No change proposed
9548 - Mr R Harris [8146]	Support	Supports and considers proposals sound provided that housing is limited: queries the location of agreed sites for 11,851 houses which have planning permission.	Noted, but comment is more relevant to Policy 14. The housing commitment covers both sites with planning permission and sites already allocated in existing plans: site details are published in the Annual Monitoring Reports produced by the constituent districts.	No change proposed
7964 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 9867 - Hill Residential [8215]	Support	Support. Many areas, esp. fringes, need tidying up.	Noted	No change needed
	Support	Acknowledge the need to integrate new development effectively with the existing urban edge of the city in a way which promotes sustainable access. Additional policy clause proposed: "For opportunities which are well related to the built up edge of the City and in good proximity to existing jobs facilities and services."	We consider that the Joint Core Strategy has the clear aim of promoting sustainable accessibility in all new development in the area as a matter of course and we adequately address these issues within Policy 16. We see no obvious need to reiterate the same objectives for the Norwich urban area in Policy 4.	No change proposed.
8722 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Support	Supports but doubts proposals can be funded.	We are working closely with a range of public and private sector organisations in an integrated development programme to ensure that suitable funding sources and mechanisms exist (or can be identified) to support the required programme of growth and implement the specific proposals for the Norwich urban area in the strategy.	No change proposed.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9826 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	Support	Broad support for new development and regeneration proposals (including for NNDR), albeit concerns about impact on traffic flows on Fakenham Road without a completed northern bypass; also mentions deficiency of local convenience shopping provision in Taverham. Current proposals for Taverham Garden Centre seen as consistent with and complementary to the Joint Core Strategy's proposals and would address retail needs of area sustainably and appropriately.	Support welcomed although there are no plans to complete a Norwich northern bypass at this time. Local retail provision is an issue for more detailed DPDs and the site-specific issue re Taverham Garden Centre is noted but is not appropriate for consideration in a strategic policy document.	No change proposed
8070 - Miss Janet Saunders	Support	Support, but meaning of "social regeneration" unclear.	Noted	Consider clarifying this term in supporting text.
Decision on (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?				
Consider scope for a clearer focus on meeting the needs of the elderly at appropriate points in the text/policies. This action has been revised.				
Consider more specific reference to local rail enhancements and growth in the knowledge economy locally: no further changes proposed.				
Consider scope for possible clarification. This action has been revised.				
Consider clarifying this term in supporting text.				
Consider change to the text to add this reference to intra-urban routes.				
Consider reference to enhancing facilities for water-based recreation and leisure as part of the riverside walks policy.				
Consider adding reference to the growth triangle AAP and specific housing numbers and locations.				
<i>(Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</i>				
9300 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Comment	Support generally - Mile Cross needs TLC.	Noted	No change proposed
7982 - mr Daniel Yellop [7836]	Comment	Need for dedicated lane for buses and P and R users along A140 corridor from Airport to B1149 junction (and potentially further north) to alleviate congestion and improve bus punctuality.	Noted (representation is also relevant to Policies 16, 19) although this kind of site-specific proposal is more appropriate to include in lower-level development plan documents and the local transport plan.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10317 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]

Comment
Strategy's 'greenfield-first' approach and growth locations would suburbanise large areas of rural Norfolk affecting tranquillity of countryside and character of market towns/villages.

No policy targets for use of brownfield land - how does this equate with RSS brownfield target of 60%? Level of greenfield allocation proposed renders Objective 8 (prioritising previously developed land to minimise loss of agricultural land and countryside) almost meaningless.

Focus more development in urban areas, rather than on greenfield land. This requires scaling down housing numbers in the NPA towns and villages and at Rackheath and a commensurate increase in NPA allocations taken by Norwich. Reducing housing delivery targets would maximise opportunities for use of previously developed land.

Strongly object to north east growth triangle concept and its extent. Will impact on rural landscape of Broadland and result in major loss of greenfield land and rural tranquillity and character, increasing congestion and light pollution.

Would also skew the spatial strategy by locating development away from the major employment locations in SW quadrant - this is a key weakness which further undermines Objective 11 to reduce the need to travel

The imperative to meet the East of England Plan's housing provision figures means that significant greenfield allocations are needed, even though the starting point of the strategy was to accommodate as much within the urban area as possible, consistent with maintaining its character and avoiding harm to environmental assets. In relation to Norwich we have pitched the requirement for new housing allocations at an achievable and realistic level consistent with the physical capacity of the city and the need to maintain and protect its historic and environmental assets. The relative scarcity of large-scale housing development opportunities in Norwich over and above the existing housing commitment - which is already under pressure from the housing market downturn - means that a significantly higher allocation level could only be achieved by increasing densities to a degree which would seriously compromise these objectives. Whether a strategy of dispersal or concentration were to be followed, the scale of greenfield allocations in the Broadland part of the area is likely to be similar. However a strategy of concentration has been followed primarily to facilitate the provision of new high level infrastructure, such as secondary education, and in order to enable the creation of a high quality link suitable for bus rapid transit through the focusing of investment on a public transport corridor which can serve the bulk of the development to be accommodated in Broadland. The north east has consistently been supported by Children's Services, and the absence of an NDR connection between the A1067 and A47 further reinforces this choice: otherwise there would be a serious risk of traffic crossing the Wensum valley to access major attractors on the south side such as the hospital, Norwich Research Park, Longwater etc. Likewise the fact that there are a number of radial roads which could more readily accommodate traffic unavoidably displaced by the public transport priorities suggests the north east is the best option available. The north east also has a relatively good access to a range of employment sites including Broadland Business Park, the Airport industrial areas, Rackheath, Salhouse Road, and other areas around the northern ring road. The different characteristics of the settlements and urban fringe and South Norfolk mean a different approach has been adopted there, but collectively the strategy combines a large scale development with a number of more modest developments, an approach broadly supported by the development industry at the issues and options stage.

Consider scope for clarifying relationship of strategic growth distribution to 60% brownfield target in RSS - explain that whilst the priority given to brownfield sites remains an important objective, the capacity of the Norwich urban area to accommodate an increased share of development is demonstrably

10716 - Ms S Layton [8354]

Comment
Does "are there any areas that we have missed" mean "what else can we demolish?"

Emphatically, no. We have responded to this point in relation to your representation at Question 7.

No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

8862 - Mr Stephen Andrews

Comment
Object: Need for physical and social regeneration should not justify demolishing good quality housing and replacing with cramped and characterless development in the name of progress. Well designed and laid out areas with ample public space and well-tended private gardens can be found even in the worst estates.

Characterless urban and suburban sprawl will not be accepted in any new development initiated through this strategy. A step-change in the quality of the built and natural environment of new and existing communities is fundamental to the success of these proposals. We are continuing to work hard to deliver big improvements in the design quality of new development: raising design quality is an imperative of national planning policy and the need for good design is highlighted by policies in both the East of England Plan and this Joint Core Strategy. This will include appropriate design for safety and security to increase natural surveillance and minimise opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour - even in the highest density development.

No change proposed

The strategy recognises that physical regeneration may include both refurbishment and selective infill development but where the structural condition of the housing stock would perpetuate unhealthy or unsafe living conditions for residents, or where the local environment is unacceptably poor, redevelopment (with care taken to minimise disruption to existing communities) may be the most realistic and beneficial option.

9961 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]

Comment
No comment

Noted

No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9549 - Mr R Harris [8146]

Comment
Object. Considers the proposed scale of growth and construction of the NNDR unnecessary. Given the probability of an extended recession, priority is to improve the A11/A47 and build A140 Long Stratton bypass, as well as improving bus and rail services.

Not accepted. Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the predominant travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity. Bus and rail enhancements are essential to the strategy and the A140 Long Stratton Bypass is an acknowledged priority. Improvements to the A11 and A47 are already programmed in the regional transport strategy - although as trunk roads they fall within the remit of the Highways Agency rather than the local authorities responsible for implementing this Joint Core Strategy. The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.

No change proposed

9675 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]

Object
Object. Can't relate to proposals for Wroxham and has reservations re Rackheath. More work needed.

Noted, however Policy 4 applies to the existing built up area and suburban fringe - neither Wroxham nor Rackheath is included. Policy 7 (Key service centres) and Policy 5 (Major change locations) are the more relevant

No change proposed.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9378 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Object	No need for wholesale demolition as much can be done with existing building stock at a fraction of the cost.	The strategy recognises that physical regeneration may include both refurbishment, selective infill development and indeed "sprucing up"; but where the structural condition of the housing stock would perpetuate unhealthy or unsafe living conditions for residents, or where the local environment is unacceptably poor, redevelopment (with care taken to minimise disruption to existing communities) may be the most realistic and beneficial option.	No change proposed.
8885 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	Object	Object. Existing cycleways are not used so why plan for more?	Whilst some cycleways might not be used to their full potential we would dispute the claim that they are "not used" - that is not borne out by statistical evidence. Provision of new and improved cycleways is essential if we are to be successful in promoting more sustainable travel choices. This is an imperative of both national and regional planning policy which the Joint Core Strategy	No change proposed
9191 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	Object. All the low density suburbs will require redevelopment in the foreseeable future as car use will become more expensive.	We acknowledge this in principle and accept that this course of action might be appropriate eventually: however the strategy does not envisage that wholesale redevelopment of all suburban areas would be necessary, practicable or realistic within the twenty year timescale covered in this document. Future reviews of the strategy may need to address suburban regeneration in other areas where it becomes necessary.	No change proposed.
10483 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	Development will destroy the area's rural character with consequent impact on tourism	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10455 - Mr David Smith [8309]	Object	Does not want Norfolk built up.	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change proposed
10849 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Object	Broad support for regeneration priorities but consider investment may be concentrated in out-of-town areas at the expense of existing Norwich urban area, which exhibits significant areas of deprivation (Lakenham, Tuckswood, Heartsease) as well as smaller 'pockets' of deprivation in e.g.Town Close and Thorpe Hamlet - these areas should not lose out through over-simplistic funding	This is not our intention. The physical regeneration priorities in this strategy recognise and are intended to address particular areas of urban deprivation - including many of the areas referred to. Funding sources are either available already or can be identified to target investment within the areas most in need.	This may again be a misunderstanding of the "tired suburbs" reference - suggest since the renewal initiatives envisaged might apply to residential areas in the inner Norwich urban area (not in fact "suburban" at all) as much as to housing estates further out, we revisit the term in favour of something that more accurately reflects where the strategy's regeneration priorities actually are.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10560 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Object	Regenerate the run down parts of Norwich - plenty of opportunities there.	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. While we accept that there are numerous regeneration opportunities within the run-down areas of Norwich (which this policy seeks to address) growth at the scale proposed cannot be accommodated solely within the boundaries of the existing built up area. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change proposed
7874 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	Object	Against principle of any development - fields, woodland and wildlife should continue to be protected and left alone.	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8332 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	Object	Object. No initiative is mentioned to reduce the carbon footprint of the existing residential and commercial building stock.	We acknowledge that this is a worthwhile aspiration. National and regional planning policy on climate change, energy efficient development, renewable energy and carbon reduction will help to reduce the carbon footprint of development as a whole, albeit that many initiatives (and policy strands in this strategy) must necessarily be targeted at new development rather than the existing stock, where the potential for effecting change directly through the planning system is more limited. Promoting carbon reduction in the existing building stock may be more effectively enacted through other legislation (e.g. building regulations) and through appropriate tax incentives to encourage more carbon-responsible behaviour at an individual level.	Consider whether a reference to carbon reduction in the existing building stock is appropriate and can be effected through Policy 4.
8205 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	Object	Object. Inclusion of East Norwich as a development location should be reconsidered especially in view of predicted sea level rise and associated increased flood	Not accepted. Allocation of development in these areas would in any case avoid the current and future functional flood plain and have to be designed and located so as to mitigate and minimise flood risk. Steering development away from areas of moderate flood risk entirely cannot be countenanced because this would prevent development in much of Norwich city centre as well as regeneration in east Norwich. The protection of areas from development on flood risk grounds must be supported by sound objective evidence: the ongoing SFRA (Strategic Flood Risk Assessment) has not identified an unacceptable degree of flood risk to these areas in the foreseeable future.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8776 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	Object	Object. NNDR will lead to increased private car use and exacerbate traffic problems. Sceptical about "bogus" policy to protect rural setting of villages. Cycle network "flawed" as practice of planting thorn hedges along particular cycleways and footpaths creates additional hazards for users. Public transport plans are token and superficial rather than fundamental to strategy.	<p>Not accepted. Although the Strategy seeks to promote healthy and sustainable travel choices and (as far as is practicable) to locate development to reduce reliance on the private car, motorised private transport will continue to be the predominant travel choice for the movement of goods and people for the period of the strategy and beyond. The NNDR is essential to service the level of growth and new development proposed. It will improve strategic access to the areas proposed for development, reduce traffic impact on local roads, enhance quality of life and provide additional capacity for delivering public transport improvements and other sustainable transport measures elsewhere in the urban area. Without the NNDR there would be far less scope to accommodate the levels of committed growth sustainably without unacceptable impacts on local environmental quality and amenity.</p> <p>Strong policies for protecting areas of recognised landscape character and importance are essential to ensure that villages will not be subsumed by uncontrolled growth, equally the strategy's emphasis on locating and scaling new development in accordance with a defined hierarchy of settlements means that the setting and character of villages will be preserved: however the overall scale of growth to be accommodated will inevitably involve some development on greenfield land and some change in the character of the areas of major change immediately adjoining the urban edge.</p> <p>The issue of the specific planting treatments along cycleways is a matter for detailed management plans and is not appropriate to address in this strategy.</p>	No change proposed
8811 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	Object	No comment. Residents of the identified areas are better placed to judge [whether they are the right areas or not].	Noted.	No change proposed.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9726 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	Object	Countryside near Norwich is being wrecked	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change proposed
9567 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	Object	Object. Regeneration proposals are not applicable to Drayton.	Not accepted: Drayton may present opportunity sites for regeneration in common with other suburban parishes.	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10168 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]	Object	<p>Site specific objection re Trowse Aggregate Depot (adjoining the Deal Ground)</p> <p>1) Reference made to particular generic policies which have been published by the GNDP for the areas covered in Chapter 7 of the Strategy.</p> <p>2) Consider that limitations placed on Deal Ground site in relation to flood risk, contamination and ecological interest render it unsuitable for regeneration and the fact that much of it is either in the functional flood plain or in Zone 2 make this policy's proposals for the site inconsistent with PPS25. Any land raising or development would have unacceptable flood water run-off impacts on both the ecological areas within the site and the aggregate depot.</p> <p>3) Development of non-brownfield areas of the Deal Ground would be in conflict with the provisions of Policy 17 of the strategy.</p> <p>4) Object to identified areas for regeneration on the above grounds and note the continued lack of protection of the adjacent strategic site inconsistent with county and regional minerals policy and guidance, (Policy T10 of the adopted RSS, policy EMP9.1 of the City of Norwich Local Plan, and Policy MIN22 of the Norfolk Mineral Local Plan as well as with emerging policy under the MWDF</p>	<p>1) There is no adopted generic policy for this site other than the existing City of Norwich Local Plan policy (EMP9): joint SPD is planned following more detailed investigation of development constraints and economic viability subsequent to the 2007 Initial Options Appraisal by Buro Happold. The specific parameters and scope of regeneration opportunities are matters of detail appropriate for a subsequent site-specific document - that in no way precludes the recognition of the Deal Ground for regeneration in general terms in this strategy</p> <p>2) The fact that the site falls part within Zone 2 and partly in the FFP is not a reason for preventing all development, which is apparent from PPS25: there are no proposals to develop in the functional flood plain other than for essential infrastructure works either in this strategy or in existing adopted policy.</p> <p>3) We do not accept that regeneration of the Deal Ground would be inconsistent with Policy 17 since identified areas of ecological value would be protected by that policy (and others) and not be earmarked for any development, but reiterate that the detailed disposition of uses on the site is in any case not a matter for this strategy.</p> <p>4) At its stated level of detail, the strategy neither protects the safeguarded minerals site in the MWP nor earmarks it or the existing aggregate depot for any development (both are clearly outside the Deal Ground site boundaries in the adopted Local Plan). Neither is it appropriate for this strategy to cover policy issues properly addressed by the minerals planning authority either in the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy or the Minerals and Waste Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>We do not therefore see any inconsistency between promoting appropriate and beneficial regeneration of the Deal Ground in this strategy, safeguarding the interests of the existing aggregate industry operator and protecting the safeguarded site in the MWP. Therefore these proposals are entirely consistent with RSS policy T10.</p>	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8591 - Mr M Read [8024]	Object	[Development should focus on] brownfield sites only.	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change proposed
9266 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	Object	Areas defined are vague and the term social regeneration needs clarifying. The history of "social regeneration" is not happy one.	Noted.	No policy change proposed. But consider need for (a) More specific definition of areas to which the policy applies; (b) more explanation of terms physical and social regeneration in supporting text: possibly include definitions in Glossary.
10583 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	Complete opposition to the entire rationale of the strategy on the grounds that growth, development and excessive urban sprawl have fatally compromised the rural character and heritage of Norfolk and its indigenous population. Consider government targets should be questioned rather than accepted.	The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.	No change proposed.
8071 - Miss Janet Saunders	Support	Support. Many of the areas identified do not do Norwich justice.	Noted	No change needed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10734 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] 10365 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] 9877 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] 8180 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 10216 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	Support	Support areas identified	Noted	No change proposed
11047 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] 9931 - John Heaser [7015] 10511 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] 9795 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] 10765 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 10979 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] 9762 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184] 9827 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 9994 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10028 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10179 - Commercial Land [8246]				
10342 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] 10432 - Mr J E Youngs [8308] 10665 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] 10822 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10931 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368] 10955 - Mr William E Cooper				
10087 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	Support	Support majority of proposals	Noted	No change proposed
8735 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Support	Support. Greater promotion of Research Park role needed with strengthened links to the one in Cambridge. Need to promote (and increase educational awareness of) the traditional agricultural identity of the area.	Support noted and welcomed. The strategy's proposals would help to facilitate these aspirations.	No change proposed.
10077 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	Support	Support physical and social regeneration proposals - will make Norwich a more attractive place to live, work and	Noted	No change proposed.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9167 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	Support	Support. Promotion of Learning City should include City College as well as University. Proposals for physical and social regeneration of people should be City-wide rather than selective.	<p>We intend that the learning city initiative would involve a range of further and higher education providers as well as supporting lifelong learning. This would include both the University and City College (as well as other educational institutions).</p> <p>We have targeted the regeneration initiatives in the areas where we consider there is greatest need but this does not imply that other areas would be neglected. We believe that the term "physical regeneration" may have been misinterpreted in your comment. Physical regeneration is intended to describe the selective redevelopment, refurbishment and improvement of buildings and areas rather than to the physical well-being of people - although the latter is also a very important policy objective (objective 3) which would be applied area-wide and assisted by a number of policies in the strategy.</p>	No policy change proposed. But consider need for more explanation of terms physical and social regeneration in supporting text: possibly include definitions in Glossary.
9452 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	Support	Support areas identified	Noted	No change proposed
10104 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	Support	Proposals should focus on areas within existing Norwich boundaries.	<p>The scale of new housing, and the broad share to be planned for in and close to the Norwich urban area, is set by the approved East of England Plan. While many challenge the East of England Plan's requirements, that is the target the Joint Core Strategy must work to, and failure to provide for this growth would be likely to make the strategy legally unsound. EERA (the regional planning body) is currently reviewing the East of England Plan, and has been asked to look at higher development rates even within the period covered by the current plan. Any attempt to reduce the scale of housing development in this strategy is likely to be successfully challenged. Growth at the scale proposed cannot be accommodated solely within the boundaries of the existing built up area. The strategy must strike a difficult balance between high density development which minimises land take, particularly in greenfield areas, promoting "workable" communities and meeting the understandable desire for people to have access to open space and countryside. There is not an easy answer to this but much will depend on the quality of the built environment.</p>	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9220 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8567 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 8906 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] 9152 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L. Read) [2055] 9034 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] 9232 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 8248 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	Support	Support areas identified	Noted	No change proposed
9700 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] 7915 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] 8359 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 9108 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 9356 - Mr Peter Rope [7113] 8518 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8001 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851] 8090 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]				
8115 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8155 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 8270 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8469 - Mr C Skeels [8016] 8493 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] 8543 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 8656 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8680 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] 8730 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8786 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]				
8838 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 8976 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9106 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111] 9327 - Ms Celia Viner [8123] 9384 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124] 9427 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]				

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10885 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Support	Support for: â€¢ physical and social regeneration proposals - will make Norwich a more attractive place to live, work and visit. â€¢ physical regeneration opportunities in east Norwich, including sustainable urban extension in NE sector. â€¢ enhanced green linkages from the city centre to the Broads.	Support noted and welcomed	No change proposed
10614 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	Support	Supports but asks whether there is potential to increase the number of households to link up existing settlements - unclear from the map.	In relation to the existing urban area Policy 4 does not propose a general merging of settlements if this is what is meant (the majority of the area to which this policy applies is generally urban or suburban already) although opportunities for regeneration could involve the redevelopment of particular redundant sites for housing and the increase in densities within established housing areas through redevelopment.	Consider potential for clarifying the areas to which this policy

Decision on (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

Consider whether a reference to carbon reduction in the existing building stock is appropriate and can be effected through Policy 4.

Action: No policy change proposed. But consider need for

- (a) More specific definition of areas to which the policy applies;
- (b) more explanation of terms physical and social regeneration in supporting text: possibly include definitions in Glossary.

No policy change proposed. But consider need for more explanation of terms physical and social regeneration in supporting text: possibly include definitions in Glossary.

This may again be a misunderstanding of the "tired suburbs" reference - suggest since the renewal initiatives envisaged might apply to residential areas in the inner Norwich urban area (not in fact "suburban" at all) as much as to housing estates further out, we revisit the term in favour of something that more accurately reflects where the strategy's regeneration priorities actually are.

Consider scope for clarifying relationship of strategic growth distribution to 60% brownfield target in RSS - explain that whilst the priority given to brownfield sites remains an important objective, the capacity of the Norwich urban area to accommodate an increased share of development is demonstrably finite.

Consider potential for clarifying the areas to which this policy applies.

(Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

9267 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	Comment	Not enough detail on the map to enable judgment	[R	the map alone cannot tell the whole story, but the map and words in the JCS are together considered sufficient. However it is accepted that the final document needs better presentation, with more use of illustrations	[R	Add more illustrative the material to pre submission publication document	[R B]
--------------------------------------	---------	---	----	--	----	---	-------

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
8457 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Development anywhere needs to recognise environmental concerns. The Norfolk Wildlife Trust cannot support the favoured option in view of concerns about the impacts of total levels of growth proposed on the environment and the probability of adequate mitigation in the form of green infrastructure, SUDS and related methods, but commit to support projects in the area which compensate for impact on, or enhance biodiversity [R B]	Position noted - the scale of development is a consequence of the East of England Plan and is not likely to be reduced as a consequence of the current review of that plan. [R B]	No change needed [R B]
11073 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] 10063 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] 10147 - R Smith [8243]	Comment	These representations concern the status of the non location specific allocation for 2000 dwellings in the Broadland part of the Norwich policy area It should be clarified whether this is a minimum Should be clarified if these are expected to deliver ahead of the strategic sites Should be clarified that none of the 2000 dwellings will be "siphoned off" into the strategic growth location housing figures [RB]	<p>The East of England Plan is clear that the housing provision targets set out in it should be viewed as a minimum (policy H1). The overall allocation to be made should therefore be a minimum, within the Norwich policy area and the remainder of the plan area. It is less certain if the individual locations should be viewed as a minimum, or whether an over shoot in one could be compensated for by a shortfall in another. On balance, given that the plan will be used for investment decisions by service providers each component should be regarded as a minimum.</p> <p>In the case of the rural part of the area, where a range is used to indicate the scale of allocation at a particular place, this should be treated as an indicative range, though elsewhere it has been suggested that the wording of the policies relating to service villages should have some additional flexibility built in to deal with particular local circumstances.</p> <p>In reality, these may well deliver ahead of large strategic sites, but it is not suggested that there should be any formal phasing to artificially hold back large sites if they are "ready to go"</p> <p>While it may be sensible for some of the South Norfolk non location specific component to be added to major growth locations, should local factors support this outcome, the same approach is unlikely to be possible in Broadland. This is because the single major growth location is expected to deliver 7000 dwellings by 2026, and this is close to the figure expected to be feasible. In the case a Broadland therefore such a reference should be deleted. [RB]</p>	<p>Indicate that each component of the allocation to be made in the Norwich policy area in strategic locations, and the non location specific component should be regarded as a minimum.</p> <p>Delete the suggestion that the non location specific 2000 dwellings in Broadland could be accommodated within the major identified growth location to the north east of the urban area. [RB]</p>
8884 - ie homes & property ltd (m red palmieri) [7620]	Comment	oppose the suggestion that the 1800 houses on smaller sites in south Norfolk should be found through further additions to major growth locations. These can be found along the A140 [R B]	The strategy refers to "smaller sites in the NPA and possible additions to named growth locations". There appears to be no merit in discarding one of these options at this stage. The site specific allocations DPD will be able to assess the full range of options before selecting the most appropriate sites for development. [R B]	Note change needed [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
11101 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	<p>Representations focus on matters of delivery</p> <p>Philip Jeans Homes</p> <p>Relevant test is whether RSS targets will be completed in the period 2001 to 2021</p> <p>Challenge ability to complete 3000 units in Norwich, largely dependent on market for flats.</p> <p>7000 dwellings in northeast require co-ordination of ownerships and infrastructure -major concern over uncertainty of funding of northern distributor road</p> <p>Do not believe 1800 dwellings in Long Stratton can deliver the bypass</p> <p>Recognize the merits of favoured option but to believe that contingency approach needs to be incorporated into the plan</p> <p>[RB]</p>	<p>In light of PPS three, believe that the relevant target date is 2026, using the extrapolated housing provision figures included in the joint core strategy</p> <p>The strategic housing land availability assessment broadly, confirms the expected in capacity in Norwich</p> <p>Other representations demonstrate the willingness of landowners to work together in the north east, though it is acknowledged that the northern distributor road is an essential component of the strategy. The intention is that, and by the time of submission, the NDR will have secured programme entry</p> <p>Discussions continue to establish the ability of a development of 1800 houses to fund the bypass, and to see if there are any available public sector funds which could support the scheme without an adverse impact on other transport schemes in the area. Current signs remain positive, but a final decision will need to be taken in the light of ongoing discussions</p> <p>[RB]</p>	No change unless current discussions confirm the proposed development at Long Stratton, and any available public funds, cannot fund the bypass
10284 - RSPB (East of England Regional Office) (Dr Philip Pearson) [8268]	Comment	<p>concern the sustainability appraisal and appropriate assessment</p> <p>RSPB comment only on the favoured option. They comment that no updated sustainability appraisal or appropriate assessment have been provided, and as a consequence it is impossible to comment. As a result they are unable to support the option.</p> <p>[RB]</p>	<p>An updated sustainability assessment was prepared, and posted on the web site. The sustainability appraisal work is currently being independently verified. An appropriate assessment is being undertaken, in dialogue with Natural England. This can only be finalized in light of the favoured option. Task two, looking at mitigation is currently in progress.</p> <p>[RB]</p>	No change needed
10606 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	Comment	<p>Harford Bridge should be shown as a strategic employment location . Case strengthened by selection of Long Stratton for strategic growth</p> <p>[RB]</p>	<p>The study undertaken by Arup and Oxford Economics, and looking at the economic potential of the area and the suitability of sites to meet it concluded that the present strategic sites were the best available. While it is true that many are constrained, it makes sense to try and resolve the constraints rather than simply give up on the sites in question. In any case, significant investment would be needed to promote a new site at Harford, including the likelihood of significant improvements to the Harford interchange with the southern bypass. Long Stratton is some way distant from Harford</p> <p>[RB]</p>	No change
9692 - Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement [8170]	Comment	<p>Support for Cringleford as a growth location. Clients own land in the area which can assist in the delivery of a scheme promoted by building partnerships, and are willing to be involved</p> <p>[R B]</p>	<p>Support welcomed though a precise definition of any area for development will need to await site specific allocations DPD</p> <p>[R B]</p>	No change needed

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
9062 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	All development should be required to comply with "Secured by Design" [R B]	The question of crime in new developments is touched on in the policy on communities and culture. While " Secured by Design" is a recognised scheme, it is understood to be a voluntary scheme of accreditation, and it would be an unreasonable requirement to try to make it compulsory. "Building for Life", the standard advocated by CABE, includes criteria about safety in public areas and the design policy may refer to this. Policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan also requires all development to have regard to crime prevention [R B]	Do not make " Secured by Design" a formal requirement, but consider the use of " Building for Life" as a criterion in an expanded design policy, and ensure that crime prevention continues to be referred to in any redrafting of the policy on communities and
10334 - Trafford Estate Rackheath [8291]	Comment	Representations concern Rackheath Trafford Estate promote land at Rackheath in their ownership, either as part of the eco settlement or as a potential extension to the Rackheath industrial estate [RB]	The precise areas of land to be allocated will be determined through an Area Action Plan, but others have suggested that additional employment land should be identified at Rackheath to reduce the need for travel from the new community. [RB]	Include employment allocation within eco development at Rackheath - precise site to be determined through area action plan [RB]
9526 - Taylor Wimpey [7257]	Comment	Support allocation of 1800 houses at Long Stratton [R B]	Support welcomed [R B]	No change needed [R B]
8050 - Mr Keith Jones [7536]	Comment	the growth triangle in the north east is said to be dependent on the NDR but the promoters of the Rackheath eco town say this element is not. This should be clarified. However the representation goes on to argue that the increase in traffic would be unsustainable in the absence of an NDR [R B]	While the promoters of the Rackheath eco community may take the view that their specific development is not dependent on the NDR, this ignores the wider picture. The proposal at Rackheath will benefit from infrastructure which needs the wider north east development to support it, in particular high quality public transport, including extensive priorities between Rackheath and the city centre, and a secondary school. In reality therefore, theeco community needs to be seen in the context of additional growth proposed in the locality, but equally the NDR forms only a part of a wider transport strategy. The view of the County Council, as transport authority, is that the NDR is needed to deal with traffic issues in the urban area as a whole, who not least by facilitating public transport priorities within the urban area. [R B]	No change needed [R B]
10702 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Comment	These representations relate to matters such as flooding The Environment Agency refer to their responses to other questions and indicate they expect development to be directed away from flood zones, but pointing out that within Norwich city centre flood-risk is a series constraint, and will require further work on hazard mapping. Some of the proposed growth areas (Cringleford, Wymondham and Costessey) have some flood-risk areas) [RB]	Noted. It will be important at the site specific allocations stage to avoid areas at risk of flood. The position in the city centre is understood, and more detailed work being undertaken [RB]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
9078 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	Comment	Permitting residential conversion of redundant shops could reduce the land take [R B]	While there are some vacancies in retail premises, until the recent economic downturn, these were not considered excessive. The retail study undertaken for the GNDP suggested a case for significant retail floorspace growth in the Norwich area, and more modest levels of growth in the main towns. Circumstances have changed with the economic downturn, but the plan looks ahead for twenty years, and some degree of recovery is likely in this time. While the space released would make only a marginal difference given the scale of housing to be accommodated, it would be appropriate to reconsider the scale of retail growth planned for, and take a more cautious approach. [R B]	Reconsider the scale of retail growth proposed. [R B]
10407 - Easton College [3570] 10292 - Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277]	Comment	The representations relate to Easton, and its relationship with Costessey Easton college note that in December, 2008 the GNDP proposed 1000 dwellings at Easton as part of the preferred approach, but in the 2009 document this has been amended to Easton/ Costessey. It is not clear on what basis this decision has been taken Agreed local stakeholders should be involved in masterplanning, but consider reference to "an accredited design methodology" is unclear. The most important factor is that a master plan exercises achieves high quality design rather than whether or not it is being undertaken by a particular methodology. [RB]	The change was in response to a belief that sites and elsewhere in the west, particularly Costessey may make an appropriate contribution, if they can be demonstrated to be appropriate. One of the strategy's objectives is to involve people in the planning process. The phrase "accredited design process" does not seek to prescribe any one process, but seeks the use of a process which has achieved some degree of recognition. Clearly high quality design is important, but so is involvement of the community. However, rather than the word "accredited" which implies some sort of seal of approval, the phrase could be amended to " recognized design process" [RB]	Amend the introduction to policy for to use the phrase "recognised design process" [RB]
9090 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Comment	Plan omits to mention future size and structure of population [R B]	Some reference might usefully be added to the spatial portrait to and/or vision [R B]	Add a reference to future population characteristics to spatial portrait and/or vision
9057 - Mr and Mrs G Watson [8103]	Comment	Promote a site at Great and Little Plumstead [R B]	Great and Little Plumstead is currently categorized as a service of village where allocation(s) for modest numbers of houses will be made. the selection of sites is a matter for the site specific allocations DPD [R B]	No change needed [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9901 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219] 10088 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10234 - Ms Jane Pond [8255] 10302 - Mrs LISA Ford [8282] 10456 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10484 - Mr I T Smith [8310] 10536 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312] Some focus their objections on the growth triangle to the north east	Object	These representations challenge the overall scale of growth being planned for. Some specifically focus on the area to the south west, and the issue of coalescence. Another is concerned about the effect of plants will have on tourism, through changing the character of the area, and particularly the broads and North Norfolk (representation comments that residents of north Norfolk were not invited to comment)	<p>The scale of growth to be planned for is set by the East of England Plan. If lower targets were unilaterally adopted, it would simply invite more representations promoting development, and the strategy would be likely to be found unsound. The current strategy seeks to focus on previously-developed land to the extent it is compatible with environmental considerations within the urban area. It is undeniable this necessitates significant green fields allocations. In South Norfolk, the scale of allocations at individual places has been reduced from some of the earlier options partly in order to help protect the established character of the settlements in question.</p> <p>An appropriate assessment is underway to consider whether there are any potential impacts on sites of international wildlife importance, such as the Broads, and if so, what mitigation measures should be introduced. While it is true individual households were not consulted, all adjoining parish councils in neighbouring local authority areas, and the adjoining districts including North Norfolk District Council were consulted.</p> <p>Whether a strategy of dispersal or concentration were to be followed, the scale of greenfield allocations in the Broadland part of the area is likely to be similar. However a strategy of concentration has been followed primarily to facilitate the provision of new high level infrastructure, such as secondary education, and in order to enable the creation of a high quality link suitable for bus rapid transit through the focusing of investment on a public transport corridor which can serve the bulk of the development to be accommodated in Broadland. The north east has consistently been supported by Children's Services. The NDR should not be seen in isolation, but as a part of a strategy which includes not only road building, but also public transport cycling and walking improvements. However the inability of the NDR to connect to the A. 1067 further reinforces the preference for the north east, particularly in contrast to the north west: otherwise there would be a serious risk of traffic crossing the Wensum valley to access major attractors on the south side such as the hospital, Norwich Research Park, Longwater etc. Likewise the fact that there are a number of radial roads which could more readily accommodate traffic unavoidably displaced by the public transport priorities suggests the north east is the best option available. The north east also has a relatively good access to a range of employment sites including Broadland Business Park, the Airport industrial areas, Rackheath, Salhouse Road, and other areas around the northern ring road. The different characteristics of the settlements and urban fringe and</p>	No change needed [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10561 - Mr G P Collings [8318]			developments, an approach broadly supported by the development industry at the issues and options stage. [RB]	
7904 - mr david harper [7790] 7952 - Colin Mould [7809]	Object	Support but only if the infrastructure comes first [R]	There is a certain infrastructure which is absolutely critical to development - this generally is true of access requirements related to safety, and water utilities. It is reasonable for other infrastructure to be provided in the course of development, provided there is sufficient confidence that it will be provided when needed. For example a school may be needed in the course of a large development, but not necessarily at day one. However it is expected that the plan needs to include an explicit implementation section considerably expanded from that in the consultation document. The current work being undertaken by EDAW will help to quantify and cost the infrastructure needed to accommodate the development proposed. [R B]	Include expanded implementation strategy itemizing infrastructure requirements. [R B]
9774 - Cemex [8191]	Object	Representation concerns a site at Lodge Farm, Bawburgh Consider that the site at Bawburgh, situated next to Chapel Break, and adjacent to the A 47 should be considered for leisure related uses, or a water sports venue. The representation supports option 1 which provides a focus for development in the south west sector and that the site at Bawburgh should be used for water sports and recreational space. Believe this is supported by PPG 17 which encourages "the provision of appropriate leisure opportunities to enable urban and rural dwellers to enjoy the wider countryside" [RB]	The availability of the site is noted. The favoured option includes the phrase "enhanced public access to the Yare valley, including Bawburgh lakes" in relation to the proposed allocation of 1000 dwellings at Easton/Costessey	No change needed [RB]
9168 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	Object	Object to transportation being designed around walking cycling and public transport - penalises disabled people [R B]	A strategy which focused on enabling unrestrained car access would be likely to result in unacceptable levels of congestion, and greenhouse gas emissions. It is important however that a degree of access for people with disabilities is retained, and there is nothing in the plan which seeks to deny this. It could however be made more explicit, perhaps in the supporting text to policy 16	Include a reference to the need to maintain access for people with disabilities in the supporting text to the transportation policy. [R]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9812 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]
 11145 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]
 10289 - Tasburgh Parish Council (Mrs Julie King) [7053]
 10105 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]
 10693 - Sunguard Homes [8320]
 11115 - The Leeder Family [8390]

Object Representations primarily concern Long Stratton

Promoters of the development associated with a proposed bypass offered general support but raise some questions about policy wording

â€¢ Concerned that the introduction to policy 5 implies all new all major development locations will require new primary health care. This may not be the case - improvements to existing facilities may be the best option.

â€¢ In the case of Long Stratton self-containment within the growth area will be less relevant than promoting integration with existing settlement and achieving a high level of self-containment for the merged settlement

â€¢ support the broader distribution of growth around the NPA rather than focusing entirely on the urban area of Norwich

Sunguard Homes argue for clarity that Long Stratton includes contiguous and partially developed parts of Tharston. Essential that planning is undertaken on the spatial rather than an administrative a boundary basis

Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council say the strategy should focus on Norwich, with green field allocations being confined to a new town at Long Stratton

Tasburgh Parish Council are still concerned about the scale of growth proposed for Long Stratton. If the proposal goes ahead it must include adequate infrastructure.

Long Stratton parish council object strongly

â€¢ Believe the consultations have been flawed and the results of consultation have been misinterpreted

â€¢ The favoured option is inconsistent with statements in the issues and options report

â€¢ Seek confirmation of forward funding for the bypass

General support welcomed. In relation to specific points raised

â€¢ The introduction to policy 5 could be interpreted in the way suggested, but the implication of new is directed chiefly to primary schools, where development of over 1000 houses is likely to require new provision. Nonetheless the phraseology could be reexamined to try and avoid any ambiguity

â€¢ The policy refers to achieving a high level of self containment while integrating well with neighbouring communities. This appears to cover the point raised by the representation. It is important that significant new development on the scale proposed does have a clear identity. Again however the phraseology could be examined.

â€¢ The anomalous boundary between Long Stratton and Tharston is paralleled in a number of other locations, and it would add unnecessary complexity to the plan to explain in each of them in detail.

â€¢ Focusing all green field allocations at Long Stratton would be unlikely to deliver the scale of development needed, and would ignore the sustainability benefits of other locations

â€¢ Agreed that the scale of development proposed will require proper attention to the infrastructure needed to support it

â€¢ Long Stratton has been included in the strategy primarily to fund a long-desired bypass and achieve local environmental benefits.

â€¢ Discussions with the proposers of development continue, to ascertain whether the scale of development proposed can fund the bypass, and whether there are any public funding sources which could contribute without having an adverse impact on the transportation strategy elsewhere. Current signs appear positive.

[RB]

9953 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd [6950]

Object Costco Wholesale UK Limited argue that policies relating to employment should explicitly be widened to include warehouse clubs, describing them as Sui generis uses, not falling within use classes B. 1, B. 2, or B. 8 of their use classes order, but which are commonly found in employment locations.

The level of detail sought appears more appropriate to a development control policies development plan document than to a core strategy [RB]

No change needed [RB]

They quote from the adopted Broadland local plan which goes some way towards their preferred wording [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
8044 - Shane Hull [7857] 10238 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] 9849 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203] 11078 - Residents of Gibbs Close, Little Melton [8385]	Object	<p>Representations concern Hethersett</p> <p>Gladedale support the favoured option with strategic growth in Hethersett. They consider the 1000 units indicated to be a minimum, and also support the suggestion that some of the 1800 units on non location specific allocations in South Norfolk should be added to the named growth locations. Promote a site at Great Melton Road, and suggest this could provide approximately 200 of the 1800</p> <p>They say Hethersett /Little Melton is close to Norwich and nearby centres of activity including a number of employment locations, enjoys good public transport and has a good range of facilities</p> <p>Residents of Gibbs' Close, Little Melton object to the scale of development proposed at Hethersett. Points made include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They recognize the need for significant development and support a focus on Norwich, with high density to maximize the use of previously-developed land. • outside the city they believe growth should be spread, with a focus on those settlements with the best employment and services, and sustainable transport links. • If this is not sufficient to accommodate all growth, a new town should be planned • Dispute the status of Hethersett as a key service centre - limited shops and virtually no employment. About 500 homes have been built in the last fifteen years without any increase in local services. Given this, and the limited employment, even with an additional 1000 houses the area would remain a dormitory, but its character and that of the surrounding villages would be damaged • Evidence studies relating to transport only focus on public transport and take no account of the impact of growth on the road network. This should be assessed. Although bus use is predicted to grow by 2021, the vast majority of trips will still be made by car, many along unsuitable routes • Transport studies show bus travel means travelling along "unsuitable routes", unless Thickethorne interchange can be resolved. This would require a series of bus priority measures. Not convinced that even with the cumulative growth there would be sufficient patronage for high quality public transport • Greater preference should be given to locations which have strategic rail access - more easily achieved than seeking to establish new services and employment centres in Hethersett 	<p>Support Noted. The precise selection of sites to be allocated at Hethersett will be determined through the site specific allocations local plan. It is not clear why Gladedale consider the site at Great Melton Road could contribute to the 1800 rather than the 1000 assigned to Hethersett.</p> <p>The opposition of the residents from Gibbs Close is noted. In response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The East of England Plan requires a focus on the Norwich policy area. This rules out Diss. The scale of growth inevitably means that, even when the fullest use is made of previously-developed sites in Norwich, consistent with environmental considerations, large scale greenfield allocations are unavoidable. There are still a number of unresolved questions over Mangreen, but it is agreed that a study of the potential for new towns should be undertaken to guide the response to the review of the East of England plan, and that Mangreen should be included in this study. One issue is likely to be the rate at which development could be delivered through such a strategy. • The attributes identified for a key service centre are typically a primary school, secondary school, range of shops and services including convenience shopping, but more limited in scope than main towns, a village hall, primary health care and library. Hethersett has all of these. Even if it were to grow as proposed, would still function in the same way as a centre for surrounding smaller parishes • Transport studies have focused on the potential for public transport as the selection of locations is primarily guided by where alternatives to the car might perform best. It is accepted that to get the best possible outcome for public transport, improvements will be needed to the Thickethorne junction • There are limited options in the Norwich policy area with existing rail services. These include Wymondham, Rackheath/ Salhouse and Brundall. Wymondham and Rackheath have been identified for significant growth. Brundall has a number of disadvantages including very high quality agricultural land, and a range of services less than those at Hethersett - specifically it has no high school. • The selection of the favoured option, rather than options 1 or 2 has moved some way towards reducing the impact at Hethersett. The scale of allocations for particular locations has attempted to take account of the character of the locations in question • Specific sites will be identified through the site specific allocations DPD • Some enhancement of local facilities is likely to be 	No change needed [RB]

â€¢ The scale of development proposed would cause coalescence and damage the identity of established settlements, contrary to government advice

required as a consequence of the development of 1000 dwellings

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

â€¢ Growth will be difficult to accommodate socially and lead to reduced sense of community
â€¢ Impacts on the countryside environment; full assessments would need to be prepared
â€¢ Options 1 and 2 are contrary to the spatial vision and the role Hethersett would be expected to fulfil as a key service centre, similarly Little Melton as an other village
â€¢ The favoured option has the same drawbacks as options 1 and 2 but simply on a reduced scale

Believe a new town at Mangreen and a greater focus to expanding development at Diss is a better option

Hethersett Parish Council
â€¢ do not see sufficient analysis to justify 1000 additional homes with the current facilities in the village.

â€¢ Could have been a preference for more than a thousand in a separate location away from Hethersett
â€¢ Where will the 1000 homes be developed?
â€¢ Raise concerns over traffic, facilities and jobs being provided

[RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9641 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Object	<p>Object - strategy not founded on robust and credible evidence and did not include rigorous consideration of all reasonable options. Introduction to " Norwich Growth Area - Infrastructure Need and Funding Study" (December, 2007) states study has been conducted " in light of strategic predefined in growth scenarios"</p> <p>Therefore the study did not assess opportunities presented by existing spare infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>A number of selected locations do not meet the stated aims of the spatial vision with regard to access to Norwich, a range of strategic employment locations and services, and the existence of potential for good public transport. In particular, the northeast requires the NNDR to be in place and this remains uncertain</p> <p>Also fails to meet other objectives â€¢ (objective 6) no evidence presented to demonstrate viability in terms of infrastructure need, â€¢ (objective 10) no evidence demonstrating communication and information technologies will diminish rural isolation -rural population will still predominantly commute, â€¢ (objective 11) no evidence that the preferred locations minimise the need to travel better than alternatives.</p> <p>[R B]</p>	<p>The criticism of the infrastructure study is misplaced. In order for an assessment of the broad scale of the infrastructure need and cost to be made, some assumption had to be made about the broad distribution of growth. The text quoted appears in paragraph 1.2 of the study in the introduction explaining this. The objector's interpretation is dispelled at paragraphs 1.20 and 1.21 of the study which make it clear that the assumptions used in the study did not represent any commitment to a specific distribution of development in the joint core strategy. Studies into some critical infrastructure, notably public transport potential and the water cycle study and strategic flood risk assessment have examined a wide range of potential locations. The locations in the favoured option are broadly those which perform well in terms of public transport, and are considered to be generally well-related to existing and proposed strategic employment allocations.</p> <p>Updated work by EDAW is a looking at infrastructure needs, costs and potential funding sources of the favoured option. The output of this work will be included in the implementation section of the core strategy.</p> <p>It is accepted that it is unavoidable that a number of rural dwellers will continue to commute, but this does not negate the objective of improving communication and information technologies as a means of their reducing the difficulties of accessing services in rural areas. It is assumed the objection is directed towards the selection of Long Stratton as a location for growth. This is essentially in order to bring about local environmental gains in a significant centre within South Norfolk. The favoured locations for housing are generally well related to strategic employment locations, and in areas with the potential for good public transport connections.</p> <p>The precise selection of sites for development within these locations will be a matter for the site specific allocations DPD. [R B]</p>	No change needed [R B]
8580 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] 8839 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	Object	<p>Overdevelopment at Hethersett - no local employment. Infrastructure improvements are needed (doctors, schools, sewerage) and to encourage the use of local roads by pedestrians and cyclists, many roads are completely inadequate. Development should avoid specific named localities within the village.</p> <p>[R B]</p>	<p>Although Hethersett is not identified as a strategic employment location, it is close to employment opportunities at Wymondham, Hethel, and Norwich Research Park. It is acknowledged that expansion of educational facilities is needed. Growth should be able to fund other infrastructure requirements which are judged to be necessary. The precise location(s) for development will be dealt with through the site specific allocations</p>	No changes needed. [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

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

<p>9058 - Newton Flotman Parish Council (Mrs D Davidson) [2036] be effective; inadequate employment opportunities and 8181 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 9701 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] 8252 - R Barker [6805] 7941 - mr David Jones [7816] 8156 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 8258 - pulham market parish council (mr laurence taylor) [7907] 8399 - Keeley Wilson [7979]</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Object to scale of development proposed at Long Stratton for a number of reasons; sustainable drainage unlikely to be effective; inadequate employment opportunities and small-scale additions who will not rectify; how can growth which almost doubles the town be described as a moderate; plan acknowledges that there is uncertainty about the ability of 1800 houses to deliver bypass; plan states new secondary school needed - need high school too; too much uncertainty for people to make informed judgments. Will result in more commuter traffic affecting local roads. Suggest more development at places such as Wymondham or Attleborough which already have employment opportunities. Development should not precede the bypass. Suggestion that all communities along the A140 corridor to Norwich will require improved access to the road as a consequence of increased traffic [R B]</p>	<p>Sustainable drainage systems include a number of techniques, and while ground conditions at long Stratton may be more difficult than in other areas, this should not preclude sustainable drainage using appropriate techniques. Consider appropriate scale for employment allocation. Investigations continue to ascertain whether 1800 dwellings will be sufficient to fund a bypass, and also to see whether any public funding could contribute. The allocation at Long Stratton is inextricably linked to a bypass, but this should be made explicit. Secondary school and high school are synonymous in this context. Some additional commuter traffic is likely, though the joint core strategy also promotes some additional local employment. A number of other representations have opposed even the reduced scale of development currently being proposed for Wymondham. Attleborough lies outside the plan area. While it is accepted that the allocation at Long Stratton is likely to increase flows along the A140, in terms of the total flows along the road, it is not accepted that this automatically requires improvements to the accesses for all communities on the route. [R B]</p>	<p>Continue investigation into feasibility of development funded bypass, or potential for contribution from public funds, and consider appropriate scale for employment allocation. Ensure policy is clear that development does not precede the bypass</p>
<p>9233 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 9291 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] 9568 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] 7875 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] result in unsoundness. While the strategy of 8400 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978] 8402 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978] 8592 - Mr M Read [8024] 8623 - Kay Eke [8025] 9385 - Mr E Newberry [8120] 9550 - Mr R Harris [8146] 9727 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Excessive greenfield developments will ruin the countryside in the area. Village identity and life will be lost. Some representations suggest a more even spread of development. Whole concept based on out of date regional spatial strategy. [R B]</p>	<p>The strategy seeks to focus on previously-developed land in the urban area of Norwich as far as possible to minimise the need for greenfield allocations, though it is acknowledged that these will need to be very significant in order to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan. Failure to meet those requirements would be likely to concentration in Broadland does focus the take of greenfields in one location, the total amount taken would not be likely to be reduced if a more dispersed approach were taken. It is undeniable that, in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle there will be large scale development in close proximity to existing villages, but the aim is to create distinctive quarters or neighbourhoods rather than a uniform sea of houses, with local centres to act as a focal points. In the South Norfolk part of the area, one of the reasons behind the approach of making medium sized allocations at a number of places is in order to try and respect their character. Though the economic downturn is causing many to question of the continued validity of the targets set out in the East of England Plan, it was only adopted in 2008, and all the indications are that the ongoing review is likely to increase rather than reduce development targets.</p>	<p>No change needed [R B]</p>

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9071 - Wymondham Heritage Society (Ms Irene Woodward) [1003]
 7881 - Mr Paul Mallett [7783]
 8737 - Ms K Dunn [8045]
 8889 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]
 8928 - Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079]

Object oppose excessive development at Wymondham -services cannot cope and roads congested. Inadequate parking, traffic calming deters shoppers, few shops left and no youth or social facilities. Comments about the poor quality of some recent developments in the town, and the lack of improvements to facilities as a consequence. There is a current need for new education facilities. One representation comments that 1800 proposed dwellings are too much for South Norfolk's smaller villages. The suggestion that the town centre should be expanded is challenged, and may conflict with the policy to protect environmental assets [R B]

Wymondham is considered to be a suitable location for growth, having good access to a range of employment sites including Hethel, local employment at Wymondham, and Norwich Research Park. It is also on the A11 corridor, currently the best performing public transport corridor in the area and one with potential for improvement if there is a critical mass resulting from the addition of new development to the existing populations, and if public transport can be routed with priority through the Thickthorn junction. If the expansion of local services is necessary, this should be undertaken in tandem with expansion. Additional population should help support facilities. The 1800 additional dwellings in the south Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area are not necessarily to be directed to a smaller villages. The policy direction them to "smaller sites in the NPA and possible additions to named growth locations". The smaller sites are referred to may well be found in fringe parishes or larger villages. The consultation draft was not explicit about how educational facilities could be improved to cope with the development, but the representation is correct that there will need to be additional capacity at primary and secondary levels. There are believed to be potential centre or edge of centre sites, though these may involve some redevelopment [R B]

No change to strategy needed, but ensure the plan is more explicit about how education facilities could be expanded to cope with the development proposed in the A11 corridor including Wymondham. [R B]

7930 - mr paul newson [7812]

Object Excessive development - divert to Scotland or North of England [RB]

Scale of growth is fixed by East of England Plan [RB]

No change needed [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9036 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Object	More development could and should be absorbed to the north and north east of Norwich rather than extending south of the southern bypass which will increase commuting. Suggests in areas outside the NNDR adjacent to the Wroxham railway line or north of the	Some have criticized the north east proposals for excessive concentration. While that view is not accepted, the current strategy adopts a mixed approach with a large scale development to the north east, likely to facilitate the provision of a large scale strategic infrastructure such as secondary schools, public transport priorities , combined heat, power and cooling, and a strategic approach to green infrastructure, complemented by a wider range of medium sized allocations to the south. This offers a choice of locations and is an approach which has in the past been advocated by development interests in order to spread the consequence of delays to a particular development, and facilitate the delivery of housing in the medium term, given the inevitable lead in time of a large scale development. Extending the north east proposal further may not enable a corresponding increase in the amount of development which could be delivered by 2026 - the development is already expected to continue beyond that date. The area to the north of the Airport does not appear to offer any significant advantages, compared with Wymondham and Hethersett, for example, which enjoy access to the best performing public transport corridor (subject to priority through the Thickthorn junction being achieved) and which have access to a choice of strategic employment locations. In addition both offer a range of existing facilities largely lacking in the area to the north of the Airport. It is hard to see how the strategy could be improved by the suggestions in the representation. [R B]	No change needed [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9815 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509] 10318 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] 8206 - Mr P Anderson [7901] 11037 - Norwich Design Quality Panel (The Manager) [8375] 11089 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	Object	<p>These representations focus on the overall concept and strategy</p> <p>Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group refer to comments on other specific questions; additional points</p> <p>â€¢ Transport carbon impacts of favoured option should be assessed to test compliance with PPS 1</p> <p>â€¢ Ambiguity of numbers of dwellings at Rackheath - different documents range from 3400 to 10,000</p> <p>â€¢ Ambiguity over location of eco community in relation to major urban extension to the northeast - community may straddle NDR or lie to the east</p> <p>â€¢ Siting eco community to east of NDR would create free-standing settlement until completion of the urban extension - even then communities would be severed by NDR</p> <p>â€¢ Question the viability of frequent rail and public transport services serving a small free-standing settlement</p> <p>â€¢ A number of specific changes suggested - delete growth triangle designation to create better match of housing with location of the strategic employment sites - delete NDR - concentrate growth in south west rather than disperse, to support public transport - extend public transport beyond that shown on the proposals map.</p> <p>Norwich Design Quality Panel ask</p> <p>â€¢ In the interests of sustainability was one large new settlement considered?,</p> <p>â€¢ Why is residential development given such a low priority in the city centre, and within the built-up area?</p> <p>â€¢ Little evidence has been produced relating to the ideal size of communities, drawing on published work</p> <p>CPRE, make a number of points</p> <p>â€¢ Strategy is Greenfield first - should promote more development in urban areas, and would like to see a scaling down of housing numbers in NPA towns and villages and at Rackheath</p> <p>â€¢ Believe housing delivery targets should be slowed down</p> <p>â€¢ Oppose the north east growth of triangle concept</p> <p>â€¢ Mismatch between north east concentration of housing and the concentration of employment opportunities which tend to lie to the south west</p> <p>â€¢ No policy targets for use of previously-developed land</p> <p>East of England Development Agency broadly support the strategy as a logical approach reflecting the identification of Norwich as an engine of growth within the</p>	<p>â€¢ The principles of sustainable development are set out in PPS 1. Paragraphs 27 onward discuss the principles and the role of spatial planning, including coordinating development plans and local transport plans, and seeking to make the fullest use of public transport, and locating new development "where everyone can access services or facilities on foot, and delete bicycle or public transport". The core strategy and Norwich Area Transportation Strategy are entirely consistent, and the potential for public transport has been a key determinant in the location of new development.</p> <p>â€¢ The joint core strategy does not specify the number of houses at Rackheath. It indicates that the growth triangle in total is expected to deliver 7000 by 2026, rising to 10,000</p> <p>â€¢ Though the principles of the eco towns programme are welcomed, in raising standards of development, the proposal in the joint core strategy at Rackheath is not specifically for an eco community. It is seen as part of an urban extension which, though it will have a distinct neighbourhoods, is seen as a whole in terms of provision of some high level infrastructure. This includes bus rapid transit. The BRT proposal is not dependent on Rackheath alone, but on the total quantum of growth. This is also significant in terms of other infrastructure, notably a secondary school, which requires a quantum of development similar to that proposed in order to support it in the long term. Therefore, the scale of development will be instrumental in providing a major facility within walking and cycling distance of most residents.</p> <p>â€¢ The strategy is not Greenfield first. The strategic housing land availability assessment broadly confirms the potential assumed for the City of Norwich</p> <p>â€¢ It is acknowledged that it is important that the detailed design of the NDR allows for permeability to access shared facilities.</p> <p>â€¢ Whether a strategy of dispersal or concentration were to be followed, the scale of greenfield allocations in the Broadland part of the area is likely to be similar. However a strategy of concentration has been followed primarily to facilitate the provision of new high level infrastructure, such as secondary education, and in order to enable the creation of a high quality link suitable for bus rapid transit through the focusing of investment on a public transport corridor which can serve the bulk of the development to be accommodated in Broadland. The north east has consistently been supported by Children's Services. The NDR should not be seen in isolation, but as a part of a strategy which includes not only road building, but also public transport cycling and walking improvements. however the inability of the NDR to connect to the A. 1067</p>	<p>Include scale of employment allocations at strategic locations</p> <p>Include an expectation of the share of future development on previously developed land</p> <p>[RB]</p>

regional economic strategy. They also support the role of the main towns, key service centres and villages. They seek more clarity regarding the scale of job growth

further reinforces the preference for the north east, particularly in contrast to the north west: otherwise there would be a serious risk of traffic crossing the Wensum

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

anticipated in particular locations. [RB]

Council's Assessment

valley to access major attractors on the south side such as the hospital, Norwich Research Park, Longwater etc. Likewise the fact that there are a number of radial roads which could more readily accommodate traffic unavoidably displaced by the public transport priorities suggests the north east is the best option available. The north east also has a relatively good access to a range of employment sites including Broadland Business Park, the Airport industrial areas, Rackheath, Salhouse Road, and other areas around the northern ring road. The different characteristics of the settlements and urban fringe and South Norfolk mean a different approach has been adopted there, but collectively the strategy combines a large scale development with a number of more modest developments, an approach broadly supported by the development industry at the issues and options stage.

â€¢ Agree the strategy should include an expression of the expected share of new development on previously-developed land, but this is likely to be much lower than the East of England Plan's indicative target because of the geography of the area

â€¢ In terms of large new settlements, one of the scenarios originally examined by EDAW looked at the potential for accommodating 10,000 dwellings in a large new town (at that stage the target date was 2021). Their conclusion was that the potential rights of development would make it difficult to deliver the necessary quantum of development. Research has been published and a paper (unpublished) has been prepared looking at experience in other major growth locations, chiefly from the point of view of delivery. Furthermore, work has been done examining experiences at Cambourne, in Cambridgeshire, a new settlement of approximately 4500 dwellings. This concludes that a future new town at Northstowe should be approximately double the size to support the full range of facilities, including the secondary school. These considerations have helped to shape the anticipated scale of the north east growth triangle. However in terms of delivery, a strategy dependent entirely on developments of this scale would risk an inability to deliver housing in the short and medium term, and the balanced approach taken is considered the best balance in terms of sustainability and delivery.

â€¢ Residential development is not being ruled out to the city centre, but the strategy has to consider that there are certain other town centre uses for which other locations would be much less appropriate. These include comparison goods retail, and certain types of employment, and the

Action

strategy should not emphasize housing ahead of these town centre uses.

Support from the East of England Development Agency welcomed. Agreed the scale of allocation for economic development at strategic locations should be indicated

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

8781 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]
9306 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]
9518 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]

Object Do not support the favoured option. The scale of growth proposed in the northeast is excessive. It follows therefore that the other options consulted on are also opposed for the same reasons. The rural charm of the area with hedgerows, spinnets, and parkland is particularly valuable and forms a wildlife habitat. The NDR is unnecessary. [R B]

[RB]

The need to meet the East of England Plan's housing provision figures means that significant greenfield allocations are needed, even though the starting point of the strategy was to accommodate as much within the urban area as possible, consistent with maintaining its character and avoiding infringing environmental assets. Whether a strategy of dispersal or concentration were to be followed, the scale of greenfield allocations in the Broadland part of the area is likely to be similar. However a strategy of concentration has been followed primarily to facilitate the provision of new high level infrastructure, such as secondary education, and in order to enable the creation of a high quality link suitable for bus rapid transit through the focusing of investment on a public transport corridor which can serve the bulk of the development to be accommodated in Broadland. The north east has consistently been supported by Children's Services. The NDR should not be seen in isolation, but as a part of a strategy which includes not only road building, but also public transport cycling and walking improvements. however the inability of the NDR to connect to the A. 1067 further reinforces the preference for the north east, particularly in contrast to the north west: otherwise there would be a serious risk of traffic crossing the Wensum valley to access major attractors on the south side such as the hospital, Norwich Research Park, Longwater etc. Likewise the fact that there are a number of radial roads which could more readily accommodate traffic unavoidably displaced by the public transport priorities suggests the north east is the best option available. The north east also has a relatively good access to a range of employment sites including Broadland Business Park, the Airport industrial areas, Rackheath, Salhouse Road, and other areas around the northern ring road. The different characteristics of the settlements and urban fringe and South Norfolk mean a different approach has been adopted there, but collectively the strategy combines a large scale development with a number of more modest developments, an approach broadly supported by the development industry at the issues and options stage.

No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen the policies dealing with the design of new development, and environmental protection. [R B]

There are many attractive aspects of the countryside in the northeast, but this is a quality it shares with much of

the countryside surrounding Norwich. Policies in the plan seek to protect environmental assets, including historic park land and other environmental assets. With appropriate masterplanning, these features can be retained and can enhance the quality of the new development who needed in the area, but it is accepted that this should be made it more explicit. [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11092 - Tesco Stores Ltd [8388]	Object	Tesco Stores Limited support the north east sector, but suggest land at Harford should be allocated for development in preference to other locations. It has good public transport connections, and the Tesco store nearby provides convenience and everyday comparison goods. The A 47 southern bypass can act as a physical and logical boundary to growth [RB]	<p>The strategy seeks to provide for a balanced portfolio of a major growth location to the north east, complemented by a number of a medium sized allocations providing a degree of choice, and also offering scope for delivery in the short to medium term. Several of these are focus on the A. 11 corridor which is currently the best performing public transport corridor in the area, inside the Thickthorn junction. The East of England Plan also suggests that the A. 11 corridor should be one of the focal areas for employment growth, and it makes sense to align employment and housing allocations.</p> <p>While the strategy is dependent on major improvements to the Thickthorn junction, a major development at Harford would be likely to require improvements to the Harford interchange. The existing public transport corridor along the a 140 would also require significant improvement.</p> <p>[RB]</p>	No change [RB]
8812 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	Object	Believe Marlingford and Colton should not be within the Norwich policy area [RB]	In terms of its location, the inclusion of the parish within the Norwich policy area does not appear particularly anomalous, -- it borders Easton and Great Melton, and almost has a border with Bawburgh. The nature of the particular settlement has been reflected through its exclusion from those places identified for significant development [RB]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

8494 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
9112 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9328 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
9386 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]

Nature Representation Summary

Object Excessive growth in the north eastern growth triangle and at Wymondham. One representation suggests the growth here has been inflated in order to gain growth point status. Excessive density (scale of development?) in the suburbs - Cringleford and Hethersett given as examples. Previous examples of design do not give confidence.

Council's Assessment

Growth Point status was sought on the basis of the requirements of the East of England Plan, in order to secure the maximum available funding for infrastructure. There was no additional level of growth sought by the GNDP in order to achieve Growth Point status.

The need to meet the East of England Plan's housing provision figures means that significant greenfield allocations are needed, even though the starting point of the strategy was to accommodate as much within the urban area as possible, consistent with maintaining its character and avoiding infringing environmental assets. Whether a strategy of dispersal or concentration were to be followed, the scale of greenfield allocations in the Broadland part of the area is likely to be similar. However a strategy of concentration has been followed primarily to facilitate the provision of new high level infrastructure, such as secondary education, and in order to enable the creation of a high quality link suitable for bus rapid transit through the focusing of investment on a public transport corridor which can serve the bulk of the development to be accommodated in Broadland. The north east has consistently been supported by Children's Services, and the inability of the NDR to connect to the A. 1067 further reinforces this choice: otherwise there would be a serious risk of traffic crossing the Wensum valley to access major attractors on the south side such as the hospital, Norwich Research Park, Longwater etc. Likewise the fact that there are a number of radial roads which could more readily accommodate traffic unavoidably displaced by the public transport priorities suggests the north east is the best option available. The north east also has a relatively good access to a range of employment sites including Broadland Business Park, the Airport industrial areas, Rackheath, Salhouse Road, and other areas around the northern ring road. The different characteristics of the settlements and urban fringe and South Norfolk mean a different approach has been adopted there, but collectively the strategy combines a large scale development with a number of more modest developments, an approach broadly supported by the development industry at the issues and options stage.

Wymondham is considered to be a suitable location for growth, having good access to a range of employment sites including Hethel, local employment at Wymondham, and Norwich Research Park. It is also on the A11 corridor, currently the best performing public transport corridor in the area and one with potential for improvement if there is a critical mass resulting from the addition of new

Action

No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen policy references to design [R B]

development to the existing populations, and if public transport can be routed with priority through the Thickthorn junction.

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		[R B]		
			Earlier options included some which proposed more growth at Wymondham, and the growth proposed here has been scaled back in recognition of the latest housing land supply figures, and in order to facilitate integration of the new development into the town	
			While design is a matter of judgment, to a degree, it is an accepted that the joint core strategy consultation document is deficient in this regard [R B]	
9962 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] 9796 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] 10850 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] 9763 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184] 9950 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd [8222] 10584 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	These representations do not raise specific points, but include "no comment", or cross references to the respondents comment on other questions. [RB]	Not applicable [RB]	Not applicable [RB]
7893 - mr andrew gibbins [7788]	Object	Excessive amounts of development of proposed in the corridors served by the A11 and the A140 [R B]	The scale of development proposed in the A140 corridor is modest. The growth in the A11 Corridor, outside the southern bypass is more significant, and the plan acknowledges that significant improvements to the Thickthorn junction will be needed. The need for these is reinforced by significant levels of development being proposed at Attleborough, also served by this corridor. [R B]	The plan already acknowledges the need for improvements at the Thickthorn junction, but ensure these are included in the implementation strategy. [R]
8863 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037]	Object	object to proposed strategy. Propose locations unsustainable or have insufficient infrastructure.Strategy therefore unsound as it departs from the evidence base thus not compliant with PPS 3 or East of England Plan.clients have interest at Wymondham [R B]	The locations selected are supported by the evidence; in the case of Long Stratton by specific local environmental factors. The scale of allocation proposed at particular locations in South Norfolk has taken account of the reduced overall scale of allocations needed, and the character of particular settlements, and forms part of a strategy combining larger scale growth with a range of more modest allocations which others have argued will assist delivery, particularly in the medium term, and reduce the risks which could be associated with an excessively concentrated approach [R B]	No change needed [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

10421 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]
 10201 - North East Norwich Consortium of Landowners [8249] their support and make specific points including
 10272 - Mr D Jeans [8265]
 10717 - Ms S Layton [8354]
 10886 - Broadland Land Trust

Object These representations concern the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle

North East Norwich Consortium of Landowners express their support and make specific points including

Believe the area is capable of delivering at least 7000 homes by 2026

The consortium controls approximately 400 hectares of land, about 200 of which is considered suitable for development, mainly unconstrained. The remaining 200 hectares is the subject of statutory and non statutory designations and protective policies, but may nonetheless contribute to the successful development of the area through providing sports pitches, green infrastructure etc.

Land controlled is to the west of Wroxham Road and could be brought forward independently but in coordination with land controlled by other consortia elsewhere in the triangle

Additional land is controlled outside the northern distributor road

The consortium is willing to work with neighboring consortia and land interests including Rackheath eco community and Broadland Land Trust, and anticipate this will be brought forward and co-ordinated under the umbrella of an Area Action Plan

The representation provides an update on the status of the consortium, and current work streams including transport assessment, a land budget, planning and delivery statement

Mr. D. Jeans supports the growth triangle, and promotes land at Canfor Road Rackheath. Mr. Jeans also supports the suggestion that 2000 dwellings on Broadland smaller sites could be developed as additions to the named growth locations

Broadland Land Trust broadly support the favoured option, specifically with regard to the growth triangle, and make a number of specific points including

Neither agree or disagree with the extent of the growth area beyond their land holding but consider the land being promoted by BLT is the most sustainable and coherent location for growth

Have initiated an Enquiry by Design process and have undertaken scoping. This will lead to the development of a strategy and vision involving local stakeholders, including the local authority through a masterplanning exercise

Their land can create an urban extension promoting

Council's Assessment

The support is warmly welcomed

It is important that the various consortia work together as some high level infrastructure will need to be shared. At the very least some overall high level planning framework is needed.

Precise sites for development will be allocated to an area action plan.

In response to other representations it has been suggested that the scale of allocations made should be clearly expressed as a minimum. This is to ensure compliance with the East of England Plan.but the same logic does not necessarily apply to growth expected after the plan period. It is accepted that this is likely to be established through a detailed design process, and that it is reasonable to indicate an anticipated scale of development in order to enable appropriate provision for infrastructure. It is not clear why the final scale of development should at this stage be constrained in one direction (i.e.downwards) but not in the other.

In response to other representations it has been suggested that the plan should no longer acknowledge the possibility of the 2000 dwellings to be found on smaller sites within Broadland NPA should be additions to the growth triangle, in view of the likely timescale for delivery

The scale of the development proposed in the north east is 10,000 dwellings, not 19,000. The fruit farm does offer a valued facility, but it could cease, and become a normal agricultural operation without any reference to the planning system.It is a commercial decision to operate such an enterprise, and there is no reason to suppose that, should it disappear, other landowners would not seek to exploit the market.

The overall strategy seeks to strike a balance between large scale new development to facilitate service provision, and also more modest allocations to assist in short to medium term delivery, and take account of the character of that settlements concerned

Action

No change needed to policies for the growth triangle

Delete reference to the possibility of non location specific allocations to accommodate 2000 dwellings on smaller sites in the Broadland part of the Norwich policy area being accommodated as extensions to the named growth location in Broadland.

[RB]

healthy communities by encouraging walking, cycling and reducing the need to travel, can be well integrated into the urban fabric, and provide a mix of uses including

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[8366]		<p>focal points to act as centres. These will act as a nodes for public transport and local facilities within the walkable/ cyclable community. The land lends itself to sustainable drainage systems, and the scheme will include onsite or nearby energy generation, water saving technologies and extensive green infrastructure</p> <p>â€¢ However the technologies to be adopted should be considered in terms of viability and feasibility</p> <p>â€¢ The development will include new primary schools, local retail, and small-scale employment and primary health care.</p> <p>â€¢ The core strategy should clarify that the growth triangle is expected to accommodate "at least" 10,000 dwellings post 2026. The precise number of houses will be delivered according to the outcome of a masterplanning process and therefore the core strategy should make it clear that figures are indicative and will not constrain the quantum of development</p> <p>â€¢ Believe the potential for further growth in the north east will extend beyond 7000, and therefore consider the potential for the 2000 dwellings to be allocated on non location specific smaller sites in the Broadland part of the Norwich policy area could be added to the growth triangle. This would mean they form part of a comprehensive master plan and benefit from the necessary infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Another representation refers to the strategic growth location for 19,000 houses, and comments it appears to include White House Farm currently operating as a pick your own fruit farm. Such facilities should be protected.</p> <p>Keymer Cavendish generally support the north east but question the allocation of growth at Long Stratton and Wymondham, and make other points relating to the consultation exercise on the Broadland area action plan.They also point out the need to take into account economic viability.</p> <p>[RB]</p>		
7939 - Mr Peter Boddy [7815]	Object	<p>The proposed eco town will cause a vast increase in traffic and crime [R B]</p>	<p>It is not clear why the eco community should be singled out for this criticism, and given the desire to raise environmental standards, the developers' commitment to the highest standards as required by the Government's programme should be welcomed [R B]</p>	No change needed [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
7965 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 9192 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	Object to excessively roads based transport strategy, in spite of references to public transport, walking and cycling, and object to growth of Wymondham. Comments about punctuation. [R B]	In reality, although there are significant elements of road building in the strategy, these are part of a wider strategy which also includes significant public transport interventions, with the potential for improved public transport being a major factor in the choice of locations selected for major growth in the Norwich policy area. Wymondham is considered to be a suitable location for growth, having good access to a range of employment sites including Hethel, local employment at Wymondham, and Norwich Research Park. It is also on the A11 corridor, currently the best performing public transport corridor in the area and one with potential for improvement if there is a critical mass resulting from the addition of new development to the existing populations, and if public transport can be routed with priority through the Thickthorn junction. [R B]	No change needed [R B]
8681 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	Object	Keep development away from small villages [R B]	The strategy seeks to focus most new development around larger settlements. Apart from the strategic locations, those of villages identified as key service centres or service villages in the Norwich policy area will be expected to accommodate some additional development, but this should be of a modest scale in keeping with the character of the settlement concerned.	No change needed [R B]
8072 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875]	Object	No indication that business will be encouraged to locate in areas of new housing.also need for social clubs sports facilities pubs and restaurants to encourage interaction between residents. [R B]	policy 5 does refer to the inclusion of small-scale employment opportunities as well as other services (health, a retail, schools etc) which will also provide some employment. The economic growth and sites and premises study undertaken by Arup broadly supports the strategic locations as identified in the plan. However it is accepted that the need for additional employment should be emphasised in the large scale development at the north east, possibly by a reference to expansion of the Rackheath employment area which would complement Broadland Business Park and other employment opportunities within the urban area. The wider range of facilities advocated by some representations are more likely to be provided by development in the larger concentration in the north east, though some of the facilities are only likely to be provided where commercially viable (pubs and restaurants for example). In other places, where more modest growth is proposed, the facilities offered by the existing community, though perhaps enhanced through developer contributions, are likely to remain the focal point [R B]	Make explicit reference to additional employment allocation in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle, for example by proposing a specific allocation at Rackheath [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9446 - Mr Geoffrey Champion [7854]
 9951 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]

Object Relate primarily to Cringleford

Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation make a number of points including

- â€¢ Support in principle the identification of Cringleford as a strategic housing location, and advocate a masterplanning approach
- â€¢ The land available may well be able to accommodate significantly more than 1000 dwellings (potentially up to 3900) and suggest that the total should remain flexible subject to the outcome of a masterplanning exercise
- â€¢ In light of the above, the figure of 1200 dwellings is too prescriptive. If numbers are to be stated it should be "a minimum of x"
- â€¢ The land is inside the Thickthorn junction, adjacent to Norwich Research Park
- â€¢ Support linkages with proposed development at Hethersett, and the south west corridor as a whole, and the potential for bus rapid transit corridors linking the south west to the north east. The Cringleford development will access the A 11 BRT corridor directly, and also offer frequent services to the hospital site.
- â€¢ The site is well-related to employment and education uses, helping to reduce travel needs
- â€¢ Not clear what "accredited design methodology" means - unclear which is the accreditation body

Other representations are concerned about the scale of development, and the implications for the Thickthorn junction, and school capacity.

[RB]

Support welcomed

It has been suggested in relation to other representations that the word accredited should be replaced by "recognized"

The strategy at present seeks to offer a balanced portfolio with a major allocation in the north east, to assist in the provision of significant high level infrastructure, balanced by a number of medium sized allocations recognizing the character of this part of South Norfolk, but also offering the prospect for a choice of location and greater confidence of delivery in the short to medium term. It is clearly important that some idea of the quantity of development proposed at strategic locations is given, but for the reasons above it is suggested that the allocation proposed at Cringleford should remain at 1200 .

It is accepted that 1200 dwellings at Cringleford will require enhanced education provision, in the form of a new primary school, and also that improvements to the Thickthorn junction will be required, taking into account the totality of the development proposed in the south west.

[RB]

Refer to "recognized design process" rather than "accredited design process" [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

11077 - Norfolk & Waveney Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust [1062]
10657 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]

Nature Representation Summary

Object Representations concern Hellesdon

Goymour Properties promote development on the Royal Norwich Golf Club. They make a number of points including

- â€¢ Concern over the delivery of 7000 dwellings in the growth triangle - challenge the capacity of the site to accommodate this number, and also whether it would be possible to achieve this level of growth in the plan period. Believe that 4150 is a more realistic estimate for a single area up to 2026. Concerned that so much development is dependent on some key infrastructure
- â€¢ Allocation for smaller sites in the Broadland NPA should not relate to "possible additions to named growth locations" - this relates to the delivery capacity of the north east
- â€¢ Challenge allocation of 1200 dwellings at Cringleford. This was not included in previous options and there is no explanation as to why it has now been included. It will require sustainability appraisal. Representation claims Cingleford is a self contained settlement with a separate identity, and a substantial expansion could result in coalescence with Norwich
- â€¢ Allocation for Broadland smaller sites in the NPA should be increased from 2000, because the Royal Norwich Golf Club site can contribute between 500 and 850 and development of the site should not be constrained
- â€¢ Not convinced the eco community meets the criteria for eco towns set out in the draft PPS, of a minimum of 5000 dwellings

The representation goes on to give an update regarding the agreement of the golf club membership to relocation, and a commitment to complete further technical work. In view of Health and Safety Executive zones for control of hazardous substances, propose to develop the RNGC site accordingly, with non-residential development on southern part of the site. It could provide affordable housing, and contribute to leisure and community facilities financially or onsite, some employment uses and onsite open-space, accessible to new and existing residents. It is in close proximity to a wide range of facilities and existing bus routes. The transport assessment will confirm the details of traffic improvements needed. Land is not at risk of flood, lends itself to sustainable drainage, and would not require decontamination or affect any listed buildings/ scheduled ancient monuments.

Council's Assessment

The availability of the sites is noted. They will be considered as part of the non location specific allowance in the Broadland part of the Norwich policy area. Allocations will be made through the site specific allocations development plan document

The expectation of 7000 in the north east includes the eco proposal, or land at Rackheath, should the proposal not progress under the eco towns banner.

Including Rackheath, 7000 is considered realistic, but is towards the limits of feasibility. Therefore it is accepted that this would not be able to accommodate any of the 2000 non location specific dwellings assigned to Broadland. This reference should be deleted from the policy, however there appears to be no case for increasing this allowance, which would reduce the clarity of the joint core strategy.

Cringleford is considered an appropriate location, well-related to a public transport corridor and to strategic employment locations. Other representations have suggested the allocation be increased. While there are clearly sensitivities about the impact on the Yare valley, much of Cringleford is separated from Eaton by the river and the flood plain, and this would be likely to impose a constraint preventing coalescence. An updated sustainability appraisal has been undertaken. Work on the sustainability appraisal is currently being independently verified.

[RB]

Action

Delete reference to the possibility of the non location specific 2000 dwellings in the Broadland part of the Norwich policy area being added to named growth locations [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Proposed redevelopment of part of the Hellesdon Hospital site could contribute towards this. The make a number of points including

- â€¢ Refer to a number of supporting documents including planning and delivery statement, landscape and visual impact assessment and concept master plan, accessibility statement, servicing strategy, and a statement from the landowners setting out their strategy for the rationalization of the site
- â€¢ Promote the upper part of the site for residential and mixed-use development
- â€¢ Proposed development consists of rationalize hospital, approximately 7000 square metres of office use including offices for accommodation by the trust and related health organizations, approximately 390 dwellings and approximate 2000 square metres of mixed-use accommodation
- â€¢ Hospital site is available, suitable and deliverable

[RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
11130 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 10049 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 11023 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425] 9862 - Diocese of Norwich [2708] South Norfolk part of the NPA should include smaller locations 10217 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] 10244 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708] 11064 - Wymondham Consortium of Landowners [8218] 9869 - Wymondham Consortium of Landowners [8218] 10195 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247] 10823 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10910 - Allied London Properties	Object	<p>Representations relate principally to Wymondham</p> <p>Persimmon Homes support in principle. Promote site at Norwich Common. Specific points include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2200 dwellings proposed at Wymondham should be provided in a number of sites • The unidentified allocations for 1800 homes in the sites at Wymondham rather than less sustainable around limited sewer capacity, limited sewage treatment • Site proposed promoted could provide early delivery of some 300 dwellings, and is well-related to existing employment and social/community facilities. Will not have detrimental impact on landscape setting or strategic gap between Wymondham and Hethersett <p>North-east Wymondham landowners also broadly support the inclusion of Wymondham in the favoured option (and support of the growth "triangle" to the north east of Norwich). They make a number of specific points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See little support or justification for development at Long Stratton - the only reason appears to be a bypass. This does not consider the issue of developing in sustainable locations • Easton is unsuitable - no local facilities • Hethersett is a dormitory village providing few job opportunities • Conversely apparent that Wymondham is the highest ranking location for growth outside the city of Norwich itself, recognized in the East of England Plan • In conclusion believe that the scale of growth at Wymondham should be increased to 6500, and no allocations at Hethersett, Easton and Long Stratton <p>Hopkins Homes do not support the favoured option. They suggest the allocation at Wymondham should be increased, and make a number of specific points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are opposed to development proposed at Long Stratton - limited facilities, doubling the size so will be hard to integrate the new community, limited access to employment, school capacity issues -at Hethersett - limited facilities particularly retail and health, limited employment, school capacity issues -- and at Cringleford - Hethersett high school not within a sustainable distance, connects to Norwich but few local facilities - • In contrast Wymondham is the main town in the settlement hierarchy and has a range of facilities, good public transport including railway. Hopkins note to the support for option 1 with a larger scale of growth in Wymondham from a number of technical consultees, and can see no evidence to depart from this option 	<p>Noted - precise sites will be determined through the site specific allocations DPD</p> <p>One of the benefits of the current strategy is that it combines a mix of large-scale allocations to facilitate service provision, and medium sized ones to help delivery in the short to medium term. There have been a number of comments made by others that the scale of development at Wymondham is already excessive. These are based including Wymondham works capacity, the difficulty for the town to assimilate large-scale new development, and the challenge of increasing the capacity of the town centre to serve an enlarged population.</p> <p>The public consultation document did not include sufficient detail about implementation. Work currently being undertaken by EDAW to assess infrastructure needs, costs, and potential funding sources will rectify that omission. It could not have been undertaken before a draft favoured option was set out.</p> <p>The Government Office for the East of England have suggested a number of improvements, but without suggesting the selection of locations for growth is fundamentally at odds with national policy</p> <p>While there are criticisms of all of the selected growth locations, in most cases there are corresponding representations from developer interests supporting them, which suggests a greater degree of deliverability than Hopkins acknowledge</p> <p>The plan does set out a vision and objectives, but it may be worth revisiting these to see if they can be improved</p> <p>The strategic housing land availability assessment is broadly supportive of 3000 as a realistic expectation for Norwich.</p> <p>Other representations confirm that land ownership is unlikely to be a constraint in the north east, as landowners are coming together in formal agreements. Some of these suggest the potential exceeds 7000</p> <p>The consultation draft of the plan was not very specific about the quantum of land required for employment uses, or the scale of new allocation required. This should be rectified. The East of England Plan and the study undertaken by Arup and Oxford Economics are both supportive of Wymondham as a location for employment</p>	<p>Include delivery strategy in the pre submission publication</p> <p>Reexamine vision and objectives to see if these can be refined</p> <p>Include an indication of the scale of employment allocation to be made at different locations,</p> <p>[RB]</p>

â€¢ The outline requirements of PPS 12 including overall vision, strategic objectives, delivery strategy for achieving them and arrangements for managing and

growth

The requirement arising from the East of England Plan is in

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

[8367]

monitoring delivery - this should be supported by evidence of what physical, social and green infrastructure is needed to achieve the strategy. Infrastructure planning should include - infrastructure needs and costs - phasing of development - funding sources - responsibility for delivery. The absence of these means the favoured option is not sound

â€¢ The requirements of PPS 3 are also pointed out including location of housing to facilitate creation of communities of sufficient size and mix to justify the development of, and sustain, community facilities, infrastructure and services - Wymondham passes these tests and the other locations referred to do not

â€¢ Sites should be developable, deliverable and achievable. The reliance on unidentified allocations does not provide clear evidence that these requirements can be met

â€¢ Hopkins also refer to policies SS 4 and SS 3 of the East of England Plan requiring consideration of the potential of "other key service centres"

Their conclusion is a greater amount of housing should be allocated to Wymondham

Allied London Properties (who also promote land at Wymondham) argue for a reduction in allocations elsewhere, specifically

â€¢ Hethersett should be deallocated or reduced to 500

â€¢ Long Stratton withdrawn or only limited development allowed

â€¢ Norwich reduced from 3000 to 2000 because of marketing considerations

â€¢ The growth triangle to the north east of Norwich reduced from 7000 to 5000 to reflect ownership and infrastructure constraints

The Diocese of Norwich welcome reference to standards of design in policy 5, and supports the identification of Wymondham as a strategic growth location but believe the quantum of development should be increased to 4000 as under option 1

Wrenbridge support the identification of Wymondham as a location for strategic growth and suggest the joint core strategy should allocate and release further land at Wymondham for commercial uses. They object to the implication that all existing employment sites should be

addition to the current stock of planning commissions, in Wymondham and elsewhere

The scale of allocation at Wymondham has been reduced compared with an earlier option, but account needs to be taken of the attributes of Wymondham, as identified by other representations, namely its location on a public transport route with great potential, subject to overcoming difficulties at Thickthorn, it's rail connections, its local range of employment and services

[RB]

protected from other uses, arguing this is contrary to PPS 3. The reconsideration of the appropriateness of existing sites and allocations is required before determining the level of new allocations required. They promote land to the east of Wymondham for a commercial led mixed use development.

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Wymondham Consortium of Landowners support the identification of Wymondham as a strategic growth location and promote a site which could contribute to the 2200 new dwellings</p> <p>Wymondham Town Council are pleased that the earlier options involving 4000 homes have been dropped but disappointed that the favoured option represents a 10% increase over options 2 and 3 consulted on previously</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ Town disproportionately targeted â€¢ The growth assigned to Wymondham should include previous planning permissions are not yet implemented â€¢ Impacts on infrastructure â€¢ Social and cultural activities will decline and town will become a dormitory <p>Other representations suggest the number should be reduced to 1000 [RB]</p>		
8907 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Object	Object to the overall scale of development and hope a future government will change it, and object in particular to the proposals at Long Stratton [R B]	<p>The strategy seeks to focus on previously-developed land in the urban area of Norwich as far as possible to minimise the need for greenfield allocations, though it is acknowledged that these will need to be very significant in order to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan. Failure to meet those requirements would be likely to result in unsoundness.</p> <p>Though the economic downturn is causing many to question of the continued validity of the targets set out in the East of England Plan, it was only adopted in 2008, and all the indications are that the ongoing review is likely to increase rather than reduce development targets.</p> <p>The proposals at Long Stratton are explicitly intended to tackle local environmental issues. [R B]</p>	No change needed [R B]
8657 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]	Object	Prefer option one [R B]	The locations selected for development are broadly consistent with those in option one, with the addition of Long Stratton in recognition of the need to resolve local	No change needed [R B]

environmental problems there. The scale of development has been reduced compared with option 1 in recognition of the updated housing land supply position compared with that in 2006. The consequence of this is that allocations have been reduced by 3000 in the Norwich policy area.

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10735 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]
 10366 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]
 9878 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]
 10016 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]
 11048 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]
 9932 - John Heaser [7015]
 11028 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]
 10512 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]
 10766 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]
 10980 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
 9772 - Mr Michael Whalley [8189]
 locations should be expressed as a minimum rather than a ceiling to development
 10154 - Timewell [8209]
 10256 - WM Morrison Supermarkets plc [8212]
 9868 - Hill Residential [8215]
 9995 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
 10029 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]
 10078 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]
 10161 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]
 10180 - Commercial Land [8246]

 10343 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]

Support noted

 With regard to specific points raised
 The identification of sites for development according to the settlement hierarchy and the need to accommodate the unidentified 2000 dwellings 1800 dwellings in Broadland and South Norfolk Norwich policy area respectively will be undertaken through site specific allocations DPDs
 It is agreed that the policy should indicate that the allocations to be made in the plan are a minimum, but the 10,000 extends beyond the plan period, and is simply intended to give an indication of the total scale anticipated to assist in infrastructure planning. There is not therefore the same case to describe this as "at least 10,000"
 Do not agree the unidentified 2000 dwellings in Broadland should be added to the north east growth of triangle. The figure of 7000 assigned to this area by 2026 is based on an assessment of deliverability based on build rates, and there is not sufficient confidence that an additional 2000 could be delivered by 2026 in this same location. Furthermore it would reduce choice.
 In response to the the representations has been suggested that it should be clarified that the scale of allocation proposed in all locations in the Norwich policy area should be expressed as a minimum

[RB]

[RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8002 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851] 8058 - Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870] 8470 - Mr C Skeels [8016]	Object	proposed housing in Hethersett, Cringleford and Wymondham should be scaled down - other locations overambitious too. Some representations advocate a more diversified approach. [R B]	<p>The first representation does not challenge the selection of locations, simply the scale of the allocations made. These are a consequence of the need to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan, and have been reduced at Hethersett and Wymondham, compared with some earlier options in view of updated housing land supply figures. If they were to be reduced still further, the only alternative would be to make corresponding allocations at other locations. Explicit reference to Cringleford was added as the favoured option was derived. At earlier stages, development interests had proposed development here, arguing it is well connected for public transport, and very close to a strategic employment location at the Norwich research park. It also minimises impact on the Thickthorn junction.</p> <p>Other representations seem to argue for a wider spread of development. The strategy is guided by the need expressed by many for new development to be accompanied by appropriate infrastructure, and this is only likely where a degree of concentration features in the strategy. A more dispersed strategy would risk adding a burden to a wide range of facilities, but without the critical mass to justify their improvement. [R B]</p>	No change needed [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
10265 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068] 10872 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes	Support	<p>Representations relate principally to Costessey</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey and Hopkins Homes broadly support the strategy; promote Lodge Farm, Costessey. They endorse the emphasis on sustainable settlements and point out that this site is close to employment and a public transport corridor proposed for improvements.</p> <p>Support the location of employment and housing in close proximity</p> <p>The site could create a gateway into the urban area, helping to deliver the aims of policy 4</p> <p>The site includes land which could be used to facilitate improvements to Longwater junction</p> <p>It is important to ensure a range of medium sized allocations alongside the major strategic allocations to promote delivery</p> <p>The site is currently being developed and an extension to it could be brought forward quickly - deliverability in the short term is a key consideration</p> <p>Costessey was supported as a sustainable location at the South Norfolk local plan inquiry, and the same considerations still apply</p> <p>Costessey Parish Council</p> <p>Still concerned that the overall scale of development including the 1000 proposed for Costessey/ Easton. Costessey has already taken or is taking a large number of dwellings over recent years</p> <p>Have considered sites advanced by landowners and consider most unsuitable</p> <p>Would be prepared to support an extension to the development of Lodge Farm up to the line of the access road to the original Lodge Farm, subject to detailed design and commensurate community benefits (estimated could accommodate about 200 dwellings) but would have concerns if the development extended further towards the southern bypass</p> <p>[RB]</p>	<p>Some development at Costessey would be consistent with the favoured option. The precise sites to be allocated it will be determined through the site specific allocations DPD</p> <p>Costessey Parish Council's views on the sites advanced by developers are noted. [RB]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10206 - Mr Paul Dunthorne [8216]	Support	Relate primarily to Rackheath	Support welcomed	Reconsider the timing of the
9952 - Barratt Strategic/Manor		<p>Barrett Strategic/ Manor Farm Rackheath are broadly supportive.They make a number of specific points including</p> <p>â€¢ Agree that local geography suggests a series of interrelated villages or quarters, do not like the phrase urban extension as it implies a uniformity of approach</p> <p>â€¢ Recognize the significance of the NDR, but the eco community is predicated on extensive public transport including rail station, high quality bus transit, walking and cycling, all of which are recognized in the policy. While the implementation of the NDR the would deliver benefits in terms of general accessibility, it is not seen as essential to the eco community</p> <p>â€¢ Question the timing of the secondary school in the first five years -preliminary discussions with the education authority suggest this may not be required until later in the plan period, but propose an education campus in the southern part of the community which can grow as demand arises.Recognize in terms of secondary education provision the eco community proposals will need to take account of other proposed development in the north east triangle</p> <p>â€¢ Support the bus rapid transit strategy</p> <p>â€¢ Not clear what "accredited design methodology" means - unclear which is the accreditation body</p> <p>â€¢ Believe policy should read "the development in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle is expected to rise to 10,000 dwellings eventually, of which a minimum of 5000 dwellings should be provided in a new settlement at Rackheath"</p> <p>â€¢ A representation supports the identification of Rackheath and promotes a site at Green Lane West, whether as part of the eco proposal, or as a separate</p>	<p>The reference to an urban extension is still considered appropriate. The representation notes that there will be certain shared infrastructure including the secondary school, but this may also extend to community heat, power and cooling, or local energy generation, comprehensive bus priorities, measures to ensure permeability across the NDR, and green infrastructure. There therefore needs to be some high level co-ordinated planning, and a willingness to cooperate with other development groups is not sufficient.</p> <p>Further work is being done by EDAW to identify infrastructure needs, and this will include timing. The outcome of this work should guide references to the timing of the secondary school</p> <p>It has been suggested in relation to other representations that the word accredited should be replaced by "recognized"</p> <p>The proposal in the core strategy is that an area action plan should determine precise land allocations within the north east.</p> <p>It would be wrong to preempt this exercise by indicating that half of the total should be provided in Rackheath.</p> <p>The precise sites to be developed will be determined through the preparation of an area action plan</p>	<p>the outcome of work by EDAW</p> <p>Refer to "recognized design process" rather than "accredited design process" [RB]</p>
9617 - RW Kidner [8163]	Support	Supports the recognition of the role of smaller sites within the Norwich policy area in the delivery of overall targets. Promote a site at Stoke Holy Cross for approximately 40 dwellings and extension to the school grounds, supported by indicative master plan which could contribute to meeting the 1800 dwelling allocation on unidentified smaller sites in South Norfolk [R B]	Support welcome. Identification of specific sites will be undertaken through site specific allocations DPD [R]	No change needed [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10696 - Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement [8170] 9828 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	Support	<p>Primarily concerned with Taverham</p> <p>Site promoted at Breck Farm lane, Thorpe Marriott. Access currently available from the existing road network to be augmented by NDR. Believe there is capacity in existing utilities, though subject to further dialogue with Anglian Water. Surface water flows can be attenuated. Believe no ownership or service obstacles. Further ecology and landscape assessments can be undertaken to confirm the status of the land.</p> <p>A different representation supports the distribution of major housing and job growth within the Norwich policy area. Understand that infill land in Taverham and Thorpe Marriott has been identified for more modest scale residential development and support this also.</p> <p>[RB]</p>	Taverham/ Thorpe Marriott has not been identified for more modest scale residential development. It is included within the urban fringe, and would therefore be considered alongside other candidates for some of the non location specific 2000 dwellings to be accommodated in the Broadland part of the Norwich policy area. This work will be undertaken through the site specific allocations DPD	no change [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
8349 - Spixworth Parish Council (Mrs R Rose) [1826] 9221 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8568 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 9153 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 8249 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] 7916 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] 8360 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 9109 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 9357 - Mr Peter Rope [7113] 8427 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] 8519 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8091 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	Support	These representations support the favoured option, though some express support conditionally. In particular, some support is conditional upon the scale of development proposed actually being needed, and some comment that the approach to masterplanning sounds good but needs to be carried through into delivery. The Highways Agency support the preferred option which offers a reasonable degree of choice in locations with good access to public transport routes which currently perform well or are prioritized for improvement, as well as to a range of strategic employment opportunities. Wroxham Parish Council are generally supportive of the strategy but express reservations about the policies for Wroxham and Rackheath. Norfolk County Football Association indicate that new development needs to be accompanied by additional sporting facilities. [R B]	Support welcomed. [R B]	No fundamental change needed, but consider whether more explicit reference to sports and recreation facilities need to be made, for example in the communities and culture policy. [R B]
8116 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888] 8271 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8544 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 9676 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 8731 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8754 - Highways Agency (Mr Eric Cooper) [8057] 8787 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] 8977 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9428 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]				
8296 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	Support	"none" though the representation was submitted via the web and expresses support [R B]	Support welcome [R B]	No change needed [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Decision on (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Continue investigation into feasibility of development funded bypass, or potential for contribution from public funds, and consider appropriate scale for employment allocation. Ensure policy is clear that development does not precede the bypass [RB]		
		Include scale of employment allocations at strategic locations		
		Include an expectation of the share of future development on previously developed land [RB]		
		No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen policy references to design [R B]		
		No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen the policies dealing with the design of new development, and environmental protection. [R B]		
		No change needed to policies for the growth triangle.		
		Delete reference to the possibility of non location specific allocations to accommodate 2000 dwellings on smaller sites in the Broadland part of the Norwich policy area being accommodated as extensions to the named growth location in Broadland. [RB]		
		Reconsider the scale of retail growth proposed. [RB]		
		Clarify that the scale of development proposed at named locations, and identified through non location of specific allocations in the Norwich policy area will be viewed as a minimum [RB]		
		Reconsider the timing of the secondary school in the light of the outcome of work by EDAW		
		Refer to "recognized design process" rather than "accredited design process" [RB]		
		Reexamine the introduction to policy 5 to see if greater clarity can be offered without losing the intent.		
		No fundamental change to the proposals, unless current discussions indicate that a bypass cannot be funded by the development and any available public funding. [RB]		
		No change unless current discussions confirm the proposed development at Long Stratton, and any available public funds, cannot fund the bypass [RB]		
		The plan already acknowledges the need for improvements at the Thickthorn junction, but ensure these are included in the implementation strategy. [RB]		
		Add more illustrative the material to pre submission publication document [R B]		
		No change to strategy needed, but ensure the plan is more explicit about how education facilities could be expanded to cope with the development proposed in the A11 corridor including Wymondham. [RB]		
		Make explicit reference to additional employment allocation in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle, for example by proposing a specific allocation at Rackheath [R B]		
		Include employment allocation within eco development at Rackheath - precise site to be determined through area action plan [RB]		

Refer to "recognized design process" rather than "accredited design process" [RB]

Indicate that each component of the allocation to be made in the Norwich policy area in strategic locations, and the non location specific component should be regarded as a minimum.

Delete the suggestion that the non location specific 2000 dwellings in Broadland could be accommodated within the major identified growth location to the north east of the urban

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

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

area.[RB]

Include expanded implementation strategy itemizing infrastructure requirements. [RB]

Do not make " Secured by Design" a formal requirement, but consider the use of " Building for Life" as a criterion in an expanded design policy, and ensure that crime prevention continues to be referred to in any redrafting of the policy on communities and culture. [R B]

Include a reference to the need to maintain access for people with disabilities.in the supporting text to the transportation policy. [R B]

Include delivery strategy in the pre submission publication

Reexamine vision and objectives to see if these can be refined

Include an indication of the scale of employment allocation to be made at different locations, including Wymondham [RB]

No fundamental change needed, but consider whether more explicit reference to sports and recreation facilities need to be made, for example in the communities and culture policy. [RB]

Add a reference to future population characteristics to spatial portrait and/or vision [R B]

Amend the introduction to policy for to use the phrase "recognised design process" [RB]

Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

10293 - Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277]	Comment	There are significant electricity supply issues in the A11 corridor. These affect growth proposals in this part of Breckland, and joint working is required to bring about a comprehensive solution. Similar considerations apply to water supply and wastewater treatment. [RB]	It is agreed that there are significant electricity supply issues. The infrastructure study being undertaken by EDAW includes an examination of these, and involves dialogue with the electricity supply company, Anglian Water Services and the Environment Agency. It is reasonable to expect that they have a view which transcends local authority boundaries, and that investment necessitated through their investment plans will take	No change needed, but ensure that the work on electricity supply, water supply and wastewater treatment in the infrastructure study and implementation strategy does take account of the wider
9067 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] 8755 - Highways Agency (Mr Eric	Comment	Growth in the north east will place further pressure on the A.47 junction at Postwick and it is recommended that the improvement proposed for the junction is tested with the full 10,000 additional dwellings in the traffic forecast. One representation argues the growth should only take place following the improvement, who particularly taking into account the current commitments at Broadland Business Park and proposals at Broadland Gate	Accepted further traffic modelling is currently being undertaken. No additional development is proposed before the capacity issues at the junction are resolved, and any such proposal would be unlikely to be acceptable to the Highways Agency. [RB]	No changes needed to the plan, subject to the outcome of the traffic modelling currently underway

Suggest checks are made to ensure the scaled down

allocation in the A 11 corridor reaches a critical mass to fund the necessary public in transport improvements and upgrades to the Thicket junction [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
9657 - Ms E Riches [8165]	Comment	<p>A number of questions raised in relation to Long Stratton</p> <p>paragraph 1.11 -questions how new infrastructure improvements can be funded in addition to a bypass</p> <p>Paragraph 2 .5 -refers to growth point funding - can this be guaranteed before development</p> <p>Paragraph 3.4 -states that the strategy identifies supporting infrastructure needed to support growth and how it will be funded-not apparent in the document</p> <p>Policy 2 - refers to transport infrastructure including the Long Stratton bypass - representation seeks assurance this will be provided and funded by the government [RB]</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.11 - dialogue continues with the promoters to establish the ability of a scheme involving the construction of 1800 houses to deliver a bypass and other necessary infrastructure. This includes examining potential funding other than developer contributions</p> <p>Paragraph 2.5 - growth point funding is subject to bidding, and there can be no certainty in advance as to the outcome. What is clear, from the evidence to date, however, is that the area has secured some funding which would not otherwise have been available</p> <p>Paragraph 3.4 - the representation is correct. Though there is some references to the necessary infrastructure, this falls a long way short of the necessary comprehensive implementation strategy. This will need to be added.</p> <p>Policy 2 - appendix 0 is explicit that "The final number of new homes built in Long Stratton is intended to fund the bypass". It therefore follows there can be no guarantee that this will be funded by the Government, although ongoing discussions will continue to explore if some part of the funding can be secured from mainstream government sources. [RB]</p>	<p>On completion of the current work being undertaken by EDAW, draft a comprehensive implementation strategy itemizing the infrastructure needed, when it is needed, and responsibility for its provision, including funding</p>
9061 - Chenery Drive Residents Association (Mr R. Craggs) [3412]	Comment	<p>Seek assurances that no development at the eco community at Rackheath will be undertaken until the northern distributor road is at least largely completed</p>	<p>The current strategy sees the NDR as essential for development in the north east in totality, rather than relating it specifically to the Rackheath proposal. It is considered necessary because, as well as offering a route which will enable many users to avoid the urban area, it will release capacity within the urban area and the approaches to it, which will permit additional priorities for public transport walking and cycling. It is critical that the delivery and timing of the NDR is secure before development takes place in the wider northeast, though it may not be possible to ensure the NDR is largely completed before any development takes place. The position with the Rackheath proposal is complicated because of the Government's eco towns proposals which may affect the sequencing and timing of development in the northeast [RB]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10079 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	Comment	<p>General support for a major development in the north east triangle. Detail of infrastructure needs will be established through an Enquiry by Design exercise. Willing to cooperate with developers of the Rackheath eco community.</p> <p>Agree the Norwich northern distributor road represents a strategically significant and important element of infrastructure but believe it is not essential for the north east triangle, and other infrastructure would suffice. This includes an inner link road, completing the link partially proposed in the adopted Broadland Local Plan. This will support north-- south traffic movements around the urban edge. Support increased use of "underused" Bittern Line. This would increase transport choice and encourage modal shift. [RB]</p>	<p>While the inner link road referred to is valuable and is in line with the current planning strategy, it serves a different purpose from the northern distributor road. It provides a more local link from the northern and northeastern urban area to a strategic employment location, but is not likely to create the "elbow room" inside the urban area to permit the implementation of extensive priorities suitable to accommodate bus rapid transit. The NDR is still considered an essential piece of infrastructure, necessary to accommodate the development proposed in the northeast [RB]</p>	No change needed [RB]
10887 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Comment	<p>In relation to the urban extension to the north east of Norwich, Broadland Land Trust acknowledge that the infrastructure identified presents a fair picture. BLT are undertaking a masterplanning exercise and intend to involve service providers which will give more detail and enable a detailed implementation strategy to be prepared.</p> <p>They are not opposed to the northern distributor road but would argue that the urban extension could precede this subject to some other transport interventions. These include provision of an inner link connecting Postwick interchange to Wroxham Road. This will enable the delivery of the urban extension and provide for some north -south traffic movements around the periphery of Norwich. There is also scope to use existing capacity on the "underused" Bittern Line A rail halt within a new urban extension linking with the proposed eco settlement at Rackheath would create a valuable interchange. BLT would support reviewing the feasibility of increased frequency on the line and full the exploration of the potential for tram/train on the line. A sustainable transport plan will be one of the outputs of the masterplanning exercise being undertaken [RB]</p>	<p>It is not clear whether the representation is suggesting the entire proposal in the northeast including the Rackheath eco community could go ahead in advance of the Norwich northern distributor road. The GNDP's view has always been that the NDR is an essential prerequisite for high quality public transport in the form of bus rapid transit. The NDR should not be seen in isolation But as an integral part of the Norwich area transportation strategy, intended to serve the whole of the urban extension, including better Rackheath. There is some critical high level infrastructure which depends upon the whole development to support it, and it would be wrong to deal separately with individual components of the overall development.</p> <p>The potential for tram train may well depend on the outcome of experiments being held in another part of the country. It is not clear that the Bittern Line is currently underused, in terms of the heavy rail currently permitted to use it [RB]</p>	No change needed [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Representations

10703 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]

Nature Representation Summary

Comment
 The Environment Agency stress the importance of water utilities and the need to take into account the outcome of the water cycle study. They make a number of points
 • Assume stage 1 and stage 2 A. have assisted in the development of the favored option. Stage 2 B. should inform this further and Environment Agency assume consultation is taking place with the water companies. Suggest that GNDP considers how aspirations for water efficiency compare with those of the water company
 • Environment Agency are currently undertaking review of consents and the water quality aspect is nearing completion
 • Support the last bullet point in policy 5 requiring sewerage infrastructure to be masterplanned into large-scale developments. Development should not proceed until wastewater infrastructure is in place
 • Stage 2 A of water cycle study assumes no additional capacity within the waste water sewer and water supply systems for the area. This will need to be considered carefully in terms of timing and cost
 • A number of sewage treatment works may require upgrading in terms of their discharge quality, including Whitlingham - otherwise increased flows may impact on BroadsSAC/ Broadland SPA. Wymondham and Rackheath sewage treatment works, if used may also require technical modifications and/or volumetric upgrades. The water cycle study should supply further details
 • Note Anglian Water is now forecasting lower growth than the East of England Plan figures over the next three to four years, but is assuming any shortfall will be made up in subsequent years. GNDP may need to consider this in planning
 • Assume Anglian Water have been consulted in the drafting of the joint core strategy. They have recently produced a water resource management plan.

[RB]

Council's Assessment

Noted - the water cycle study stage 2 B is expected to be completed in the near future. base Anglian Water and the Environment Agency have both been fully involved.

The review of consents is the factor which has created most uncertainty around Aylsham, and it's approaching completion is good news. However the timescale for producing the joint core strategy is likely to mean that an allocation there will need to be proposed, conditional upon the resolution of sewage treatment issues.

Anglian Water's view of likely rates of development may well be borne out by the facts, but the requirement to meet the target set out in the East of England Plan remains, and failure to maintain a supply of housing land in accordance with the East of England Plan could lead to the loss of appeals.

The infrastructure needs and funding study being undertaken by EDAW is taking into account the parallel work going on in the water cycle study, and, although water utilities have their own funding mechanism, this will be taken into account in the outcome of the study.
 [RB]

Action

Subject to the outcome of the work by EDAW, and the water cycle study, no change needed
 [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
11116 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Comment	<p>The Leeder family make a number of points relating to transport</p> <p>The representation also says the promoters of the development have identified a need for new 1.5 form primary school with attached nursery but have not identified a need for any extension at the secondary school [RB]</p>	<p>In relation to education, the advice of Children's Services is that some expansion of the local high school may be needed. Furthermore, Long Stratton High School has no post 16 provision and further consideration of this aspect will be needed. There is likely to be a need for an additional 420 place primary school with early years provision attached, and a site of around 2 hectares will need to be provided for this. Further 0 to 5 one year provision will also be required to meet the demand from the new housing. [RB]</p>	<p>Transport elements in delivery plan to be updated to reflect most up to date evidence from work to determine an NATS implementation plan.</p> <p>Incorporate the requirements of Children's Services in the favoured option [RB]</p>
10235 - Ms Jane Pond [8255]	Comment	<p>Some of the funds from the major development in the north east should be devoted to the funding of a Wroxham bypass as well as a northern distributor road</p>	<p>It is expected that there will be enhancements to bus services from Long Stratton. Increased frequency is likely to be driven by the increased market. To support and promote bus patronage priority enhancements will be needed. The detail will emerge through more detailed work on NATS implementation, but is likely to include capacity and bus priority improvements at the A140/A47 junction and some bus priority at key junctions along the A140 into the city (eg Tesco/B1113).</p> <p>The funds derived from the major development in the north east are likely to be required to fund infrastructure there, or if a CIL mechanism is adopted, to contribute to debate infrastructure needs in the wider Norwich area to accommodate the scale of development needed. While the difficulties experienced from time to time in Wroxham are recognized, a bypass is no longer included in the local transport plan. [RB]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>
9059 - Newton Flotman Parish Council (Mrs D Davidson) [2036] 8886 - ie homes & property ltd	Comment	<p>Junction improvements are needed along the A. 140, and speed restrictions in villages along the road [RB]</p> <p>additional commuting to Norwich, it is not accepted that</p>	<p>While the proposal to allocate 1800 new homes at Long Stratton, and 300 at Diss may well result in some</p> <p>this additional traffic will automatically require widespread junction improvements, seen in the context of existing traffic flows. [RB]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>
9091 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Comment	<p>need to determine the likely impact upon the Broads and the inclusion of appropriate environmental mitigation measures. Such assessments need to be undertaken in advance of and inform decisions on the type and distribution of growth [RB]</p>	<p>An Appropriate Assessment looking at the impacts on internationally designated sites has been undertaken. This has highlighted limited impacts generally, but stage 2 work to identify appropriate mitigation is currently under way.</p>	<p>Incorporate the findings of the stage 2 Appropriate Assessment into relevant policies [RB]</p>
11049 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	Comment	<p>There is no sewage treatment works capacity issues which would prevent further estate scale development in Aylsham [RB]</p>	<p>The sewage treatment works would require extension, but more critically, additional discharges would require consent from the Environment Agency. Nevertheless, in response to representations to other questions, it has been suggested that an allocation of 300 dwellings should be proposed at Aylsham subject to current sewage treatment limitations being overcome [RB]</p>	<p>Propose an allocation for 300 dwellings at Aylsham subject to sewage treatment limitations being overcome. [RB]</p>

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
10767 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	Need to consider impact on secondary health care services [RB]	Noted and accepted. The infrastructure needs and funding study the work being undertaken by EDAW is looking at factors as such as the need for additional beds in acute and mental care hospitals, and this will need to be included in the implementation strategy [RB]	Ensure impact on secondary health care is included in implementation strategy
10408 - Easton College [3570]	Comment	Policy 5 implies all new major growth locations will be required to include "new primary schools, local retail and other services, small-scale employment opportunities and primary health care facilities". Do not consider all locations necessarily need to provide this entire range. Do not see the need for the JCS to include a policy requiring it, as consideration of infrastructure should be a matter of course. [RB]	All strategic locations include proposals for at least 1000 dwellings. This is likely to require a new primary school, but it is true that it may be possible to serve the population in some of these areas by expansion of some existing local facilities. Nevertheless, 1000 dwellings is likely to require expansion across a wide range of facilities, and this is what the policy is designed to promote. A policy reference is considered appropriate in light of PPS 12, paragraph 4.45 which states that core strategies should show how the vision, objectives and strategy will be delivered, by whom and when, including making clear how infrastructure which is needed to support the strategy will be provided. This will be itemized in more detail in the implementation strategy, but requires a policy "hook". [RB]	No change to the policy, but ensure the implementation strategy reflects as accurately as possible the position in the major growth areas. [RB]
10824 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	Comment	Although it is expected that infrastructure will be needed the on no abnormal costs relating to Wyndham at the scale proposed [RB]	Noted [RB]	No change needed [RB]
11093 - Tesco Stores Ltd [8388]	Comment	In the north east, additional retail provision will be needed. This should be provided for many of the dwellings by the planned district centre at Sprowston - the centre already exists and is well served by public transport [RB]	The favoured option in appendix 0 makes it clear that a district centre, and new local centres, are required in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle. The appropriate location for the centres should be determined through masterplanning. The proposed centre at Sprowston may well serve part of the development, but would also be peripheral to much of it, and it would be wrong to preempt the master planning	No change [RB]
10250 - Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260]	Comment	The title of policy 10 (The Countryside) is misleading. It refers to development in the countryside [RB]	It is true the policy refers to development in the countryside, outlining the approach to development in small rural communities and the open countryside. This is a necessary part of the strategy. However, it needs to be borne in mind that other policies including those dealing with the protection of environmental assets also apply across the plan area including the countryside. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
10148 - R Smith [8243]	Comment	Logical to make the best use of existing infrastructure, particularly in relation to small-scale developments where it may permit early delivery. [RB]	Agreed. the strategy involves a balanced portfolio of sites ranging from very large, through strategically significant, to provision for development of 3000 dwellings on new sites in Norwich, 2000 in the Broadland Norwich policy area, and 1800 in the Norwich policy area in unspecified locations. Many of these unlikely to be delivered on more modest sites. [RB]	No change in policy, but clarify that the dwellings to be provided in unspecified locations will be distributed in line with the spatial hierarchy and other planning considerations. [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
10276 - Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266]	Comment	need for recognition of the role of faith communities. Larger new developments are likely to need new places of worship or extension of existing ones (for Christian and other faiths). Cambridge Horizons has undertaken research which is a useful starting point. [RB]	It is accepted that the Communities and Culture policy is weak and could be improved. There may well be a role for faith groups in community development, and this should be recognized. The Cambridge Horizons study does, however, point out that premises shared between a different faiths are rare, and at the core strategy level, the focus may be better on ensuring that adequate community facilities and community development support is available, including provision for faith groups within this	Redraft the communities and culture policy including references to the potential role of faith groups in promoting community cohesion and the need for premises when it can be demonstrated. [RB]
8458 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	Outside Norwich and the north east, the favoured option takes a more dispersed approach. This will require a commitment to green infrastructure at an appropriate scale in each of these locations. [RB]	Agreed, but the text in appendix the 0 acknowledges this [RB]	No change needed [RB]
9037 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Comment	Suggest more use of local railway stations and potential use of light rolling stock [RB]	The description of major growth in the north east included within appendix 0 includes a reference to a new rail halt at Rackheath. There is a longstanding proposal for an additional station at Broadland Business Park, but the prospect of additional stations may well be dependent on the introduction of light rolling stock as described in the representation, to avoid timetabling problems. Discussions with Network Rail and other rail interests have suggested that there may be scope for the introduction of tram train services to serve the north east, though there is doubt that these could be extended to serve Wymondham for example. Currently, it is understood that regulations do not permit mixed use of heavy rail track in this way, though it is understood that there are trials of such arrangements currently going on in the north of England. The feasibility of this type of approach may well depend on the outcome of these trials [RB]	No change needed [RB]
9933 - John Heaser [7015] 8453 - Frederick Watkins (Mr Frederick Watkins) [8013] 10239 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	Comment	In relation to proposals at Hethersett, local infrastructure improvements needed include improved pedestrian cycle facilities, localized road improvements, primary care, schools, sewerage and improvements to the village hall. [RB]	The text in appendix 0 includes references to " expansion of the existing village services" "new primary school provision as part of new development", "safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes around Hethersett, and enhanced longer distance cycle access..." It also refers to possible expansion of secondary education provision, though the precise strategy for secondary education had not been clarified at the time of drafting. This will need to be included in the next version of the document. Clearly any highway safety issues would also need to be addressed.	No change needed, subject to the requirements in appendix 0 being translated into policy in the next version of the plan, along with a clarification of the strategy for secondary education in the area. [RB]
			While the specific comments made in the submissions are not challenged, the strategy as drafted appears to give enough "hooks" to require any necessary improvements [RB]	

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
9850 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	Notwithstanding the eventual size of the strategic allocation in Hethersett, a minimum of 200 new dwellings could be delivered within existing infrastructure capacity. Promote a site at Great Melton Road [RB]	Noted, but the favoured strategy proposes a larger scale development which will require some infrastructure enhancement, to be specified in the implementation strategy. The selection of a site or sites will be undertaken through the site specific allocations development plan document. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
9063 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Comment	The scale of growth and Rackheath will make it likely a facility for the safer neighbourhood team will be required here. The overall scale of growth is likely to increase the potential for crime and disorder in Norwich city centre, and further police resources are required for the area.	The infrastructure study currently being undertaken by EDAW includes an assessment of the needs of emergency services, including crime prevention. Increased population should automatically lead to increased funding, through normal funding mechanisms, but it is accepted that there will be some additional costs, and this will need to be included in the implementation	Ensure the implementation strategy pays due regard to crime prevention requirements [RB]
9093 - National Grid (Mr Les Morris) [8110]	Comment	Development proposals will not have a significant effect on National Grid's infrastructure, but reference should be made to the localized networks operated by EDF and National Gas Distribution [RB]	Noted - the work being undertaken by EDAW to establish infrastructure needs includes dialogue with utility operators [RB]	No change needed in response, but ensure the plan includes an implementation strategy setting out the infrastructure needed to accommodate the development proposed [RB]
10851 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Comment	Norwich green party refer to a number of transport interventions [RB]	The strategy seeks to identify all the strategic transport interventions that are a requirement of the strategy being promoted. Where other improvements are desirable, for example longer distance rail improvements the strategy sets a policy context for their promotion. The contention that dropping the NDR will allow funds to be used for other projects is based on an incorrect assumption that funding could be transferred in this way. All major schemes, be they public transport or road has to be bid for and justified in their own right. Therefore funding the NDR will not impact on a separate bid for public transport enhancements. Further detail of transport interventions and delivery will emerge through the work on NATS implementation.	Include Implementation strategy in pre submission publication
10911 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Comment	The representation highlights the A 47 and its junctions, Whitlingham sewage treatment works and Long Stratton bypass [RB]	All of these are highlighted in various parts of the document, either in appendix 0 or in paragraph 6.2	No change needed [RB]
8640 - The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]	Object	Essential that sufficient waste management capacity is planned in tandem or advance of the growth option. This is a task of the waste LDF, but important for the core strategy to recognize it. [RB]	Noted. A waste LDF is in preparation. It is important that the GNDP is satisfied that the chosen growth options can accommodate the scale of growth proposed without infringing any relevant protection zones. [RB]	No change needed, but continue a dialogue with team preparing waste LDF [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8882 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037] 10196 - Hopkins Homes Limited	Object	Significant infrastructure requirements supporting the favoured option should have been considered in detail in the infrastructure assessment. Objector's assessment is as follows Long Stratton, Hethersett and Cringleford all require significant infrastructure (primary and secondary school capacity, retail, health care, employment, and in the case of Long Stratton a bypass) which cannot be delivered by developer contribution. In contrast, Wymondham requires primary and secondary school capacity and health care. Much of the infrastructure can be delivered by developer contribution [RB]	More detailed work based on the favoured distribution of the growth is being undertaken by EDAW and will be incorporated into an implementation strategy. This will examine all infrastructure requirements, for example Wymondham may require some access improvements to the A11, and sewerage improvements. It is notable that the objection states that much of the infrastructure requirements can be delivered by developer contribution, but does not suggest all of it can be. In many cases, additional employment development is likely to be commercially viable rather than a burden on the developers. [RB]	No change to strategy, but ensure implementation strategy reflects fully the infrastructure needs of the chosen locations. [RB]
7931 - mr paul newson [7812] 10457 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10485 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	Oppose development in principle [RB]	The scale of development to be accommodated overall is already established through the East of England Plan. The strategy focuses on accommodating as much as possible in the urban area, but the overall scale of development required means some green field allocations will be needed. [RB]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Decision on Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?		
		No change needed, subject to the requirements in appendix 0 being translated into policy in the next version of the plan, along with a clarification of the strategy for secondary education in the area. [RB]		
		Redraft the communities and culture policy including references to the potential role of faith groups in promoting community cohesion and the need for premises when it can be demonstrated. [RB]		
		Include Implementation strategy in pre submission publication		
		No change to strategy, but ensure implementation strategy reflects fully the infrastructure needs of the chosen locations. [RB]		
		Ensure the implementation strategy pays due regard to crime prevention requirements [RB]		
		Propose an allocation for 300 dwellings at Aylsham subject to sewage treatment limitations being overcome. [RB]		
		No changes needed to the plan, subject to the outcome of the traffic modelling currently underway [RB]		
		On completion of the current work being undertaken by EDAW, draft a comprehensive implementation strategy itemizing the infrastructure needed, when it is needed, and responsibility for its provision, including funding sources. [RB]		
		Incorporate the findings of the stage 2 Appropriate Assessment into relevant policies [RB]		
		Subject to the outcome of the work by EDAW, and the water cycle study, no change needed [RB]		
		Ensure impact on secondary health care is included in implementation strategy [RB]		
		No change needed, but continue a dialogue with team preparing waste LDF [RB]		
		No change in policy, but clarify that the dwellings to be provided in unspecified locations will be distributed in line with the spatial hierarchy and other planning considerations. [RB]		
		No change needed, but ensure that the work on electricity supply, water supply and wastewater treatment in the infrastructure study and implementation strategy does take account of the wider picture. [RB]		
		No change to the policy, but ensure the implementation strategy reflects as accurately as possible the position in the major growth areas. [RB]		
		Transport elements in delivery plan to be updated to reflect most up to date evidence from work to determine an NATS implementation plan.		
		Incorporate the requirements of Children's Services in the favoured option [RB]		

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?</i>				
10873 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	Comment	Relates to Costessey. Site promoted to the west of Lodge Farm could add to the critical mass to support a quality public transport infrastructure along Dereham Road. The site would require limited additional infrastructure, and would have limited impact on the Longwater junction . Access could be gained by a new roundabout connecting to Dereham Road, and would also offer the possibility of land needed to improve Dereham Road and/ or Longwater junction.	support noted. The identification of specific sites will be undertaken through a site specific allocations DPD	No change needed [RB]
10126 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	Comment	The inherent suitability of the site and limited infrastructure mean it could be provided early to help maintain housing land supply in the short term [RB] The north east development offers opportunities to integrate new homes with established employment areas, support economic growth and provide good public transport links to the city centre. The Bittern Line could provide new rail transit linking the urban extension to Norwich, and beyond. Opportunities include -- connectivity, walkable neighbourhoods, sustainable transport -- enhancing landscape and biodiversity providing for informal recreation -- creation of job opportunities -- access to the new facilities for existing residents and employees in the area -- creation of distinctive neighbourhoods involving high quality innovative design -- sustainable development promoting health, environmentally conscious lifestyles. [RB]	The support for the strategic growth location in the north east, and commitment to delivering high quality development here is a welcomed. [RB]	no change needed [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
11131 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 10825 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10912 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Comment	<p>Relate to Wymondham Persimmon homes</p> <p>Support the strategy provided the 2200 houses assigned to Wymondham are accommodated on a number of sites around the town, and some of the 1800 non location specific allocations in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area are assigned to Wymondham</p> <p>The site at Norwich Common offers the opportunity to provide 300 dwellings well related to transport, employment and services and would have no impact on the strategic gap between Wymondham and Hethersett</p> <p>North-east Wymondham landowners</p> <p>Propose a larger scale of development (6500 dwellings)</p> <p>The location of the land promoted is convenient for the town centre, for Norwich, accessibility and has the benefit of easy access to the rail link to Norwich and the wider sub-region</p> <p>Allied London Properties</p> <p>Support the strategy in part but are concerned that it is a highly dependent on deliverability of core infrastructure, notably the Long Stratton bypass</p> <p>Other representations on behalf of Allied London Properties propose a 6500 dwellings and new employment at Wymondham [RB]</p>	<p>The support for Wymondham as a strategic growth location is noted and welcomed. There have been many other representations concerned about the scale of development at the town, and its impact on the character of Wymondham, notably the town centre and other areas of environmental importance around Wymondham. Partly in response to these, the favoured option proposes a lower rate of growth here compared with some previous options. The strategy of a number of medium sized allocations, to complement the large-scale allocation in the north east could also help in terms of the ability to bring forward land in the medium term, and spread the risk associated with delays in a particular location. [RB]</p>	No change [RB]
10294 - Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277]	Comment	<p>There may be potential for strategic infrastructure providers to take advantage of the critical mass of the development in the A11 corridor taking into account development in Breckland too - further dialogue with the Breckland Council needed [RB]</p>	<p>Major infrastructure providers should be aware of the proposals in Breckland, but their vision should transcend district boundaries, and their investment programs should be taking account of the totality of growth in this area</p>	No change needed [RB]
8887 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	Comment	<p>The small sites allowance of 1800 should offer flexibility of choice, locations along the A 140 are advocated</p>	<p>The allowance for 1800 dwellings on unidentified sites will add flexibility. Their locations will be established through the site specific allocations development plan document</p>	No change needed [RB]
10458 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10486 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Comment	<p>Oppose development [RB]</p>	<p>The scale of development required is established through the East of England Plan and cannot readily be changed [RB]</p>	no change needed [RB]
8459 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	<p>Needs costed and prioritised green infrastructure implementation plan [RB]</p>	<p>The plan needs to have an implementation strategy added. this will need to be based on the work currently being done by EDAAW, and will need to include green infrastructure [RB]</p>	Ensure green infrastructure is included in implementation strategy [RB]
10384 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Comment	<p>the commitment in policy 5 to masterplanning and high design standards is welcomed, but it could go further by more emphasis on the green movement corridors. Consider embedding eco town standards for Rackheath within policy and across the area action plan area [RB]</p>	<p>The general expression of support is welcomed. Some reference to eco town standards could be included in the policy, but if it is possible to apply such standards to the whole of the area action plan, this raises the question why they could not be applied across the entire plan area. This in turn raises the question of the purpose of the eco towns programme, if it is not raising standards above what can</p>	Include in policy a reference to moving towards eco town standards, or aspiring to them. [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10888 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Comment	<p>Relate to the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle. Broadland Land Trust</p> <p>Support for the north east as a major growth location</p> <p>Has good connections to Norwich city centre and Broadland business park</p> <p>The Bittern Line could offer a link to the city centre, sub region and beyond, if a rail halt were incorporated</p> <p>Masterplanning proposed to bring about vibrant walkable neighbourhoods</p> <p>Summary of advantages includes - connectivity between the city and fringe -promotion of sustainable transport modes -enhance and maintain landscape and biodiversity -creation of more jobs and better access to employment -improved facilities for existing employees at Broadland Business Park-- high quality housing and innovative design -improved services and facilities to serve new and established residential areas [RB]</p>	<p>Support welcomed. The detailed planning for the area will need to take account of the whole of the growth triangle through a high level masterplanning approach to ensure the appropriate provision of high level shared infrastructure [RB]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>
11102 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	<p>Support the strategy in part and believe that the amount of growth proposed within the regional spatial strategy can be achieved within the Norwich policy area but this is dependent on delivery of core infrastructure, and contingency planning needs to be introduced</p> <p>Other representations on behalf of the same organization promote increased scale of growth at Loddon [RB]</p>	<p>noted.However Loddon is not in the Norwich policy area and it could not contribute to meeting the NPA requirement [RB]</p>	<p>No change [RB]</p>
9851 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	<p>believe Hethersett could deliver not only the level of growth identified, but a large number of the 1800 dwellings to be found on unidentified sites within the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area. Gladedale are promoting a site north of Great Melton Road which could deliver up to 200 units largely within the capacities of existing infrastructure, and which could therefore be delivered</p>	<p>Noted. The selection of sites to accommodate the level of development proposed at Hethersett will be determined through the site specific allocations development plan document. The table in a policy five indicates that the 1800 dwellings to be found on unidentified sites could be elsewhere in the NPA or could be accommodated by additions to named growth locations. This too will need to be undertaken through the site specific allocations DPD.</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
10694 - Sunguard Homes [8320] 11117 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Comment	<p>Relate to Long Stratton</p> <p>Representation on behalf of the Leeder family Note the East of England Plan proposes a focus on the Norwich policy area, and this includes Long Stratton Agree with statement in public consultation document that it would not be possible to accommodate all development in the Norwich urban area Support the range of locations selected to accommodate major growth The strategy adopted supports the requirements of the East of England Plan Note the evidence base for the housing market assessment identifies a degree of self-containment in the Long Stratton area. This can be enhanced by some additional employment, and the growth will also support improved public transport Further growth will deliver a bypass offering local environmental improvements, confirmed by an inspector conducting a compulsory purchase order inquiry in 2006, who observed that there would be local benefits and also benefits in terms of the functioning of the A 140 In short the existing facilities of Long Stratton offer the basis for a truly sustainable community</p> <p>Representation of behalf of Sunguard Homes Support the identification of Long Stratton but believe some of the evidence relating to congestion in the town centre is overstated. There is capacity at the junctions of Flowerpot Lane and Swan Lane with the A140, subject to appropriate management measures, which could accommodate at least 100 new dwellings ahead of the provision of a bypass. [RB]</p>	<p>support for the selection of Long Stratton noted and welcomed.</p> <p>It is important that planning for the area, including improved facilities as well as transport, is undertaken comprehensively, through a site specific allocations development plan document. This would result in all relevant developments contributing to the range of facilities and improvements needed. [RB]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>
10704 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Comment	<p>The Environment Agency comment that there is an opportunity for enhanced green infrastructure, more sustainable development, and measures such as sustainable drainage systems with overall benefits to the environment. [RB]</p>	<p>noted [RB]</p>	<p>no change [RB]</p>
11094 - Tesco Stores Ltd [8388]	Comment	<p>Refer to other questions [RB]</p>	<p>see other questions [RB]</p>	<p>see other questions [RB]</p>
9038 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Comment	<p>Less use of private car [RB]</p>	<p>Noted [RB]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
10050 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 8865 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037] 8878 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037]	Object	Representations are related to Wymondham Persimmon Homes support the strategy provided the 2200 dwellings are located in a number of sites around the town as stated in the appendix 0 of the public consultation document. This is likely to assist early delivery. Hopkins Homes support the identification of Wymondham as a location for strategic growth, but believe that more housing could be supported here, resulting in a more sustainable outcome. The strategy therefore misses an opportunity. They go on to argue that the necessary infrastructure could not be provided through developer contributions at the Cringleford, Hethersett or Long Stratton, but much of it could at Wymondham [RB]	support for the selection of Wymondham as a favored growth location is welcomed. The strategy of accommodating and growth in a number of locations in proposed in light of concerns about the need to respect their form and character. in the case of Wymondham, which includes a historic town centre and some iconic landmarks, this need is seen as paramount. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
Decision on Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? Include in policy a reference to moving towards eco town standards, or aspiring to them. [RB]				
Ensure green infrastructure is included in implementation strategy [RB]				
Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?				
8460 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	the creation of ecological networks is a priority for Norfolk Wildlife Trust. Will cooperate in helping to implement green infrastructure [RB]	Noted [RB]	no change needed [RB]
11132 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 10826 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	Comment	Related to Wymondham Persimmon homes-Have an interest in the site and are actively promoting it through the local development framework. Intention to develop at the earliest opportunity North-East Wymondham landowners- committed to long-term strategy for land holdings and creation of sustainable urban extension. Creating a delivery vehicle	noted [RB]	no change [RB]
8888 - ie homes & property ltd (mred palmieri) [7620]	Comment	promote brownfield site in Tasburgh [RB]	Noted. Tasburgh is currently identified as a service village which could accommodate a modest amount of development [RB]	No change needed [RB]
10889 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Comment	Broadland Land Trust - committed to long-term strategy for land holdings and creation of sustainable urban extension. Creating a delivery vehicle to coordinate the interests of the various landowners. Committed to an inquiry by design process to identify the key and detailed issues associated with growth in this location. [RB]	noted [RB]	no change [RB]
10127 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	Comment	Lothbury has a long-term commitment to the area of the growth triangle in the north east, and to the Broadland Business Park, but there are a number of landowners needed to bring forward the development and the detailed financial planning will need to be acceptable to all of them. [RB]	Noted. The commitment to deliver part of the area of the growth triangle, subject to the caveats referred to is welcomed [RB]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
10874 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	Comment	Already committed to development on neighboring site - extension to Lodge Farm, Costessey would clearly fit with longer-term strategy [RB]	noted [RB]	no change [RB]
10705 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Comment	refer to other responses [RB]	not applicable [RB]	not applicable [RB]
11095 - Tesco Stores Ltd [8388]				
10295 - Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277]	Comment	There is an opportunity for collective working to ensure necessary infrastructure is provided, particularly in the A11 corridor, to accommodate development in both the GNDP and Breckland areas [RB]	EDAW are currently finalising work on the infrastructure needs and funding sources required by the favoured option. This includes a dialogue with service providers. They are well aware of the proposals in Breckland, and their perspective extends beyond local authority	No change needed [RB]
10051 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	Comment	The representor controls a site for 300 dwellings at Norwich Common, Wymondham which could be brought forward quickly [RB]	Noted. The precise selection of sites will be undertaken through the site specific allocations development plan document [RB]	No change needed [RB]
8417 - Ed King [7965]	Comment	A proposed business park development near the Airport could be brought forward in the short term [RB]	Noted. However, the delivery of the proposed strategic employment allocation near the Airport is likely to be dependent upon the implementation of the northern distributor road [RB]	No change needed, but ensure the implementation strategy links the implementation of the employment allocation to the implementation of the northern distributor road
10459 - Mr David Smith [8309]	Comment	Oppose development [RB]		No change needed [RB]
10487 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Comment		The scale of development to be accommodated is fixed by the East of England plan and cannot readily be changed. [RB]	
9039 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Comment	links with Government policy [RB]	Noted [RB]	No change needed [RB]
10768 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Comment	Investment strategies in place for next five years - understand NHS funding will require commissioning of health services in a tight financial climate [RB]	Noted - NHS Norfolk have been involved in the infrastructure needs and funding study currently being completed by EDAW. Their requirements will need to be incorporated in the implementation strategy [RB]	Ensure health facilities are included in implementation strategy [RB]
8867 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037]	Object	Hopkins Homes seek to deliver a mixed use development in south Wymondham. This could be		
8872 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037]		delivered in accordance with the core strategy, but this would miss an opportunity which would be presented by a larger development. Challenge viability of infrastructure provision through developer contributions deletes at Cringleford, Hetherset and Long Stratton. The development of small-scale sites (3800 dwellings) is contrary to national guidance. [RB]	The detailed infrastructure requirements needed to deliver the favoured option are currently being examined and costed by EDAW. At this stage of there is no reason to believe that the development proposed at Cringleford, Hetherset and Long Stratton would not be a viable. In particular, the discussions are ongoing to see if there are any public funding sources which could contribute towards a Long Stratton bypass. It is assumed the reference to 3800 dwellings refers to the 2000 in Broadland and 1800 in South Norfolk to be accommodated on unidentified sites. The precise distribution of these cannot be determined ahead of the more detailed work entailed in the preparation of the site specific allocations DPD, but it the would be useful to give some criteria based guidance suggesting that they were distributed according to the spatial hierarchy. [RB]	Clarify that the 3800 dwellings on unidentified sites in Broadland and South Norfolk will be distributed within the Norwich policy area according to the spatial hierarchy, taking into account service capacities, environmental and other planning considerations.

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Decision on Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?				
No change needed, but ensure the implementation strategy links the implementation of the employment allocation to the implementation of the northern distributor road [RB]				
Ensure health facilities are included in implementation strategy [RB]				
Clarify that the 3800 dwellings on unidentified sites in Broadland and South Norfolk will be distributed within the Norwich policy area according to the spatial hierarchy, taking into account service capacities, environmental and other planning considerations. [RB]				
<i>Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?</i>				
8756 - Highways Agency (Mr Eric Cooper) [8057] 10296 - Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277]	Comment	Breckland Council considers insufficient evidence is presented to demonstrate favoured option is justified and deliverable, in particular whether levels of growth proposed along the A11 and A 47 corridors are most appropriate in relation to necessary infrastructure provision. The Highways Agency do not object provided it can be demonstrated that the appropriate infrastructure can be delivered through developer contributions without	There is no doubt that the overall cost of infrastructure needed to deliver the favoured option will be very large. EDAW are currently examining the infrastructure needs and potential funding sources in relation to the favoured option. The point raised specifically by the highways agency relates to transport infrastructure, and this has been a feature in representations are made by Breckland District Council. Preliminary, very broad estimates of the cost of transport infrastructure attributed to different areas confirm that in terms of the cost per house the A11 corridor is relatively expensive, compared with other locations included within the favoured option, with the some particular costs associated with local issues at Wymondham. However, any development outside the southern bypass is likely to have an impact on one or more southern bypass junctions and there is no reason to believe that the costs would be materially different. The A11 corridor has the benefit of existing extensive public transport interventions. Equally critical is how funds are gathered and disbursed. Depending on future legislation, a community infrastructure Levy may be introduced, which would allow polling of contributions. the similarly, and growth point finding for specific infrastructure requirements may be achieved, and" the level of costs of between different	No change needed [RB]
11133 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 10052 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	Comment	Persimmon Homes support favoured option provided the 2200 dwellings proposed at Wymondham are accommodated on a range of sites [RB]	Noted. The selection of sites will be undertaken through the site specific allocations development plan document [RB]	no change needed [RB]
10128 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10890 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Comment	committed to supporting sustainable urban extension in the northeast [RB]	Commitment welcome [RB]	No change needed [RB]
10827 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	Comment	Support Wymondham As a strategic growth location - promote a site in NE Wymondham- willing to cooperate with other land owners [RB]	Support welcomed - Site selection will be undertaken through the Site Specific Allocations DPD [RB]	no change needed [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
8461 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Comment	cannot fully support - have concerns about the total level of development, but wish to cooperate in projects to help deliver the strategy provided they mitigate and compensate for any impacts on biodiversity, or enhance biodiversity. [RB]	Noted [RB]	No change needed [RB]
10913 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Comment	Allied London Properties propose changes to the favoured option. Although the favoured option is considered to be less constrained than those consulted on previously, it would be irresponsible to suggest there are no constraints to delivery, and contingency planning needs to be introduced. Not convinced that the north east growth triangle can deliver 7000 dwellings in the plan period - do not dispute the suitability of the location, but on the basis of research carried out elsewhere, looking at major developments in the east of England, believe the only 5000 dwellings can be delivered in the time available. This is compounded by the risk of delays to the northern distributor road. There is also real concern about the ability of Long Stratton to deliver 1800 dwellings, based on the potential delay to the Long Stratton bypass. It is essential that funding and compulsory purchase orders are in place from an early point in the development to ensure delivery. Note - other representations on behalf of Allied London Properties propose increasing the amount of growth allocated to Wymondham. [RB]	It is agreed that the rate of delivery plan for the north east is ambitious, but it is based on the assumption that development can proceed simultaneously in three locations. This corresponds with the three groupings of landowners. Some of these have suggested that more than 7000 could be achieved. The northern distributor road, as a component of the Norwich area transportation strategy, is considered essential, but uncertainty should have been reduced by programme entry being achieved by submission of the joint core strategy. Discussions continue with proposers of development at Long Stratton to ensure the development can fund a bypass. The proposers of large-scale development at Long Stratton also control land capable of accommodating a bypass, and subject to viability, this should be deliverable. [RB]	Subject to the outcome of continuing discussions with the promoters of development at Long Stratton, no change [RB]
10769 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Object	NHS Norfolk cannot commit it to the strategy as yet, but the hope to be able to once the infrastructure assessment and funding work currently being undertaken by EDAW has been completed [RB]	noted -ensure health requirements are included in the implementation strategy [RB]	Include an implementation strategy in the pre submission version of the plan, including health requirements [RB]
10460 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10488 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	Oppose development [RB]	The scale of development to be accommodated is fixed by the East of England plan and cannot readily be changed. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
10852 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] 10706 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Object	Refer to comments made and recorded elsewhere	Noted	As recorded elsewhere

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
8880 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037] Other representations on their behalf indicate that they 10199 - Hopkins Homes Limited	Object	Hopkins Homes do not fully support the favoured option. They are not convinced about delivery of development elsewhere in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area, and believe sustainability could be maximized by a larger scale of development at Wymondham. [RB]	The detailed infrastructure requirements needed to deliver the favoured option are currently being examined and costed by EDAW. At this stage of there is no reason to believe that the development proposed at Cringleford, Hethersett and Long Stratton would not be a viable. In particular, the discussions are ongoing to see if there are any public funding sources which could contribute towards a Long Stratton bypass. It is assumed the reference to 3800 dwellings refers to the 2000 in Broadland and 1800 in South Norfolk to be accommodated on unidentified sites. The precise distribution of these cannot be determined ahead of the more detailed work entailed in the preparation of the site specific allocations DPD, but it would be useful to give some criteria based guidance suggesting that they were distributed according to the spatial hierarchy. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
11096 - Tesco Stores Ltd [8388]	Object	Do not support - suggest additional housing development at Harford bridge also. [RB]	Although one option considered previously did involve a major development on the A140 corridor, there remained doubts about aspects of the development. Major development in this area, even if located inside the southern bypass, would be likely to require major improvements to the Harford junction. Furthermore, the A140 does not incorporate extensive public transport priorities in the same way as the A11 corridor inside the southern bypass, and these would need to be created. Depending on the precise location shows and, then may also be issues about intrusion into the sensitive valley landscape. [RB]	No change [RB]
10736 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] 9879 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] 8890 - ie homes & property ltd	Support	support [RB]	Support welcome [RB]	No change needed [RB]
9040 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] 8418 - Ed King [7965]	Support Support	Keymer Cavendish --"strategic developments might contribute to the project" [RB] Business park development in the vicinity of the Airport could be implemented in the next five years [RB]	not clear what point is being made - see other representations by Keymer Cavendish [RB] Noted. However the implementation of the strategic employment allocation in this area is likely to be dependent on the implementation of the northern distributor	No change [RB] No change needed [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10875 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	Support	<p>Note that policy 5 refers to 1000 dwellings at Easton/Costessey. Believe the two locations are materially different. Policy 1 includes Costessey in the definition of the Norwich urban fringe, but not Easton, and states that the scale of development will be reduced at each level of the hierarchy.</p> <p>Easton is physically separate from the Norwich urban area and has a limited range of facilities. Support Costessey as a location for growth, and promote a site at Lodge Farm [RB]</p>	<p>The strategy has been to accommodate as much as practical in the urban area - the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment broadly confirms the assumptions for Norwich. A further 3800 dwellings (2000 in Broadland and 1800 in South Norfolk) have been identified for smaller sites elsewhere in the Norwich policy area, including the urban fringe. The overall strategy is therefore considered to be in line with the statement in the policy 1, but it must be recognized that in order to achieve the overall scale of development required to meet the East of England Plan's targets, significant allocations will need to be made elsewhere. Easton/Costessey has been identified as one of the locations, with the precise sites to be determined through a site specific allocations development plan document. That document will also consider which sites should be allocated to make up the 1800 additional non location specific allocations in South Norfolk [RB]</p>	no change [RB]

Decision on Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?
 Subject to the outcome of continuing discussions with the promoters of development at Long Stratton, no change [RB]

Include an implementation strategy in the pre submission version of the plan, including health requirements [RB]

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

(Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

10207 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]

Commen
t

We have reviewed the current Reg 25 Technical Consultation document. No changes have been made to the sections of the document dealing with Aylsham (principally Policy 6) so our comments made in August 2008 still stand, with our main point of contention that Aylsham should be allocated 300 dwellings. A number of respondents queried whether the lack of sewerage capacity at Aylsham should be reviewed as a definitive constraint. Our view is that, through appropriate investment, additional sewerage capacity could be made available at Aylsham. We are pleased that statutory consultees believe there are no other significant constraints so assert that an allocation of 300 dwellings should be made. We hope the results of Stage 2B of the Water Cycle Study will confirm that the sewerage constraints in Aylsham are not as significant as currently state in the JCS, and thus that an allocation of 300 dwellings could be made safely. We have made a pre-development inquiry to Anglia Water Services for its site in Aylsham; AWS's response is that additional wastewater transport/treatment capacity will be provided for sites allocated within the LDF from 2016. An appropriate amendment to the text should be made to say "accommodate new housing growth that will be moderate in Aylsham. Policy 6 allocates specific housing numbers each of the 4 chosen Main Towns. Aylsham is a thriving Market Town well endowed with shops and services and it is recognised it has available employment land and spare capacity in all its schools. We are promoting a site at Burgh Road Aylsham and believe it will be able to deliver about 200-300 dwellings. Initial SHLAA analysis (Sept 08) finds the site at low flood risk, not close to hazardous installations, could be assessed safely and is well located for local services and public transport connections to Norwich. Other utility enquiry responses suggest that the cost of connecting the site to the main infrastructure is already present. It is apparent that the water constraints can be overcome by 2016 if suitable housing numbers and sites are included in the JCS/Site Allocations DPD (i.e. Anglian Water will provide the infrastructure)

The Water Cycle Study Stage 2 is seeking clarification of water quality and sewage discharge issues to establish the true capacity of Aylsham to accommodate new housing growth.
dsw

Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9779 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	Comment	Agree with the places proposed as main towns this would require that the infrastructure needs very careful consideration and planning. SN has disproportionate number of sites in concentrated area i.e. around Wymondham. Large concentrations will put an increased burden on schools and health care that are already oversubscribed.	Noted. Infrastructure needs are being assessed through the consultation process. Certain services are known to be operating at or near capacity and will require improvement or replacement. Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving the necessary services. The preferred distribution of growth within South Norfolk is mainly concentrated to the west of Norwich and along the A11 corridor to benefit from good access and transport links. The low proportion of the South Norfolk Norwich Policy Area housing growth provision located at Wymondham is not considered to be disproportionate. dsw	No change.
8710 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Comment	Where there are villages close to main towns and key service centres, is there not a case for limited development in them of both additional housing and associated small business capacity? A hub and spoke approach should prove advantageous in terms of reduced destruction of large areas of countryside and less travel	The proposed Settlement Hierarchy provides for housing and small scale commercial development in a large number of villages based on their provision of certain services and their ease of access to alternative services in nearby settlements. dsw	No change
9642 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Comment	There is the potential for confusion with the "main towns" in that neither Aylsham, Diss nor Harleston are within the Norwich Policy Area and it should be made clear that these locations do not contribute towards the housing requirements/provision for the NPA	Noted. dsw	Add references to the "Executive Summary" to note the emphasis on the provisions for growth required in the Norwich Policy Area, cross refer to the relevant chapters/policies and annotate the summary table of housing provisions to clarify the Norwich Policy Area and Rural Policy Area provisions.
8051 - Mr Keith Jones [7536]	Comment	This supports my belief that required future housing development should be allocated around Norfolk rather than concentrated in one place	Noted. dsw	No change.
9658 - Ms E Riches [8165]	Comment	Page 30 7.15 Last paragraph "Long Stratton will have main town status - it states at Appendix 30 option 3 moderate growth at Wymondham and Long Stratton - this if 1500 houses at Long Stratton - it needs to be made known the number of dwelling considered to be moderate and which major development - if 1800. In that paragraph it states "The final number of new homes built in Long Stratton is intended to fund a bypass - this indicates we should not have a bypass until all homes were built - there is nothing definite about a bypass being provided before any development takes place! What is the range of community infrastructure?"	Cannot see different references to "moderate" and "major" growth in Appendix 3. The favoured growth option shown in the Executive Summary provides for 2200 dwellings at Wymondham and 1800 dwellings at Long Stratton described in general by paragraph 1.1 as "large scale development". The proposed housing growth at Long Stratton is intended to be dependant on the provision of a bypass whose funding must be assured before the construction of the new housing can commence. The construction of the proposed housing and a bypass could run concurrently. The appropriate community infrastructure will be provided for through legal agreements with developers and the provisions of the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) within the provisions of Policy 19. These will also be coordinated with the investment plans of the major infrastructure providers.	To clarify the link between the provisions of new housing and a bypass at Long Stratton in the sections providing for the locations for major growth in the Norwich Policy Area, the Main Towns, and Access and

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9816 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509]	Comment	Whilst the role of the urban centre of Norwich is key, the RES also explicitly recognises the role that other centres and villages within the sub-region will play in facilitating growth through a balanced approach to housing and employment distribution. The roles highlighted for the main towns and key service centres in addition to Norwich, are also welcomed by EEDA. The role of these locations and their relationship to the main urban areas as part of an interdependent economic system is highlighted in the RES and their importance in considering appropriate levels of development, economic challenges and service provision are all critical to sub-regional success.	Noted. dsw	No change.
10089 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	Comment	Lucky Aylsham!	Noted. dsw	No action required.
9764 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]	Comment	Insufficient knowledge of the areas concerned	The priority areas for growth and new development are proposed within the context of government guidance and the Regional Spatial Strategy. The strategy is intended to be a broad brush approach to the distribution of growth with provisions to improve the local quality of life in accordance with a vision for the area derived from local sustainable community strategies. The Joint Core Strategy is being prepared by council officers with local knowledge and requires approval from the elected local Members of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership local authorities. dsw	No change.
10791 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360]	Comment	All expansions of existing main towns need to be matched or exceeded by measures to reduce the need to travel and to provide sustainable transport provision. It would be desirable to leave all development areas in a better state for sustainable transport than before.	Noted. The strategy provides for the location of new development to reduce the need to travel and provides for the enhancement of non-car transport links. dsw	No change.
8495 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Comment	Shall move to Aylsham at once - then I will know can't be made into a bigger sprawl	Aylsham could accommodate some growth depending on the outcome of further infrastructure studies. The Water Cycle Study Stage 2 is seeking clarification of water quality and sewage discharge issues to establish the true capacity of Aylsham to accommodate new housing	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
9271 - Mrs Gray [5927]	Comment	I could not find locations for major change and development in the NPA so don't know what I am commenting on regarding Wymondham	Chapter 1, the "Executive Summary" summarises the growth provisions for the major growth areas including Wymondham (2200 new homes). Wymondham is detailed further in Chapter 5 "Spatial Vision" pp10/11; Chapter 7 "Policies for Places" Policy 5, p26 and Policy 6 "Main Towns", pp29-31.	No action required.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
10698 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]	Comment	One of our main concerns in the current iteration of the CS is the treatment of Aylsham. Although classed as one of the four 'Main Towns', it is not proposed to make a housing allocation for Aylsham because of the lack of spare capacity in the town's sewage works. The agreement that Stage 2B of the Water Cycle Study will include a specific examination of the sewerage constraints in Aylsham are not as significant as currently stated in the JCS, and thus that an allocation of 300	The Water Cycle Study Stage 2 is seeking clarification of water quality and sewage discharge issues to establish the true capacity of Aylsham to accommodate new housing growth. dsw	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
11079 - Residents of Gibbs Close, Little Melton [8385]	Comment	a) Aylsham's potential for housing growth should be reassessed as the sewerage constraints could be overcome through developer contributions.b) Diss could accommodate more than the proposed 300 dwellings as it has good services and transport links and serves its own rural catchment away from Norwich.c) The Wymondham provisions for 2200 dwellings would be counterproductive by harming its historic market town character and encouraging commuting to Norwich.	a) Following uncertainty, the Water Cycle Study Stage 2 is seeking clarification of water quality and sewage discharge issues to establish the true capacity of Aylsham to accommodate new housing growth. b) The proposed growth for Diss is limited by the low Rural Policy Area total housing growth provisions and the need to balance growth provisions in the rural main towns and key service centres. c) The preferred provisions for new housing growth in Wymondham reflect South Norfolk Council's wishes to retain the form and character of the town, while Policy 13 provides for the retention of the distinctive local character of the main towns. dsw	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
10806 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Comment	All expansions of existing main towns need to be matched or exceeded by measures to reduce the need to travel and to provide sustainable transport provision. It would be desirable to leave all development areas in a better state for sustainable transport than before.	Noted. The strategy provides for the location of new development to reduce the need to travel and provides for the enhancement of non-car transport links. dsw	No change.
8510 - Sunguard Homes [8320]	Comment	The designation of Long Stratton as a main town is supported. It should however include the adjacent land along Chequers Road, administratively within Tharston Civil Parish which is part of the Long Stratton settlement in town planning terms	Noted. dsw	To be clarified in the supporting text to Policy 6 Main Towns or the relevant policy following the proposed reconsideration for consistency of the designation of Long Stratton. (See also response to 9293).
8909 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Comment	Yes they are the main towns but they should not be swamped by development. The overall housing numbers need to be reduced. Long Stratton should not be elevated to main town status	Outside Norwich and the major growth areas, the Main Towns form the main foci for development in accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy and other Government guidance. Aylsham's housing growth provisions will be reconsidered in the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. The status of Long Stratton will be reconsidered for consistency with other settlement categorisation. dsw	(1): Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. Actions (2): Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8117 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	Comment	Wymondham needs improved access to the town centre and the provision of increased friendly car parking	Noted. Improved town centre access will be made in accordance with Policy 16, the needs of new development and the provisions of the Norfolk Local Transport Plan. dsw	No change.
8593 - Mr M Read [8024]	Comment	Brownfield sites only	The JCS seeks to maximise the use of brownfield sites to accommodate growth in accordance with government guidance. dsw	No change.
7917 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	Comment	It is difficult to understand how the jobs get provided	Background evidence including "The Greater Norwich Employment Growth and Employment Sites and Premises Study" has concluded that the required employment growth is achievable. Recent monitoring has suggested that it is being achieved. Potential job growth will include growth in the services, research and development, education and construction sectors, while the strategy area also includes limited major manufacturing firms too. dsw	No change.
9846 - Spen Hill Developments Limited [8201]	Comment	We broadly support the retail hierarchy. We would support the identification of Diss as a 'main town'. The allocation of the centre is therefore consistent with the advice in PPS6. Our representations concern retail provision within Diss. We support the continued allocation of our client's land to the south of Park Road Diss for 'retailing and leisure purposes'. We do not consider that our client's site should be brought forward in line with an Area Action Plan, an application is likely to be before the LPA within the coming months. We consider our client's land should be included within the defined town centre boundary. PPS6 advises that the defined town centre boundaries should include "areas of predominantly leisure, business and other main town centre uses within or adjacent to the primary shopping area". The site is immediately adjacent to the 'Central Business Area'. The inclusion of the land within the defined boundary would maximise the potential to enhance the town centre's vitality and viability.	Noted. The Area Action Plan is to promote the development of the land to the south of Park Road in accordance with existing South Norfolk Local Plan policy. The designation of the Diss central business area/ town centre boundary will be addressed through the production of the Local Development Framework Site Specific Policies Development Plan document. dsw	No change.
10718 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Comment	I agree with valuing the specialness of market towns, but the intrinsic value of established communities in Norwich should also be respected and enhanced, rather than...in order to justify demolition and replacement with "high density" systems which contain elements which are socially flawed due to their layouts.	Policy 18 expects all development to maintain or enhance the quality of life and well being of communities in general. However the Spatial Vision subtly differs in its approach to the benefits of the provisions of focal points for communities under the headings "The Urban Area of Norwich" and "The Rural Area". dsw	Ensure a consistent approach to the Spatial Vision provisions for communities under the headings "The Urban Area of Norwich" and "The Rural Area".

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10303 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	Comment	Increasing housing in Wymondham will not automatically be a good thing for the shops in the town centre - shops are closing in the town centre with the current development. The town is losing it's identity due to the large developments - this is what is causing the town centre to suffer (for example the opening of the large DIY store on the outskirts and it's effect on the business of the DIY store in Wymondham town centre).	While shops may be closing in relation to the current recession is noted, the 2007 Norwich Sub Region and Town Centres Study concluded a moderate retail growth potential which did not take into account the shopping requirements of the (then unknown) potential preferred housing growth provisions for Wymondham. The preferred growth option will support additional shops and services in Wymondham which will also benefit existing residents. dsw	No change
9963 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Comment	No comment	Noted. dsw	No action required.
10915 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Comment	The RSS EoE Plan proposes that market and other towns should also accommodate significant levels of growth. They should have the potential to increase their social and economic sustainability through measures to support regeneration and improve their accessibility, especially by public transport. Four main towns have been identified, Aylsham, Diss, Harleston and Wymondham. We support these proposals. However, in the case of Wymondham, which is only 'main town' to be designated with major development and the only main town within the NPA, we believe the proposed infrastructure improvements will come forward as a result of the proposals supported under the Favoured Option.	Noted. dsw	No change.
9392 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Comment	Surely these all are or have been main towns. But by closing down various portions of their sustainability people have been (made?) to travel	The Main Towns have been designated within the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy as foci for sustainable growth. Further growth provisions will support services and facilities and reduce the need to travel. dsw	No change.
9852 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Comment	For the emerging Spatial Vision for the NPA to conform with the RSS the provision of new homes across the Policy Area during the Plan period should be regarded as a minimum. Pending the review of the RSS (H1) and given that the current provision set by the RSS significantly falls short of what is needed for the region based on evidence about housing pressure, affordability and household projections; it becomes increasingly important to consider the number of dwellings associated in the Policy Area as a minimum. Important to ensure there is sufficient flexibility within the Partnership's emerging Spatial Strategy to allow for the delivery of a greater number of residential units throughout the Plan period to achieve higher rates of provision, subject to environmental and infrastructure constraints.	The proposed housing provisions are already considered to be a minimum by the inclusion in Policy 14 "Housing Delivery" of the words "at least 35750 new homes...". This could be further emphasised by the addition of the words "at least" to preface the reference to the Norwich Policy Area housing provision in Policy 14. dsw	Policy 14 - to add the words "at least" to preface the Policy 14 references to housing provisions in the Norwich Policy Area.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10537 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Comment	Parking will be a problem in all these locations.	Improved parking will be provided for in accordance with the needs of new development and the provisions of the Norfolk Local Transport Plan. The overall proposals for growth are also intended to reduce the need to travel and provide for enhanced transport alternatives to the car which should also have an impact on the need for car parking.	No change.
8361 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	Object	Significant investment in terms of building new sewage/water facilities is needed before Aylsham, Diss and Harleston can even be considered as 'main towns' and Long Stratton will require major development before it reaches this status. Only Wymondham already fulfils the criteria	Noted. Certain services are known to be operating at or near capacity and will require improvement or replacement. Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving the necessary services.	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
8739 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Object	It will ruin the character of Wymondham	Noted. Policy 13 requires new development to respect the distinctive and historic character of the market towns including Wymondham. The major growth areas will be supplemented by the provision of "green infrastructure" to provide for natural open space and enhanced local landscape. dsw	No change.
10106 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	Object	Whilst investment in improvements in these areas is valid the proposed housing development is too large.	The total levels and distribution of housing growth have been provided for within the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy and other government guidance which requires most new development to be located in places with good accessibility to jobs, services and facilities required to meet everyday needs, while reducing the need to travel and reliance on the car. dsw	No change.
9829 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	Object	Aylsham, as BDC's only market town, should be allocated housing subject to a satisfactory conclusion being reached on sewage!	The Water Cycle Study Stage 2 is seeking clarification of water quality and sewage discharge issues to establish the true capacity of Aylsham to accommodate new housing growth. dsw	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
10461 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10489 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	No development.	Noted. The total levels and distribution of housing growth have been provided for within the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy which is the adopted government policy. dsw	No change.
7882 - Mr Paul Mallett [7783]	Object	No further destruction of Wymondham town centre must take place. No more shopping space is needed, simply better use of existing units/buildings and using the new gateway estate	The 2007 Norwich Sub Region and Town Centres Retail Study concluded that modest retail growth was required in Wymondham, excluding the needs of potential additional major housing growth. Any expansion of the town centre is expected to respect its distinctive and historic character. The strategy also seeks to maximise the use of brownfield sites in accordance with government guidance. dsw	No change.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11146 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	Object	a) We support the growth provisions for Aylsham, Diss, Harleston and Wymondham.b) We object to the designation of Long Stratton as a Main Town and its provisions for housing growth.	a) Noted. b) The wide range of services and facilities in Long Stratton with some improvement can sustain major growth. The designation of Long Stratton as a Main Town requires reconsideration for consistency with the designations of other settlements coinciding with major growth areas.	Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.
10667 - Mrs Lyn Robertson	Object	I believe that Wymondham has already been saturated with development and that Aylsham and Harleston are too far from Norwich to provide economical public transport links as well as having a strong rural identity which would be swamped by additional large development. Diss on the borders of the county could be developed further to provide jobs locally and the rail network to London improved and made more reliable.	The growth proposed for the Main Towns is also intended to reflect the strategy's provisions for the retention of their distinctive Norfolk character. Aylsham and Harleston are important centres serving rural catchments not so dependent on Norwich. The housing provisions for Aylsham will be the subject of a review within the context of the outcomes of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. The housing provisions for Diss reflect the relatively low growth proposed for the Rural Policy Area and the need to distribute growth provisions between the main rural centres and larger villages to aid rural regeneration. dsw	No change other than to review the housing provisions for Aylsham within the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
8520 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	Object	Harleston should be excluded as the lack of commercial bus operation means a growth (larger) in non sustainable travel	Harleston is well served by public transport. dsw	No change
9041 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Object	Strategic development in satellite towns is unsustainable for the reasons stated	Reasons not attached to this response. Settlement Hierarchy settlements are designated to accommodate growth in accordance with the provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy. Certain services are known to be operating at or near capacity and will require improvement or replacement. dsw	Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of achieving this.
9569 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	Object	Not applicable to Drayton	Noted as a matter of fact. dsw	No change.
8624 - Kay Eke [8025]	Object	Main towns should be allocated in terms of their proximity to Norwich. If the intention is to reduce travel etc, would it not make more sense to develop those towns which are furthest away from the City Centre and thereby provide their residents with enhanced facilities	Most of the proposed housing growth is to be accommodated within the Norwich Policy Area which includes the potential Main Towns of Wymondham and Long Stratton, other key service centres and large villages with potential for development. The remaining Main Towns have a wide range of services and will provide the foci for most housing growth in the Rural Policy Area, subject to a reconsideration of Aylsham growth provisions within the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. dsw	No change subject to the reconsideration of the growth provisions for Aylsham within the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2, and the status of Long Stratton for consistency.
9519 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Object	Diss could do with investment	Implicit support noted. dsw	No change required.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9193 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	You should choose to use a railway line - so DBS and Wymondham are OK but not Aylsham and Harleston - take Hoveton/Wroxham and N. Walsham instead	Outside Norwich and the major growth areas, the designated Main Towns form the main foci for development in accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy and other Government guidance. Aylsham's housing growth provisions will be reconsidered in the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. The status of Long Stratton will be reconsidered for consistency with other settlement categorisation. Wroxham and North Walsham are outside the Joint Core Strategy area.	(1): Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. Actions (2): Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.
9560 - Cllr John Francis Pitt-Pladdy [8147]	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Process too 'top-down' 2. Infrastructure needs not fully assessed 3. Planning guidelines too opaque for public to understand 4. Full traffic surveys of towns required as part of overall 	<p>The priority areas for growth and new development are proposed within the context of government guidance and the Regional Spatial Strategy. The strategy is intended to be a broad brush approach to the distribution of growth with provisions to ensure the appropriate provisions of infrastructure, services and facilities to improve the general quality of life and provide for everyday needs. Infrastructure needs are being assessed through the consultation process. Certain services are known to be operating at or near capacity and will require improvement or replacement.</p> <p>Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving the necessary services. Detailed local issues will be resolved through the Site Specific policies Development Plan Document. Traffic assessments are being carried out where necessary to inform the provisions for growth.</p> <p>dsw</p>	No change.
8933 - Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079] 9329 - Ms Celia Viner [8123] 9387 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	Object	Wymondham cannot sustain significant growth, its doctors, dentist and schools are already full and roads are extremely busy.	<p>Certain services are known to be operating at or near capacity and will require improvement or replacement. Secondary education provision in Wymondham remains to be resolved.</p> <p>dsw</p>	Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of achieving all required provisions.
8892 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	Object	Wymondham does not lose retail trade to Norwich - trade has been driven out by SNDC policy. Compare with Dereham	<p>Wymondham loses trade to Norwich due to market forces, the ease of access to Norwich and the physical difficulties in expanding Wymondham's historic town centre for retailing development. Current planning policies have provided for both edge-of-centre and out-of-centre retailing in Wymondham. Future retailing development will be provided for by Policy 12 "The Hierarchy of Centres" and government planning policy guidance.</p> <p>dsw</p>	No change.
9702 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	Object	As mentioned previously, 1800 in Long Stratton is too many without specific employment areas to support this number and with certainty that infrastructure will keep pace with development, so existing residents are not affected. More commuting to Norwich will increase already large traffic flows on A140.	<p>The strategy provides for small scale employment opportunities within the proposed major growth areas. Additional employment land will be allocated in general through the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document in accordance with the provisions of Policy 15.</p> <p>dsw</p>	No change.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10319 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Object	We recognise market towns listed may need to accommodate some growth within the spatial strategy for the Greater Norwich area. We have concern how this development will be sensitively integrated into the existing settlement and its wider landscape. We would like to see specific policy commitments on the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and use of appropriate local materials, in this section. The level of growth proposed at Wymondham needs to be lowered. An addition of 2200 homes will lead to a population increase of 40%, putting too much pressure on local services and significantly affect the historical character of the town. A new housing estate will not enhance the special qualities of Wymondham or its surroundings, but simply set apart the old part and the new part of the town in a striking way. We cannot support the principle of delivering new homes in Long Stratton simply to provide developer subsidy for a bypass. The need to make Long Stratton a Main Town is thus questionable.	<p>Policy 13 "Reducing Environmental Impact" refers to the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and the use of locally sourced materials wherever possible. However it is accepted that these provisions should be enhanced within the strategy.</p> <p>The preferred level of growth at Wymondham reflects the consideration of its impact on the town's form and character, and is based on the town's services, facilities and good accessibility. Every effort will be made to integrate the new growth with the existing development through the master planning process.</p> <p>The choice of Long Stratton for significant housing growth reflects its existing good range of services and facilities which will be enhanced in relation to the proposed growth. The potential support for a bypass will be a benefit arising from the preferred level of growth. The designation of Long Stratton as a Main Town however should be reviewed for consistency with the designation of other settlements which coincide with other major growth locations. dsw</p>	<p>(1): To amend and enhance the policy provisions for the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and the use of locally sourced materials.</p> <p>(2): Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other settlements also subject to significant growth.</p>
7876 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	Object	Leave well alone	General objection noted. dsw	No change.
7907 - Norfolk Homes Ltd (Mr Terence Harper) [6956]	Object	Aylsham should be proposed for sizeable housing allocations (say 500 houses), being ideally suited and not actually restricted by sewerage discharge	The Water Cycle Study Stage 2 is seeking clarification of water quality and sewage discharge issues to establish the true capacity of Aylsham to accommodate new housing growth. dsw	Policy 6 - To reconsider growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
8253 - R Barker [6805] 7942 - mr David Jones [7816] 8658 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8682 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	Object	Long Stratton should not be classed as a Main Town and should remain as a service centre.	The proposed reclassification reflects the perceived future role of the settlement post proposed growth. dsw	Policy 6/para 7.15- Long Stratton's designation will be reconsidered for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.
10585 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.	Noted. The total levels and distribution of housing growth have been provided for within the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy and other government planning policy guidance, and the constraints raised by the respondents to the earlier Regulation 25 technical consultation. The Water Cycle Study Stage 2 is seeking clarification of water quality and sewage discharge issues to establish the true capacity of Aylsham to accommodate new housing growth.	No change subject to specific reasons covered under Question 28, and the reconsideration of the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10241 - Mr Duncan Smith [8257]	Object	I object strongly to the building of lots of houses in and near to Norwich. It is destroying the countryside and making us like the huge built-up areas in the Midlands and	The total levels and distribution of housing growth have been provided for within the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy which focuses growth on Norwich as a Key Centre for Development and Change, and other places within the Norwich Policy Area with good accessibility to jobs, services and facilities while reducing the need to travel and reliance on the car. dsw	No change.
8385 - M Harrold [7966]	Object	The decision not to make a new housing allocation at Aylsham is base on the mistaken assumption that sewage treatment cannot easily be provided. Our consultants have demonstrated that sewerage treatment can easily be provided for a new allocation by extending the existing STW, or by building an on-site STW	Noted. The Water Cycle Study Stage 2 is seeking clarification of water quality and sewage discharge issues to establish the true capacity of Aylsham to accommodate new housing growth. dsw	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
9358 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	Object	Acle need to be included as it has good transport links (i.e. trains & frequent buses)	Acle qualifies as a Key Service Centre within the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy and government guidance. Its services are insufficient to qualify as a Main Town albeit the good quality public transport links are acknowledged.	No change.
9025 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535]	Object	Strongly disagree that Aylsham does not have the capacity for additional growth give the capacity in the town for employment and the services provided. It is identified as having the fourth highest level of shops and services outside Norwich, available employment land and spare capacity at its schools	The Water Cycle Study Stage 2 is seeking clarification of water quality and sewage discharge issues to establish the true capacity of Aylsham to accommodate new housing growth. dsw	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
10562 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Object	Leave things as they are.	Noted. The total levels and distribution of housing growth have been provided for within the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy which is the adopted government policy. dsw	No change.
9293 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Object	No main town for Long Stratton, small amount of development with no bypass so we can remain rural	Long Stratton has a good range of services capable of supporting growth. The proposed Main Town reclassification reflects the perceived future role of the settlement post proposed growth. A reconsideration would confirm the consistency of this designation. dsw	Policy 6/para 7.15 - Long Stratton's designation will be reconsidered for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth. (See also response to 8510)
11118 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Object	The "Main Town" status for Long Stratton should be referred to in the main part of Policy 6 for clarity, and not just in the supporting text.	Although it has significant services able to support growth, the designation of Long Stratton as a Main Town should be reviewed for consistency with the designation of other settlements which coincide with other major growth locations. dsw	Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other settlements also subject to significant growth.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7966 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Support	Diss is currently dying on its feet and needs help to prevent the business area becoming a dead area. Again the bribery for a by pass at Long Stratton the shops here are described as being good but compared with Harleston are pathetic	Diss and Harleston are designated Main Towns to accommodate Rural Policy Area housing development. The 2007 Norwich Sub Region and Town Centres Retail Study supported moderate retail growth for Diss and modest retail growth for Harleston. The currently proposed housing growth will support additional retail growth on top of this. Long Stratton has a wide range of services capable of supporting part of the growth requirements of the Norwich Policy Area which will also contribute towards a new bypass and support additional retail growth. dsw	No change
10616 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	Support	This would seem to respond to the demand for housing for local people in their own local areas.	Noted. dsw	No change.
8003 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	Support	I think there is a need to regenerate the site at Park Road Diss but there has already been a lot of development along Victoria Road and query if the school, doctors etc can cope with the number of people proposed - same comments for Harleston	The area to the south of Park Road, Diss allocated for retail and leisure development in the South Norfolk Local Plan is the subject of an Area Action Plan to promote its development. The need for this development land allocation has been supported by the conclusions of the 2007 Norwich Sub Region and Town Centres Retail Study. Certain services are known to be operating at or near capacity and will require improvement or replacement. dsw	Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving the necessary services.
7884 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	Support	Major market towns must be allowed to expand, but not by just using supermarkets, they have virtually killed Diss' town centre as has the lack of access and free parking, it is quicker for us to use the Eye post office rather than the Diss one	Noted. The 2007 Norwich Sub Region and Town Centres Retail Study supported a moderate retail growth for Diss that will be provided for adjacent to the town centre in a location easily accessible by non-car forms of transport. All Diss supermarket development has occurred within the defined town centre in accordance with government planning policy guidance. dsw	No change
8207 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	Support	What happens if Wymondham and Harleston becomes a citta-slow town? You should be seeking to apply the citta-slow philosophy to all towns	It is up to town councils to apply for Cittaslow status which sets a series of goals to improve the local quality of life, and can be used as a context for the joint improvement of local services and facilities using third party funding. Policy 18 "Communities and Culture" proposes a holistic approach to the improvement of local quality of life as supplemented by polices . dsw	No change
8182 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	Support	But does Cittaslow status still exist in Diss or funding has been withdrawn/ceased?!	Diss has had Cittaslow status since 2006. Funding is not directly available for schemes but the Cittaslow organisation sets a series of goals to improve the local quality of life against which member towns self assess themselves and use as a context for the implementation of improvements to services and facilities with third party funding.	No change.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10853 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]

Support

NOTE: in the descriptions of Main Towns and Key Service Centres, Diss and Harleston are identified as requiring a new water supply for any further development while growth in Aylsham, Hethersett, Reepham and Wroxham is shown to be limited to varying degrees at present by existing sewer capacity. The common recurrence of these themes points to a likelihood that they will be major issues with the scale of development envisaged and it is surprising that descriptions for some of the larger developments proposed, such as North East Norwich or Wymondham, omit mention of these vital prerequisites.

The references to water supply and sewerage capacities are included for information where existing settlements are likely to be the subject of significant growth. The proposed major growth areas will all require adequate water supplies and sewerage provisions among other things through the provision of new infrastructure. Further detail is required to clarify the key infrastructure required to enable the implementation of the proposed growth areas.
dsw

To clarify the key infrastructure requirements of the major growth areas under Policy 5 "Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area".

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9223 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8569 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 10367 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] 9154 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 9880 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] 8606 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] 11134 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 10053 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 9234 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 10218 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	Support	Support	Noted dsw	None
8813 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] 11050 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] 9934 - John Heaser [7015] 9110 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 10513 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] 10770 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 8964 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]				
8272 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8297 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915] 8545 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 9677 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 8732 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8840 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 8978 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 8995 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093] 9115 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111] 9169 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] 9429 - Swannington with Alderford				

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9488 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139] 9603 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] 9728 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] 10981 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] 9996 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10030 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10129 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10181 - Commercial Land [8246]				
10398 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] 10434 - Mr J E Youngs [8308] 10828 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10891 - Broadland Land Trust 9454 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	Support	- Left blank -	Noted. dsw	No change
10344 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	Support	But you run the risk of changing the character of Wymondham if it is overdeveloped with too many houses and shops.	The preferred provisions for new housing growth reflect South Norfolk Council's wishes to retain the form and character of Wymondham, while the strategy provides for the retention of the distinctive Norfolk character of the main towns. dsw	No change.
8157 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	Support	What plans are there for services infrastructure shortcomings?	Policy 19 requires the appropriate services to accompany new development. Certain services are known to be operating at or near capacity and will require improvement or replacement. Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of achieving this. Funding will be provided through legal agreements with developers and potentially the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). dsw	No change
8060 - Cedric Brown [7871]	Support	I am very concerned that Aylsham has had further development without the infrastructure	New development will be accompanied by the necessary infrastructure. Proposed new growth for Aylsham has been deferred pending the clarification of water quality and sewage discharge issues to establish the true capacity of Aylsham to accommodate new housing growth. dsw	Policy 6 - To reconsider growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10737 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)	Support	Yes, in principal, but require clarification as to how suitable expansions of Aylsham Town Centre would be achieved. The Town Council would be opposed to out of centre retail development.	Aylsham's housing growth provisions will be reconsidered in the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. All provisions for growth will be addressed through the designation of the appropriate town centre boundary and development land allocations through the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. dsw	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
8232 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] dsw 8428 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	Support	Support	noted	none
9797 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Support	The scale of expansion is low relative to the size of these town, with the exception of Hethersett.	It is also not low in relation to other places such as Cringleford and Easton which reflects the need to allocate growth in places with good services and facilities and good access to employment areas related to Norwich. dsw	No change.
8788 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	Support	But what about North Walsham.	North Walsham is in North Norfolk district and outside the JCS area. dsw	No action required.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

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

Decision on (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

(1): Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Actions (2): Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.

No change subject to specific reasons covered under Question 28, and the reconsideration of the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

1): To amend and enhance the policy provisions for the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and the use of locally sourced materials.

(2): Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other settlements also subject to significant growth.

Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.

Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of achieving all required provisions.

(1): Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Actions (2): Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.

No change subject to the reconsideration of the growth provisions for Aylsham within the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2, and the status of Long Stratton for consistency.

Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Policy 6 - To reconsider growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

No change other than to review the housing provisions for Aylsham within the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Policy 6/para 7.15- Long Stratton's designation will be reconsidered for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.

Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of achieving this.

Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Add references to the "Executive Summary" to note the emphasise on the provisions for growth required in the Norwich Policy Area, cross refer to the relevant chapters/policies and annotate the summary table of housing provisions to clarify the Norwich Policy Area and Rural Policy Area provisions.

Policy 6 - To reconsider growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

To clarify the link between the provisions of new housing and a bypass at Long Stratton in the sections providing for the locations for major growth in the Norwich Policy Area, the Main Towns, and Access and Transportation

Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other settlements also subject to significant growth.

Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving the necessary services.				
To be clarified in the supporting text to Policy 6 Main Towns or the relevant policy following the proposed reconsideration for consistency of the designation of Long Stratton. (See also response to 9293).				
Policy 6/para 7.15 - Long Stratton's designation will be reconsidered for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth. (See also response to 8510)				
Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.				
Policy 14 - to add the words "at least" to preface the Policy 14 references to housing provisions in the Norwich Policy Area.				
Ensure a consistent approach to the Spatial Vision provisions for communities under the headings "The Urban Area of Norwich" and "The Rural Area".				
To clarify the key infrastructure requirements of the major growth areas under Policy 5 "Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area".				
<i>(Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</i>				
8910 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Comment	Agree these are the Key Service Centres but due to past over development, care must be taken to protect the remains of their character.	Policy 13 states that all development will make efficient use of land with the density of development varying according to the type of area while being designed to a high standard to respect and enhance local distinctiveness and character. This policy is subject to review to accentuate the provisions to promote good design and to respect local distinctiveness. (DSW)	Action: To maintain the policy references to respecting local distinctiveness including the varied character of our market towns and villages. (DSW)
8814 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]	Comment	Should be decided by local residents	All local residents will have had the opportunity to comment on the settlement hierarchy & key service centre during the public consultation so their views will be taken into account, although it will ultimately be for Members to decide which key service centres form part of the submission document.	None
10792 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] 10807 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Comment	All expansions of Key Service Centres and Main Towns need measures to reduce the need to travel and provide for sustainable transport.	The definitions of Main Towns and Key Service Centres reflect their good accessibility, public transport access and services and facilities that reduce the need to travel for residents of proposed new housing development. Policy 16 provides for enhanced public transport to serve the Main Towns and Key Service Centres while sustainable transport is to be enhanced in general through the policies of the Norfolk Local transport Plan. (DSW)	Action: No change. (DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9773 - Mr Michael Whalley [8189]	Comment	Blofield is supported as a Key Service Centre but should have a greater provision for housing growth.	Noted. The housing provision figures should be considered to be a minimum within the context of the provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy. The proposed policies provide for additional housing growth as infill and small groups of housing. Blofield will also be considered for potential new housing land allocations to contribute towards the preferred growth strategy requirement for an additional 2000 dwellings on small sites within the Broadland district share of the Norwich Policy Area. (DSW)	Action (1): To consider the potential accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Blofield in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. Action (2): To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision. (DSW)
11068 - Mr R W Kidner [5016]	Comment	Poringland: Agree with the choice of Key Service centres but require new employment land in Poringland such as part of a mixed use development	Policy 7 provides for the promotion of local employment opportunities. This will include the consideration of potential employment sites in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)	To consider the needs for and allocation of employment sites in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)
9817 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509]	Comment	The roles highlighted for the Main Towns and Key Service Centres in addition to Norwich are welcomed by EEDA.	Noted. (DSW)	Action: No change. (DSW)
9395 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Comment	Are these not already important locations with out giving them fancy new names to confuse people into thinking otherwise	The names used in the settlement hierarchy are taken from the East of England Plan. The policy wording and supporting text seeks to make it clear to readers - the intention is certainly not to confuse. RBC	None
8118 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	Comment	Is buliding on productive land a sustainable policy?	The Core Strategy seeks to maximise the use of 'brownfield' sites as well as avoiding development on the best agricultural land. However, greenfield development is necessary in order to meet the housing requirement. GNDP will seek to reduce the amount of land required through good design, site choice and increased densities. RBC	None
8711 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Comment	Where there are villages close to main towns and key service centres, is there not a case for limited development in them of both additional housing and associated small business capacity? A hub and spoke approach should prove advantageous in terms of reduced destruction of large areas of countryside, less travel to work and assist in stemming village demise.	The proposed settlement hierarchy provides for housing and small scale commercial development in a large number of villages based on their services provision and ease of access to alternative services in nearby places.	Action: No change. (DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10320 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Comment	<p>â€¢ Concerned regarding the sensitive integration of the proposed development into the existing settlements and the wider landscape.</p> <p>â€¢ Would like a specific policy commitment to the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and the use of appropriate local materials in this section.</p> <p>â€¢ Requests housing land allocations and a policy in this section to address local housing needs.</p>	<p>Policy 13 provides for varying densities to suit the type of area, the protection of landscape and townscape character, high standards of design, respect for local distinctiveness and the use of locally sourced materials wherever possible. However it is accepted that these provisions could be enhanced within the strategy.</p> <p>Policy 14 provides generically for a mix of housing and a proportion of affordable housing on otherwise market housing sites, and provides in appropriate settlements for schemes that specifically meet an identified local need for affordable homes. Paragraph 8.8 provides for affordable homes "exceptions sites" to be allocated through the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document in settlements defined as "Other Villages" and above within the Settlement Hierarchy. This reflects national government guidance which cannot be repeated in the policy. (DSW) Support noted.</p>	Action: To amend and enhance the policy provisions for the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and the use of locally sourced materials. (DSW)
10916 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Comment	<p>Wymondham:</p> <p>â€¢ Promotes the advantages of selecting Wymondham as a major growth location (and South Wymondham in particular in relation to other preferred growth locations) with regard to transport, education provision, town centre improvements, existing facilities, retail provision/capacity, and the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>â€¢ Queries how the choice of Wymondham as a sustainable growth location will link with longer term investment strategies to provide drainage and transportation solutions in particular.</p> <p>â€¢ Suggests that greater growth (such as 6500 dwellings and new employment) is required to provide for more comprehensive solutions to access to the A11, secondary education, primary schools, new health centres and major open space provision</p>	<p>Re the drainage and transportation issues, Policy 19 is intended to provide for the provision of the appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>Slight increases in the overall growth provisions for Wymondham may arise from the current policy provisions for infill and small groups of housing, plus the potential consideration in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document of sites to contribute towards the favoured growth option including 1800 dwellings on small sites within the South Norfolk district share of the Norwich Policy Area. (DSW)</p>	Action: To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Wymondham in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)
9643 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Comment	<p>Same as for question 14, it should be made clear that some of the Key Service Centres do not contribute towards the housing requirements/provision of the Norwich Policy Area.</p>	<p>Policy 7 sets out proposed levels of development in the Key Service Centres. Of those listed only Blofield, Brundall, Hethersett and Poringland/Framingham Earl are within the Norwich Policy Area.</p>	Consider using an * or similar notation to distinguish Norwich Policy Area Key Service Centres in submission document
8645 - Mr Alan Cant [8032]	Comment	<p>The pressure to meet housing targets should not favour higher density developments, especially in villages which deserve developments sympathetic to existing surroundings and highways.</p>	<p>Policy 13 states that all development will make efficient use of land with the density of development varying according to the type of area while being designed to a high standard to respect and enhance local distinctiveness and character.</p> <p>This policy is subject to review to accentuate the provisions to promote sustainability and address climate</p>	Action: To maintain the policy references to development density reflecting the characteristics and accessibility of particular areas. (DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
11062 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] 10164 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	Comment	<p>Wroxham:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ Agree role as a Key Service Centre and the growth proposed. â€¢ Suggest that the growth proposed should not be reduced in the case of provision being reviewed in Aylsham. â€¢ Development could produce the opportunity for public open space and community facilities for which local views are being sought. <p>11062 makes the above plus the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ Growth targets should not be expressed as ceilings â€¢ Growth levels should be based on landscape and infrastructure capacities â€¢ Points made in favour of potential development land to the south of Wroxham. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>There are no proposals at this stage to reduce provisions in Wroxham arising from the review of provisions in Aylsham.</p> <p>The strategy provides for the developer funding of community facilities.</p> <p>All growth provisions are a minimum and allocations will be supplemented by additional infill housing development. The relevant wording requires clarification regarding this.</p> <p>Landscape and infrastructure capacities are relevant factors in the allocation of land for development.</p> <p>Potential sites for development will be assessed as part of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)</p>	<p>Action: To add the appropriate text to clarify that the housing provision figures represent a minimum provision. (DSW)</p>
7918 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	Comment	<p>Second homes should be restricted particularly in the villages to ensure infrastructure is used by local</p>	<p>The distribution of second homes reflects market forces and is beyond the control of the Joint Core Strategy. Other means of their discouragement are possibly such as through the setting of higher levels of local authority council tax. (DSW)</p>	<p>Action: No change. (DSW)</p>
9964 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Comment	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Noted RBC</p>	<p>None</p>
8594 - Mr M Read [8024]	Comment	<p>Brownfield sites only</p>	<p>The JCS will seek to maximise the use of previously developed sites but the availability of such sites and the levels of growth proposed mean that some greenfield allocations will be required. RBC</p>	<p>None</p>
10697 - Mr A Semmence [6362]	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ Hingham - supports status but requests its growth to be expressed as a minimum as per Regional Spatial Strategy housing totals â€¢ requests a minimum of 100 dwellings for Hingham plus employment and service development appropriate to the needs of the town and its rural hinterland. â€¢ Reminds the GNPD of the respondent's submitted development site which is suitable, available and developable. 	<p>Hingham support noted. All such provisions are a minimum and allocations will be supplemented by additional infill housing development. Employment uses will be promoted and services provided for within a central business area to be defined in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (</p> <p>All submitted potential development sites will be considered during the preparation of the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)</p>	<p>Action: To add the appropriate text to clarify that the housing provision figures represent a minimum provision. (DSW)</p>
11103 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	<p>Loddon: Supports growth which should be increased to some 350 dwellings.</p>	<p>Support noted. The provision for new housing in Loddon is limited by the relatively small provision for new housing development in the Rural Policy Area and the need to balance new growth between the Main Towns, Key Service Centres and the Service Villages. (DSW)</p>	<p>No change. (DSW)</p>

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9786 - East Carleton Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1997]	Comment	Concerned that the current infrastructure is already overstretched and that the Key Service Centres will have insufficient development to fund the additional services such as schools and health care to support the proposed expansion in both the Key Service Centres and the neighbouring villages reliant on those services.	Certain services are known to be operating at or near their limits and discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving them. (DSW)	Action: No change. (DSW)
9624 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Comment	<p>â€¢ The settlements appear to have been selected on the basis of their levels of services rather than their functions. Detailed analyses of the functions, constraints and potential of settlements should inform the plans.</p> <p>â€¢ There is an inconsistent approach to the scales of housing growth and the presence of constraints, e.g. at Acle and Brundall, and a lack of reasoning for linking growth at Acle with the lack of potential at Aylsham.</p> <p>â€¢ There should be more evidence of the needs and potentials of settlements other than just the provision of housing numbers.</p> <p>â€¢ Greater recognition is required of how to avoid these settlements becoming further entrenched as Norwich commuter settlements</p>	<p>The choice of settlements reflects the service and facilities provisions of government guidance in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (The East of England Plan), known service capacities and known functions inherited from the Norfolk Structure Plan and existing local plans.</p> <p>The relating of housing growth in Acle to that in Aylsham reflects the need to accommodate a significant share of Broadland district's Rural Policy Area housing provision within higher level sustainable places in the Settlement Hierarchy, due to a lack of alternative sustainable locations with the appropriate services and accessibility in lower order villages.</p> <p>Local employment opportunities will be promoted (through the Site Specific Policies development Plan Document) to improve the balance between new housing growth and local jobs.</p> <p>Further justification of the Settlement Hierarchy will be produced in the Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper, a supporting document. (DSW)</p> <p>Poringland is shown to represent its Key Service Centre status and will have potential for infill and small groups of housing development, irrespective of any additional allocations. Poringland and Blofield will also be the subject of reviews regarding the potential allocation of land for the additional 1800 homes on smaller sites to be found in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area and the additional 2000 homes requiring sites in the Broadland district share respectively. (DSW)</p>	<p>Action (1):To add supporting text to Policy 7 "Key Service centres" to clarify the functions of the centres within the context of the RSS and where relevant, previous structure and local plan policies.</p> <p>Action (2): To clarify the basis of the settlement hierarchy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper. (DSW)</p>
10149 - R Smith [8243]	Comment	Of the Key Service Centres in the Norwich Policy Area, queries the need to include Poringland when no further growth is proposed and considers that Blofield should have higher growth provisions due to its lack of	Of the Key Service Centres in the Norwich Policy Area, queries the need to include Poringland when no further growth is proposed and considers that Blofield should have higher growth provisions due to its lack of	Action: To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Blofield and Poringland in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)
10090 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	Comment	Acceptable if the Hingham and Hethersett numbers are reduced	<p>The provisions for both places reflect their jobs, services and facilities to provide sustainable locations for the housing provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy (The East of England Plan) for the Norwich Policy Area, and by deduction the Rural Policy Area. (DSW)</p> <p>Action: No change. (DSW)</p>	No change. (DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8496 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Object	Hethersett/ Reepham/ Wroxham: object to excess levels of new housing growth in all three of these places	All three places meet the relevant Regional Spatial Strategy (East of England Plan) services criteria for the accommodation of growth. The proposed growth for Wroxham also takes into account its close links with the services and facilities in the adjacent town of Hoveton. The levels of growth reflect service capacities and while certain services are known to be operating at or near their limits, discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving them. The provisions for Hethersett may be reconsidered in the context of the potential need to accommodate part of the provisions for smaller sites in the Norwich Policy Area. (DSW)	Action: No change. (DSW)
10107 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	Object	Housing development should be retained in Norwich on brown field sites and at a new town at Long Stratton where the development can be properly planned.	A spread of potential housing land allocations is required to provide for a wide choice of housing developments in a range of sustainable locations with easy access to jobs, services and facilities. Norwich and Long Stratton are proposed as two such locations as required throughout the plan area. (DSW)	No change. (DSW)
9520 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Object	The areas will lose their charm if they are further developed. Wroxham is regularly at a standstill in the summer months owing to the traffic increase.	Policy 13 states that all development will make efficient use of land with the density of development varying according to the type of area while being designed to a high standard to respect and enhance local distinctiveness and character. This policy is subject to review to accentuate the provisions to promote good design and to respect local distinctiveness. The main areas for new development are intended to provide for everyday needs to reduce the need to travel and have good accessibility by a choice of means of travel. (DSW)	Action: To maintain the policy references to respecting local distinctiveness including the varied character of our market towns and villages. (DSW)
10982 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	Object	The Key Service Centres are too dominant in relation to the Service Villages with too great a proportion of new housing land allocations.	The strategy provides for new housing development in accordance with the provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (The East of England Plan). This concentrates most new general housing growth in Norwich, the Main Towns and the Key Service Centres. The RSS acknowledges that the villages are dependant upon the Key Service Centres and higher order places for everyday needs and that the main challenges in villages include providing housing for a full range of local needs. As a result of the Regulation 25 Technical Consultation 2008, the Settlement Hierarchy is being reviewed to reappraise in particular the designation of the Service Villages and Other Villages. This may increase the number of villages designated for limited growth and would reduce the balance of village growth in favour of the Key Service Centres. (DSW)	Action: To complete the review of the Settlement Hierarchy and revise the designations of the "Service Villages" and "Other Villages" as required. (DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9026 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] 8045 - Shane Hull [7857] 8409 - pete eldrige [7990] 9194 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] 9503 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]	Object	Existing settlement infrastructure unable to cope with additional growth	The GNPD has been working closely with various service providers to ensure that the necessary improvements to infrastructure required as a result of growth are understood, co-ordinated and planned. This includes discussions with the Local Education Authority and Highway Authority on education and transport (including public transport) issues.	None
9416 - Mr David Gladwell [8126]	Object	Loddon: Queries the consideration given to the use of the River Chet, the lack of publicity for Pyes Mill as a public amenity, sewage discharges from new development entering the river and the adverse impact of local car parking charges.	Policy 15 provides for the promotion of tourism, leisure and cultural elements including the implementation of the Green infrastructure Strategy which will provide for the enhanced use of public open space. Policy 17 protects the area's environmental assets and Policy 18 provides for the protection and enhancement of existing leisure facilities. Sewage treatment facilities. Any sewage discharges to the river system will be the subject of the Environmental Agency's Consent Standards and processes such as phosphate stripping. Where possible the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems will be encouraged. (DSW)	Action: No change (DSW)
9570 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] 7877 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	Object	Object	Noted RBC	None
10462 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10490 - Mr I T Smith [8310] 10563 - Mr G P Collings [8318]				
8999 - Mr & Mrs Roger Brown [5038]	Object	1) Conflict with Spatial Planning objectives 6, 7, 10 and 11 2) Village facilities extremely limited 3) Suggested building plot wholly inappropriate 4) Small business proposals in Yelverton already refused	1) Development in the Key Service Centres would meet the stated objectives which cover a ready access to services, the provision of educational facilities, enhanced infrastructure provision and development locations reducing the need to travel by car. 2) The Key Service Centres meet the required service provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy. Villages with limited services have provisions for very limited development. 3) This comment cannot be answered out of context. Particular development sites will be identified through the Site Specific Policies development Plan Document. 4) Yelverton is contiguous with part of Alington and together proposed as an "Other Village" for infill development and small scale business uses. However its position in the proposed Settlement Hierarchy is the subject of a review. 5) Assuming the Yelverton area is being referred to, rural roads in general are not the safest but the choices of most new development locations provides for access by non-car forms of transport to reduce the pressure on	Action: No change other than changes arising from the Settlement Hierarchy review.

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7908 - Norfolk Homes Ltd (Mr Terence Harper) [6956]	Object	Aylsham should be a key service centre and the location for sizeable housing growth (e.g. 500 houses), as sewage discharge is not restricted and Anglian Water proposes an extension to the sewage treatment works.	The Water Cycle Study Stage 2 is seeking clarification of the water quality and sewage discharge issues to establish to true capacity of Aylsham to accommodate new housing growth. (DSW)	Action: Policy 6 - to reconsider Aylsham's growth provisions to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. (DSW)
9703 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	Object	Long Stratton should not become a town until it has sufficient employment opportunities to support it. An in-depth plan should be drawn up to show how this will work. Long Stratton is already very much a dormitory village. It will become a dormitory town without proper	The GNPD considers Long Stratton to have a good range of shops, services and local employment opportunities. It is proposed to provide opportunities for further employment growth alongside residential development. RBC	None
11029 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	Object	Poringland: support for the employment provisions but object to the lack of further housing growth to provide for choice other than the current single development by Norfolk Homes.	Support noted. The proposed policies provide for additional housing growth in the form of infill and small groups of housing. However Poringland will be considered for the potential allocation of additional new housing land to contribute towards the preferred growth strategy requirement for an additional 1800 dwellings within the South Norfolk district share of the Norwich Policy Area.	To consider the potential accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Poringland in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)
9552 - Mr R Harris [8146] 9551 - Mr R Harris [8146]	Object	Views as follows: • Aylsham - agree • Diss - agree • Harleston - agree for local residents only, not major growth. • Wymondham - object to major expansion • Long Stratton - objects to housing to provide for a bypass which should be government funded. • Hethersett - objects to major growth (which should be limited to some 200 houses) and provisions for local employment. • Need a green belt between Wymondham and Hethersett to protect farming. • Hingham - agree subject to a limited extension to the industrial estate. • Loddon - agree growth but it should be limited to 100 dwellings. • Poringland - agree. • Reepham - agree but subject to a limit of 100 dwellings.	Support noted, albeit provisions for Aylsham are subject to review within the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. Harleston and Wymondham are also defined as Main Towns in accordance with government guidance in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (The East of England Plan). Long Stratton and Hethersett are defined as Key Service Centres in accordance with the above RSS government guidance and are required to accommodate significant growth directed by the RSS to the Norwich Policy Area. There is no currently assured government funding for a Long Stratton bypass due to changing regional road scheme funding priorities. The provisions for Hingham, Loddon and Reepham reflect their accessibility and available jobs and services, albeit some services require improvement subject to discussions with service providers. The provisions for Hethersett, Long Stratton, Poringland and Wymondham may be adjusted to accommodate a share of the unallocated Norwich Policy Area provisions for smaller sites in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. There is scope to improve the strategy's policy provisions to protect important gaps between settlements to prevent their coalescence. (DSW)	Action (1) : Policy 6 - to reconsider growth provisions in Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. Action (2): To address the protection of important gaps between settlements in the proposed design policy. Action (3): To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9979 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535]	Object	Reepham: Objection to 100 dwellings provision due to school over capacity, and inadequate services and roads.	<p>The provisions for Reepham reflect its accessibility and available jobs and services. Certain services are known to be operating at or near their limits and discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving them.</p> <p>Most new development locations provide for access by non-car forms of transport to reduce the pressure on roads. Road improvements required to serve new developments will be developer funded in association with other provisions of the Norfolk Local Transport Plan capital spending programme. (DSW)</p>	Action: No change. (DSW)
9295 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Object	Reduce the housing growth proposed for Wymondham, Hetherset, Cringleford and Long Stratton etc by increasing housing provisions in the villages..	The locations named here comply with the development location criteria of the Regional Spatial Strategy (The East of England Plan). However a review of the proposed Settlement Hierarchy to apply greater flexibility to the choice of villages for development may result in a larger number of villages able to benefit from limited growth.	Action: To review the village categories of the proposed Settlement Hierarchy. (DSW)
9235 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	Object	Hetherset and Acle: Too much development proposed.	Both places meet the relevant Regional Spatial Strategy (East of England Plan) services criteria for the accommodation of growth. The levels of growth reflect service capacities and while certain services are known to be operating at or near their limits, discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving them. The provisions for Hetherset may be reconsidered in the context of the potential need to accommodate part of the provisions for smaller sites in the Norwich Policy Area. (DSW)	No change. (DSW)
7943 - mr David Jones [7816]	Object	Tasburgh: No development should be allowed until the traffic problems are resolved.	Tasburgh is proposed to be designated as a "Service Village" for at least 10- 20 dwellings with the potential need to accommodate additional growth as part of the provisions for smaller sites in the Norwich Policy Area. Local traffic and access issues will be addressed through developer funding contributions towards improvements required to serve new development coordinated with provisions proposed through the County Council Local	Action: No change. (DSW)
8392 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]	Object	Poringland/ Framingham Earl: Object to Policy 7 provisions for no further growth and have proposed a mixed-use employment, housing and education provisions development.	While the current lack of provision reflects large outstanding commitments not built, Poringland/ Framingham Earl could be considered for development to accommodate part of the provisions for smaller sites in the Norwich Policy Area. This will be addressed in the production of the Site Specific Policies development Plan	Action: No change but to consider the accommodation of additional growth through the provisions of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9863 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Object	<p>â€¢ Hingham - supports 100 dwellings but these should be viewed as a minimum.</p> <p>â€¢ Poringland/ Framingham Earl - further growth should be considered and suggests a further 100 dwellings allocation.</p>	<p>Hingham support noted. All such provisions are a minimum and allocations will be supplemented by additional infill housing development.</p> <p>The provisions for Poringland/ Framingham Earl will be reviewed in relation to the allocation of smaller sites in the Norwich Policy Area in the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document. The existing provisions provide for infill development in addition to any allocated land. (DSW)</p>	<p>Action (1): To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures representing a minimum provision.</p> <p>Action (2): To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)</p>
9798 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Object	Object as there has been an insufficient consideration of the need to disperse homes, services and employment to a broader geographical area within the NPA and beyond. The hierarchy needs to be considered.	The choice of Key Service Centres reflects their known roles and services provision within the context of government guidance in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (The East of England Plan), and a requirement to provide for most growth in sustainable locations with easily accessible jobs, services and facilities to meet everyday needs. Concerns have been expressed regarding the need to distribute growth more widely throughout the villages to aid rural regeneration and a Settlement Hierarchy review is in hand to achieve that aim. (DSW)	Action: To complete the Settlement Hierarchy review and revise the village categories of the Settlement Hierarchy to provide for additional sustainable locations for lower scales of housing, employment and services
9678 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	Object	<p>â€¢ Wroxham should be reclassified as a Service Village.</p> <p>â€¢ The proposed housing growth at Wroxham and Rackheath are unrealistic in relation to employment,</p>	<p>Wroxham is designated a Key Service Centre within the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy (The East of England Plan) as it combines with the adjacent Hoveton to provide for a wide range of services and job opportunities with good accessibility.</p> <p>Rackheath forms part of an urban extension to Norwich required to accommodate a major part of the Norwich Policy Area housing requirement of the Regional Spatial Strategy. The area will provide for local job opportunities and improved transport links, while its impact on the countryside will be mitigated by the retention of important green spaces and the provision of new "green infrastructure", i.e. open spaces and links to the countryside for the benefit of people and wildlife. (DSW)</p>	Action: No change. (DSW)
11147 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] 8659 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8683 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	Object	<p>Long Stratton:</p> <p>â€¢ Should be a Key Service Centre.</p> <p>â€¢ (11147 only) as above plus its growth provisions should be lower at around 20-50 dwellings</p>	<p>Long Stratton has a good range of services equivalent to those of a Key Service Centre capable of supporting growth.</p> <p>The level of chosen growth reflects the need to accommodate growth which is concentrated by the Regional Spatial Strategy within the Norwich Policy Area and to contribute towards the necessary infrastructure including a bypass.</p> <p>The proposed Main Town classification reflects the perceived future role of the settlement following the proposed growth. However a reconsideration of this status is required to ensure consistency with the designation of other places proposed for significant growth. (DSW)</p>	<p>Action (1): No change to growth provisions. (DSW)</p> <p>Action (2): Policy 6/ para. 7.15 - reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other settlements subjected to significant growth provisions. (DSW)</p>

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8075 - mr steve kittle [7753]	Object	Poringland should have further housing.	The Settlement Hierarchy (including policy 7) and the location of the 'floating 1800' houses referred to in policy 5 are still being refined. As such the submission document could include an allocation at Poringland. The location of the floating 1800 will be determined through the Site Specific Development Plan Document that will follow the Core Strategy. The speed at which the existing Poringland allocation has been built was determined by the developer. RBC	None
7906 - Mrs Lucy Perry [7800] 8625 - Kay Eke [8025] 8841 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 9330 - Ms Celia Viner [8123] 10304 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	Object	<p>â€¢ Hethersett growth objections:</p> <p>â€¢ Services at their limit</p> <p>â€¢ Proposed growth anything but "modest" scale/ growth too large re other Key Service Centres/growth too large and will merge with Wymondham/ growth unsustainable.</p> <p>â€¢ Greater consideration required regarding the means of achieving growth and its location.</p> <p>â€¢ Adverse impacts of traffic on the historic centre</p>	<p>Hethersett meets the relevant Key Service Centre services criteria required by the Regional Spatial Strategy (East of England Plan) for new development.</p> <p>Certain services are known to be operating at or near their limits and will require improvement or replacement.</p> <p>Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving the necessary services.</p> <p>The location and development of the proposed development will respect the existing built and natural environments, respect local distinctiveness, protect landscape character and sites important for biodiversity and make provisions to encourage the use of non-car forms of transport to reduce traffic impact. However there is scope to improve the strategy's policy provisions to protect important gaps between settlements to prevent their coalescence. (DSW)</p>	Action: To address the protection of important gaps between settlements in the proposed design policy. (DSW)
8298 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	Support	Support	Noted RBC	None
7967 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Support	This is a much more reasonable proposal than swamping other communities with huge numbers of houses	Noted RBC	None
9729 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	Support	Requests "small development".	The provisions for new housing development will include a wide range of housing types and sizes to provide for a wide range of demands including affordable housing as concluded by background evidence studies. (DSW)	Action: No change. (DSW)
11051 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	Support	Blofield: The modest growth proposed is a missed opportunity. Blofield has good transport links to Norwich and employment nearby at Thorpe. There are sustainable sites available for further housingdevelopment.	The proposed policies provide for additional housing growth in the form of infill and small groups of housing. However Blofield will be considered for the potential allocation of additional new housing land to contribute towards the preferred growth strategy requirement for an additional 2000 dwellings within the Broadland district share of the Norwich Policy Area. (DSW)	To consider the potential accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Blofield in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9224 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8570 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 9155 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 8607 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] 9042 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] 8233 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	Support	Support	Noted RBC	None
8184 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 8362 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 9111 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 9359 - Mr Peter Rope [7113] 8965 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]				
8429 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] 8521 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8158 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 8472 - Mr C Skeels [8016] 8546 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 8733 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8790 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]				
8979 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 8996 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093] 9116 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111] 9170 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] 9388 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124] 9430 - Swannington with Alderford				
8273 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]	Support	Loddon: Support growth proposed but subject to improved parking capacity	Noted. Parking issues will be addressed through developer funding contributions towards the necessary improvements, South Norfolk Council off-street parking provisions and on-street provisions implemented through the County Council Local Transport Plan. (DSW)	Action: No change(DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10738 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] 10771 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 10854 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] 10668 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] 10829 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10892 - Broadland Land Trust [8366] 10934 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368] 10958 - Mr William E Cooper 10399 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294]	Support	Support	Noted RBC	None
8004 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	Support	Supports Acle development provided sympathetic to the existing village and totalling some 100 dwellings over the next fifteen years.	Support noted., but development may be at a higher rate albeit over twenty years. (DSW)	Action: No change. (DSW)
8436 - J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003]	Support	As long as these towns have the necessary facilities to support the number of houses proposed.	Noted - the Settlement Hierarchy is based upon an assessment of services/facilities within settlements. RBC	None
9455 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134] 9765 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184] 11005 - Mrs S Plaw [8370]	Support	Support the recognition of Loddon as a Key Service Centre, but would prefer a greater allocation of housing for the period up to 2026, as 100-200 dwellings is a small number when considering the length of time.	The level of growth in the rural policy area is significantly less than that in the norwich policy area. The suggested level of growth for Loddon reflects an apportionment of growth based upon the settlement heirarchy i.e. main towns are preferred locations, then key service centres and so on down the hierarchy. If there are no suitable sites in higher order settlements or in other key service centres then figure for growth in Loddon may need to be revised.	To be addressed in submission version of JCS settlement heirarchy which will set out levels of growth proposed in key service
	Support	Loddon/Chedgrave: Care should be taken to avoid "rat running" through the villages while access to the A146 is a priority for new housing.	Noted RBC	None
	Support		Only a small proportion of the total new development will be located in the villages. Developers will be required to provide for the appropriate local access improvements to serve their developments to be coordinated with the traffic management provisions of the Norfolk Local Transport Plan. Access to the A146 will be a significant consideration in the assessment of sites for the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document to reduce the growth in traffic flows through inappropriate places.	Action: No change. (DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10368 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] 9881 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] 10219 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	Support	Support	Noted RBC	None
9935 - John Heaser [7015] 10514 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] 7885 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] 9830 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 9997 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10031 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10130 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10182 - Commercial Land [8246]				
10345 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] 10435 - Mr J E Youngs [8308] 10538 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]				
10539 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]				

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Decision on (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

Policy 6/ para. 7.15 - reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other settlements subjected to significant growth provisions. (DSW)

To maintain the policy references to respecting local distinctiveness including the varied character of our market towns and villages. (DSW)

Policy 6 - to reconsider growth provisions in Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

To address the protection of important gaps between settlements in the proposed design policy.

To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

To review the village categories of the proposed Settlement Hierarchy. (DSW)

Consider using an * or similar notation to distinguish Norwich Policy Area Key Service Centres in submission document

To complete the review of the Settlement Hierarchy and revise the designations of the "Service Villages" and "Other Villages" as required. (DSW)

To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Wymondham in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

No change but to consider the accommodation of additional growth through the provisions of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

To consider the potential accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Blofield in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision. (DSW)

To add the appropriate text to clarify that the housing provision figures represent a minimum provision. (DSW)

To consider the needs for and allocation of employment sites in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

To consider the potential accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Poringland in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

To consider the potential accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Blofield in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

To maintain the policy references to respecting local distinctiveness including the varied character of our market towns and villages. (DSW)

To add supporting text to Policy 7 "Key Service centres" to clarify the functions of the centres within the context of the RSS and where relevant, previous structure and local plan policies.

To clarify the basis of the settlement hierarchy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper. (DSW)

To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Blofield and Poringland in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

No change other than changes arising from the Settlement Hierarchy review. (DSW)

To complete the Settlement Hierarchy review and revise the village categories of the Settlement Hierarchy to provide for additional sustainable locations for lower scales of housing,

employment and services development. (DSW)

To be addressed in submission version of JCS settlement hierarchy which will set out levels of growth proposed in key service centres.

To maintain the policy references to development density reflecting the characteristics and accessibility of particular areas. (DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
To amend and enhance the policy provisions for the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and the use of locally sourced materials. (DSW)				
To address the protection of important gaps between settlements in the proposed design policy. (DSW)				
To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures representing a minimum provision.				
To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)				
<i>(Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</i>				
8712 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Comment	Where there are villages close to main towns and key service centres, is there not a case for their limited development of both additional housing and associated small business capacity? A hub and spoke approach could reduce the destruction of large areas of countryside and travel to work, and assist in stemming village	The proposed settlement hierarchy provides for housing and small scale commercial development in a large number of villages based on their services provision and ease of access to alternative services in nearby places.	No change.
9475 - Louisa Young [8135]	Comment	A bus service that only caters for work hours would restrict travel to only 9 to 5 office hours.	The provision of journey-to-work public transport is an essential minimum service to provide a choice of means of travel to work and possibly enable the remaining members of a family to use the family car for improved daytime access to schools, shops and other services. The public transport arrival and departure criteria used could enable slightly wider hours than those mentioned but relatively few local services provide access for very early starts and Sunday working. (DSW)	No change.
8430 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	Comment	Must consider the provisions of green space and leisure facilities within these villages	Outdoor recreation facilities are one of the facilities considered in the selection of villages as part of a Settlement Hierarchy review of villages. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
8595 - Mr M Read [8024]	Comment	Brownfield sites only	The JCS seeks to maximise the use of previously developed land but the sparsity of such sites and the level of growth to be accommodated means that a number of greenfield developments will also be required. RBC	None
9397 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Comment	This sounds the same as Q15.	The questions relate to different categories of villages in the proposed Settlement Hierarchy. (DSW)	No change.
10491 - Mr I T Smith [8310] 10719 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Comment	Provide for a small number of rentable/affordable houses only and not large scale development.	The "Service Villages" provisions for 10-20 dwellings are not considered to be large scale development. The "Other Villages" category provides for infill and small scale development only in which affordable housing is provided for by generic housing Policy 14 on sites of five or more dwellings.	No change.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
9780 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	Comment	Agree with proposed Service Villages identified. Planning must ensure the current lack of facilities, particularly for the young and elderly, are met and extended to cover additional populations. There is a concern that "Other Villages" could become part of adjacent "Service Villages"	Policies 18 and 19 provide for the appropriate services and infrastructure. The needs of the existing populations however must be met through the funding provisions of the main service providers, as developers will be required to contribute towards the funding of the servicing needs of their own developments. The facilities so funded would also benefit existing residents.	No change.
8815 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	Comment	This should be judged by local residents	Local residents have had the opportunity to make their views known through the JCS public consultation. Responses on Service Villages will inform the decision of elected Members on whether to endorse the settlement hierarchy.	None
10600 - Mr G Barnes [8321]	Comment	Agrees with Tasburgh's identification as a Service Village, the accommodation of 10-20 homes and potential for additional development as part of the NPA provisions. The number of proposed homes should be expressed as a minimum figure rather than a ceiling and the policy amended to include provisions for development "where sufficient capacity exists or can be provided to serve the growth and where it would not unduly impact upon existing environmental assets.	The housing provision total is intended to be a minimum in accordance with the housing provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy. Additional development could also occur in the form of infill and small groups of dwellings. General Policy 19 provides for development to be accompanied by the appropriate infrastructure.	To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.
10321 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Comment	Agree with Service Village selections. Concerned that the housing commitment is not binding for Service Villages in the NPA which needs clarification. Some flexibility is welcomed but should be in isolated cases for local needs housing only- a 'bottom-up' approach. Would like to see specific policy commitments to	Support noted. Further clarification would be useful regarding the implications of the need to find additional locations to accommodate the South Norfolk Norwich Policy Area residue of 1800 dwellings as small sites or additions to named growth locations arising from the chosen growth option. Affordable housing is provided for by generic housing Policy 14 on sites of five or more dwellings.	To clarify the supporting text regarding the implications of the need to find additional housing land allocations to accommodate the South Norfolk Norwich Policy Area residue of 1800 dwellings as small sites or additions to named growth locations arising from the chosen growth option.
10290 - Tasburgh Parish Council (Mrs Julie King) [7053]	Comment	The appropriate level of development in Tasburgh would be 10-20 homes, constructed in a sympathetic manner.	Noted. Policy 13 requires all development to respect and enhance local character and distinctiveness.	No change.
10463 - Mr David Smith [8309]	Comment	One or two in the villages could be accepted for local people.	The "Other Village" category of the Settlement Hierarchy provides for infill development and small groups of dwellings which could satisfy this point.	No change
10619 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	Comment	This seems right but the local residents should know best	Note support and point out that local residents have had opportunity to comment on Joint Core Strategy. RBC	None
10297 - The Thelveton Estate (Sir Rupert Mann) [8279]	Comment	Support position of Diss, Dickleburgh, Scole & Burston in Settlement Hierarchy. Respondent has potential sites in each settlement.	Note support. Site allocations will be subject of separate DPD although settlements position in hierarchy will be crucial consideration.	Respondent advised to check position of settlements in submission document. Suggestions for Site Specific DPD can be sent to Council.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9858 - Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd [8210]	Comment	Support to the flexibility of the approach to accommodate growth settlements. The Joint Core strategy should understand the importance of villages outside the NPA, including Marsham, to accommodating this growth. The level of growth should be appropriate to the size, role and function of each existing village.	A more flexible approach and the designation of Marsham are being addressed by a review of the Settlement	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9744 - Ms Fae Whalley [8177]	Comment	Agreed that Ditchingham has the services and facilities to support housing growth. However this growth should not be limited to 10-20 dwellings and increased to 20-30	The overall housing provisions including those for the Service Villages are a minimum provision in accordance with the policies of the Regional Spatial Strategy. Additional development may occur in the service Villages in the form of infill and small groups of houses on sites which do not require allocation. (DSW)	To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.
10155 - Timewell [8209]	Comment	Little Melton has the range of services and facilities to have been included as a Service Village. Do not agree with the criteria set against which growth allocations to villages should be considered. The number of proposed homes should be expressed as a minimum figure rather than a ceiling. Gibbs Close in Little Melton alone could accommodate up to 60 homes.	A proposed Settlement Hierarchy review of the village categories in particular will be based on a more flexible choice of services requirements and address the status of Little Melton. The proposed housing provision figure is intended to be a minimum in line with the provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy and excludes potential infill and small groups of dwellings which may also be provided for. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages. To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.
10150 - R Smith [8243]	Comment	The designation of settlements has been inconsistent, especially where a Service Village has been defined as comprising two settlements, e.g. Lingwood. Lingwood has been proposed to include Burlingham instead of Strumpshaw - which is closer and therefore more accessible.	A proposed Settlement Hierarchy review of the village categories will re-address the status of and links between villages such as these.	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9965 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Comment	No comment	Noted RBC	None
10266 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson)	Comment	Between 12 and 24 homes in each settlement is not enough to keep local businesses viable. Many Service Villages suffer little or no growth for years.	The choice of potential growth provisions of 10-20 dwellings was based on a minimum that would require the allocation of land while offering additional support for local services and providing for most growth to be directed to the main towns and key service centres as required by government guidance. Villages in the Norwich Policy Area however may be required to accommodate additional growth as a result of the overall chosen growth strategy.	No change.
10202 - Mr Robert Debbage	Comment	Alpington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton in their collective proximity and shared facilities should be considered as an acting Service Village. The revised criteria for Service Village match the facilities available from the three settlements.	A proposed Settlement Hierarchy review of the village categories will re-address the status of and links between villages such as these.	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
9644 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Comment	An explanation should be provided as to why Service Villages located within the NPA should be considered for further development when criteria was set out in paragraph 7.27.	<p>The criteria in paragraph 7.27 are being reviewed as part of a Settlement Hierarchy review and the need for greater flexibility in the choice of services to justify the choice of villages for growth. The criteria alone do not dictate the total housing provisions for the Service Villages and could support additional growth such as that arising from a residue of housing land to be allocated within the Norwich Policy Area due to the favoured growth option.</p> <p>The text could be usefully clarified regarding these points, but at this stage, the potential distribution of the land allocations required is not known so this issue will remain to be resolved through the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)</p>	<p>Policy 8 - To consider new supporting text to clarify the impact of the favoured option on the potential need for additional housing land allocations within the Norwich Policy Area.</p> <p>To consider the allocation of sites in the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document to accommodate the South Norfolk share of new housing growth on small sites in the Norwich Policy Area.</p>
10793 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] 10808 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Comment	Expansions to the key service centres and main towns need to be matched by sustainable transport provision and measures to reduce the need to travel.	The designation of key service centres and the main towns are based on the availability of wide ranges of services within easy reach of new development. Policy 13 provides for minimising the need to travel; Policy 16 provides for the improvement of public transport accessibility to and between the main towns and key	No change.
8895 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	Comment	Tasburgh on A140 and close to Long Stratton could take 200.	Settlement hierarchy methodology is being reviewed. The representation acknowledges the suitability of Long Stratton for major development. Tasburgh is within the new methodology as a service village, within the NPA. Site specific DPDs may propose development at Tasburgh, as part of identifying sites to accommodate the 1,800 other sites in the NPA category of the allocation	None
8511 - Sunguard Homes [8320]	Object	Policies should be consistent, e.g. Tharston has been considered as Long Stratton in planning terms for the last 40 years. It should remain so.	The Settlement Hierarchy review of villages will address this issue. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9718 - Ingleton Wood LLP [8171]	Object	A few villages identified as Service Villages (and located out of the NPA) are considered sustainable locations to support the growth, e.g. Dickleburgh.	The overall housing provisions for the South Norfolk share of the Rural Policy Area have been largely taken up by the Main Towns and Key Service Centres in accordance with government guidance. The designation of the Service Villages to aid rural regeneration requires an over allocation of land for new housing. The promotion of further villages such as Dickleburgh to Key Service Centre status would require the further over allocation of land which could be contrary to a balanced and sustainable distribution of housing development overall. (DSW)	No change.
10540 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Object	Stoke Holy Cross should not be included because of poor shops, facilities and roads and parking	The village met the relevant criteria to justify its "Service Village" classification. However a proposed Settlement Hierarchy review of the village categories will re-address the status of villages such as this.	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9521 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Object	People live in villages for their charm, why destroy that?	The Settlement Hierarchy proposes limited development in the villages to enhance the choice of local housing, provide support for rural services and assist in rural regeneration. Policy 13 requires high standards of design and respect for local distinctiveness. (DSW)	No change.
8736 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]	Object	Brooke should not be classed as a service village - it does not have the facilities to fulfil these needs. There are no opportunities to increase development without ruining the character of the village. Brooke should be classed as "Other Village".	Brooke satisfies the essential services provisions criteria to be a Service Village which will be reviewed as part of the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages. Site allocation issues will be resolved as part of the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9982 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	Object	Great Moulton has already proven its ability to accommodate further residential development, and with its level of service provision should be designated as a Service Village. Mixed development would resemble the existing structure of the village. The boundary of the village should be extended to entice such development.	The designation of Great Moulton is being addressed by a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9195 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] 10436 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	Object	<p>â€¢ No real commitment to improvements in local services and transport.</p> <p>â€¢ Inadequate public transport and services.</p>	The Service Villages all have journey-to-work and other public transport services and a range of other important services. The Settlement Hierarchy villages are being reviewed to provide for a more flexible services based approach to their designation. Policy 12 provides for the protection of existing services. Policies 18 and 19 provide for the provision of services and infrastructure. Other service improvements will arise to meet the needs of growth and the investment decisions of transport and public service providers. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
7886 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	Object	The service growth should be allowed in more villages e.g. Burston and villages like burston, all villages should be allowed planned growth and services to those villages improved. .	Burston and villages like Burston are show in the consultation document as service villages (policy 8). As such they would be allowed some growth and local shops and services protected. RBC	None
9331 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	Object	Tasburgh, Stoke Holy Cross and Newton Flotman should not grow larger or be spoiled. They are close enough to larger service villages.	These villages meet the service requirements to justify their designation as Service Villages. As they fall within the Norwich Policy Area, they could also be considered as locations for additional growth to accommodate some of the 1800 dwellings to be allocated on small sites within the South Norfolk share of the Norwich Policy Area. The production of the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document will address this and other site availability issues. (DSW)	No change
10108 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	Object	Development should be restricted to growth regions such as Brownfield sites in Norwich or new sites in Long	Government planning policy guidance prioritises the development of brown field sites but the scale of growth to be provided for exceeds the availability of such sites.	No change.
10983 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	Object	Each new housing site should be assessed on its own merits and more new housing allocated to stimulate ServiceVillage economies.	The assessment of all potential housing sites against a set of criteria will form part of the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. The designation of Service Villages and their commensurate housing land allocations are intended to support rural	No change.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7878 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	Object	leave well alone enough said	Noted RBC	None
9571 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] 10564 - Mr G P Collings [8318] 10587 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	Object	Noted RBC	None
7984 - Mr Robert McKee [7840]	Object	Wroxham: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ Already a lack of facilities for existing residents. â€¢ More housing would exacerbate the problem. â€¢ Loss of local employment. â€¢ Would just become a housing estate 	Wroxham has been designated as a Key Service Centre on the basis of its services and accessibility and the shared services and employment available in the contiguous settlement of Hoveton. Certain services are known to be operating at or near their limits and will require improvement or replacement. Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving the necessary services. New development would also contribute towards funding enhancements to	No change.
8966 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]	Object	We feel Wicklewood should be included as a service village. We have shop premises but no shop, village pub and businesses	Note comments re: Wicklewood. Submission document will look to categorise settlements based on factors such as availability and accessibility to services and facilities in a standardised and transparent way.	None
9919 - stephen eastwood [7962] 8440 - MR Philip Hearsum [8004] unsuitable/unsustainable. 8643 - Mr Steve Dowall [8033] 8760 - Ms Sarah Smith [8059] 8997 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093] 9002 - Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094] 9006 - Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095] 9010 - Mr Philip Smith [8096] 9013 - Mr KD White [8097] 9017 - Mr Robert Hall [8098] 7888 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	Object	Size of proposed site doe not accord with Lingwoods position in settlement heirarchy and is JCS.	For Lingwood, site-specific proposals are the responsibility of Broadland District Council and are not matters for the considered as part of their site RBC	Pass site specific representations to Broadland District Council to be specific DPD consultation.
	Object	It is wrong to anly allow infill within boundrys, this does not help affordable housing which is much neede in all villages. all villages should be allowed planned growth both within boundries and outside, the latter is especially important regards affordable housing	Allowing indiscriminate development throughout the countryside would be contrary to national policy. All villages except those under Policy 10 'The Countryside' will have defined development boundaries and affordable housing 'exceptions' (outside of boundaries) will also be possible under policy 10. RBC	None
8052 - Mr Keith Jones [7536]	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ Insufficient numbers (of villages?). â€¢ Increased allocations would reduce pressure for growth to the NE of Norwich. 	The Settlement Hierarchy services requirements are the subject of a review to provide for greater flexibility in their choice to support the designation of villages for growth. This will result in additional villages for potential development. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8005 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851] 8751 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Object	<p>â€¢ Even a small development would overburden existing village facilities (such as mains drainage).</p> <p>â€¢ Post offices were omitted from the services required.</p>	<p>Services constraints might prevent development at the scale proposed. This will be addressed during the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. Certain services are known to be operating at or near their limits and will require improvement or replacement. Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving the necessary services. New development would also contribute towards their improvement. (DSW)</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy villages are also subject to a review following comments from the Regulation 25 Technical Consultation. Post Offices were not considered to be a basis essential service alone as they often found within a general village food shop but the above review will provide for the consideration of additional services.</p>	No reductions in the levels of housing allocation
9296 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Object	Each village could spread the development so that large settlements such as Wymondham and Hethersett do not have so many additional houses.	The Settlement Hierarchy village services requirements are the being reviewed to provide for a greater flexibility in the designation of villages for growth to increase their number and assist rural regeneration. However the housing provisions for the favoured major growth areas and main towns are unlikely to be reduced. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9625 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Object	<p>â€¢ The reasoning and role of service villages is not made clear.</p> <p>â€¢ There is too much flexibility in the amount of development and identification of villages to comment on the questions asked, e.g. the actual number of houses proposed.</p> <p>â€¢ There is no mention of any assessment of the environmental capacity of the villages to accommodate development or the sustainability (including transport and employment) or the ability to conserve the existing character of the area.</p> <p>â€¢ No information is provided on the changes in resulting size, distribution and structure of the populations arising from the proposed housing developments.</p>	<p>The choice of Service Villages reflects the provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (The East of England Plan), the provision of services and public responses to the Joint Core Strategy initial "Issues and Options" public consultation.</p> <p>The supporting text could include further clarification about the role of the Service Villages within the context of government guidance and the impact of potential provisions for additional growth in the Norwich Policy Area.</p> <p>Details of the services availability and choice of villages, plus the impact of village development on the overall strategy will be detailed in a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper.</p> <p>The environmental capacity of the designated villages will be addressed in the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. The designation of villages is no guarantee of the availability of suitable development sites.</p> <p>Policy 13 requires all new development to respect and enhance the distinctiveness of local character.</p> <p>Policy 8 should be amended to refer to form and character</p>	<p>To amend Policy 8 and its supporting text to clarify the "Service Villages" functions within the context of the RSS, to emphasise form and character considerations and clarify the services basis for the choice of villages.</p> <p>To clarify the basis for the Settlement Hierarchy and impact of villages growth on the strategy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper.</p>

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary	Council's Assessment	Action
9553 - Mr R Harris [8146]	Object	Generally agree with Policy 9, but villages with * rating should contain more detail as to the future of the village and firm boundaries up to 2026 and beyond. Proposals should be available for public consultation	<p>Policy 9 "Other Villages" for infill and small groups of housing development will be defined by a development boundary.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy village services requirements are being reviewed to provide for a greater flexibility in the designation of Service Villages and Other Villages.</p> <p>It would be useful to clarify the impact on villages in the Norwich Policy Area of the potential accommodation of part of the favoured growth option requiring 3800 dwellings to be allocated on small sites within the Broadland and South Norfolk districts' shares of the Norwich Policy Area (NPA). (DSW)</p>	<p>Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.</p> <p>To clarify the supporting text regarding the impacts of the potential accommodation of a further 3800 dwellings on smaller sites within the NPA.</p>
7887 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	Object	If you allow planned growth in all villages you lessen the impact and objections on those few that have been chosen as special needs.	<p>The settlement hierarchy seeks to direct growth to those settlements best able to accommodate it. A large proportion of settlements will experience some growth during the plan period - although whether this lessens the impact/objections remains to be seen.</p> <p>RBC</p>	None
9799 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Object	Insufficient consideration of the need to disperse development to a broader area. The hierarchy needs to be reconsidered.	<p>A Settlement Hierarchy is in hand to provide for a more flexible approach to the choice of services used to justify in particular the villages for limited new development. This is intended to provide for a greater spread of sustainable locations for such development. (DSW)</p>	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
10333 - Burston & Shimpling Parish Council (Mrs P Anderson) [8290]	Object	Burston and Shimpling should not be included because there is no: village hall, food shop, regular bus service, Secondary school. The facilities could therefore not sustain 10-20 additional homes.	<p>Noted. A proposed Settlement Hierarchy review of the village categories will re-address the status of and links between villages such as these.</p>	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9508 - South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142]	Object	<p>⌘ Trowse meets criteria but is not listed as a service village.</p> <p>⌘ Limited, mixed use development on the May Gurney site would receive local support.</p> <p>⌘ Trowse could lose its river valley protection and be singled out for greater development.</p> <p>⌘ Trowse's location as an urban fringe has resulted in the possibility of unspecified development.</p>	<p>Policy 1 defines Trowse as a Norwich fringe parish as part of the Norwich urban area forming a focus for new development.</p> <p>The May Gurney site falls within a defined settlement development boundary and its proposed redevelopment could be considered against existing South Norfolk Local Plan policies.</p> <p>The river valley will retain development restrictions based on government guidance relating to areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Trowse could be considered for the accommodation of a share of the favoured growth option requiring some 1800 dwellings to be allocated on small sites within the South Norfolk district share of the Norwich Policy Area. (DSW)</p>	<p>To consider the allocation of sites to accommodate the South Norfolk share of new housing growth on small sites in the Norwich Policy Area as part of the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document.</p>

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8497 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Object	Agree with small, possibly infill development in these villages, but they should not have more on top because of the favoured option.	While the favoured Settlement Hierarchy option provides for declining levels of growth, additional development in the larger villages with sufficient services is required to maintain a good quality of rural life and to support rural regeneration. (DSW)	No change.
9998 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]	Object	Bunwell is already a sustainable community and should be included as a Service Village.	The designation of Bunwell is being addressed by a review of the Settlement Hierarchy.	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
11006 - Mrs S Plaw [8370]	Object	Rockland St Mary could be subjected to detrimental suburbanisation. Despite certain services there are no activities for teenagers or evening bus services and even small-scale development would affect the village.	The designation of Service Villages and their housing land allocations are also intended to support rural services. Activities for social groups rely on private individuals aided by the availability of facilities such as village halls and schools as found in Rockland St Mary	No change.
9236 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 8159 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 8209 - Mr P Anderson [7901] 8791 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	Object	Missed service provisions of a post office, bank, pub and allotments.	The Settlement Hierarchy village services requirements are the being reviewed to provide for a greater flexibility in the designation of villages for growth. This will result in the consideration of additional services. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
8660 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8684 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	Object	Tasburgh is unsuitable for anything other than infill development and is not a service village.	Tasburgh satisfies the essential services provisions criteria to be a Service Village which will be reviewed as part of the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages. Site allocation issues will be resolved as part of the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8571 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 9156 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 8608 - Tacolnестon Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] 9043 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] 8234 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	Support	Support	Noted RBC	None
8185 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 9704 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] 9272 - Mrs Gray [5927] 8363 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 9113 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 9360 - Mr Peter Rope [7113] 8522 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8119 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8120 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8274 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8299 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915] 8473 - Mr C Skeels [8016] 8547 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 9680 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 8842 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 8980 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9021 - Mr and Mrs Peter Tann [8099] 9117 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111] 9171 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] 9389 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124] 9431 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]				
9225 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	Support	Justification is not necessarily correct, e.g. some villages that do not qualify employ more people than other villages that do qualify.	The choice of Service Villages was based on a range of essential services which are being revised as part of the Settlement Hierarchy review to provide for a more flexible services-based approach to the designation of villages for development. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10032 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10183 - Commercial Land [8246]	Support	How can 10-20 new dwellings be incorporated into tightly defined development boundaries? Areas that present a logical extension of residential development should be considered to cater for the current demand for housing. The level of development should not be a restrictive target and the choice of settlement should be decided on local context. For example, the residential spread east of Buxton, along the Street is an ideal location.	Development in the Service Villages will rely on the availability of suitable sites, subject to the considerations of form and character and development constraints such as areas liable to flood. Such issues will be resolved during the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. The overall housing provisions are intended to be a minimum provision in accordance with the provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy. Additional development may occur in the Service Villages in the form of infill and small groups of houses on sites which do not require allocation. (DSW)	To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.
8911 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Support	These settlements should continue to have development area boundaries no mention of this on page 34	Service villages will have defined development boundaries. The extent of boundaries will be progressed in the Site Specific document (to follow after the Joint Core Strategy). The only category in the settlement hierarchy that will not have a defined development boundary will be those classified under Policy 10 'The Countryside' RBC	None
10855 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] 9618 - RW Kidner [8163]	Support Support	Promotion of organic farming and renewable energy could present improved rural job opportunities. The designation of Stoke Holy Cross as a service village is welcomed. But the level of growth in these villages should be determined by the need for homes, level of service provision, infrastructure, capacity and deliverability. Given the proximity of Norwich to Stoke Holy Cross and the subsequent level of service provision, 40 dwellings would be more appropriate than	Organic farming will result from market forces. Policies 13 and 19 provide for the use of renewable energy. The choice of villages reflects the availability of services and facilities while the levels of growth reflect the need to balance provisions for new housing between the different levels of the Settlement Hierarchy. Villages in the Norwich Policy Area may be reconsidered for the accommodation of part of the favoured growth option requiring 1800 dwellings to be allocated on small sites within the South Norfolk district share of the Norwich Policy Area. The Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document will address this issue. (DSW)	No change. To consider the allocation of sites in the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document to accommodate the South Norfolk share of new housing growth on small sites in the Norwich Policy Area.
8348 - Spixworth Parish Council (Mrs R Rose) [1826] 9766 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184] 9456 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	Support Support Support	Support Sufficient consideration must be given to transport to secondary schools and higher education. Support	Noted RBC Policy 18 provides for sufficient provision of and access to schools and adult learning opportunities.(DSW) Noted RBC	None No change. None

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10739 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] 11052 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] 10772 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 10669 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] 10830 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10893 - Broadland Land Trust [8366] 10935 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368] 9538 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149]	Support	Support	Noted RBC	None
	Support	Support. However, the amount of residential development should be set as a guideline rather than a	Support noted. The housing allocations are intended to be a minimum provision and will be supplemented by infill and small groups of housing subject to form and character considerations. (DSW)	No change.
10369 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] 9882 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] 10220 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] 9936 - John Heaser [7015] 10515 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] 8061 - MR MIKE HOWARD [7872] 9679 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 9831 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 10131 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10091 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10346 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	Support	Support	Noted RBC	None

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Decision on (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

No reductions in the levels of housing allocation

Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

To consider the allocation of sites in the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document to accommodate the South Norfolk share of new housing growth on small sites in the Norwich Policy Area.

To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.

To consider the allocation of sites to accommodate the South Norfolk share of new housing growth on small sites in the Norwich Policy Area as part of the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

To amend Policy 8 and its supporting text to clarify the "Service Villages" functions within the context of the RSS, to emphasise form and character considerations and clarify the services basis for the choice of villages.

To clarify the basis for the Settlement Hierarchy and impact of villages growth on the strategy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper.

To clarify the supporting text regarding the implications of the need to find additional housing land allocations to accommodate the South Norfolk Norwich Policy Area residue of 1800 dwellings as small sites or additions to named growth locations arising from the chosen growth option.

Respondent advised to check position of settlements in submission document.

Suggestions for Site Specific DPD can be sent to Council.

To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.

Policy 8 - To consider new supporting text to clarify the impact of the favoured option on the potential need for additional housing land allocations within the Norwich Policy Area.

To consider the allocation of sites in the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document to accommodate the South Norfolk share of new housing growth on small sites in the Norwich Policy Area.

To clarify the supporting text regarding the impacts of the potential accommodation of a further 3800 dwellings on smaller sites within the NPA.

To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.

To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.

Pass site specific representations to Broadland District Council to be considered as part of their site specific DPD consultation.

Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>(Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</i>				
10156 - Timewell [8209]	Comment	Notwithstanding Timewell Properties Ltd's objection to the Core Strategy's failure to identify Little Melton as a Service Village, the suggested approach in Policy 9's footnote that settlements identified in the policy within the Norwich Policy Area will be considered for further development is supported.	Support noted. A Settlement Hierarchy review is also proposed which will address a more flexible approach to the choice of villages for development. The reference to the consideration of "Other Villages" within the Norwich Policy Area for "sustainable development" should be reconsidered as it appears to imply higher levels of housing development in villages which lack the levels of services required to support	Action (1): Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages. Action (2): To reconsider the reference to Other Villages within the Norwich Policy Area being considered for (implied additional) sustainable development which could contradict the services levels required to support additional growth.
8596 - Mr M Read [8024]	Comment	Brownfield sites only	The JCS seeks to maximise the use of brownfield sites to accommodate growth in accordance with government guidance - CB	No change
9781 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	Comment	There is no primary school in Bracon Ash	Noted. The settlement hierarchy is being reviewed to re examine the role of settlements based on up to date information about services and facilities. This work will pick up on the fact that there is no school in Bracon Ash. The settlement hierarchy review is also looking at clustering settlements which share facilities and it is possible that Bracon Ash could be considered with	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review
9400 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Comment	There will always be a need for property in small villages but these must be affordable to the local population, not just holiday homes or large properties for the rich	The need for affordable housing in smaller villages is recognised. The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) will require an element of affordable housing to be provided on all sites of 5 dwellings or more. The JCS also allows for affordable housing schemes to come forward in smaller villages as an exception to policy, where housing might otherwise not be considered appropriate (see Policy 10) - CB.	None
10794 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Claburn) [8360] 10809 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Comment	All expansions of existing key service centres (10794) and main towns (10809) need to be matched or exceeded by measures to reduce the need to travel and to provide sustainable transport provision. It would be desirable to leave all development areas in a better state for sustainable transport than before.	The definitions of Main Towns and Key Service Centres reflect their good accessibility, public transport access and services and facilities that reduce the need to travel for residents of proposed new housing development. Policy 16 provides for enhanced public transport to serve the Main Towns and Key Service Centres while sustainable transport is to be enhanced in general through the policies of the Norfolk Local transport Plan. (DSW)	No change.
7983 - mr Daniel Yellop [7836]	Comment	Support for some housing in the small villages mentioned to support local services such as pub and village store	Support noted - CB	None
8816 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	Comment	No comment. This should be judged by local residents	The JCS needs to put policies in place to guide the location of development to help in the planning application decision process. Not possible to leave the decision about the location of development entirely to local residents, although they do have a chance to comment as part of this process and when a planning application is submitted -	None

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8713 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Comment	Where villages are close to main towns and key service centres, is there not a case for limited development of housing and small businesses? A hub and spoke approach should prove advantageous in terms of protecting the countryside and reducing travel to work. May also assist in stemming the demise of villages.	The proposed settlement hierarchy provides for housing and small scale commercial development in a large number of villages based on their services provision and ease of access to alternative services in nearby places.	No change.
8323 - Mr Geoffrey Loades	Comment	Other villages can benefit from modest growth to prevent further decay. Some villages could benefit by looking at shared facilities	The settlement hierarchy is being reviewed to re examine the role of settlements based on up to date information about services and facilities. It is likely that as a result of this exercise some settlements will be classified differently within the hierarchy. The settlement hierarchy review is also looking at clustering settlements which share	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review
9775 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8193]	Comment	Please take into account comments that were previously made in response to the Technical Consultation on behalf of Gladedale, relating to their land interest in Hempsall.	A Settlement Hierarchy review is proposed which will address a more flexible approach to the choice of villages for development. Proposed development sites will be considered during the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9966 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Comment	No comment	None - CB	None
10695 - Mr G Mackintosh [8284]	Comment	<p>â€¢ Welcome the review of the settlement hierarchy but unclear as to what "infill or small groups of dwellings and small scale business or services" actually means in practice.</p> <p>â€¢ Suggests that Barford should be a "Service Village" to reflect the level of facilities, while the provision of employment facilities should be an essential criterion. Considers that a maximum of 10-20 dwellings is too limiting.</p> <p>â€¢ Growth targets should be seen as a minimum and not</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Infill or small groups of houses could mean developments up to ten dwellings (above which land allocations would be required) subject to the form and character of a village and other development constraints. Small scale business development should reflect the scale and function of the settlement or locality. Detail will be included in a background topic paper to be prepared to justify the Settlement Hierarchy.</p> <p>The proposed review of the Settlement Hierarchy will re-examine the status of Barford through a more flexible approach to the assessment of services which includes the provision of employment facilities.</p> <p>Numerical housing growth provisions are intended to represent a minimum in accordance with the provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy (The East of England Plan). (DSW)</p>	<p>Action (1): To produce a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper.</p> <p>Action (2): To amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.</p> <p>Action (3): To amend the supporting text to clarify that housing provision figures imply a minimum provision.</p>
10322 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Comment	Agree with the places proposed as "Other Villages" and welcome the commitment to limit housing allocations and retain development boundaries in the rural areas. The note that this commitment is not binding for "Other Villages" in the Norwich Policy Area is of concern and needs clarification. It is not clear what is meant by sustainable development. Some flexibility is welcomed but this should be in isolated cases and for local housing need only.	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The reference to the consideration of "Other Villages" within the Norwich Policy Area for "sustainable development" should be reconsidered as it appears to imply higher levels of housing development in villages which lack the levels of services required to support</p>	Action: To reconsider the reference to Other Villages within the Norwich Policy Area being considered for (implied additional) sustainable development which could contradict the services levels required to support additional growth.

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9666 - Mr Richard Rallison [8167]	Comment	I live in a part of Alington that should be defined as a Service Village as it has access to a bus route on A146 and a farm shop, but currently it is outside the existing development boundary. Local consultation should take place to define the position of the development limit so any new housing has access to suitable facilities.	A Settlement Hierarchy review is proposed which will address a more flexible approach to the choice of villages for development. The development limit will be subject to public consultation in 2009 as part of the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9626 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Comment	The Broads Authority welcomes provision for small scale business or service development in villages in the vicinity of the Broads area to redress the balance of past losses. However no justification is given for the development of further housing in the settlements listed. Settlements seem to have been selected on presence of village hall and primary school, but there is no evidence of an assessment of settlement function. Unsure how presence of village hall and primary school reduces number of car trips. Various other comments: â€¢ The rationale for these village being considered for sustainable development under policy 5 is not clear. â€¢ Not clear how paragraph 7.30 relates to this policy. â€¢ Where is policy to provide for housing for local â€¢ Welcome the review of the settlement hierarchy but unclear as to what "infill or small groups of dwellings and small scale business or services" actually means in practice. â€¢ Re site in Carleton Rode, there should be a defined development boundary but also sufficient flexibility in policy wording so as not to restrict growth. â€¢ Growth targets should be seen as a minimum and not a ceiling to development.	The justification for the scale and distribution of development will be clarified in a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper, a supporting document. A Settlement Hierarchy review is proposed which will address a more flexible approach to the choice of villages for development. The choice of village hall and primary school represented a minimal approach to essential services that could support development in a village and be easily accessible on foot or by bicycle and thus save car trips. Policy 14 provides for affordable and local needs housing.	Action (1): To clarify the basis of the settlement hierarchy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper. Action (2): Action: Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
10690 - Messrs P & A Jackson [8351]	Comment	â€¢ Welcome the review of the settlement hierarchy but unclear as to what "infill or small groups of dwellings and small scale business or services" actually means in practice. â€¢ Re site in Carleton Rode, there should be a defined development boundary but also sufficient flexibility in policy wording so as not to restrict growth. â€¢ Growth targets should be seen as a minimum and not a ceiling to development.	Support noted. Infill or small groups of houses could mean developments up to ten dwellings (above which land allocations would be required) subject to the form and character of a village and other development constraints. Small scale business development should reflect the scale and function of the settlement or locality. Detail will be included in a background topic paper to be prepared to justify the Settlement Hierarchy. Carleton Rode would have a defined development boundary but it is also subject to a review of the Settlement Hierarchy which could result in a change to the village's status. Numerical housing growth provisions are intended to represent a minimum in accordance with the provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy (The East of England Plan). (DSW)	Action (1): To produce a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper. Action (2): To amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages. Action (3): To amend the supporting text to clarify that housing provision figures imply a minimum provision.
10437 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	Object	Again, lack of public transport and services	Settlements will only be classified as 'other villages' if they have an appropriate level of services and access to public transport - CB	None

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9983 - GF Cole and Son [8226]

Object Policy excludes Great Moulton. If the settlement cannot be classified as a service village it should at least be recognised as a village suitable for development under Policy 9. The settlement boundary needs to be re drawn to enable small scale housing development, support existing facilities and enable the provision of new

The settlement hierarchy is being reviewed to re examine the role of settlements based on up to date information about services and facilities. The settlement hierarchy review is also looking at clustering settlements, which share facilities, and it is possible that if considered with Aslacton the settlement of Great Moulton could be included under Policy 9 or even warrant inclusion as a service village under Policy 8. If Great Moulton is classified as a settlement suitable for some development in the Joint Core Strategy then the settlement boundary will be reviewed as part of the site specific document. - CB

Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10740 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Object	Yes	Support noted	No change to plan
8572 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]				
10370 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]				
9157 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]				
9883 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]				
8609 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]				
9044 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]				
9237 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]				
8235 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]				
9705 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]				
10221 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
9273 - Mrs Gray [5927]				
11053 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]				
8364 - Alyson Lowe [6992]				
9114 - Mr John Osborne [7111]				
9361 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]				
10516 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]				
8897 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]				
10773 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]				
8523 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]				
8161 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]				
8160 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]				
8210 - Mr P Anderson [7901]				
8275 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]				
8300 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]				
8474 - Mr C Skeels [8016]				
8498 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]				
8792 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]				
8843 - Mr John Nelson [8064]				
8981 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]				
9118 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]				
9172 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner				

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9432 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]				
9457 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134] 9490 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139] 9606 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] 9731 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] 10984 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] 9767 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184] 9832 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 10132 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10092 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10347 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] 10401 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] 10670 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] 10831 - North East Wymondham	Object	Various settlements should be classified differently in the the role of settlements based on up to date information	The settlement hierarchy is being reviewed to re examine outcome of the settlement about services and facilities. It is likely that as a result of this exercise some settlements will be classified differently within the hierarchy - CB	Amend policy based on the hierarchy review.
8967 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706] settlement hierarchy 8661 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8685 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] 8738 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 9999 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10203 - HJ Spratt & Sons [8250]				
10204 - Mr Nicholas Evans-Lombe [8252] 11075 - Duke of Grafton [8253] 10205 - Duke of Grafton [8253] 10291 - Bunwell Parish Council (Mr John Pennell) [8276] 8251 - Mr John Seville [7086]	Object	Some villages in this category have a good range of services and could support small scale development. These should be identified under a different policy or the existing policy should be modified to categorise	The settlement hierarchy is being reviewed to re examine the role of settlements based on up to date information about services and facilities. It is likely that as a result of this exercise some settlements will be classified differently within the hierarchy. Some of the settlements in this policy with a good range of services and facilities	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10033 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10184 - Commercial Land [8246]	Object	Development in "Other Villages" should not take preference over development on the edges of "Service Villages" and higher. The council should direct development towards small scale schemes on the edge of "Service Villages" before locating housing in "Other Villages". This will result in more sustainable developments. Development should be allowed to come forward where suitable sites arise in close proximity to existing dwellings and services, thus allowing settlements	Development in "Other Villages" would not take preference over development in Service Villages or higher order settlements. Service Villages could also accommodate potential infill and small groups of housing as solely provided for in the "Other Villages". Both village categories are based on differing levels of accessible services. Sites will be consulted on as part of the preparation of the Site Specific Policies development Plan Document. (DSW)	No change.
9859 - Felthorpe Parish Council (Mr Chris Copsey) [8213]	Object	Felthorpe is not included as an "Other Village". This means that the community may suffer detriment and a sustainable future cannot be ensured for future generations. Policy 9 states that the hierarchy will be reviewed but gives no indication of when/how this review	A Settlement Hierarchy review is proposed which will address a more flexible approach to the choice of villages and the status of Felthorpe. The results of that review will be included in the pre-government submission version of the Joint Core Strategy proposed for September 2009.	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
10068 - The Greetham Trustees [7606]	Object	Spooner Row should be categorised at a higher level in the Settlement Hierarchy. It is considered that Spooner Row has a greater capacity for development than the rest of the villages in the "Other Villages" category. It is considered that the document does not provide the opportunity to development sufficient levels of housing at the lower levels of the hierarchy, while it is unclear to what extent additional development would be acceptable in the settlements within the Norwich policy Area. The Taylor Report supports a spread of housing allocations	A Settlement Hierarchy review is proposed which will address a more flexible approach to the choice of villages for development. This may affect the status of Spooner Row and result in additional villages for development overall with a greater spread across the rural area. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9800 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Object	There is insufficient consideration of the need to disperse homes, services and employment to a broader geographical area within the NPA and beyond. The hierarchy needs to be reconsidered.	The provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy (The East of England Plan) direct most local development to the Norwich Policy Area to promote sustainable development with ease of access to everyday needs. A Settlement Hierarchy review is proposed which will address a more flexible approach to the choice of villages for development and by implication, a more widespread distribution. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
8752 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Object	Spooner Row is not a stand-alone village as it is within the parish of Wymondham and we have been considered under the Wymondham proposals	For the purposes of the settlement hierarchy Spooner Row has been considered as a stand alone village and is not considered under the Wymondham proposals - CB	None
7968 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 8393 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] 10267 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068] 8410 - M Harrold [7966] 9196 - Widen the Choice Rural	Object	Policy too restrictive. More settlements should be identified in this policy to ensure the continued sustainability of rural communities otherwise they will be frozen in time with no chance to regain lost infrastructure	The settlement hierarchy is being reviewed to re-examine the settlements at the lower end of the hierarchy based on up to date information about services and facilities. It is likely that as a result of this exercise more settlements will be included in this category and be considered suitable for infill or small groups of dwellings. Only those settlements with very few/no facilities or services will be classified as being in the countryside and not suitable for development.	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review.

These settlements are very reliant on the services of larger centres for their everyday needs and new development would not necessarily help to retain or attract new services due to the ever increasing population thresholds required to support them - CB

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9573 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] 10620 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	Object	As per previous answer	See previous question for response - CB	None
8336 - Mr Steve Horrocks [7941]	Object	The approach to local needs housing is being poorly implemented, long standing infrastructure improvements have not been made and this inhibits housing development. Improve infrastructure and mixed housing could meet Alington/Yelverton's community needs.	Policy 14 provides for the delivery of affordable housing within market housing developments and on sites not normally released for housing. Policy 19 provides for the necessary infrastructure to accompany proposed housing developments. (DSW)	No change.
10541 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Object	Some of these villages have better road links and facilities than the service villages and should be	The settlement hierarchy is being reviewed to re examine the role of settlements based on up to date information about services and facilities. It is likely that as a result of this exercise some settlements will be classified differently within the hierarchy - CB.	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review
9645 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Object	Do not agree with the places proposed as other villages because the reasoned justification explains that these settlements are reliant on services of larger centres for their everyday needs and new development would not necessarily help to retain or attract services. This could apply equally to service villages or Hethersett where 1000 houses are proposed to be allocated.	The supporting text explains that the "Other Villages" would not form appropriate locations for "significant new development" due to the limited availability of services. However limited services which include certain basic important services should not preclude provisions for small scale development which could contribute towards overall rural regeneration. Hethersett however has a wide range of services which would be increased in association with the additional growth. (DSW)	No change.
9227 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	Object	Villages that do not qualify have been gradually expanding over the years and have proved to be sustainable in this day and age.	The Settlement Hierarchy services requirements are the subject of a review to provide for greater flexibility in their choice to support the designation of villages for growth. This will result in additional villages for potential development. (DSW)	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
8006 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	Object	These villages have all had small infill and in some cases facilities and services are at a maximum. Some have been outside the development boundary, not in line with council policy. Need to take account of the requirements of people already in the village and not just fulfil a quota without reference to knock on effects on families, schools, lack of public transport etc.	Developer contributions towards services are available through legal agreements which may apply to differing development thresholds. All development will be required to contribute towards transport, health, recreation, education and other community provisions if the Government proposals are carried out. Policy 14 proposes to apply affordable housing requirements to sites of five or more dwellings. (DSW)	No change.
10588 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for reasons	Noted. See question 28 for response - CB	None
10109 - Kimberley and Carleton	Object	No development. Leave villages as they are.	The settlement hierarchy is based on the availability of	None, although the policy will be

Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]
 10464 - Mr David Smith [8309]
 10492 - Mr I T Smith [8310]
 10565 - Mr G P Collings [8318]

services and facilities within settlements. The settlements in this policy are considered to have a minimum level of essential services and so therefore can accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings. This level of development will be minimal and it is not considered that it would have an adverse impact on the settlement. The settlement hierarchy is currently being reviewed but it is not a practical option to have no development in any

amended based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9752 - MRS JENNIFER HALL [8180]	Object	The road system around Alington/ Yelverton is very poor and will not support an increase in vehicular	Noted. Alternative transport is available through the provision of local bus services including journey-to-work services to Norwich and/or other main centres. (DSW)	No change.
9303 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] 7889 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	Object	Every village should be considered for limited	It is not seen as sustainable to put housing development in settlements with very few/no services or facilities, as people would then be reliant on the services of larger centres for their everyday needs. New development in these settlements would not necessarily help to retain or attract new services due to the ever increasing population thresholds required to support them. To allow development in every small village would be contrary to government policy on sustainability. The settlement hierarchy is being reviewed based on up to date information about the services and facilities in settlements and it is likely that as a result of this exercise some settlements will be classified differently within the hierarchy. - CB	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review.
8548 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]	Support	Yes	Support noted - CB	None
9937 - John Heaser [7015]	Support	Yes but it is nonsense to say that a village is not sustainable for "significant new development" and then say that it will be considered because it is in the Norwich Policy Area.	Support noted. The reference to the consideration of "Other Villages" within the Norwich Policy Area for "sustainable development" should be reconsidered as it appears to imply higher levels of housing development in villages which lack the levels of services required to support additional growth. (DSW)	To reconsider the reference to Other Villages within the Norwich Policy Area being considered for (implied additional) sustainable development which could contradict the services levels required to support additional growth.
8186 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	Support	Road network in Bressingham not suitable for even small scale businesses with larger vehicles except adjacent to the A1066	Comments noted - CB.	None
8913 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Support	Pleased that Hempnall is defined in this group and wish to remain as an 'other village'. Please do not re-define	The settlement hierarchy is being reviewed to re examine the role of settlements based on up to date information about services and facilities. It is likely that as a result of this exercise some settlements will be classified differently within the hierarchy. Cannot guarantee that Hempnall will remain in the 'other village' category - CB	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review.
9522 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Support	Other villages need access to services but not substantial growth	The "Other Villages" have limited services and access to alternatives in nearby settlements, and thus have provisions for limited small scale/ infill housing development and small scale commercial development.	No change.

10856 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Support	The promotion of organic farming and renewable energy, being relatively 'jobs-rich', could present improved rural job opportunities	Comment noted - CB	None
--	---------	---	--------------------	------

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8326 - Mr David Cantrill [7934]	Support	Small scale well designed environmentally conscious development should be supported, particularly if it retains younger people in villages and not just the retired and commuters. The soul of villages must be restored, which may be achieved if people can afford to live and work in them. The few services that exist may survive if more people were present to use them and community/cooperative enterprises may also develop.	Support noted. (DSW)	No change.

Decision on (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

To clarify the basis of the settlement hierarchy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper.

Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

To which could contradict the services levels required to support additional growth.

To produce a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper.

To amend the supporting text to clarify that housing provision figures imply a minimum provision.

(Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

10720 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Comment	I don't know what is meant by "countryside". Norwich remains the heart of a rural working county, so respecting the mutual needs of both should be the core of any future development around the Norwich area..	The countryside is any area outside the defined towns and villages. Remaining comments noted. (DSW)	No change.
8597 - Mr M Read [8024]	Comment	Brownfield sites only	The aim of the policy is to restrict development in the countryside and protect greenfield sites from unacceptable development. The policy covers the use of brownfield sites for extensions, conversions or replacement buildings but unfortunately the relatively small supply of brownfield land in the area will inevitably lead to some greenfield development for affordable housing exceptions sites or small scale commercial enterprises although this will be strictly controlled and only allowed in exceptional circumstances or where a rural location can be justified -	None
10409 - Easton College [3570] 10414 - Honingham Thorpe Farms	Comment	Policy 10 - specific reference should be made to the need to support agriculture and related industries. Given the	Government planning policy guidance and the policy provisions for farm diversification and small scale	No change.

Limited [8296]		importance of agriculture to the countryside a new opening sentence should be added to say, "Support will be given for proposals which enable the agricultural industry to innovate, remain competitive and exploit synergies with environmental industries..."	commercial enterprises where a rural location can be justified are considered to cover this point. (DSW)	
10242 - Mr Duncan Smith [8257]	Comment	Allotments should be made available	The provision of allotments is something to be considered at the site specific stage, potentially as part of the developer requirements for an allocated site - CB	None

Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10621 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	Comment	Agree, but people who live and work in these localities should know best	The aim of the policy is to protect and enhance the countryside whilst providing appropriate opportunities for development. The people who live in rural communities have a chance to have their say on particular schemes through the planning application process - CB	None
8073 - Miss Janet Saunders	Comment	People choose to retire to smaller villages to get away from noisy neighbours. Be careful not to build 'affordable housing' in these areas unless there are sufficient work opportunities available	Affordable housing will only be permitted in the countryside as an exception to general policy and then a specific local need will have to be demonstrated and a certain level of facilities available in the settlement or close to the settlement. There are also limits on the number of houses that can be built based on the size of	None
9402 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Comment	Very strict control needed to prevent over development/urban sprawl in the countryside. Services must be available	The aim of the policy is to restrict development in the countryside. Affordable housing will only be allowed if a need is identified and commercial, leisure and tourism development will only be allowed if a rural location can be justified and the scheme will maintain and enhance the rural economy. Whether services are in place is a matter for development control when deciding any planning application - CB.	None
8915 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Comment	Great care needs to be taken when setting up commercial enterprises in the countryside to ensure that they do not transform an area into an urban island e.g. Seething industrial estates lights create a motorway service area	Concern is noted. Lighting and other similar matters will be dealt with at the planning application stage and guided by development control policies - CB	None
9967 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Bringham) [6903]	Comment	No comment	Noted - CB	None
10323 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] 9627 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Comment	Neither the policy nor the supporting text makes a case for the value of the countryside and the benefits of its enhancement which act as a key driver for the local economy, tourism and the quality of life. The policy reads more like a development control policy rather than to relate these considerations to the need to provide for economic and service provisions. Care is required to ensure that the character of the countryside is protected where providing for new development	The policy and supporting could usefully be strengthened to relate the need to balance the protection and enhancement of the countryside with an approach to the provision of limited housing, commercial, leisure and tourism related development. (DSW)	To revise Policy 10 and supporting text to strengthen the need to balance the protection and enhancement of the countryside with the provisions for limited housing, commercial, leisure and tourism related development.

9659 - Ms E Riches [8165]	Comment	Agricultural land needs to be protected. How, if taken for development?	The aim of the policy is to protect and enhance agricultural land and it is very restrictive about the type of development that can take place in the countryside. The only development to be allowed is affordable housing exceptions and development that would enhance the rural	None
9458 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	Comment	Many people who live in small villages need new, cheap housing so they can stay where they were born and not be ousted by high property prices.	The policy provides for affordable housing as an exception to general policy in small villages where a specific local need can be demonstrated. These houses will be affordable and made available to local residents who qualify for them on the basis of need. - CB	None

Page 254 of 392
7.Policies for Places (Q3 - Q20)

Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8431 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	Comment	What does limited mean when in regards to leisure and tourism facilities?	'Limited' is not defined in the policy. This would be a judgement to be taken at the planning application stage with regard to the merits of the scheme and its contribution towards maintaining/enhancing the rural economy - CB	None
8007 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	Object	Exception sites on agricultural land mean that the farmers who own them get rich out of the scheme but there is no benefit for the village ie already no facilities etc.	Exception sites for affordable housing do not bring any additional facilities to the village but they do have a benefit in terms of additional housing to support existing facilities within the settlement and allowing local people to continue to live in these communities - CB	None
8900 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620] 8758 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Object	Concern about agricultural buildings are being converted. Important wildlife is being displaced.	The policy allows for agricultural buildings to be converted but any scheme will still need to be subject to a planning application which will test whether the scheme/design is appropriate and in keeping with its surroundings. A planning application would also consider whether any important wildlife would be displaced by the proposal - CB	None
9241 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	Object	Sustainable needs can be achieved by using local transport or car.	Comments noted. Policy 18 recognises that in the rural area the car will remain an important means of travel while seeking to improve public transport accessibility to and between the Main Towns and Key Service Centres. This complements the provisions of the Norfolk Local Transport Plan which provides access strategies for the rural areas.	No change.
8121 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	Object	Object to the emphasis on affordable housing. Any new housing should not detract from the existing character and standard in any area.	Although affordable housing is referred to in the countryside policy there are still strict controls over where this would be permitted. Such schemes would only be considered where a specific local need can be shown and only a limited number of these developments are permitted. Any housing built as exception to general policy would still need to be well designed and in keeping with the existing character of an area -CB	None
9984 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	Object	Hierarchical approach means many small settlements are not considered suitable for housing development, other than exceptions affordable housing. Approach overlooks important contribution of infill development and the conversion of redundant buildings	The settlement hierarchy is being reworked so that a larger number of settlements are now included within policies 8 & 9. Some small settlements still fall under policy10, but these settlements lack even the most basic services and facilities and cannot be considered suitable for housing development on sustainability grounds. Policy 10 does	None

9801 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Object	No. As stated above there is insufficient consideration of the need to disperse homes, services and employment to a broader geographical area within the NPA and beyond. The hierarchy need to be reconsidered.	not preclude the conversion of buildings to residential in the countryside, indeed this is referred to in the supporting text to the policy - CB	The settlement hierarchy is currently being re worked to reflect an up to date study of the services and facilities in settlements. The only settlements to be included under the countryside policy will be those with few/no services or facilities. This means that the majority of settlements in the NPA will be considered suitable for some form of housing development ranging from infill to larger numbers of dwellings dependent on their size, proximity to Norwich, communication links etc - CB.	None
--	--------	---	--	--	------

Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9474 - Louisa Young [8135]	Object	This sounds like protecting the rich from development	The aim of the policy is to protect and enhance the countryside whilst providing appropriate opportunities for the rural economy to develop in terms of employment and tourism provision. The policy also provides for affordable housing where a specific local need can be shown. The policy is trying to ensure that the countryside is accessible for all groups of society in terms of employment opportunities, service provision, tourism facilities and affordable housing - CB.	None
8714 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Object	<p>â€¢ No mention of SNDC settlements technical study re the NPA..</p> <p>â€¢ Criteria should be unbiased, and consulted on.</p> <p>â€¢ What assumptions are made?</p>	The technical study of the potential for new settlements in the Norwich Policy Area is a separate exercise that is not part of the Joint Core Strategy consultation. However the outcome could affect a review of the strategy which would be the subject of public consultation. (DSW)	No change.
8394 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] 8421 - M Harrold [7966]	Object	Policy includes too many small villages within open countryside and ignores the need to maintain the sustainability of these communities.	The settlement hierarchy will be revised to look in detail at the suitability of settlements for development. Only those settlements with no/very few facilities will be categorised as open countryside. Having development in settlements with minimal facilities does not accord with planning policy on sustainability - CB	Settlement hierarchy to be
8817 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	Object	We question how the Norwich Policy Area can encompass areas of countryside as there are clear differences between urban and rural needs and priorities	The Norwich Policy Area (NPA) comprises a number of settlements well related to the city of Norwich which could potentially be considered for larger scale housing growth. Because of the rural nature of Norfolk the NPA also includes areas of open countryside and a number of smaller settlements which would not be appropriate for large scale development without some investment in infrastructure and communication links. In drawing up the JCS major growth is to be directed to the larger, more sustainable settlements in the NPA but smaller levels of growth may be considered at other locations if needed - CB	None
10034 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)	Object	Locations adjacent to development boundaries should be considered for housing and development boundaries need	When the settlement hierarchy is confirmed then the Council will start to look at specific sites for housing. As	None

[8230]
10185 - Commercial Land [8246]

to be reassessed. Not all housing can be accommodated on brownfield sites and greenfield sites on the edge of villages should be considered rather than open countryside. Particular site in Buxton referred to.

part of this process pieces of land directly adjacent to development boundaries will be considered and current development boundaries will be reviewed and in some cases extended to include additional housing land. If the Council have to allocate greenfield land for housing this will be in sustainable locations well related to existing settlements and not in the open countryside. The particular site referred to in Buxton will be considered as

Page 256 of 392
7.Policies for Places (Q3 - Q20)

Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9197 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	Nothing useful on countryside access. Need a thought through green access strategy. Provisions not clear. regarding sustainable development and development linked to agriculture and forest activities?	Policy 18 recognises that in the rural area the car will remain an important means of travel while seeking to improve public transport accessibility to and between the Main Towns and Key Service Centres. This complements the provisions of the Norfolk Local Transport Plan which provides access strategies for the rural areas. The provisions of the Joint Core Strategy will be revised to take account of the outcomes of a Green Infrastructure Strategy which will provide for enhanced links between new housing development areas and the countryside to provide for leisure and recreation uses and wildlife corridors. Policy 10 already provides for sustainable development and activities linked to farm diversification and other aspects of the rural economy. (DSW)	To revise policy to take account of the results of the Green infrastructure Strategy.
9574 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	Object	The proposed development will leave very little countryside to be considered	Even with the numbers of houses proposed across the 3 districts there will still be large areas of open countryside remaining. Development boundaries will be drawn around the main settlements to protect the countryside and development will only be allowed outside these boundaries in exceptional circumstances as outlined in Policy 10 - CB	None
10110 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] 10348 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] 10465 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10493 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	No large scale development	The purpose of this policy is to protect the countryside from large scale development. The policy specifically states that only small scale or limited development will be acceptable - CB	None
10589 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	No	Noted - CB	None
11157 - Robinson & Hall LLP	Object	Objects to Wortwell being "open countryside"	The Settlement Hierarchy is being re-assessed in light of	None

(Miss Victoria Pearson) [8407]

10566 - Mr G P Collings [8318]

Object The countryside is the most important thing for quality of life, also for food production and tourism. Leave it as it

responses received during the consultation process, the position of Wortwell in the submission document may well differ from it's Reg 25 classification.

The aim of this policy is to restrict development in the countryside, whilst providing appropriate opportunities for business and tourism. Whilst it is important to protect and enhance the countryside it is also necessary to sustain the rural economy and provide affordable housing where a specific local need can be shown. It is not a practical option to allow no development in the countryside - CB

None

11054 - Norfolk Homes Ltd

Support Support

Support noted - CB

None

Page 257 of 392

7.Policies for Places (Q3 - Q20)

Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

8793 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

Support Landowners and farmers could be further encouraged to restore traditional buildings in the interests of

This policy allows for restoration and diversification schemes to come forward. Landowners and farmers might be further encouraged to undertake such schemes through negotiation and discussion with Development Management and Conservation departments but no further information needs to be included in the Core Strategy- CB

None

7890 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]

Support It must be right to support some of the villages, be it historical, environmental

Noted - CB

None

9681 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]

Support Support, other than previous comments

Support noted, previous comments will be dealt with under the appropriate question - CB

None

9782 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]

Support There should be more flexibility regarding development in the countryside villages, not just affordable units, particularly if settlements have good communication links or adjoining facilities. Potential for small developments in all villages. This would share the requirements for homes and sustain rural communities

The settlement hierarchy is being reviewed to reflect updated information about the services and facilities in settlements. As a result of this work some settlements will move up the hierarchy and the only settlements to remain classified as 'countryside' will be those with very few/no services. In policy terms it is difficult to accept housing development in these locations (other than affordable housing) on grounds of sustainability. When updating the settlement hierarchy consideration has also been given to clustering settlements which share facilities or have good communication links - CB

None

10371 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]

Support yes but greenfield sites should be protected

The purpose of the policy is to restrict development in the countryside and avoid the use of greenfield land where possible, other than for perhaps affordable housing exceptions sites or small scale commercial enterprise - CB

None

Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8573 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 9158 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 9045 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] 9238 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 8236 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	Support	Support	Noted - CB	None
9301 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] 9706 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] 9274 - Mrs Gray [5927] 8365 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 9122 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 9363 - Mr Peter Rope [7113] 8524 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8046 - Shane Hull [7857] 8122 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8162 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 8211 - Mr P Anderson [7901] 8276 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8475 - Mr C Skeels [8016] 8499 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] 8549 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 8662 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8686 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] 8740 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8845 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 8982 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9119 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111] 9173 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] 9345 - Ms Celia Viner [8123] 9391 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124] 9433 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]				
9491 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139] 9523 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]				
8092 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	Support	As little development in the countryside as possible	Support noted. The purpose of the policy is to prevent unsuitable development in the countryside	None

Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8187 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	Support	See comments to Q17 (road network in Bressingham is not suitable for even small scale businesses with larger vehicles except adjacent to the A1066)	See response to Q17. Comments noted in relation to Bressingham - CB	None
7969 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Support	Agree with small scale conversion of unused agricultural buildings in the countryside	Support noted	None
7953 - Colin Mould [7809]	Support	Broad band internet access should be included in the plan.	The standard of Broadband provision has been raised as an issue and will be addressed by revised policies in the strategy. (DSW)	To include policy provisions for Broadband access.
8301 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	Support	Extensions to Country properties should be discouraged as these lead to property price levels rising beyond the reach of Countryside workers. eg land workers and	Extensions to dwellings are only one form of development that could be acceptable in the countryside. Any planning application for an extension would be considered on its merits through the development control process. As well as having the potential to lead to rises in property prices, extensions also have the potential of allowing families who need more space but cannot afford to move house the opportunity to continue living in rural locations - CB	None

Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10741 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Support	Yes	Support noted - CB	None
9884 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]				
10222 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
9938 - John Heaser [7015]				
10517 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]				
10774 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]				
10857 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]				
10985 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]				
9768 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]				
9833 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]				
10000 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]				
10133 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]				
10093 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]				
10402 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294]				
10438 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]				
10795 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360]				
10810 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]				
10832 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]				
10895 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]				
10937 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]				
10961 - Mr William E Cooper				

Decision on (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?
Settlement hierarchy to be reviewed.

To include policy provisions for Broadband access.

To revise policy to take account of the results of the Green infrastructure Strategy.

To revise Policy 10 and supporting text to strengthen the need to balance the protection and enhancement of the countryside with the provisions for limited housing, commercial, leisure and tourism related development.

Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>(Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</i>				
10324 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Comment	Agree with the aspiration, but this does not fit with the favoured option of large scale development within the adjacent to Broads villages.	Comment noted. The plan is subject to Appropriate Assessment to ensure that development does not have a negative effect on the habitats in the Broads.	No change to plan
9364 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	Comment	Page 39 is on the e company in my copy	Comment unclear	No change to plan
8334 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	Comment	There must be much closer cooperation with the Broads Authority than seems to be allowed for in Policy 11.	The policy covers only the area adjacent to the Broads as the Broads have their own plans.Full co-operation takes place between the planning authorities	No change to plan
8818 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]	Comment	No comment	None	No change to plan
10385 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Comment	Policy consistent with the statutory duty to have regard to its 'National Park' purposes, but adds little in terms of spatially specific content. Scope for strengthening the Strategy's vision for the Broads, and for managing the area's relationship to growth in the north east of Norwich in particular. For example, there will be increased visitor pressure on protected habitats, but there may also be opportunities to improve appropriately managed access to the Broads.	Comments noted.	Consider amending policy to take account of the potential effects and benefits of growth NE of Norwich on the Broads.
7919 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	Comment	Need to restrict second-home ownership.	Comment noted. The plan does not deal with the Broads National Park itself and therefore cannot cover this issue.	No change to plan
10590 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	See question 28	See question 28	No change to plan
9198 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	The Broads is about more than visual impact see 18.	See 18	No change to plan
7970 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Object	Sea level rise will flood the Broads without a response	It is agreed that sea level rise is a key issue facing the Broads, but that is beyond the scope of this plan which does not cover the Broads or coastal areas	No change to plan
10439 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]				
10672 - Mrs Lyn Robertson				
10543 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Object	Sympathetic Development could take place in the Broads area for housing and tourism	This policy covers areas adjacent to the Broads and seeks to ensure that any development enhances the Broads. It does not deal with development in the Broads National park itself as this area is subject to its own plans.	No change to plan

Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8237 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] 9575 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] 10094 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10111 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] 10466 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10494 - Mr I T Smith [8310] 10567 - Mr G P Collings [8318] 9628 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Object	There should be no development by the Broads the Broads, but requires very careful assessment of its	Noted. The policy does not prevent all development near visual impact.	No change to plan
	Support	<p>Welcome policy but wish to see expanded to include tranquillity, recreational value and navigational use. Suggested rewording of policy and text:</p> <p>POLICY: In areas in close proximity to the Broads Authority area particular regard will be applied to maintaining and enhancing the economy, environment, tranquillity, setting, visual amenity, recreational value and navigational use of the Broads</p> <p>REASONED JUSTIFICATION: The Broads is an area of acknowledged national importance for landscape, biodiversity, and recreational and navigational value. It is a major contributor to the economy and quality of life of the Joint Core Strategy area and wider region. Development within the Joint Core Strategy area has the potential to strengthen, complement and link with Broads assets, but also risks harming or under-valuing them if the inter-relatedness of the two areas is not properly recognised.</p>	General support and suggested rewording of policy and text noted	Consider use of suggested rewording of policy and text
9419 - Mr David Gladwell [8126]	Support	The BROADS AREA is of vital importance to retain the unique environment and attraction we have. Under the stewardship of John Packman as Chief Executive this has been maintained and developed, with the new BESL strategies and flood bankworks creating a saviour of the system with roll back reed beds establishing a new panoramic view of the Broads. Around the Chet mouth confluence to the Yare (Hardley Cross) this has been of major importance and an outstanding success where angling has also been taken into consideration sympathetically too.	Support noted	No change to plan
10622 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	Support	Yes as long as the term 'enhancement' also means 'safeguarding' and has full regard to proper flood risk and water management.	The policy seeks to protect the Broads. All development must take full account of flood risk and water quality.	No change to plan

Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9404 - Mr E Newberry [8120]
9525 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]

Support But not enough details given

Support noted. The policy covers the area adjacent to the Broads and seeks to prevent inappropriate development.

No change to plan

Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10742 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Support	Yes	Support noted	No change to plan
9242 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]				
8574 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]				
8916 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]				
9159 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]				
9885 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]				
9046 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]				
9239 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]				
8188 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]				
9302 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]				
9707 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]				
10223 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
11055 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]				
8366 - Alyson Lowe [6992]				
9939 - John Heaser [7015]				
9124 - Mr John Osborne [7111]				
10518 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]				
9802 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]				
8903 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]				
10775 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]				
8526 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]				
8093 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]				
8123 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8163 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]				
8212 - Mr P Anderson [7901]				
8277 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]				
8302 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]				
8476 - Mr C Skeels [8016]				
10858 - Norwich Green Party (Mr				

Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

[8021]
8663 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
8687 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
8753 - Ms K Dunn [8045]
9682 - Wroxham Parish Council
(Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
8741 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]
8794 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

8846 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
8983 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9120 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9174 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner
[8112]
9346 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
9393 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]
9434 - Swannington with Alderford
& Little Witchingham Parish
Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9459 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
9492 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]
9555 - Mr R Harris [8146]
9608 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
[8162]
9733 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson
[8174]
10986 - Howard Birch Associates
(Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
9769 - Damien van Carrapiett
[8184]
9834 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]
10001 - The Bunwell Partnership
(Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
10035 - The London Planning
Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)
[8230]
10134 - Lothbury Property Trust
Company Ltd [8234]
10186 - Commercial Land [8246]

10403 - Acle Parish Council (Ms
Pauline James) [8294]
10796 - Liftshare (Ms Ali
Clabburn) [8360]
10811 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]
10833 - North East Wymondham

Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Decision on (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Consider amending policy to take account of the potential effects and benefits of growth NE of Norwich on the Broads.				
Consider use of suggested rewording of policy and text				
<i>(Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</i>				
9473 - Louisa Young [8135]	Comment	Anglia Square is a substandard shopping centre encouraging shoppers to travel elsewhere by car to shop.	The planning system has little control over particular retailers other than on the overall need for, and impacts of, proposed new shopping developments. Norwich City Council is producing an Area Action Plan for the Anglia Square area which might result in proposals by differing types of retailers. The "Norwich Sub-Region: Retail and Town Centres Study" (October 2007) concludes a potential for additional shopping floor space in the area. (DSW)	Action: No change.
9847 - Spen Hill Developments Limited [8201]	Comment	Welcome the identified retail hierarchy which follows the specific typologies identified in PPS6 'Planning for Town Centres'	Noted - CB	None
9734 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	Comment	Not sure	Noted - CB	None
10305 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	Comment	Existing small shops such as at Hethersett are struggling due to competition from the larger chains. Adding the potential for retail expansion will exacerbate this position.	The "Norwich Sub- Region: Retail and Town Centres Study" (October 2007) concludes a potential for additional shopping floor space which will be provided for in the centres identified. Proposals for large retail schemes or schemes not appropriate to a particular centre require consideration in accordance with the need, sequential test and impact tests of government planning policy guidance	Action: No change.
8009 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	Comment	Development of Hall Road is supported. Query the need for small towns to have any more development that they cannot support	Support for the inclusion of Hall Road is noted. Regarding small towns the policy encourages development at a scale appropriate to their form and function. The need for and impact of particular schemes in a location will be assessed at the planning application stage in accordance with Government guidance - CB	None
9660 - Ms E Riches [8165]	Comment	Re growth in Long Stratton, the government should fund the bypass first as developer funding would be inadequate to fund a bypass and the necessary community facilities without the cost of the housing being	This is not an issue related to the hierarchy of centres which is intended to provide for the appropriate scales of shops and services to serve the proposed growth. Government funding for a bypass is not assured and discussions are underway to establish the best means of providing the necessary services and facilities for the proposed growth. (DSW)	Action: No change.
7971 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Comment	foresee traditional shops disappearing as more shopping is done on line	Comments noted but the Core Strategy still needs to provide a hierarchy of centres for retail development as	None

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10288 - ASDA Stores Ltd [8274]	Comment	Supports the hierarchy, but considers that the policy suggests that new retailing and other town centre uses can only be located within the hierarchy of defined centres. This conflicts with PPS 6 which states that retail development can be located on edge-of-centre sites where no sequentially preferable sites are available in the identified centres. Suggests the inclusion of the following paragraph be included at the end of the policy: "New retailing, services, offices and other town centre uses should be located in accordance with the sequential approach outlined in PPS 6".	The hierarchy reflects government planning policy guidance in PPS 6 to show the main foci for retailing and other town centre uses. It does not state that such development can only be located within the defined town and other centres. The policy also states that further policies will be introduced within all categories of centres as well as the service villages to enhance the environment and economy of the centre. While policies are not supposed to repeat government planning policy guidance such as the sequential test, there will be further clarification in the Site Specific Policies and Development Control Policies Development Plan Documents regarding the location of retailing and other town centre uses. (DSW) Noted - CB	Action: No change.
9746 - Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155]	Comment	Castle Mall and Chapelfield more geared up to help the blind and partially sighted. Shop Mobility works well in		None
8278 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]	Comment	No. There is too much retail space already in Norwich.	The "Norwich Sub-Region: Retail and Town Centres Study" (October 2007) concluded varying levels of potential for new convenience and comparison goods floor space in Norwich and other centres to be provided for by the	Action: No change.
10721 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Comment	Does the policy mean that the proposed Blue Boar Lane district centre will be located at the Tesco Extra Store or further along the road? How would White House Farm fit in with the "new high street".	The Blue Boar Lane Tesco store will form the nucleus of a proposed district centre once the existing planning permission for associated community facilities has been implemented. White House Farm is the location of an existing housing commitment which is the subject of a development brief providing for links to the proposed district centre. Noted - CB	Action: No change.
9968 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Comment	No comment		None
10286 - Henderson Retail Warehouse Fund [8270]	Comment	* Support the designation of Norwich city centre. * Request a reference to the Riverside Retail Park within the Norwich City centre designation.	Support noted.The Riverside Retail Park is located in an edge of centre location that has been shown by the Norwich Sub-Region Retail Study to be a mainly car-based shopping destination with only 8% of visitors combining their trips with trips to Norwich city centre and 43% of visitors never doing so. While the current local plan policy identifies it as part of the city centre, the evidence suggests otherwise, which prompts the need to reconsider the status of the retail park as a potential district centre.	Action (1): Policy 12 - in the context of the Norwich Sub Region Retail and Town Centres Study (October 2007), to confirm whether Norwich city centre should include the Riverside Retail Park and to consider the designation of the latter as a potential district centre. Action (2): Policy 12 -in supporting text paragraph 7.38 immediately

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8598 - Mr M Read [8024]	Comment	Brownfield sites only	Development will be promoted on brownfield sites where these are available and in the case of new retail development in existing centres it is quite likely that a high proportion of these sites will be brownfield. However, due to the limited supply of brownfield sites in some locations it is not always possible use previously developed land so some take up of greenfield land may be necessary - CB	None
10325 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Comment	Primary retailing areas should be concentrated in Norwich city centre and existing settlements and not on out-of-town sites. There should be a policy commitment to the retention of local distinctiveness to support local shops and food chains.	The primary shopping areas will be concentrated in the main centres as defined plus local provisions elsewhere. The planning system can control proposals for shops in terms of their need and impact related to comparison goods and convenience goods, but cannot discriminate between particular named retailers. (DSW)	Action: no change.
10268 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson)	Comment	The Longwater Retail Park should be added to the list to reflect its ability to serve existing housing at Costessey and the proposed growth at Easton, while enabling the retailers of smaller goods to provide a wider range of local shopping for nearby residents.	The Longwater Retail Park has evolved in an out-of-town location approximately 1.6km (1 mile) from the nearest housing on the basis of the past need for "bulky goods" non-food retailing and the lack of adverse impact of the Sainsbury's large food store. While bus and cycling access is available, the area does not have easy non-car access from most of its catchment and is not within easy walking distance for shopping purposes of the nearest housing. (This includes an allowance for committed and proposed housing growth areas). The retail park is referred to in the supporting text and additional retailing development could be provided for within the context of current government planning policy guidance. (DSW)	Action: No change.
8795 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	Comment	Agree with hierarchy. Agree with Magdalen Street and Anglia Square. No shopping malls	Support noted. Government planning policy guidance provides for new retailing development including shopping malls provided such proposals show a "need", lack of adverse "impact" on existing centres and if not located in a preferred defined centre location, prove that there is a lack of suitable and available sites. (DSW)	Action: No change.
9527 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Comment	Magdalen Street and Anglia Square in need of development. Concerned Norwich city centre may not be able to sustain more retail outlets	The policy encourages the development of centres at a scale appropriate to their form and function. The need for and impact of particular development schemes in Norwich city centre would be assessed at the planning application	None

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

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

<p>8501 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] 9405 - Mr E Newberry [8120] 10095 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10096 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10349 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] 10495 - Mr I T Smith [8310] 10544 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312] (10544) Norwich is the location of the best shops which is 10568 - Mr G P Collings [8318]</p>	Object	<p>Local retail to develop. Less dominance of supermarkets. More quality and variety in shop choice. (10095) More small food stores are needed in Norwich. (10096) No more large supermarkets. (10349) Need independent village shops and post offices and not more Tesco stores. (10495) Leave the towns, villages and hamlets as they are and help small shops so they are not destroyed by Tesco. No large development. where people will want to go. Local shopping areas need good cheap parking and interesting shops to attract people. (10568) Villages and towns are fine as they are so do not change them.</p>	<p>The "Norwich Sub-Region: Retail and Town Centres Study" (October 2007) concluded varying levels of potential for new convenience and comparison goods floor space to be provided for by the strategy. The consideration of retailing proposals is within the context of government planning policy guidance which is under review but so far has declined to include a "competition test". However existing guidance provides for an assessment of the need for and the retail and other impacts of retail proposals outside defined primary shopping areas on a existing centres. The quality and variety of shop choice arises largely from market forces subject to planning policy tests of "need" and "impact". Policies cannot discriminate between particular retailers. The closure of post offices is a government policy beyond the control of the strategy.</p> <p>The Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document and the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document will provide for defined areas in which shops will be encouraged, provisions for car parking where required and policies to control proposed losses of shops and services. (DSW)</p>	Action: No change.
9332 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	Object	<p>Wymondham will be too large. Hall Road, Norwich does not need to be a district centre as it is too close to Norwich.</p>	<p>Wymondham already fulfils the role of a main town shopping centre and the "Norwich Sub-Region: Retail and Town Centres Study" (October 2007) concludes a potential for additional shopping floor space in the town, irrespective of the additional housing growth proposed in the strategy.</p> <p>Hall Road shopping will serve a significant population in the southern part of Norwich. Its development will reduce the need for shopping trips to Norwich city centre while forming part of the mixed use redevelopment of a redundant industrial area. (DSW)</p>	Action: No change.
9304 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Object	No	Noted - CB	None
9770 - Damien van Carrapiett	Object	We do not need further growth in Thorpe St Andrew	This is not an issue related to the hierarchy of centres	Action: No change.

which is intended to provide for the appropriate scales of shops and services to serve the proposed growth. The proposed housing growth beyond Sprowston, Thorpe St Andrew and Rackheath reflects the outcomes of evidence studies suggesting these as some of the sustainable locations for new growth around Norwich. (DSW)

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10135 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]
10897 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]

Object * Support the identification of Old Catton/ Rackheath/ Thorpe St Andrew/ Sprowston growth area as a location for a new district centre/ high street.
* However request that such a centre should be ranked higher up the hierarchy in Group 2.

Response
Support noted.The Old Catton/ Rackheath/ Thorpe St Andrew growth area in particular will be sufficiently large to require a district centre to preferably comprise a food store as an anchor and sufficient leisure and ancillary activities to provide for the attraction of a range of trips."

Action: Policy 12 - For consistency to revise the status of the proposed district centres of Old Catton/ Rackheath/ Thorpe St Andrew, Blue Boar lane, Sprowston and Hall Road, Norwich to Category 3 on the basis of their potential ranges of goods sold and potential sales floor space.

However it is not intended to provide for a range of comparison goods retailing and other services equivalent to that of a town or large district centre. Once the centre has been developed and its provisions established, its status will be reviewed. However for consistency, it would be appropriate to raise the status of the proposed district centres to the equivalent of Category 3 centres providing for mainly daily needs (DSW)

9047 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]

Object No, further development of Long Stratton and Wymondham is unsustainable.

Wymondham and Long Stratton are selected areas for further growth on the basis of their existing services provisions and their levels of accessibility. (DSW)

Action: No change.

7932 - mr paul newson [7812]

Object no retail should be spread out and kept local to avoid excessive transport use local village small scale retail

The policy names the most important centres to be provided with defined central business areas by the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document which with the policies of the Development Control Policy Development Plan Document will provide for new shops and services and control the potential losses of all existing shops and services within the context of government

Action: No change.

10467 - Mr David Smith [8309]

Object Do not build in the countryside. This is best left as it is.

The proposed Hierarchy of Centres concentrates most new retailing, offices and other town centre uses within defined centres and other settlements.

Action: No change.

10112 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]

Object Development should be retained within Norwich on brown field sites and at a new town in Long Stratton.

This is not an issue related to the hierarchy of centres which is intended to provide for the appropriate scales of shops and services to serve the proposed growth. Norwich does not have the capacity to accommodate the total proposed growth but its share will be provided for on brown field sites as far as possible. Long Stratton is a proposed

Action: No change.

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10386 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]
9803 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]
9629 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]
9269 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]

Object * (9269) Agree with Norwich as the top centre but do not understand the groupings and relationships between for example, Aylsham and Anglia Square/ Magdalen Street.
* (9629) The hierarchical significance of the four categories is not clear as they all appear to be subject to the same test of development at a scale appropriate to their form and function.
* (9803) Greater focus is required on the town and district centres rather than centralising on Norwich.
* (9269) Re protection of commercial premises, the failure to protect small businesses from unfair competition by large supermarkets does not bode well for the future.
* (10386 - GoEast) Questions whether this policy provides sufficient guidance as to the function of different levels within the hierarchy and hence the appropriate scale of development in each case. Clarification of the scale of urban edge retail/office locations and the role of Norwich city centre would be helpful; support for maintaining and strengthening the city's place in the hierarchy as the primary focus for retail and office development would be consistent with Policy 3. In particular, the scale and location of district centres proposed to the north east of Norwich should be clarified.

The groupings of shopping centres reflect government planning policy advice, the amounts of shopping floor space available within the centres and their relative functions and catchments. Categories 1 and 2 represent the largest retailing and services centres which serve significant catchments and have potentials for additional shopping floor space and new leisure provisions as identified by the "Norwich Sub Region: Retail and Town Centres Study" (October 2007). The Category 3 centres are centres serving much more local catchments with an emphasis on provisions for everyday needs, supplemented by the Category 4 centres proposed to serve the proposed new housing growth areas. The focus on Norwich is commensurate with its role as a major regional centre and government planning policy guidance. Potential growth has nevertheless been identified for lesser centres by the above retail study which also assumes a continuation of their current levels of shopping attraction. The four categories will provide a context for the definition of central business areas in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document to provide foci for the encouragement of shops and services, while the protection of commercial premises will be provided for in the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. The supporting text to Policy 12 should be clarified regarding the above points. Re the protection of small businesses, the consideration of retailing proposals is within the context of government guidance which is under review but so far has declined to include a "competition test", albeit existing guidance provides for an assessment of the retail and other impacts of retail proposals on a town centre. (DSW)

Policy 12 - to clarify the supporting text regarding the functions of and basis and reasons for the defined hierarchy of centres as suggested below: Insert three new paragraphs between Paragraphs 7.36 and 7.37 as follows: "The hierarchy of centres reflects the functions of and catchments served by each centre, their availability of shops and services and their potential to accommodate growth as assessed by background evidence studies. Categories 1 and 2 respectively group the largest centres of Norwich and the main towns (plus a large district centre) which serve notable urban and rural catchments and have potentials for additional shopping floor space and leisure uses as identified by the "Norwich Sub Region: Retail and Town Centres Study" (October 2007), and office development potential in Norwich as detailed below. Category 3 shows the smaller district centres within Norwich and the smaller towns and large villages with centres serving more localised catchments and which have a greater emphasis on providing for everyday needs. (This category also includes the

largest proposed new district centres). Local smaller scale provisions to serve the remaining proposed new housing growth areas are shown in Category 4. Other local shops and services will also be provided for where local needs arise. Overall the development of potential town centre uses will be provided for on a scale appropriate to the form and functions of, and the potentials for development identified by background evidence studies as detailed below." Add to Paragraph 7.37:" (of which most retail comparison goods), while the centre also provides for most of the strategy area's commercial leisure provisions".(Follow 7.37

Page 272 of 392

7.Policies for Places (Q3 - Q20)

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

with new para.): "Norwich is expected to continue as the area's primary retailing and leisure centre, with expansion potential to 2016 (based on high confidence levels) in the city centre for up to some 4%-12% additional convenience goods floor space (depending on expenditure being taken up by large or small stores respectively), and some 21% additional comparison goods floor space. Norwich city centre will remain the focus for much large scale commercial leisure development to reflect a potential growth in leisure expenditure of 23% by 2016, while Norwich and parts of its fringe are identified as potential locations for significant office growth to 2021. The latter could total some 300,000m2 of which some 33% would be accommodated within the city centre, while 50% could be accommodated in the Norwich Research Park and Broadland Business Park with the remainder to be divided between a variety of potential city centre and other locations." Para, 7.38: Replace

first word "This" with, "Norwich city centre". Add to paragraph 7.38 the words, "The district centres would be considered for additional improvements as shopping destinations. On a sequential site selection basis, Anglia Square would provide a potential location for growth identified for Norwich city centre. However no potential has been identified for additional out-of-centre retailing." Insert two new paragraphs after paragraph 7.39 to say: "The market and other main towns will need to maintain their roles and diversify their shops and services. Recent major food store developments have taken up any potential for convenience goods stores in the town centres of Aylsham and Diss, whose respective potentials for further comparison goods floor

Page 273 of 392

7.Policies for Places (Q3 - Q20)

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

space to 2016 amount to an additional 35% and 42%. The remaining town centres of Harleston and Wymondham have been identified as having floor space potentials for an additional 22-67% convenience/ 18% comparison goods, and 15-43% convenience/ 19% comparison goods floor space respectively (the convenience goods ranges again reflecting expenditure take up by large or small stores). These towns will also act as foci for leisure development such as cafes, bars, restaurants and other food and drink establishments. These could total broadly some 15% of total town centre floor space and would be provided for to enhance the vitality and viability of such centres as a whole." Insert two new paragraphs after paragraph 7.40 to say: "No specific retail floor space potentials have been identified for this range of smaller centres, albeit evidence shows a notable

potential for additional convenience goods floor space growth within the Norwich urban area as a whole. Policies will define all retail and service centres in which provisions may be protected and enhanced." "The proposed large scale housing areas will provide for shops and services to meet local needs where they are not able to benefit from existing centres. The Old Catton/ Rackheath/ Thorpe St Andrew growth area in particular will be sufficiently large to require a district centre to preferably comprise a food store as an anchor and sufficient leisure and ancillary activities to provide for the attraction of a range of trips."

Page 274 of 392

7.Policies for Places (Q3 - Q20)

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9200 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	Hoveton/ Wroxham is not included in 2. There is no mention of corner shops or post offices which need	Wroxham is a defined Key Service Centre in relation to provisions for housing growth due to its close links with the adjacent centre of Hoveton. Hoveton is the main shopping centre but is not named as it is located outside the strategy area in North Norfolk district. However it would be useful to refer in the supporting text to the complementary roles of the towns and main district centres of Beccles, Bungay and Hoveton as significant shopping and service centres adjacent to and serving the strategy area.	Action: to refer in the Policy 12 supporting text to the complementary roles of the towns and main district centres of Beccles, Bungay and Hoveton as significant shopping and service centres adjacent to and serving the strategy area.
7940 - Mr Peter Boddy [7815]	Object	I object to this proposal on the grounds that it will mean the building of an eco town at Rackheath. I have already submitted my objections to that under Policy 5	Policy 12 refers to the introduction of further policies in all categories of centre. These policies will define shopping centre boundaries and other areas in which shops will be encouraged in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document, while policies in the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document will control the potential losses of all such premises. This will assist the provisions of small shops which often include post offices. However the retention of post offices alone is a government policy beyond the control of the strategy. Objection to eco town at Rackheath is noted. Objection to be dealt with under responses to Policy 5 - CB	None
8917 - Hempnall Parish Council	Object	(8917) Long Stratton should not be elevated to town	As a general location for growth, Long Stratton meets the	Action: To reconsider the status of

(Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
11119 - The Leeder Family [8390]

status.
(11119) Long Stratton should be listed in Group 2 and not Group 3 for consistency with the Spatial Vision, Policy 5

criteria to be a Key Service Centre but has been proposed to have Main Town status to reflect its potential housing growth. However this requires reconsideration for consistency with the status of other centres coinciding with other proposed major growth locations, and the status of the village within the Hierarchy of Centres. It is not assumed at present that the town centre will be able to expand to accommodate the additional shops and services which could be required for and most likely to be provided for within the proposed new housing development. (DSW)

Long Stratton as a Key Service Centre in terms of general growth for consistency with the maintaining of the existing status of other centres that coincide with major housing growth locations, and for further consistency, to consider the retention of this centre in Group 3 of the Hierarchy of Centres as the centres in Groups 1 and 2 have an acknowledged and quantified growth potential for significant retail floorspace. However in view of the proposed housing growth and the potential for additional shops and services to meet the needs of that growth within the new housing areas, the status of Long Stratton in terms of both the Settlement Hierarchy and the Hierarchy of Centres will be reviewed in future reviews of the strategy to reflect the impacts of the proposed housing and potential new commercial development

Page 275 of 392

7.Policies for Places (Q3 - Q20)

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

8944 - Miss Marguerite Finn	Object	There are already town centres in the places listed, they are popular for being what they are now
9576 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	Object	This will lead to the overpopulation of Norfolk
8664 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]	Object	Development should be undertaken on a needs basis to be sustained.
10591 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	Answered no to all questions. See Q28 for reasons
7954 - Colin Mould [7809] 8213 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	Support	Need to prevent the dominance of one supermarket retailer. Doubt whether the increasing presence of supermarkets

The aim of the policy is not to establish new town centres (other than point 4) it is simply to permit development in existing centres appropriate to their form and function. The need for and impact of particular development schemes in a location will be assessed at the planning application stage in accordance with Government guidance
The provisions for housing growth are within the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy (The East of England Plan). The hierarchy of centres acts as a focus for the provision of the appropriately scaled development of shops and services to serve that growth. (DSW)
Government planning policy guidance provides for the consideration of retail and other town centre use proposals on the basis of need among other things. (DSW)
Noted - CB
The consideration of retailing proposals is within the context of government guidance which is under review but so far has declined to include a "competition test", albeit existing guidance provides for an assessment of the impact of retail proposals on a town centre. Policies referring to the consideration of new proposals will

None
Action: No change.
Action: No change.
None
Action: No change

7892 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]

Support Market towns should be allowed to grow and encourage a complete range of commercial investment

be provided for in a separate Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

The policy encourages the development of market towns at a scale appropriate to their form and function. The need for and impact of particular development schemes in a location will be assessed at the planning application stage in accordance with Government guidance - CB

None

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10743 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]
10372 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]
9886 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]
10054 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]
10224 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

Support Support

Support noted - CB

None

9940 - John Heaser [7015]
10755 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048]
10519 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]
10776 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]
9460 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
10987 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]

10002 - The Bunwell Partnership
(Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
10036 - The London Planning
Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)
[8230]
10187 - Commercial Land [8246]

10404 - Acle Parish Council (Ms
Pauline James) [8294]
10440 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]
10623 - Central Norwich Citizens
Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]

10673 - Mrs Lyn Robertson
[8348]
10834 - North East Wymondham

10017 - notcutts Limited (Mrs
Erica McDonald) [6911]

Support Agree with the proposed hierarchy but consider that retail uses such as garden centres are too extensive to be accommodated in central areas and are thus not city centre uses. Policy should encourage the retention and improvement of garden centres.

Support noted. Locations outside the defined centres for retailing uses including garden centres may be justified in certain circumstances within the context of government planning policy guidance which is not repeated in the strategy. Other provisions for the general consideration and location of retailing uses will be made in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document and the Development Control Policies Development Plan

Action: No change.

9175 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner

Support I agree with one condition that access by car is made for blue badge holders.

Support noted, access by car for blue badge holders is too detailed a point for this broad retail hierarchy policy. This issue should be considered at the planning application stage - CB

None

Page 277 of 392

7.Policies for Places (Q3 - Q20)

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10797 - Liftshare (Ms Ali
Clabburn) [8360]
10812 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]

Support The centres need to be accessible by a range of sustainable transport

The Policy 12 centres are all accessible by a range of means of transport. Policy 13 "Reducing Environmental Impact" is a generic policy providing for all new development to reduce the need to travel and give priority to modes of travel in accordance with the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy. DW

Action: No change.

9556 - Mr R Harris [8146]

Support Support the centres but limited to the reduced housing need as suggested.

Support noted.
The "Norwich Sub-Region: Retail and Town Centres Study" (October 2007) concludes a potential for additional shopping floor space which will be provided for in the centres identified. (DSW)

Action: No change.

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9244 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8575 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 9160 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 8610 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] 9240 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 8238 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	Support	Support	Support noted - CB	None
8189 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 9708 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] 8819 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] 8367 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 9125 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 9365 - Mr Peter Rope [7113] 8527 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8124 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8126 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8127 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8164 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 8477 - Mr C Skeels [8016] 8551 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 8688 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] 9683 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 8742 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8847 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 8984 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9121 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111] 9394 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124] 9435 - Swannington with Alderford				
8125 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	Support	The current projections on climate change are based on dubious data and are not convincing. Reduction of pollution is a worthy objective.	Noted but not really relevant to this particular question -	None
9835 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	Support	Please add Taverham as an existing district centre	The provision of shops and services in Taverham is divided between a garden centre that includes miscellaneous businesses with overall poor non-car access and local shops and services distributed elsewhere. There is no one centre that would fulfil a sustainable district	Action: No change.

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10859 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Support	We must evaluate how Norwich's status as "the highest ranking retail centre in the region" has impacted upon smaller retail centres such as Cromer or Great Yarmouth, and it also affects the viability of creating new smaller retail centres elsewhere in the Norwich policy Area. Making Norwich or market towns/ the rural economy the focus for growth is to some extent mutually exclusive, particularly in terms of retail. It would perhaps be better to talk of finding a balance between these two objectives.	The growth of Norwich as a major regional retail centre has long been in balance with changes to retailing provisions in other places such as Cromer and Great Yarmouth as a result of market forces and peoples' freedom of choice of where to shop. However the "Norwich Sub Region: Retail and Town Centres Study" (October 2007) based its conclusions regarding the potential for additional retail and other floor space in the strategy area's main retailing centres on the continuation of the current balance of their attraction of retailing expenditure. This provides for the current proportions of catchment expenditure to continue to be attracted to retailing centres outside the strategy area, and to the smaller centres within it, and maintains a balance which will continue to provide for retailing growth in centres other than Norwich. Such expenditure will also increase additionally where centres coincide with areas of proposed new housing growth, which will include provisions for additional shops and services to meet local everyday needs. DW	Action: No change.
11135 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 11056 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] 11148 - JB Planning Associates	Support	Support	Support noted - CB	None
8303 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	Support	Full	Support noted	None
8438 - J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003]	Support	Welcome recognition of Loddons significance	Noted - CB	None

Decision on (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

refer in the Policy 12 supporting text to the complementary roles of the towns and main district centres of Beccles, Bungay and Hoveton as significant shopping and service centres adjacent to and serving the strategy area.

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8. Area-wide policies (policies about topics) (Q21 -Q26)				
(Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)				
10683 - Ms Natalie Beal [8349]	Comment	Is this repeating national policy or do you intend to go further than national policy - it is unclear what you are intending. The bullet point that starts 'make sustainable use of resources ...' is totally weakened by the inclusion of the wording 'wherever possible' - this gives developers a get-out clause and should be reconsidered.	The policy as drafted goes beyond national requirements. This will be reconsidered in the light of the findings of the energy study.	Consider amendments to policy in the light of the findings of the Energy Study and more detailed wording amendments as
10641 - Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333]	Comment	Cohousing is a particularly effective way of reducing environmental impact.	Comment noted. The strategy promotes both environmentally sensitive housing development and the provision of a variety of types of home to meet different needs.	No change to plan
8048 - Mr Keith Jones [7536]	Comment	I have an interest in the designation of a Conservation Area covering parts of Beeston St Andrews.	The comment does not relate to this policy or plan. Conservation Areas are designated by local authorities under different legislation.	No change to plan
7972 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Comment	don't believe that you will force developers to build anything other than their typical square boxes without regional character. Housing could be greatly improved if garages were built underground as on the continent instead of the car dominating the development	Comment noted.	Consider need for more detailed design policy.
10707 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Comment	Include: requirement to enhance biodiversity and landscape character as well as protect them, particularly waterbodies under Water Framework Directive. appropriate remediation of contaminated land. pollution control measures	Comments noted	Consider amendments to policy to cover water bodies, pollution and contamination.
9630 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Comment	Reduction of environmental impact should be inherent and the first policy in the strategy document. Agree with overall approach of policy	Comment noted	Consider placing environmental policies as the first policies in the strategy.
8128 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	Comment	The present concern about climate change is based on projections from dubious data and is not convincing. The reduction of pollution is a worthy objective.	Support for reduction of pollution noted. Government policy requires planning to address climate change	No change to plan
9646 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Comment	Policy unnecessarily repeats national and regional	Comment noted	Ensure environmental policies are locally distinctive
10387 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Comment	Welcome the commitment to reducing environmental impact but encourage you to avoid repetition of national policy and strengthen those elements which provide a spatially specific basis for reducing carbon emissions, for example by identifying opportunities for renewable energy generation; we understand that further evidence to inform energy policy will become available prior to publication of the submission draft	Comments noted.	Ensure submission policy is locally distinctive and takes account of the findings of the

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11155 - British Wind Energy Association (Ms Gemma Grimes) [8401]	Comment	Strongly recommend need for specific policies to promote renewable energy and energy efficiency with discrete proactive rather than generic policies	Noted	Ensure policies for renewable energy and energy efficiency are proactive and can be implemented through the use of recognised standards rather than generic
9969 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Comment	No comment	None	No change to plan
9783 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	Comment	General support, but concerns about high densities and lack of open space in some developments.	Comment noted. Policies elsewhere in the plan require densities of new development to be appropriate for the surrounding area and require open space to be supplied to serve new development.	No change to plan
10649 - Ms Lucy Hall [8295]	Comment	This Core Strategy and NATS seem unwilling to grasp the principle that encouraging one form of transport means restricting another. You can't just encourage (public transport, cycling) without doing some restricting (cars, lorries).	The JCS sets out a broad strategy to promote the use of sustainable methods of transport, to reduce the need to travel and to reduce reliance on the car. Details of how this strategy will be implemented will be set out in NATS.	No change to plan
10251 - Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260]	Comment	Bullet point 2 misses out geodiversity protection. (Conserving geodiversity in its own right is not the same as keeping reserves of minerals for later use.) Suggest amendment to: "...sites that are important for biodiversity, geodiversity, landscape character ..."	Comment noted.	Consider reference to geodiversity in policy.
8214 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	Comment	Development is likely to use up scarce resources and the road proposals are unlikely to minimise the need to travel by car. What is the flood risk? Is it the latest figures predicted? I think a lot of this is just words.	Comment noted. Policy uses defined national standards to ensure it can be implemented and will therefore reduce resource use in new development. NDR is intended to free up road space for bus rapid transit system. Flood risk is assessed by the Environment Agency. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has ensured none of the new growth areas are in areas of fluvial flood risk.	No change to plan
10592 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	See question 28.	See question 28.	No change to plan
9048 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Object	No - Not agreed relating to Long Stratton and	The policy does not relate to specific locations for growth.	No change to plan
9406 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Object	All measures must be in place before housing starts and they must be far in advance of what is expected now, otherwise it will never be put into practice, as we already have seen, transport links essential without major road building which only encourages traffic	Objection noted. The plan sets out implementation requirements associated with development. Requirements for specific schemes and timing of their provision will be set out in later plans.	No change to plan
8599 - Mr M Read [8024] 8715 - Mr Nick Miller [8049] 8952 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] development to provide local services and employment 10350 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole	Object	Development should be on brownfield sites only and should minimise the need to travel by ensuring there are local facilities	Noted. The strategy maximises the use of brownfield land. However, there is insufficient brownfield land to meet growth requirements. The strategy requires new and to be designed to promote the use of public transport.	No change to plan

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11136 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 10055 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 10756 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048] 10136 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 11104 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] 10646 - David Morris (Mr David Morris) [8335] 10835 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10898 - Broadland Land Trust [8366] 10917 - Allied London Properties [8367] 11120 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Object	Unreasonable to require all new housing to match current Housing Corporation requirements under the Code for Sustainable Homes. A more flexible policy wording is needed that promotes more sustainable construction and carbon reduction measures rather than requiring certain levels or ratings and does not affect viability. This would also be more adaptable to changing technologies and any future changes in government policy	Objection noted. PPS1 requires local planning authorities to address climate change through their plans. PPS1 climate change supplement enables planning authorities to make specific energy and water requirements for new development based on national standards provided a local evidence base is provided to justify such an approach. An Energy Study is being done and will inform energy policy and the Water Cycle Study for water.	Consider Code for Sustainable Homes requirements in the light of further evidence base findings.
9494 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]	Object	Very worthy but over optimistic	The policy ties environmental requirements to national standards to ensure that they can be implemented.	No change to plan
8319 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922] more CO2 emissions 8450 - Ian Harris [8007] 8789 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	Object	NDR contradicts this policy approach as it will generate transport by freeing up road space for bus rapid transit	Objection noted. The NDR will enable better public	No change to plan
7933 - mr paul newson [7812]	Object	all new housing should have its own solar power or CHP or heat pumps not just roll of insulation and low wattage lamp	Objection noted. The policy approach requires new development to use renewable energy. The findings of the Energy Study will help to inform more policy detail in subsequent versions of the plan.	Consider energy policies in relation to findings of the energy study.
9528 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Object	Agree with the sentiment, do not agree with the overall strategy	Objection noted, though it is not clear which element of the overall strategy is objected to.	No change to plan
10326 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Object	impact on the environment will be considerable given the major new road developments and high level of greenfield land that the Strategy proposes. The measures outlined in this policy merely reflect aspirations of very modest damage limitation, in our view. We welcome the commitment that all new housing should match Housing Corporation requirements under the Code for Sustainable Homes. A policy commitment to the upgrade of existing buildings would also be welcome. Indeed, 70% of today's homes will still be with us in 2050 the gains to be achieved from improving the environmental performance of existing housing are arguably greater than building new settlements.	Objection noted to overall strategy. The Code for Sustainable Homes requirements will be reconsidered in the light of the findings of the Energy Study.	Take account of the findings of the Energy Study, particularly in relation to the sustainability performance of existing

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11149 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	Object	We support Policy 13. However, we are concerned that the proposed level of development in Long Stratton will be incompatible with this policy's aim to 'Minimise the need to travel and give priority to modes of travel in accordance with the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy hierarchy of different types of transport.'	General support for policy and opposition to growth in Long Stratton noted.	No change to plan
8094 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] should at least meet ecotowns standards 8773 - Ms K Dunn [8045] 9333 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	Object	Environmental design standards not stringent enough, the findings of the energy study which will assess what	Objection noted. The standards will be further informed by environmental design standards, standards for energy efficiency and renewable energy are viable locally.	Consider amendments to taking account of the findings of the energy study
10113 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	Object	The environmental impact of these proposals is huge affecting large areas of countryside therefore development should be retained within Norwich on brownfield sites and at a new town in Long stratton thereby reducing environmental impact	Objection noted. The plan focuses development on brownfield sites as far as possible. Focussing other development on a single new town would not enable sufficient delivery of housing and infrastructure.	No change to plan
8920 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] 9577 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] 10468 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10496 - Mr I T Smith [8310] 10569 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Object	No development is the only way to save our	The growth is required under the regional plan to provide housing and employment to meet need. The policies in the plan attempt to minimise the environmental impact of the growth, and where possible create environmental improvements eg green infrastructure	No change to plan
10169 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]	Object	Policy should safeguard and protect mineral and waste resources . In addition, mineral railheads have national safeguarding provisions, which should be replicated and covered under travel element of this policy	Objection noted.	Consider amendments to policy to protect minerals sources and railheads.
11057 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] 9920 - stephen eastwood [7962] 8644 - Mr Steve Dowall [8033] 8762 - Ms Sarah Smith [8059] 9003 - Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094] 9007 - Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095] 9011 - Mr Philip Smith [8096] 9014 - Mr KD White [8097] 9018 - Mr Robert Hall [8098] 8998 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093]	Object	Policy states that all the developments will protect sites of landscape character. The site specific proposal S39-02a and S39-02 is not in accordance within the Broadland District Landscape Assessment as having	Objections relate to a specific proposal in the Broadland LDF Site Allocation Plan and will be considered in relation to that plan, rather than to the overarching strategy.	No change to plan
9243 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 9079 - Ms R Pickering [8109] 9201 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] 9396 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	Object	Larger developments within the village would destroy the current landscape.	The objection does not relate to this policy or plan	No change to plan
	Object	Strategy must include public transport improvements if it wishes to reduce car use and provision of local facilities.	Noted. The strategy aims to enable public transport improvement. This will be implemented through NATS. The strategy requires local facilities to serve new	No change to plan

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10860 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Object	The Code for Sustainable Homes standard should be Level 4 or higher. Support aims of this policy but feel potentially undermined by other policies in plan such as housing and economic development. It is a real concern that the pressure on land because of large scale development could mean this provision being used to justify the building on environmentally sensitive sites.	Objection noted. The plan tries to strike the difficult balance between provision of housing and economic development and environmental protection. Environmentally sensitive sites are protected from development through environmental designations. Policies in the plan require landscaping to serve new development. The Code for Sustainable Homes requirements will be reconsidered in the light of the completed findings of the	Consider Code for Sustainable Homes requirements in the light of the completed findings of the evidence base.
9619 - RW Kidner [8163]	Object	The policy needs to refer to a specific code level as well as an energy efficiency figure and sustainability standards in order to make the policy clear offering certainty for developers to ensure the policy is enforceable and deliverable.	Noted.	Consider use of national sustainability standards in policy, taking account of findings of energy study.
9854 - Mr Paul Johnson [8207]	Support	Universally recognised that it is vital that impacts on the environment be kept as small as possible. Unfortunately, this hits a major dichotomy as any increase in population will create greater demands for roads, transport, jobs etc. and the more rubbish and disposal needs	Support noted. The plan attempts to address the dichotomy identified by promoted sustainable	No change to plan
7894 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	Support	All houses should be encouraged to save energy and rely less on fossil fuels	Support noted.	No change to plan
7955 - Colin Mould [7809]	Support	Need to ensure a fully comprehensive waste re-cycling system is in place before development.	Support noted. Waste recycling is included in the plan	No change to plan
8344 - Age Concern Norwich (Phil Wells) [7957]	Support	Providing the housing mix reflects the needs of older people - it is clear that an even spread of older people is not working in terms of delivery of social care, but equally many do not wish to live in older communities. Small affordable homes around a service centre may be a useful compromise allowing community development with potential for effective service delivery.	Support noted	Ensure strategy promotes housing which provides flexibility and meets the needs of all, including the elderly.
9176 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	Support	Agree with two provisos 1. That access is given to disabled blue badge holders 2. That all council housing and housing associations bring their stock up to the current requirements within five years and keep it that way not just new housing	Support noted. 1. This strategy does not make any amendments to blue badge holder policy. 2. All new social housing is built to significantly higher sustainability standards than the majority of private housing and funding requirements will continue those	Consider potential to improve the energy efficiency of existing social housing stock.

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10744 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Support	Yes	Noted	No change to plan
9245 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]				
8576 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]				
10373 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]				
9161 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]				
9887 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]				
8611 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]				
8239 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]				
9709 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]				
10225 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
9276 - Mrs Gray [5927]				
8820 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]				
8368 - Alyson Lowe [6992]				
9941 - John Heaser [7015]				
9126 - Mr John Osborne [7111]				
9366 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]				
10520 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]				
8905 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]				
10777 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]				
8528 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]				
8010 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]				
8165 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]				
8279 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]				
8304 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]				
8478 - Mr C Skeels [8016]				
8502 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]				
8552 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]				
8665 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]				
8689 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]				
8743 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]				

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8985 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9022 - Mr and Mrs Peter Tann [8099] 9123 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111] 9436 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]				
9463 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134] 9610 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] 9735 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] 10988 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] 9836 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 9902 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219] 10003 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10037 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10188 - Commercial Land [8246]				
10441 - Mr J E Youngs [8308] 10545 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]				
10624 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]				
9804 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Support	General support, but: housing should be located close to employment; densities should not be too high and should allow for gardens	General support noted. The plan promotes housing and employment to be located close to one another and for densities to be appropriate to the surrounding area.	No change to plan
9557 - Mr R Harris [8146]	Support	Subject to the limited number of housing as detailed in other questions.	Support noted	No change to plan
10655 - Mrs Helene Rinaldo	Support	Development should also take into account the notion of human footprint and food security, limiting new development to brown field, away from green field is essential and would follow the principle of Sustainable Development as defined by Defra.	General support noted. Insufficient brownfield sites are available to meet all the development need.	Consider how the notion of human footprinting and food security might be incorporated in policies.
8190 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	Support	Therefore do not encourage commercial growth in rural areas, i.e. Hethel engineering.	Support noted. Strategy generally promotes development in existing settlements. However, in specific cases such as Hethel local considerations such as the presence of an important business cluster may take precedence	No change to plan

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9684 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 9308 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Support	Have you correctly and sympathetically identified sites that are important for landscape character? Some are not immediately obvious but are an integral part of Norfolk's singular rural appeal - e.g. common and heath lands between Norwich & Coltishall for instance.	Landscape character assessments have been done for both South Norfolk and Broadland. These will be used to ensure any greenfield development is in keeping with its surroundings. Many areas of woodland, parkland and heathland are protected from development by nature conservation designations.	No change to plan
9305 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Support	But all developments should not be encompassed by the same Governmental density - each new site should be taken into consideration of the surrounding areas	Minimum advisory densities are 30 dwellings per hectare. Policies require local character to be taken account of in the design of development.	Consider need for flexibility on densities in design policies
Decision on (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)				
Consider amendements to environmental design standards, taking account of the findings of the energy study				
Consider need for more detailed design policy.				
Consider need for flexibility on densities in design policies				
Consider reference to geodiversity in policy.				
Consider Code for Sustainable Homes requirements in the light of the completed findings of the evidence base.				
Ensure strategy promotes housing which provides flexibility and meets the needs of all, including the elderly.				
Consider placing environmental policies as the first policies in the strategy.				
Consider amendements to policy to protect minerals sources and railheads.				
Consider use of national sustainability standards in policy, taking account of findings of energy study.				
Take account of the findings of the Energy Study, particularly in relation to the sustainability performance of existing buildings.				
Consider potential to improve the energy efficiency of existing social housing stock.				
Consider energy policies in relation to findings of the energy study.				
Ensure submission policy is locally distinctive and takes account of the findings of the Energy Study.				
Ensure environmental policies are locally distinctive.				
Consider Code for Sustainable Homes requirements in the light of further evidence base findings.				
Consider how the notion of human footprinting and food security might be incorporated in policies.				
Consider amendements to policy in the light of the findings of the Energy Study and more detailed wording amendements as suggested.				
Consider amendements to policy to cover water bodies, pollution and contamination.				

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action****(Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?**

10388 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]

Comment
Inclusion of housing trajectory is helpful but should be presented alongside key dependencies to maximize its value. The policy deals mainly with housing mix, and more information on delivery should be elsewhere in the submission DPD

In relation to Gypsy and traveller provision the plan should clarify the requirement for further sites including a post 2011 allocation consistent with the east of England plan [RB]

The numeric tables in the consultation draft set out housing totals, but are not intended to be a trajectory. The full trajectory will be included in the pre-submission publication version, and it is accepted that this needs to form the basis of an implementation strategy

Comments on the need to extrapolate Gypsy and Traveller requirements beyond 2011 are noted. This will need to include transit pitches as well as long stay, and provision for Travelling Showpeople as well as Gypsies and travellers. [RB]

Include housing trajectory and implementation strategy in pre-submission draft

Calculate requirement for Gypsies and travellers for long stay and transit pitches, and for Travelling Showpeople and include in pre-submission draft. [RB]

9080 - Ms R Pickering [8109]

Comment
Some shops could be changed to dwellings [RB]

It may be possible for some shops to be converted, but it is necessary to retain the vitality of shopping areas by retaining the commercial focus of these areas, even if in the short term this is difficult. In reality, although some contribution could be made by conversion of shops this is likely to be limited. In any case, any dwellings derived from conversion of existing buildings would contribute towards the total [RB]

No change needed [RB]

8612 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]

Comment
Suggest possible conflict between "green pastoral areas" and 2200 new homes in Wymondham [RB]

While the representation is not strictly relevant to the housing policy, housing locations have been selected having regard to factors such as access to a range of employment locations, good public transport connections, access to a range of local facilities. Measured against these criteria, Wymondham appears an appropriate choice. Given the need to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan, if allocations were reduced at Wymondham, they would have to be replaced elsewhere. [RB]

No Change needed [RB]

9092 - Dr. Ruth Roseveare

Comment
From personal experience, appreciate the facilities available in care homes. Many more such homes are needed for an ageing population as well as ordinary housing for able bodied people. Small houses needed for first time buyers. [RB]

Paragraph 8.5 recognises the needs of an ageing population but does not prescribe institutional care. Instead, the model favoured by care organisations best placed to judge appropriate approaches to such responsibilities will be followed.

No change needed [RB]

The policy on housing recognizes that the mix of housing to be sought will need to meet the requirements of the projected population [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10684 - Ms Natalie Beal [8349]

Comment
 The percentage of affordable homes sought on mixed tenure sites should be set out in policy
 The level of affordable housing provision should be increased to 50% on such sites with particular emphasis on large family properties

It may give the percentage sought more prominence to include it in policy, though because it is derived from a housing market assessment which has a relatively short "shelf life" it will need to be reviewed it during the course of the joint core strategies plan period. Furthermore, in line with the government policy, it will need the caveat that in particular circumstances site economics will be taken into account in the percentage sort
 Across the plan area, there is no evidence of a need for 50% affordable housing, though in the areas closest to Norwich the evidence base for the housing market assessment indicated such a need. However, in pragmatic terms, 40% is widely treated as a reasonable target which will not unduly inhibit housing development. Recent research into the viability of affordable housing provided through section 106 within the City of Norwich indicates that, though some developments were able to achieve this level, others were not, based on detailed viability assessments. These developments generally were undertaken in a fairly buoyant housing market.

Include 40% target in policy, but with a suitable caveats concerning the need for updated housing market assessments, and the need for flexibility in the light of viability assessments on particular

8864 - Mr Stephen Andrews

Comment
 Concerned about quantity of development; support affordable housing, concerned about "densification" in Norwich with consequential damage to character

The overall quantity of development needed is established through the East of England Plan. The strategy has been to accommodate as much as can be accommodated in Norwich having regard to the need to protect environmental assets, in the conviction that this is a green policy through providing homes for people close to facilities and a wide range of employment opportunities accessible by walking, cycling and public transport.

No change needed [RB]

9647 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]

Comment
 The policy fails to address delivery, simply describing the number type tenure etc of housing, affordable housing and provision for Gypsies and travellers. and states that these will be considered where an identifiable local need for affordable homes is met. It should deal with when, where and how dwellings and associated infrastructure and services will be produced, and this is absent in the consultation document. This needs to include costs and timings of development to enable an understanding of any proposed phasing arrangements. The requirement for affordable housing on all sites of five or more dwellings requires further justification and it needs to address the consequences for the viability of sites particularly if the public subsidy is unavailable [RB]

The representation makes a fair point that details of implementation are not included in the consultation document. These have been the subject of further work by EDAW based on the favoured option for distribution of development, and an implementation strategy needs to be added. The requirement for a contribution towards affordable housing from all sites of five or more dwellings is derived from an assessment of the likely yield from a higher threshold which would have implied an unrealistically high percentage contribution to meet the identified need. Within Norwich, where need is greatest, and also in rural areas, it is likely that a significant number of sites will fall below the national indicative threshold of fifteen units. [RB]

Include an implementation strategy indicating the infrastructure needs, cost and funding sources related to strategic developments, and a global figure to cover the estimated infrastructure cost for smaller scale development in the pre-submission publication version

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

10918 - Allied London Properties [8367]

Support policy on reducing environmental impact, but express concern about additional costs of higher standards set out in code for sustainable homes. Evidence that a house built to code level 6 will cost an additional £30 to £35,000 at 2007 prices. Do not challenge need for sustainable homes but argue that they need to be taken into account in calculation of developer contributions, whether by CIL or other mechanism.

It is assumed that housing requirements are based on an up to date housing market assessment

Provision of affordable housing must be determined on a site by site basis rather than by a predetermined sector policy figure. Viability assessments are needed to support such requirements

Support the policy on the economy

Broadly support the strategic access and transportation policy and consider Wymondham provides a good opportunity to promote car reduced travel more than any other location. It is well-related to public transport including rail, has a good range of local facilities. Believe Wymondham can be expanded without infringing significant environmental assets. In contrast, doubts are expressed about the sustainability of long Stratton and north east urban extension

Accept the need for improvements to the A 11 and A 47, but believe further details should be available

Support the policy on communities and culture and believe development at Wymondham could fully comply with it

Council's Assessment

Higher code levels will be required in due course as a consequence of evolving Building Regulations. The local energy study suggests that it is technically possible to meet the area's electricity requirements by low carbon means. It suggests however that the right approach is to reduce the demand for energy rather than rely on the focusing exclusively on the generation side. Furthermore in an area of low rainfall, limited water resources and sensitive water environments, the benefits of approaching the question from an energy and water efficiency viewpoint, in line with the code for sustainable homes, makes sense. It is an accepted however that there will be some costs to achieving this and developer contributions will need to take account of viability. To an extent, such predictable costs can be taken into account in the price paid for land, and this will need to form part of any evaluation..

There has been a housing market assessment undertaken. The evidence base for this took the form of a study by ORS published in 2006. This includes a formula to update assessments of the need for housing of different tenures (though not the size of property required).

The strategy is expected to give an overall target for the provision of affordable housing, as set out in the first bullet point of paragraph 29 of planning policy statement 3.

Note the comments on the economic policy and the inherent suitability of Wymondham. Wymondham is one of the favoured locations for growth, in part because of its access to employment, its range of facilities, and access to rail and a potentially could bus route

Long Stratton has been included in the strategy essentially for local reasons, but also provides a degree of choice in housing location. The north east is viewed as a potentially sustainable location, being close to a number of employment locations, of a scale capable of accommodating a wide range of infrastructure, and having the critical mass to support bus rapid transit .

Improvements to the A 11 and A 47 are strategic connections which are the responsibility of the Highways Agency. This is made clear in the supporting text. It is acknowledged however that improvements will need to be made to the Thickthorn junction where the two roads meet. Within a core strategy, it is considered sufficient that the authorities are satisfied a suitable arrangement which would satisfy the Highways Agency is possible. It is not

Action

No change needed in a direct response, but include in housing policy or supporting text some more detail on the source of information on the housing mix required.

Ensure the housing policy and implementation strategy take account of market conditions and recognize that market conditions of pertaining at any given time may require viability assessment

In the light of evidence drawn from the renewable energy study, new policies on climate change/sustainable design should be included

In response to other representations it has been suggested elsewhere that the communities and culture policy could be significantly strengthened

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10374 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	Comment	Support in principle, but not for Gypsy and traveller sites. The representation goes on to make a number of comments relating to the selection of sites through the South Norfolk Gypsy and traveller DPD [RB]	Support welcomed. The comments relating to site selection in the South Norfolk gypsy and traveller DPD need to be considered by South Norfolk Council in a different context [RB]	No change needed [RB]
10640 - Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333]	Comment	Joint core strategy should include and promote opportunities for co housing [RB]	Such schemes are not excluded, but there does not appear to be a case to make specific allocations, which would preclude other forms of housing from any sites so identified [RB]	No change needed [RB]
8395 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]	Comment	There is an over reliance on larger sites [RB]	The plan seeks to adopt a mixed strategy. There are some larger allocations proposed, notably the urban extension to the north east of Norwich, but more moderate overall allocations ranging up to 2200 in Wymondham, and it is possible that some of these will be composed of a number of specific sites. Elsewhere, there is provision for smaller sites in the Broadland and South Norfolk parts of the Norwich policy area, and the 3000 additional dwellings proposed for Norwich may well, in part, be accommodated on smaller sites. Smaller sites are likely to predominate in rural areas. [RB]	No changes needed [RB]
7973 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Comment	Do not believe the plan will achieve the required housing mix, avoiding more large houses [RB]	The representor's doubt is noted, but the core strategy's role is limited to setting the most appropriate policies	No change needed [RB]
9661 - Ms E Riches [8165]	Comment	paragraph 8.5 refers to the need to care for an ageing population. Need residential care homes; current care arrangements are unsatisfactory. Should be community care buildings in every community with over a given number of houses Findings of most recent housing needs assessment indicate 43% of overall housing needs should be affordable. Seeking 40% and excluding sites below five dwellings means it will not be achieved	Paragraph 8.5 recognises the needs of an ageing population but does not prescribe institutional care. Instead, the model favoured by care organisations best placed to judge appropriate approaches to such responsibilities will be followed. The representation is right that the current policy is unlikely to fully eliminate housing need, including current backlogs, but as many other representations have pointed out, it needs to be grounded in reality having regard to market conditions and viability of development, otherwise development will be stifled and the number of affordable units achieved will be diminished. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
8369 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	Comment	Support strategy in theory but believe it is unachievable in current economic climate, particularly provision of facilities [RB]	It is fully accepted that the recession is a major challenge, and it may well delay development, at least in the short term. What is not clear is whether rates of development in future will accelerate to make up for the shortfall, or not. However it is clear that the plan has to look ahead to 2026 and plan on the basis that the scale of development set out in the East of England Plan will be needed by then. Failure to do so would be likely to lead to many objections promoting sites to make up any shortfall, and would also be likely to result in the strategy being declared unsound following a public examination. [RB]	No change needed [RB]

8908 - ie homes & property ltd
(mr ed palmieri) [7620]

Comment
t Suggest avoiding the southern part of the A143 corridor
for Gypsy sites in view of the character of the local area
[RB]

The selection of sites will be undertaken through South
Norfolk's Gypsy and traveller DPD, or in other districts
through other development plan documents [RB]

No change needed [RB]

8. Area-wide policies (policies about topics) (Q21 -Q26)

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10546 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]

Object
Too many Gypsy pitches assigned to South Norfolk
Mixed private/social housing developments do not work
[RB]

The number of Gypsy and traveller pitches assigned to
each district is derived from the East of England Plan. The
higher number assigned to South Norfolk reflects the
balance of need as established by the research
undertaken on behalf of EERA
Government policy promotes mixed tenure schemes. Such
schemes have been developed within the plan area and
have proved successful. [RB]

No change needed [RB]

11058 - Norfolk Homes Ltd

Object
All development should be subject to making a
contribution to affordable housing, with schemes of five
or less dwellings contributing financially to assist the over
onerous requirements on larger sites

There is a national indicative threshold of fifteen units, or
the equivalent area. Many have criticized the strategy for
seeking a lower level than this. Under current
circumstances, contributions to affordable housing are
generally obtained under section 106 obligations. These
involve a certain amount of administrative effort, both to
enter into, and to monitor. It is considered that a threshold
of five dwellings represents a pragmatic approach. It is
possible that once the CIL is introduced, the process may
be different, and even if affordable housing continues to
be arranged through section 106, the arrangements might
change. For the time however five is regarded as a
reasonable pragmatic approach

No change

10306 - mrs LISA ford [8282]

Object
Strategy should focus on a new community away from
Norwich to protect existing villages and suburbs -stop
areas on the A. 11 becoming commuter towns by not
dualling the A. 11 [RB]

One of the difficulties about the provision of a new
community concerns the delivery of enough dwellings to
satisfy the East of England Plan within the necessary
timescale. Early work by EDAW demonstrated that such a
strategy would struggle to deliver enough houses in time.
The role of new settlements in the longer term should not,
however, be dismissed, and as part of the extended
horizon implied by the review of the East of England Plan,
looking ahead to 2031, the role of a new settlement will be
explored.
The A. 11 is largely dualled, and is critical to the
connectivity of the area. There is no prospect of turning it
back into a quiet local road. [RB]

No change needed to the joint core
strategy, but recognise that new
settlements may become part of
any strategy looking further ahead
into the future. [RB]

7895 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]
9903 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]

Object
Affordable housing should be a priority not an
afterthought. More is needed throughout Norfolk than
planned for, [RB]

Affordable housing is a priority, there is nothing in the plan
which implies it is an afterthought. The level sought is
based on an assessment of need, but it must be
acknowledged that the requirements in the plan are unlikely
fully to meet the scale of need identified. However these
requirements also have to take account of available
funding and the viability of the development, where a
share of affordable housing is sought through developer
contributions, otherwise development could be stifled and
the achievement of affordable housing compromised.

No change needed [RB]

Long Stratton was not supported for development at the initial issues and option stage. What has made it suitable now? [RB]

Significant development has been proposed specifically to fund or the help fund a bypass in order to bring local environmental benefits [RB]

No changes needed, unless other evidence demonstrates that a bypass cannot be delivered through developer funding, augmented where feasible by available public funds. [RB]

8. Area-wide policies (policies about topics) (Q21 -Q26)

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations**Nature Representation Summary**

9805 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]

Object

Scale of the allocation of 9000 new homes in South Norfolk part of Norwich policy area is excessive - should be distributed over a wider area. More affordable homes needed - believe should maintain the PPS 3 indicative threshold of 15 dwellings for provision of affordable housing on mixed tenure sites.

Gypsy and traveller sites need to be selected in close consultation with local communities in order to promote cohesion [RB]

Council's Assessment

The scale of housing development needed is established by the East of England Plan. There is flexibility between the districts, and the strategy has been to accommodate as much as practical within Norwich, subject to environmental considerations. Unless this approach and assessment can be shown to be seriously flawed, the remainder must be accommodated in Broadland and South Norfolk.

A concentrated approach has been adopted in Broadland, primarily driven by the need for large scale infrastructure, high quality public transport, and access to a range of employment opportunities. In South Norfolk a more dispersed approach has been followed, in recognition of the different character of the area, though significant development is still clustered within the A. 11 corridor which is currently the best performing public transport corridor in the area and offers access to a range of employment sites. An even more widely dispersed approach would be unlikely to lend itself to effective public transport, and ultimately increase congestion, and would be likely to put an intolerable strain on a wide range of local services, but often without the critical mass to resolve the resultant problems.

Increasing the threshold for contribution of affordable homes would be unlikely to increase the total supply of such homes as the representation seems to seek.

It is agreed that the selection of Gypsy and traveller sites should be undertaken in consultation with local communities. Ultimately such sites will need to be allocated through a development plan document which will

Action

No change needed [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

9864 - Diocese of Norwich [2708] Object The policy adds little to national/regional policy. It should set out the level of affordable housing sought and targets for social rented and intermediate housing in order to comply with PPS 3. The PPS also requires that targets reflect an assessment of economic viability which needs to be undertaken

The level of affordable housing sought should be set out in policy and tested through the independent examination and consultation [RB]

Council's Assessment

Paragraph 29 of PPS 3 does say that targets for social rented and intermediate housing should be included "where appropriate". In this case, where the plan covers a wide range of different situations, from the city centre to very rural areas, a single range of tenure may be inappropriate in all circumstances. More detailed plans covering allocations in particular localities may be able to offer this level of detail, but it is considered an excessive for a core strategy.

A housing market assessment, including significant primary research as its basis, has been undertaken. The housing market assessment research is currently being refreshed, but it appears unlikely at this stage that there will be any case for a reduction in the level of affordable housing sought. The strategic housing land availability assessment included some site viability work by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, and the same company is looking in more detail at deliverability of affordable housing in Norwich, where the predominance of brownfield sites makes viability a particularly relevant issue. The work being undertaken by EDAW on infrastructure needs and funding options is also taking into account the local market in its judgment of the potential for developer contributions.

While the concerns embodied in the representation are entirely understood, any assessment of the market can only be a snapshot in time, and it is important that the policy wording allows a sufficient flexibility for particular site viability issues to be taken into account.

The percentage sought can be set out in policy, although that is not the universal practice. Current local plans for the partner authorities refer to the percentage in lower case text. The lower case is tested at independent examination and subject to consultation in the same way as a policy but, nonetheless it may strengthen future negotiations if the figure is set out in policy. Given the limited shelf life of a housing market assessment, however, compared with a development plan document, an appropriate caveat allowing for adjustment in the light of new evidence would

Action

Ensure the final policy recognises that viability may be an issue which will need to be judged according to the circumstances of a particular site, and refer to the 40% target in policy, subject to caveats about viability and about the need for adjustment in the light of future housing market assessments [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

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

10069 - The Greetham Trustees [7606]
 9985 - GF Cole and Son [8226]
 10038 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]
 10137 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]
 10151 - R Smith [8243]
 10189 - Commercial Land [8246]

Object Believe there is a need for a more explicit evidence base in the form of a Housing Market Assessment and evidence to support affordable housing targets in order to ensure deliverability. This is required to meet the requirements of PPS 12.

Some representations go on to argue that insufficient housing is proposed for rural areas, and that as a consequence, insufficient affordable housing may be provided here.

There is no consideration to the delivery of wholly affordable housing such as exception sites. [RB]

A housing market assessment, including significant primary research as its basis, has been undertaken. The housing market assessment research is currently being refreshed, but it appears unlikely at this stage that there will be any case for a reduction in the level of affordable housing sought. The strategic housing land availability assessment included some site viability work by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, and the same company is looking in more detail at deliverability of affordable housing in Norwich, where the predominance of brownfield sites makes viability a particularly relevant issue. The work being undertaken by EDAW on infrastructure needs and funding options is also taking into account the local market in its judgment of the potential for developer contributions.

While the concerns embodied in the representations are entirely understood, any assessment of the market can only be a snapshot in time, and it is important that the policy wording allows sufficient flexibility for particular site viability issues to be taken into account.

The scale of development proposed in rural areas is largely a consequence of the East of England Plan. The strategy proposed in the consultation document was designed to meet these requirements, including the definition of an appropriate settlement hierarchy. Other representations have suggested more flexibility needs to be built into the settlement hierarchy, particularly at the lower end. If this is undertaken it may increase slightly the amount of development proposed in rural areas, but assist in meeting the needs related to a particular locality. There is provision in the strategy for exceptions sites to be brought forward specifically to meet local affordable housing needs.

The policy includes a description of exceptions sites (though without using the phrase) [RB]

9970 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]
 8074 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875]

Object This group of representations refers to others dealt with elsewhere, or records "no comment" [RB]

Not applicable [RB]

Not applicable [RB]

10442 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]

Object Support general policies but not traveller provision [RB]

The number of Gypsy and traveller pitches assigned to each district is derived from the East of England Plan. The number assigned to each local planning authority reflects the balance of need as established by the research undertaken on behalf of EERA [RB]

No change needed [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

11150 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]
 10861 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]
 10836 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]
 10899 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]

Object A statement should be included emphasizing the need to deliver new homes in an efficient and coordinated manner in accordance with the strategic growth options to ensure that housing targets are met.

The representations suggest policy 14 needs to reflect a target to 2021 and an additional target 2021 to 2026

The representation notes a range of housing types will be included. These should be derived from a strategic housing market assessment which should inform policy 14 in terms of housing mix

The strategic housing market assessment should also inform affordable housing policy in terms of the level and type of affordable housing required. The adoption of a lower target than the indicative national minimum of fifteen should be justified, and an assessment of the economic viability undertaken. Believe further research is required to support the percentage of percentages of affordable housing required to ensure this will not have a detrimental impact on housing deliverability.

Policy 14 should also refer to the contribution the strategic growth location will make toward meeting the Government's objective of improving affordability of housing by substantially increasing housing supply.

One response specifically says the policy and supporting text should make it clear that the 40% affordable housing target will be subject to review by subsequent housing market assessments

Council's Assessment

The plan does not need to include a statement emphasizing the need to deliver new homes to ensure strategic housing targets are met. That is its objective.

It is not agreed that separates targets are required for 2001 to 2021 and 2021 to 2026. The East of England Plan includes a formula to extrapolate targets to meet the requirements of planning policy statement 3 for a horizon of fifteen years. It is accepted, however, that there is a need to ensure land supply throughout the plan period. The strategic housing land availability assessment indicates that a number of sites can come forward quickly, and this is assisted by the overall strategy of complementing a large-scale allocation in the north east by medium scale allocations in the South Norfolk part of the plan area.

The policy or supporting text should give more indication of the nature of housing to be sought as well as its tenure. The representation is correct in this regard. The evidence base for the housing market assessment undertaken by ORS in 2006 did indicate requirements in terms of tenure and size. However, it may be best to refer to the ORS study and rather than be specific about the house sizes in view of the prospect of a fully updated housing market assessment changing them. Work is in hand to refresh the main conclusions, but the formula for periodic refreshes will cover the need for affordable housing but not the range of house sizes. That will need to await a comprehensive review of the housing market assessment to be undertaken by the Greater Norwich Housing Partnership.

The strategic housing land availability assessment included some assessment of viability, and more detailed work on this aspect is being undertaken in Norwich, where the prevalence of previously-developed sites adds to the complexity. In addition the infrastructure needs and funding study being undertaken by EDAW also includes an assessment of the housing market, being undertaken by Drivers Jonas.

It is not expected that the policy should refer to improving affordability of housing and by increasing supply. It is by no means certain that increasing the supply as planned will be the main determinant of house prices, given that most of the house is available on the market have already been built, and the availability and price of credit unlikely to be just as significant.

Action

Add further information to the policy or supporting text concerning the type of housing required to meet needs in the area, stating that it is derived from the ORS study, but acknowledging the possibility of outdated future

Paragraph 8.6 and the policy both are clear that the mix of house types and tenures sought will be based on the most

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

8921 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
 9307 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]
 9710 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]
 9277 - Mrs Gray [5927]
 9578 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]
 7934 - mr paul newson [7812]
 8215 - Mr P Anderson [7901]
 8479 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
 8600 - Mr M Read [8024]
 8666 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
 8690 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
 8852 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]
 9068 - Ms Penny Tilley [8108]
 9407 - Mr E Newberry [8120]
 9334 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
 9529 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]
 9558 - Mr R Harris [8146]
 9855 - Mr Paul Johnson [8207]
 10247 - Mrs Angela Garner [8258]

Object
 general opposition to the scale of development proposed [RB]

The level of growth proposed is set by the East of England Plan. Failure to make appropriate provision would be likely to result in the joint core strategy being found unsound [RB]

No change needed [RB]

10351 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]
 10469 - Mr David Smith [8309]
 10497 - Mr I T Smith [8310]
 10638 - Mr Alan Ives [8299]

Object
 Oppose scale of development
 All new housing should be attractive to live in and look at - plan says little about quality and aesthetics
 Gypsy and travelers sites should be required to be looked after [RB]

The level of growth proposed is set by the East of England Plan. Failure to make appropriate provision would be likely to result in the joint core strategy being found unsound
 The representation makes a fair point about quality - there is insufficient emphasis on this in the consultation draft, although it has always been a concern of the GNDP
 Authorised Gypsy and traveller sites should not suffer from a lack of proper maintenance. They are likely to be maintained by a local authority or housing association, or in some cases, where privately owned by Gypsies and travellers themselves who will have a vested interest in the maintenance of their property. One of the aims of the policy is to provide a viable alternative to unauthorised encampments which can often give rise to difficulties. [RB]

Strengthen policy on quality of development [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8503 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] 8626 - Kay Eke [8025] 8777 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Object	<p>Oppose scale of development Comment about alleged inconsistency of approach in the South Norfolk's Gypsy and traveller DPD and the policy in the core strategy</p> <p>Comment about the equitability of social housing and Gypsy/traveller site provisions.</p> <p>Comment about the impact of traveller sites on permanent residents [RB]</p>	<p>The scale of development required is established by the East of England Plan</p> <p>The concern about the Gypsy and traveller sites being proposed (at Spooner Row) appears to relate more to the Gypsy and traveller DPD, and should be considered by South Norfolk Council in that context.</p> <p>The comment about equitability is not fully understood. The split of Gypsy and traveller sites between the districts is established through the East of England Plan</p> <p>The aim of the Gypsy and traveller site policy is to provide for authorised and appropriately managed sites. This should reduce the incidence of unauthorised encampments, which can give rise to difficulties. [RB]</p>	No change needed [RB]
9049 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Object	Oppose selection of Long Stratton and Wymondham as locations for strategic housing allocations [RB]	The housing policy is a plan wide policy, and similar comments have been made by the representor in relation to the favoured option for development of the Norwich policy area. While the representation is not strictly relevant to the housing policy, housing locations have been selected having regard to factors such as access to a range of employment locations, good public transport connections, access to a range of local facilities, and, in the case of Long Stratton, the potential to bring about local environmental improvements [RB]	No change needed [RB]
8011 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	Object	South Norfolk is rural and cannot support the proposed developments. Challenge the distribution of Gypsy and traveller sites between the three local planning authorities [RB]	<p>The scale of development is established by the East of England Plan. For housing, there is flexibility between the districts, and the strategy has been to accommodate as much as practical within Norwich, subject to environmental considerations. Unless this approach and assessment can be shown to be seriously flawed, the remainder must be accommodated in Broadland and South Norfolk.</p> <p>In the case of Gypsy and traveller provision, the number of pitches has been established through a review of the East of England Plan and reflects the research undertaken on behalf of EERA [RB]</p>	No change needed [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

11153 - Friends Family and Travellers (Planning) (Mr S J Staines) [7224]
10675 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348]
10965 - Mr William E Cooper

Nature Representation Summary

Object These representations relate to Gypsy and Traveller issues

Question the rationale for accommodating 2 caravans on site, and how this will permit family events

Inadequate local consultation - referring specifically to South Norfolk Gypsy and Traveller development plan document and sites proposed in it

Friends Family and Travellers make a number of points

- â€¢ Support the principle of including requirements for Gypsies and Travellers
- â€¢ Current policy only extends to 2011.the Secretary of State's proposed changes to the East of England Plan (March, 2009) give a formula to extend residential provision beyond 2011, and this should be reflected in the core strategy
- â€¢ FFT consider more pitches should be allocated than the minimum indicated in the draft East of England Plan policy, following advice in an RTP1 good practice note
- â€¢ The restrictions of sites to no more than twelve pitches is unduly rigid
- â€¢ Locational criteria listed in the policy are inappropriate for residential pitches, and perpetuate the misconception that residential pitches should be located close to arterial routes
- â€¢ The policy makes no mention of the diversity of different groups, which have different requirements in terms of site provision. The needs of New Travellers appear to have been ignored
- â€¢ The Secretary of State's proposed changes to the East of England Plan include provision for transit sites and this should be included
- â€¢ The policy does not discuss tenure of type or delivery. Attention drawn to guidance from the Homes and Communities Agency
- â€¢ Gypsy and Traveller sites are a form of affordable housing and similar consideration should be given to delivery beyond the mere identification of pieces of land

â€¢ Policy should include reference to monitoring and when the next round of Gypsy and Traveller

Council's Assessment

Two caravans per pitch is understood to be typical accommodation, for a family unit, with an average of around 1.7 overall. This simply reflects common arrangements.

The South Norfolk Gypsy and Traveller development plan document is guided by the same regional spatial strategy targets, but in response to the pressing issues South Norfolk Council decided to progress that development plan document early. The comments on the consultation arrangements relate to that development plan document, not the joint core strategy

In response to points made by Friends and Families Travellers

- â€¢ It is accepted that the policy should be updated to take into account the extrapolation formula proposed by the Secretary of state to indicate the number of residential pitches to be provided by 2026
- â€¢ Do not accept that an additional allowance should be provided. The figures in the RSS review were derived from research undertaken by consultants but modified to spread the supply across the region more evenly. The research included in the issues and options document produced by EERA in May, 2007 showed the requirement according to the consultants' research as Broadland; 1, Norwich; 5, and south Norfolk; 21. The second option assigning 15 pitches each to Broadland and Norwich in the period 2006 to 2011 already represents a significant increase over the level of need identified by the consultants. South Norfolk's figure was increased on the basis of the District Council's own research. The extrapolation formula continues this pattern. Therefore it is not considered necessary to increase further the level of provision
- â€¢ Agree that the blanket requirement for a maximum of twelve pitches is too rigid -suggest an indicative total of ten to twelve pitches. A number of smaller sites is considered an appropriate response, taking into account of the diversity of the Gypsy and Traveller population. This should be mentioned in the supporting text
- â€¢ Agree the locational criteria are inappropriate for residential pitches and more appropriate to transit pitches. Agree the Secretary of State's proposed requirement for transit pitches should be included, insofar as it applies to this area
- â€¢ Agree the supporting text should refer to diversity of tenure
- â€¢ Agree some reference should be made to future Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation assessments. The precise arrangements for this have not yet been agreed,

Action

Amended the policy/supporting text to include

- â€¢ Residential pitch targets extrapolated to 2026, but with a reference to possible modification in the light of future Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments
- â€¢ Locational guidance for these to refer to the demonstrable needs of Gypsies and Travellers, Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessments, and access to a range of facilities. In the longer run, some sites should be provided in association with the major strategic housing developments.
- â€¢ An appropriate share of the Norfolk total for transit sites as recommended by the Secretary of State, linked to the main corridors of movement
- â€¢ Suggestion that sites will generally accommodate about ten to twelve pitches, but with variations to suit the circumstances of particular sites
- â€¢ Reference to the diversity of Gypsy and Traveller groups as explanation for the strategy of a number of smaller sites rather than a large concentration
- â€¢ Although not mentioned by FFT, the Secretary of State's proposed modifications also include a requirement for additional plots for Travelling Showpeople, again with an extrapolation formula.This too should be added to the policy.

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8716 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Object	Representation points out an inconsistency in the scale of allocations required in South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area. Different parts of the plan imply 9000 or 10,800 by 2026 [RB]	The representation is correct. The true figure should be 9000 [RB]	correct the error in policy 2
10327 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Object	<p>Challenge the scale of housing needed</p> <p>Believe recession will result in slower build-rates, therefore trajectory should reflect this. This would mean fewer greenfield allocations are needed, otherwise developers will "cherry pick" the easier greenfield sites</p> <p>Affordable housing is dependent on "planning gain" method which is opposed by CPRE</p> <p>In the current climate, viability will be used as an argument by developers to reduce the affordable housing contribution, particularly where other contributions are required e.g. Long Stratton [RB]</p>	<p>The scale of housing is fixed by the East of England Plan.</p> <p>It is fully accepted that the recession is a major challenge, and it may well delay development, at least in the short term. What is not clear is whether rates of development in future will accelerate to make up for the shortfall, or not. However it is clear that the plan has to look ahead to 2026 and plan on the basis that the scale of development set out in the East of England Plan will be needed by then. Failure to do so would be likely to lead to many objections promoting sites to make up any shortfall, and would also be likely to result in the strategy being declared unsound following a public examination.</p> <p>Government policy is to seek delivery of some affordable housing through the "planning gain" route. CPRE may oppose this, but it is a reality.</p> <p>Clearly, developers may well argue that the recession limits the amount of affordable housing which can be delivered due to the viability of the scheme. In some cases this will no doubt be a justifiable argument. In these cases to fail to recognize it would thwart the scheme and ultimately limit the amount of affordable housing which can be delivered. The important thing is that any assessments made it to check the validity of such claims</p>	No change needed [RB]
9253 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	Object	Priority should be given to traveller sites, affordable housing, social housing, energy saving construction	All of these are included in the plan, though the policy on energy saving construction should be strengthened. There is no explanation offered as to whether other proposals within the plan should be discarded. [RB]	Strengthen policies on energy efficiency [RB]
9133 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]	Object	The threshold for affordable housing should remain at 15 as in PPS 3. Proposed sites for Gypsies and travellers should be published as soon as possible for consultation to facilitate cohesion. [RB]	The requirement for a contribution towards affordable housing from all sites of five or more dwellings is derived from an assessment of the likely yield from a higher threshold which would have implied an unrealistically high percentage contribution to meet the identified need. Within Norwich, where need is greatest, and also in rural areas, it is likely that a significant number of sites will fall below the national indicative threshold of fifteen units.	no change needed [RB]
			Gypsy and traveller sites will be identified through site specific allocations development plan documents or area action plans. These will need to be consulted on in the	

8. Area-wide policies (policies about topics) (Q21 -Q26)

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8191 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 8129 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	Object	Comment that high density housing estate developments do not provide sustainable living environment Object to level of provision for Gypsies as resultant sites will diminish value of surrounding properties [RB]	Not clear why high density developments cannot provide sustainable environment, but the plan should include a commitment to a participative form of masterplanning for larger developments to enable interested parties to become involved The level of provision for Gypsies and travellers has been established through a review of the East of England Plan [RB]	Strengthen the design policy, but retain a commitment to masterplanning of large developments [RB]
8529 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8166 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	Object	The concern about previous examples of large scale development e.g. Dussindale - comment about dead end roads and culs de sac, which "frustrate everyone". One representation seeks more mixed development [RB]	The road system in Dussindale was designed to deter extraneous traffic, but there are large number of pedestrian and cycle connections. Nevertheless, the implementation policy in the consultation draft refers to the need for participative masterplanning to improve standards. It is accepted that more emphasis needs to be placed on the quality of development [RB]	Strengthen the design policy, but retain a commitment to masterplanning of large developments [RB]
9202 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	nothing about house size - how can plan ensure locals can afford to live in the countryside (beyond "affordable" housing) [RB]	policy does refer to the need to meet the mix of housing required according to the most recent research, and the supporting text at paragraph 8.5 of the plan confirms this means an appropriate mix of "sizes, types and tenures" the plan does propose some development in rural settlements. Affordability is a general issue, and not specifically confined to rural areas. However, given the housing market is dominated by sales of existing housing, it is doubtful if simply increasing the number of new houses to the point where it would reverse trends of affordability is feasible, even if it were to be considered environmentally acceptable [RB]	No change [RB]
9311 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Object	Excessive development proposed on the north side of Norwich and Wensum valley with traffic and environmental consequences [RB]	The Wensum valley has not been identified for strategic growth in Broadland, and the scale of growth proposed in the Easton/Costessey area is limited. There are relatively few attractors on the Broadland side of the valley in this area, and appropriate green infrastructure should limit visitor impacts. This will be assessed through the appropriate assessment looking at potential impacts on wildlife sites of international quality. While there is significant development proposed to the north side of Norwich (principally the north east) there is no more than in the South Norfolk part of the NPA. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
9495 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]	Support	Not sure what is meant by onsite and offsite. Glad Gypsies are being considered. [RB]	In the context of affordable housing, on site means that a developer of a private scheme will make a contribution to	No change needed [RB]

meeting affordable housing need by including some affordable houses within the development. Off-site refers to the practice of making a contribution towards affordable housing built elsewhere. Support for appropriate provision for Gypsies and travellers noted and welcomed [RB]

8. Area-wide policies (policies about topics) (Q21 -Q26)

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

8305 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
9398 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]

Support Gypsy and traveller sites should be kept clean and tidy at occupants' expense

Gypsy and traveller sites should be funded by the Gypsy and traveller communities through appropriate charges [RB]

Council's Assessment

Authorised sites would require the payment of rent which would contribute towards maintenance. If managed by a housing association, this could be similar to the management of affordable housing for the settled community. A number of authorised sites are owned by Gypsies and travellers themselves, and in such cases the entire cost of maintenance is borne by the owner/occupier [RB]

Action

No change needed [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

10876 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]
11121 - The Leeder Family [8390]

Support Similar representations have been submitted on behalf of the Leeder family and Taylor Wimpey Developments and Hopkins Homes. Both refer to the total home level of housing, while the comments on affordable housing are submitted on behalf of the Leeder family.

Generally support the overall scale of housing provision identified to meet the East of England Plan. Agree that, given the wording of policy H. 1 of the East of England Plan, a minimum of 47,500 dwelling completions should be achieved across the plan area in the period 2001 to 2026. Agree how this has been translated into scale of new allocations needed.

The East of England Plan is being reviewed, as noted in paragraph 3.5 of the public consultation document. It will therefore be necessary for the joint core strategy to establish a sound spatial strategy capable of accommodating growth in the period up to 2031. During that period that housing provision figure is expected to increase. The representation goes on to compare the Government's latest published household projections for the period 2006 to 2026 in Norfolk, and compare it with the East of England Plan's housing provision figure for the same period. The joint core strategy needs to be sufficiently robust to accommodate a corresponding increase.

In terms of affordable housing, there is a need to explain how the target in the plan relates to the East of England Plan's overall target of 35% affordable housing coming forward through new permissions granted after the East of England Plan's publication. Paragraph 8.6 quotes affordable housing need at 43%. It implies that the most recent data predicts affordable housing need at 43% to 2026, when in fact it does not. Paragraphs 8.6 and 8.8 suggest the GNDP intends to meet the 35% affordable target with a combination of 0%, 40% and 100% affordable housing in different scenarios. This will necessitate the balance of exempt and exceptions sites so an undue burden does not fall onto the 40% sector. It is not clear why a single target of 40% will be used across the plan area, since the ORS survey completed in June, 2006 identified a variation in need across the area. High density housing can afford a higher affordable percentage, for example 60% affordable homes on a 70 dwellings per hectare city development would leave a developer with just as many market homes to sell as 30% affordable home would on a 40 dwelling per hectare development elsewhere.

Council's Assessment

The review of the East of England Plan is underway. Although Government household projections have been published, these do not necessarily translate directly into housing provision figures, and indeed the East of England Plan review will also take a view on the distribution of growth between the various parts of the region. In terms of looking beyond 2026, it is expected that 3000 dwellings in the north east growth triangle will be developed in the 2026 to 2031 period. Furthermore, although windfalls cannot be counted against the need for allocations in advance, once constructed they can be counted against completions, and as the plan is rolled forward they will contribute towards the total needed. In addition, the GNDP has committed to the examination of the potential for a new town to meet longer term growth, and rather than assuming a "business as usual" approach. It is an accepted however that this may need to be incorporated in a review of the joint core strategy, depending on the outcome of the East of England Plan review.

The East of England Plan does seek 35% of all housing coming forward through planning permissions granted after publication to be affordable. It also requires development plan documents to set targets taking into account local assessments of affordable housing need. It is clear therefore that the 35% set out in the East of England Plan is not the target the joint core strategy is striving to meet. The local evidence is drawn from work done by ORS and completed in 2006. It is true that this sets out five year housing requirements which are affected by an existing backlog. The "headline" figure for Greater Norwich is that 56.6% of net housing requirement can be provided by the market, leaving 43.4 to be provided by affordable homes of various tenures. It is true that this varies between the districts, with the affordable requirements being Broadland 29.5%, Norwich 55.5% and South Norfolk 24.9%. (ORS study figure 159)

However, this headline can be misleading, as it relates to the need which could best be met in the district concerned, and takes no account of the practicality of delivering. The percentages quoted above translate into net affordable requirements of 98 for Broadland, 624 for Norwich and 121 for South Norfolk. This sums to a net requirement for 843 affordable dwellings per annum. Including market housing, the annual net requirement by district is Broadland 330, Norwich 1122, South Norfolk 485, giving a total of 1938. As an overall scale of development, this matches reasonably closely with the annual requirement of 1996 derived from the table at paragraph 8.4 of the public consultation regulation 25 document (column i divided by

Action

No change

In conclusion, it appears that the new development is being asked to provide an increased proportion of affordable housing over and above the need attributable

the eighteen years from 2008 to 2026) It is demonstrably not possible for Norwich to generate this proportion of the total housing requirement across the area, and a

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

to that development, not only to rectify a pre existing backlog but also to compensate for under provision of affordable housing by existing allocations made in accordance with the previous policy.

This appears contrary to ODPM, circular 05/05 on planning obligations requiring that they should be "directly related to the proposed development", and be "fair and reasonable"

Council's Assessment

significant amount of the need which could best be met in Norwich will need to be met in south Norfolk and Broadland. This applies across tenures. The same table in the Regulation 25 public consultation document indicates an expectation that Norwich will produce 8,911 new homes 2008 to 2026 out of a total of 36,467.

Although ORS use their own model, there is a standard "basic needs assessment model" which has been included in the ORS report for illustration. This appears at figure 161. Although this does not show a breakdown by district, it helps to understand the relative significance of the backlog of need existing at the time the work was done. This table shows a net annual need for affordable housing of 841 units, which compares closely to the ORS model conclusion of 843 quoted above. This is a net figure, having taken account of the potential supply (arising for example from the existing affordable stock being vacated, or household dissolution). The gross figure for annual affordable housing need is 2600, comprised of 281 to reduce the backlog and 2319 to meet newly arising need. In other words the backlog component accounts for 10.8% of the total need, if the backlog is eliminated over a period of five years (this is as recommended in the government approved model, and therefore any suggestion that it is somehow unfair that the percentage sought from new development should take backlog into account appears misplaced)

The policy and supporting text acknowledges that assessments of need may have to be updated in the light of the most recent research. Any such research will make an adjustment if backlog has been eliminated.

Whilst it is true, mathematically, that 40% market homes on a 70 dwellings city development would produce the same number of market homes as 70% on a 48 dwelling development elsewhere, this does not take account of the sometimes higher costs of building in urban areas - many developers are keen to point out the added costs of using previously-developed land, possibly suffering contamination, compared with a "clean green field." Previous housing needs year studies have assumed 40% to be a pragmatic upper limit of what is likely to be attainable without inhibiting housing delivery. If it is accepted that there is a practical limit to what can be delivered on sites within the urban area, the need remaining unmet there can only be accommodated in other

Action

parts of the plan area. Furthermore, it should be remembered that the allocations in places such as Long the Stratton (the subject of other representations on behalf of the Leeder family) are intended to meet in part needs are rising in the Norwich area. More detailed viability work undertaken within the City of Norwich indicates that while

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

some developments have been able to meet the target 40% without subsidy, others have not, as verified by viability assessments. These developments were generally undertaken in a reasonably buoyant financial climate.

Furthermore, the percentage sought on qualifying sites needs to take account of the fact that not all sites will qualify. It is unavoidable that a need assessed at any one time may only be partially tackled by planning permissions granted in line with current policy. This is inherent in the fact that evidence assessing levels of need must be gathered before planning policies are adopted. It is possible that new arrangements following the introduction of CIL will change matters, but this appears unlikely to have happened before submission of the joint core strategy.

It is accepted that, in terms of the tests normally applied to planning obligations, the approach to affordable housing is anomalous, but the approach taken is considered to be in line with government policy.

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

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

10745 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]
 9246 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
 8577 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]
 11137 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]
 10056 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]
 8240 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

 10226 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

 8822 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]
 9942 - John Heaser [7015]
 9127 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
 9368 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
 10521 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]
 10778 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]
 8280 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]
 8553 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]
 9685 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
 8744 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]
 8797 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

 8849 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
 8986 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
 9177 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]
 9437 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

 9464 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
 9539 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149]
 9611 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162]
 9736 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson

Support Support - some of the respondents mention particular reservations [RB]

Support welcomed [RB]

No change needed [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9837 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 10004 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10114 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] 10277 - Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop 9888 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]	Support	Refer to the report by Matthew Taylor M. P. and hope its message will be taken on board [RB]	The GNPD is aware of the report. Though the Government has given a generally warm welcome, it is not yet clear how this will be translated into Government policy. It is one of the factors influencing a desire to reconsider the settlement hierarchy, which was criticized through the technical consultation process, particularly at the level of service villages and other villages with a view to making it more responsive to local circumstances and less mechanistic [RB]	Reconsider the policies relating to "service villages" and "other villages" to avoid undue rigidity [RB]
9620 - RW Kidner [8163]	Support	In general support, but more should be located in villages - promote a site at Stoke Holy Cross [RB]	The aim of the strategy in the Norwich policy area is to locate new development where it has good access to the existing infrastructure or where new infrastructure can be provided, where there is good access by non car modes to a range of employment locations, and potential for high quality public transport connections to Norwich. However, the strategy recognizes that some development should be located in smaller settlements, and a number of villages have been identified as service villages where modest allocations could be made. This includes Stoke Holy Cross. In response to comments on the technical consultation, it has been agreed that there should be a re-examination of the settlement hierarchy and the policies, with the aim of removing undue rigidity. [RB]	Reconsider the policies for service villages and other villagers compared with those included in the technical consultation and public consultation documents, to avoid excessive rigidity. [RB]
9747 - Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155] 9163 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L. Read) [2055]	Support	The plan is silent on space standards in housing. Reference to former Parker Morris standards for public housing Need for accessibility for disabled people [RB]	In the absence of public funding, the Building Regulations are the prime influence on internal layout of houses, though where public sector funding is included, higher standards can sometimes be achieved, for example through Homes and Communities Agency grant. The Building Regulations require disabled access, although this frequently falls short of the needs of wheelchair users. In Development Control Development Plan Documents, it would be worthwhile requiring a proportion to be fully accessible/lifetime homes standard, though this is considered excessively detailed for a core strategy. However a "hook" could be added to the policy to ensure that the housing mix specifically takes account of the needs of an ageing population, who many of whom will	Add a "hook" to the policy to ensure that the housing mix specifically takes account of the needs of an ageing population, who many of whom will have limiting long-term disabilities

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Decision on (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Strengthen the design policy, but retain a commitment to masterplanning of large developments [RB]

Ensure the final policy recognises that viability may be an issue which will need to be judged according to the circumstances of a particular site, and refer to the 40% target in policy, subject to caveats about viability and about the need for adjustment in the light of future housing market assessments [RB]

No changes needed, unless other evidence demonstrates that a bypass cannot be delivered through developer funding, augmented where feasible by available public funds. [RB]

Reconsider the policies relating to "service villages" and "other villages" to avoid undue rigidity [RB]

Amended the policy/supporting text to include

• Residential pitch targets extrapolated to 2026, but with a reference to possible modification in the light of future Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments

• Locational guidance for these to refer to the demonstrable needs of Gypsies and Travellers, Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessments, and access to a range of facilities.

In the longer run, some sites should be provided in association with the major strategic housing developments.

• An appropriate share of the Norfolk total for transit sites as recommended by the Secretary of State, linked to the main corridors of movement

• Suggestion that sites will generally accommodate about ten to twelve pitches, but with variations to suit the circumstances of particular sites

• Reference to the diversity of Gypsy and Traveller groups as explanation for the strategy of a number of smaller sites rather than a large concentration

• Although not mentioned by FFT, the Secretary of State's proposed modifications also include a requirement for additional plots for Travelling Showpeople, again with an extrapolation formula. This too should be added to the policy.

No change needed in a direct response, but include in housing policy or supporting text some more detail on the source of information on the housing mix required.

Ensure the housing policy and implementation strategy take account of market conditions and recognize that market conditions of pertaining at any given time may require viability assessment.

In the light of evidence drawn from the renewable energy study, new policies on climate change/sustainable design should be included

In response to other representations it has been suggested elsewhere that the communities and culture policy could be significantly strengthened

Strengthen the design policy, but retain a commitment to masterplanning of large developments [RB]

Include an implementation strategy indicating the infrastructure needs, cost and funding sources related to strategic developments, and a global figure to cover the estimated infrastructure cost for smaller scale development in the pre-submission publication version of the joint core strategy [RB]

Ensure the final policy recognizes the need for any particular site viability evidence to be taken into account in the operation of the policy, and reconsider the policies for service villages and other villages to avoid undue rigidity. [RB]

No change needed to the joint core strategy, but recognise that new settlements may become part of any strategy looking further ahead into the future. [RB]

correct the error in policy 2 [RB]

Strengthen policies on energy efficiency [RB]

Include 40% target in policy, but with a suitable caveats concerning the need for updated housing market assessments, and the need for flexibility in the light of viability assessments on particular sites.

Add further information to the policy or supporting text concerning the type of housing required to meet needs in the area, stating that it is derived from the ORS study, but acknowledging the possibility of outdated future studies.

Reconsider the policies for service villages and other villagers compared with those included in the technical consultation and public consultation documents, to avoid excessive rigidity. [RB]

Include housing trajectory and implementation strategy in pre-submission draft

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Calculate requirement for Gypsies and travellers for long stay and transit pitches, and for Travelling Showpeople and include in pre-submission draft. [RB]

Add a "hook" to the policy to ensure that the housing mix specifically takes account of the needs of an ageing population, who many of whom will have limiting long-term disabilities [RB]

(Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

8324 - Mr Geoffrey Loades

Comment
Question the evidence for job growth especially in a stagnant housing market resulting from lower levels of migration
[RB]

The local economy report prepared by Arups concluded that the economy had the capacity to grow by at least the amount forecast in the East of England Plan. Monitoring in the early years suggests that the Greater Norwich area has experienced significant employment growth, though it is acknowledged that data on jobs has significant margins of error at the local level. While the area is not immune from the effects of the recession, in the longer run there is likely to be a recovery, and it is important that the Core Strategy maintains the longer term perspective[RB]

No Change[RB]

10287 - Henderson Retail Warehouse Fund [8270]

Comment
The policy should be broadened to reflect emerging national guidance. Emerging policy recognises the importance of non-B class uses and sets out the key objective of job creation.

Riverside retail park should be recognised in Policy 15.

Retail, leisure and recreation and other non-B class uses clearly play an important role not just in the local economy but also in terms of providing services and facilities for residents.

No action necessary.

Policy 12 sets out the broad policy framework for town centre style uses. This policy is considered to set an adequate framework in this regard and will ensure that these types of uses continue to contribute to the local economy. This is in addition to those places and types of uses set out within policy 15. The GNDP do not seek to duplicate policies within the document unless absolutely necessary.

The GNDP maintain, that subject to changes resulting from this consultation this approach remains the most appropriate when considered against all others.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10282 - Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrold)

Comment

Policy 15 is inconsistent being containing both broadly defined and detailed elements.

The policy requires more flexibility to allow small scale employment in rural areas, e.g. farm shops.

The knowledge economy and cultural industries are not covered adequately within the policy.

There is no reference to wider transport issues.

There needs to be reference to the GNDP economic strategy.

The policy wording on tourism needs to be clearer.

There is not sufficient reference to the sustainability of rural communities.

No housing or other development should occur without proper infrastructure in place from the start. Resist government pressure to build without proper resources.

Within a strategic policy there will always need to be a balance struck between specificity and flexibility, the GNDP has strived to strike that balance with the policy proposed. Nevertheless the GNDP will consider with the policy needs more specificity.

Policy 10 provides further guidance on the types of economic development considered appropriate in rural areas, and farm shops and farmers markets are specifically referenced within Policy 15. The GNDP maintains that the policies of the JCS strike broadly the correct balance between supporting development in rural areas and addressing the need to tackle the causes of climate change, of which transport is a significant element.

Policy 16 deals specifically with transport issues, including those related to economic development. The GNDP seeks within the JCS to minimise repetition or replication between policies. Subject to the results of this consultation, Policy 16 is considered to sufficiently illustrate the transport issue relevant to development within the area.

Comments on the knowledge economy and cultural industries, reference to the economic strategy and wording of the tourism element of the policy are noted. Consideration will be given to providing greater emphasis to these issues within the policy.

The GNDP is conscious that growth is dependant upon infrastructure improvements. It is not realistic to expect that all of the infrastructure will be pump primed to be in place before any development starts. The key requirement is to ensure that infrastructure is delivered in a timely fashion to be in place when it is needed. This approach will mean that there will need to be a phased approach to development and infrastructure delivery. The GNDP are in the process of producing a detailed infrastructure delivery plan that will be in place for the submission version of the JCS. If the GNDP refuse to accommodate the need for development as identified in the RSS there is a real risk of piecemeal, ad-hoc development taking place that will

The comment in regard to churches and faith groups is noted.

Consider provide more detail on the role of the knowledge economy and cultural industries. Consider including references to the Economic Strategy. Consider strengthening the wording of the Tourism policies.

10278 - Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266]

Comment

Research has indicated that churches and faith groups within communities has a positive impact on the

The comment in regard to churches and faith groups is noted.

Consider whether further references to incorporation of churches and faith groups could usefully be incorporated into policy 15 or elsewhere in the JCS.

Representations

10375 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]
 10411 - Easton College [3570]
 9313 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]
 10415 - Honingham Thorpe Farms Limited [8296]
 11063 - The Norfolk Food Hub (Mr Ian Alston) [8380]

Nature Representation Summary

Comment
 More help should be provided for small farmers and organic growers, support should be provided in markets and supermarkets.

No information is provided to support the target of 33'000 new jobs between 2008 and 2026. No mention is made of agricultural industries, which are traditionally important to Norfolk. Agricultural industries should be specifically mentioned.

The importance of agriculture is underplayed in the policy. Additional text should be added to support agricultural industries, the development of a "food hub" concept and exploiting the synergies between Easton College, the UEA and land based industries.

Over 75% of the land in the East of England is used for farming and the Region possesses a high number of businesses in food processing and in the food supply chain. It is important that the JCS acknowledges the importance of these industries. Support should be given the concept of a "food hub". The RES seeks to maintain the EoE as the UK's leader in agriculture and food sector. The JCS evidence base recognises the potential of agricultural related industries to create a "food cluster".

Council's Assessment

The GNDP accepts that the JCS does not currently acknowledge whether the agricultural industry is important to the GNDP area. The strategy is based upon robust evidence and is considered to present a comprehensive and achievable framework to capture the prosperity of the GNDP area. However, consideration will be given to whether recognition of this specific area of industry could further help to further enhance the prosperity of the area.

Action

Consider providing specific recognition of agricultural industries across the GNDP area, the potential for a "food hub" or "food industry cluster" and links between this industry and existing industry and key educational

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10328 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]

Comment

Welcome the commitment to raising the proportion of high skill jobs but consider the position may need to be reconsidered because of the current economic downturn.

There should be a sensible relationship between levels of housing provision and jobs growth (ideally 1:1). Excess levels of immigration of the retired and economically inactive should not be encouraged by excess housing provisions.

There needs to be a stronger commitment to ensuring the survival of local businesses on the high street.

Large scale suburbanisation of the countryside, much of it on the edge of the Broads National Park, will impact upon Norfolk's rural identity and make it less attractive to tourism.

Support for elements of the policy is welcome. Undoubtedly the current economic recession is having a negative affect on the local economy. However, the plan is intended to look ahead to at least 2026. Although there are no accurate predictions to when this recession will end it is likely that this plan will endure well beyond the end of the current downturn.

The economic strategy in the JCS has been informed by the Employment Growth and Sites and Premises Study. This study looks at the potential economic growth of Norwich and it results broadly illustrates a strong performance in job creation in the recent past whilst also predicting a prosperous future in the longer term.

The relationship of jobs growth to housing growth is a key concern of the JCS. The elderly and retired a significant demographic within any area and current predictions are that the ratio of the over 65s to the under 16s is likely to grow significantly over the next 20 years. It is critical that the needs of this key demographic are accommodated within forward plans.

Notwithstanding the requirement for the GNDP to meet housing targets as set out in the upper tier of the development plan, It is not considered practical, or indeed feasible, that the JCS could create a framework where housing and jobs were restricted to a 1:1 basis and access of the elderly and retired to the private housing market were restricted.

Policy 12 deals specifically with the policy for higher order centres within the area. Specific detail on policies for small villages is provided within policies 7 to 10. The GNDP maintains, that subject to changes resulting from this consultation, this remains the appropriate response to the needs of villages and other centres outside of Norwich.

Given the level of growth that is required within the area, the use of Greenfield sites on the edge of Norwich and other market towns and villages is inevitable. However, alongside enabling this growth to occur the GNDP is committed to protecting key assets. In regards to the

No changes necessary.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9631 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]

Comment

Support the recognition given to the interrelationship between fulfilling the area's potential and maintaining and enhancing the environment.
 Specific references to the importance of the Broads could be included within the policy.
 The section on rural areas could be strengthened by referring to supporting the local economy through conservation of historic or locally distinctive settlements.

 There may be opportunities that are not recognised within the current policy. In particular, there is the possibility for the Greater Norwich Area to provide tourist and leisure facilities, the need for which is generated by the presence of the Broads, but where the facility cannot itself be accommodated within the Broads Area.

General support for the policy is welcomed. Comments in relation to the importance of the Broads are noted. It is agreed that the Broads are important to the local economy, particularly in terms of their value to tourism. The role and value of protecting and enhancing historic and locally distinctive settlements is also an important point.

 It should be noted that the JCS contains a specific policy which considers the place of the Broads relative to the Greater Norwich Area. This policy specifically refers to maintaining and enhancing the economy and environmental setting of the Broads. It may be the case that the points raised could better be acknowledged through possible revisions to this policy.

Consider giving greater acknowledgement in the policy to the importance of the Broads in respect of local tourism and potential opportunities generated.

 Also consider giving greater acknowledgement to the importance of protecting historic and locally distinctive settlements to the tourism economy of the Greater Norwich Area.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10018 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]
8439 - J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003]
10059 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Alan Presslee) [8160]
10170 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]

Object Support for the policy but consider that the final version should recognise existing businesses and all scope for them to grow and diversify.

There should not be a broad brush approach to protecting land that is currently identified for employment purposes. Scope should be provided to allow for consideration of alternative uses of existing employment land if circumstances have rendered it inappropriate for the originally envisaged use, or where better options have become available.

Land already allocated in Loddon should be retained.

Policy 15 does not identify the safeguarding requirements of existing intermodal transshipment sites, the economic policy could address this type of issue by seeking to ensure that sensitive land uses, e.g. residential development, do not encroach on existing and important activities.

The policy does not acknowledge the further provision of minerals and waste sites. Whilst it is accepted that these are specifically addressed through County Council documents, these matters should be taken account of in Local Authority documents as well.

Although a support is provided for existing businesses within other policies of the JCS, e.g. Policy 3, the GNDP accepts that policy 15 does not specifically identify the need to support existing businesses.

Clearly a blanket policy supporting the growth and diversification of all businesses will be inappropriate. In some cases, further expansion of existing businesses or certain types of diversification will be inappropriate for quite justifiable reasons, e.g. environmental impact or highway safety. Notwithstanding the above the GNDP will consider the whether there is scope within the policy to provide a level of support for existing businesses.

Policy 15 does set out a broad brush approach to the protection of employment sites. The reallocation of sites will be considered in detail through the subservient documents, which will address the issues of ongoing suitability of sites. It is considered that there is sufficient flexibility within the planning systems, established by national policy, to accommodate incidences where a site is no longer suitable for a particular type of use and its re-use for other purposes may be appropriate. As a general rule the GNDP will not seek to unnecessarily reproduce or repeat national policy within local guidance.

The GNDP acknowledge that policy 15 does not specifically restrict more sensitive land uses in and around more intrusive businesses that already exist. Clearly such considerations will be a key consideration when identifying land for sensitive land uses in further subservient development plan documents. Nevertheless where the GNDP will consider whether this issue could usefully be acknowledged within the JCS.

Regard has been had to the plans, policies and strategies of other organisations within the development of the JCS, the County Council being a key strategic partner in the development of the document. Nevertheless consideration will be given to whether further acknowledgement of the County Council Minerals and Waste Strategy is needed within the document.

Consider providing specific support for existing business within Policy 15.

Consider whether additional policy restrictions need to be put in place to avoid conflicts between existing intrusive industry and further more "sensitive land uses".

Consider whether sufficient regard has been given to the County Minerals and Waste Strategy.

9579 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]
9971 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Bringham) [6903]
9438 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish

Object See answer to Q28

As already stated

No comment

Comments noted

No action necessary

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

8922 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
 9588 - Mr R Harris [8146]
 9662 - Ms E Riches [8165]
 10470 - Mr David Smith [8309]
 10571 - Mr G P Collings [8318]

Object

We need less housing and therefore fewer jobs. Large scale economic growth will urbanise the countryside. We only need to provide the jobs to meet local needs. Education standards need to be raised for locally important industries.
 Employment land cannot be found if agricultural land is to be supported, this policy contradicts others.
 We do not want our quality of life ruined for the sake of people from "outside" to make money.
 No development is acceptable.

It is the clear view of central government that there is a pressing need for new housing development. This need for housing is the result of significant expected increases in population and changes in society, such as more people living alone and living longer. The need for housing is demonstrated, in part, by the very large increases in house prices that have occurred over the last decade. These house price rises have made suitable housing unaffordable to many people living in the UK, and this includes Norfolk where the ratio of house prices to household income is generally accepted as being higher than the national average.

No changes necessary.

This need for housing is acknowledged by a national growth agenda of which Norfolk is part.

The exact level of housing which is being planned for is determined at regional level and has had regard to the likely housing demand in an area and its capacity for growth. The GNDP are committed to meeting the housing needs for the Greater Norwich Area.

If growth is to occur in a sustainable way then growth in the economy, and therefore availability of employment, will need to go "hand in hand" with housing growth. The GNDP maintains that, subject to changes that may result from this consultation, the policy is founded on robust evidence and offers the most appropriate option for the development of the economy of Greater Norwich when considered against all others.

There is an intrinsic conflict between protecting the countryside for agricultural and other activities, such as leisure and recreation, and accommodating the need for growth. It is the opinion of the GNDP that a balance needs to be struck between these competing issues. Therefore the policies set out within the JCS seek to protect the countryside whilst also providing sufficient land to meet the need for economic development and housing. In order to achieve this aim the GNDP will seek to provide only the land which is necessary to fulfil the potential of Greater Norwich.

Representations**Nature Representation Summary**

Representations	Nature	Representation Summary
7879 - Mr Paul Mallett [7783] 7896 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] 7900 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] 8095 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] improved. 8937 - Mrs Margaret Elbro [8084] biggest reason for lack of commercial investment in 11105 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] 10548 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Object	<p>NNDR must be dualled and connected to the southern bypass at both ends.</p> <p>Essential that Norfolk's transport infrastructure is shorter length of the road it is still considered to fulfil the Deficiencies in transport infrastructure are the single Norfolk.</p> <p>The A140 should be dualled as should the road links between Norwich and Gt. Yarmouth, Norwich and Kings Lynn and Norwich and the North Norfolk Coast. It will be difficult to increase employment opportunities without better links from Norwich to the rest of the UK. Too much emphasis on road building, not enough emphasis on cycling and walking.</p> <p>Rail and busses are expensive, flights from Norwich are declining and this will cause more road usage to use other airports.</p> <p>Achieving the full economic potential of the area is dependant on improved connectivity and implementation</p>

Council's Assessment**Action**

<p>The NNDR is central to the GNDR's growth strategy. In order to avoid damage to the environmentally and visually sensitive Wensum Valley the road will not form a complete loop with the southern bypass. Despite the</p> <p>important objectives of providing a key high speed road link to the north of Norwich, which is crucial for continued economic growth, and reliving pressure on the radial routes into Norwich from the north, which will allow public transport prioritisation between the city and key growth areas.</p> <p>The wider transport network in and around Norwich, including road, rail, air and sea, is also a key planning concern. In particular circumstances the Local Development Framework will be able to directly deliver improvements, for example the NNDR or Long Statton Bypass. However, it will often be the case that longer distance strategic links can only be delivered by outside agencies such as Network Rail and the Highways Agency. In these instances it will be important that the JCS sets out the appropriate framework for them to occur and ensures that their importance is recognised. Policy 13: Strategic Access and Transportation seeks specifically to address these wider issues by promoting wider transportation links including improvements to the A11 and A47 and enhanced rail services from Norwich to London.</p> <p>The road building proposed as part of the JCS forms only part of a wider package of transport improvements aimed at tackling key economic and environmental problems associated with accessibility and over reliance on the private car. In addition to road building are plans to improve public transport and walking and cycling facilities. In addition the spatial distribution of land uses is intended to promote a better relationship between homes, jobs, services and facilities. A better relationship between these elements will help to promote more diverse methods of transportation. Policy 16 provides more detail on the</p>	No changes necessary
---	----------------------

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

7974 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]
 8504 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
 8632 - University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]
 9081 - Ms R Pickering [8109]

Object Norfolk will need to improve its level of educational attainment if it is to encourage and sustain high level/skill jobs.
 The tourist industry needs to improve quality standards and training must be available and mandatory to achieve this.
 Increasing the proportion of high value knowledge economy jobs can only be achieved if the University plays a major part in generating a training workforce. There should be a strong reference in the policy to continued development of the University.
 Provision must be made for the unemployed to learn new skills.

The provision of primary and secondary education facilities is central to the proposals for growth within the GNDP area. It is essential that adequate provision is made for education facilities to ensure that the standards of existing institutions are not undermined due to a lack of adequate space. The GNDP Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study developed in conjunction with Norfolk County Council will help to inform the level of provision that will be required in support of growth. Continued liaison with education professionals will help to ensure that needs continue to be met.

Consider making stronger references in the policy to the link between the UEA and the development of the high knowledge economy.

In addition to primary and secondary facilities the strategy specifically seeks the expansion of further and higher education facilities, support for a retail academy, encouraging links between training/education and businesses and support for enterprise hubs.

Clearly it is beyond the powers of the plan to require an employee in a specific industry to undertake particular training, this will be a matter for the individual employer or regulatory body. However, the plan seeks to put in place the appropriate framework for this to occur.
 Hethel was one of the locations supported by the Arup study (page 26 of final report)- for a specific sector[RB]

Continue to support Hethel, but for particular sectors[RB]

8192 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]

Object Do not support any further development (or financial support) at Hethel [RB]

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

8130 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888] Object
 Employment opportunities need to focus on value added
 10862 - Norwich Green Party (Mr
 Stephen Little) [8018]
 8601 - Mr M Read [8024]
 10418 - Mr Alan Ives [8299]
 10607 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]
 10645 - David Morris (Mr David

activities.

Only brownfield sites should be used

Sufficient land must be provided for employment purposes if economic growth is to occur. Concerned that the strategy is too reliant on constrained sites such as the UEA science park. Reliance on constrained site could undermine delivery.

Longwater is not a good location for a business park when considered against other options. This unsuitability of this location is demonstrated by the proliferation of quasi-retail uses as opposed to business park type uses.

Growth at the airport is reliant upon access improvements.

Harford Bridges should be identified as a strategic employment site for early development.

Further debate is required on the type and location of uses on existing allocations to ensure their swift development.

Mixed use sites comprising of a mix of residential and employment uses should be welcomed where it assists in creating sustainable communities, this would require a more localised a stable economy.

The emphasis on promoting the heart of Norwich as a retail centre threatens the viability of creating new "town centres" in proposed settlements.

The economic importance of small scale manufacturing should be acknowledged.

Using house building as an economic stimulus, as well as being environmentally questionable, will tend to create jobs in low skill service sectors.

Existing areas of deprivation should receive the greatest benefit from development and the growth agenda should not divert funds away from tackling existing problems.

Not enough attention has been given to the long term unemployed who tend to be clustered on certain estates. Work place and support facilities should be planned for

Council's Assessment

The GNPD agrees that the identification of sufficient land for employment uses, which can be readily delivered, is essential to an effective strategy. Although this policy quite correctly identifies key strategic employment locations it is not considered that this unduly restricts the flexibility of the strategy in allocating sites elsewhere if site specific factor cannot readily be overcome.

Given the scale of growth needed it is undoubted that a level of greenfield sites will need to be identified.

Comments regarding Longwater are noted. The GNPD maintains that professional studies that underpin the strategy are robust and provide a credible framework within which to plan for economic growth. The strategy reflects the findings of these professional studies.

The GNPD agrees that improved accessibility is essential to the delivering economic prosperity. It should be noted that Policy 16 deals specifically with accessibility issues and that access improvements are central to the overall strategy for the area.

The promotion of Harford Bridges as a strategic employment site is noted.

Through subsequent and subservient development plan documents specific areas of land will be identified for different uses. A key element of the site selection process will focus on their ongoing suitability and deliverability, which will be tested through examination in public.

The GNPD agrees that a mixture of employment land and residential development can help to create sustainable communities in certain circumstances and this is recognised in policies within the JCS.

Norwich is one of the most successful retail centres in the UK. Its continued success is considered essential to the overall success of the area, in both economic and social terms. Undoubtedly given the offer provided by Norwich it will have a sphere of influence wider than its immediate hinterland and this needs to be recognised and to an extent facilitate. However, the strategy also recognises the importance of small centres in the surrounding town and villages, which are supported and promoted as part of the strategy.

The needs of small scale business, of whatever type, are

Action

Consider whether Harford Bridges should be recognised as a strategic employment location.

specifically recognised in the policy.

There is clearly a close relationship between house building

Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Morris) [8335]

those estates.

Council's Assessment

Action

and economic development. Despite difficulties resulting from the recent economic downturn, this is a growing area both in population and economic terms. The need for housing is pressing as population grows and societal change occurs. The need is reflected in the very large rises in houses prices over the past decade which has meant that many people are unable to find adequate housing. Equally as population grows so will the need for employment. The strategy focuses on growth within key sectors which will address issues of job quality.

Policy 4 deals specifically with areas in the Norwich urban area, where the majority of existing IMD problems exist. Tackling existing problems is a key element of the wider strategic framework. Clearly there will need to be a balance struck between diverting available funds towards existing areas and new growth area. Although existing problems will need to be tackled new potential problems should not be created or stored up in the growth areas.

Education is a key element of the strategy as acknowledged in the policy.

10498 - Mr I T Smith [8310]

Object Do not support the concept of further economic growth

Noted - however there are acknowledged shortfalls in the local economy compared with the rest of the East of England, in terms of Skills and aspirations. Most observers consider that economic well being, as much as housing, is an essential part of a sustainable community. [RB]

No Change [RB]

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9309 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]
 9711 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]
 8370 - Alyson Lowe [6992]
 7935 - mr paul newson [7812]
 8012 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]
 8216 - Mr P Anderson [7901]
 8778 - Ms K Dunn [8045]
 9335 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]

Object Economic improvement is impossible in the current economic climate.
 The strategy is no longer relevant because of the current economic recession.
 The aspiration of providing 33,000 jobs is unachievable. There will not need to be additional office space in the city because there will be an abundance of empty office buildings as it is.
 The policy sounds "too good to be true".

Undoubtedly the current economic recession is having a negative affect on the local economy. However, the plan is intended to look ahead to at least 2026. Although there are no accurate predictions to when this recession will end it is likely that this plan will endure well beyond the end of the current downturn.

The economic strategy in the JCS has been informed by the Employment Growth and Sites and Premises Study. This study looks at the potential economic growth of Norwich and it results broadly illustrates a strong performance in job creation in the recent past whilst also predicting a prosperous future in the longer term.

No specific levels of accommodation are proposed within the current policy. The policy seeks to indicate the strategy for the key expected growth areas. Accommodation provision for all types of employment will be in line with the key findings of the evidence base studies that supported the development of the strategy.

Deliverability is a key part of the overall strategy, the GNDP recognises the need to illustrate this deliverability and continues to work on a detailed implementation framework which will be in place for the final version of the document.

No changes necessary.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10416 - Honeyview Investments Limited [8298]

Object

The policy does not go far enough in setting a policy framework to meet the need for additional leisure and tourism facilities. The JCS should be more specific in its employment policies.

There is a need for additional hotel accommodation within Norwich, in particular on the western side. The EGSPS forecasts a growth of 1,200 jobs in hotels and catering.

There is a need for accommodation for business travellers, this should be provided in locations where the need to travel is reduced, i.e. close to business locations but not necessarily within town centres. The JCS should provide for this need.

There shouldn't be a policy presumption to safeguard land not currently in employment use for B1, B2 or B8 for those purposes.

Emerging policy, such as PPS4, should be considered as part of this policy. In particular the JCS should facilitate the provision of land to meet the needs of business and the needs of the whole community. The land provided should be flexible enough to respond to changing economic circumstances. In allocating sites it is essential that existing allocations are not simply taken forwards. Land should only be allocated where there is a realistic prospect of it being brought forwards. If current employment sites are no longer suitable for employment purposes the re-use for other uses, such as housing, should be considered.

Comments relating to the specificity of the policy are noted. Within any overarching policy there is a need to ensure that the policy is sufficiently detailed to set the appropriate framework for economic growth whilst at the same time not being so specific that it becomes inflexible and unable to adapt to changing economic circumstance. Nevertheless, the GNPD will consider whether any useful detail can be incorporated into the policy wording, which would help enable the economic growth sought.

The comments in terms of business travellers are noted. In accommodating such needs it will of course be important to consider the need for travel, but this also need to be considered against the opportunities for linked trips and wider economic benefits that may result from co-location of accommodation and city centre facilities.

Policy 15 does not seek to provide a blanket presumption for the safeguarding of already identified sites, nor does it indicate the sites will automatically be re-allocated. The GNPD is conscious that delivery is a key element of the current planning system and this will be rigorously tested through examination.

Consider whether more specificity could usefully be incorporated in to the policy.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9254 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]
 8857 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]
 9203 - Widen the Choice Rural
 Transport Partnership (Mr Chris
 Wood) [8114]
 10723 - Ms S Layton [8354]

Object The continuation of current patterns of development will fail to limit the contribution to climate change. This policy allows current patterns of development to continue. The UK is already overdeveloped.

The policy will not create sustainable developments.

Sustainability is more important than economic growth. Investment in education and training is the most important factor.

Sustainability will be difficult to achieve with such rapid change planned. Slower changes would make it much easier to create sustainable developments.

Sustainability is a combination of social, economic and environmental considerations. One element cannot be considered without the other. A suite of policies that considers only a single element will in itself fail to be sustainable because of its lack of consideration for other issues.

No changes necessary.

The GNDP maintains that, subject to changes that may result from this consultation, the policy is founded on robust evidence and offers the most appropriate option for the development of the economy of Greater Norwich when considered against all others. This policy will help to meet the necessary demand for employment that will occur in combination with growth.

Policy 13 deals specifically with reducing the environmental effect of development and Policy 16 deals with strategic access and transportation considerations. These policies directly effect the contributions to climate change made by new developments.

Notwithstanding the above, having received a specific study on dealing with the energy needs of new development, the GNDP is working on a specific policy dealing energy generation. This specific policy will be in place for the purposes of the final document.

The demand for growth is substantial and the need pressing, although it may be more comfortable to plan for much lower rates of growth this would fail to meet these pressing needs. In the view of the GNDP, failing to meet need the policy would itself be unsustainable.

8530 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]
 10594 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]

Object Object to Policy.

The general objection to the policy is noted. The GNDP maintains that, subject to changes that may result from this consultation, the policy is founded on robust evidence and offers the most appropriate option for the development of the economy of Greater Norwich when considered against all others.

No change necessary

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9408 - Mr E Newberry [8120]
10352 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]

Object The County continually loses jobs, especially to countries where manufacturing is cheaper.

Tourism jobs area seasonal and therefore should not be included.

We need to encourage more manufacturing.

The strategy proposed is based upon a robust evaluation of the local economy and projections of the industries which are most likely to prosper. Subject to changes resulting from this consultation, the GNDP considers the strategy set out in the document to be the most appropriate for the area when considered against all others.

No change necessary.

The loss of manufacturing jobs from the UK is a well documented trend in recent years and is illustrative of the global economy in which many companies are competing. However, the strategy does not seek to inhibit manufacturing industries and the policy framework is considered to be suitably flexible to accommodate such development. In addition, where specific local opportunities for manufacturing growth are apparent they have been specifically recognised by the strategy, i.e. Hethel.

Tourism is an essential element of the local economy, generating significant income for the area and region as a whole. To ignore this key sector would be to undervalue and undermine its importance. Undoubtedly some jobs in the tourism sector are seasonal and this is a key reason why it is important the strategy recognises, as it does, growth across a diverse range of sectors.
Support for the policy is noted. Policy 5 deals with the locations for major change. The GNDP maintain that the distribution policy proposed represents the most sustainable option for the future development of the area when considered against all others.

No change necessary.

10138 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]

Support A sustainable urban extension would make a significant contribution to achieving the principle of Policy 15. The extension would create employment opportunities, provide better access to jobs and support local economic growth.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10900 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]

Support

Broadland Land Trust (BLT) supports Policy 15.

BLT considers that a choice of local employment opportunities is a key part of sustainable communities as this can limit pressure placed on the transport network, stimulates economic growth and enterprise and limits leakage outside of the area.

The land promoted by BLT to the north-east of Norwich has a strong locational advantage because it is close to key employment sites.

The location also has the ability to accommodate at least one additional district centre which would complement the employment opportunities.

Growth in this location is well placed to benefit from wider opportunities resulting from the proposed growth in other areas.

BLT intends to accommodate a range of business and services and exploit links with existing employment areas.

The area could include space for business start ups, helping to achieve growth in the knowledge economy. Broad support for the policy.

North East Wymondham landowners consider that a choice of local employment opportunities is a key part of a sustainable community. This will limit the pressure on the local economy, stimulate growth and limit leakage outside of the area.

The land being promoted to the north-east of Wymondham as the sustainable urban extension has a locational advantage, it is close to existing employment sites and is well placed to benefit from employment opportunities in Norwich.

The landowners intend to allocate sufficient land within the urban extension to accommodate a range of business and services, creating a range of employment opportunities.

General support for the policy is welcomed.

The GNPD does not intend to comment in detail about any specific area of land that is current being promoted through the JCS process. Subservient documents, in this case the Sprowston, Old Catton, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle Area Action Plan, will consider the nature and form of the allocations within a particular area.

No changes necessary.

10837 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]

Support

The broad support for the policy is welcomed. The location specific policies for Wymondham are set out within the document and it is recognised as a location for major change.

No changes necessary.

The GNPD does not intend to comment in detail about any specific area of land that is current being promoted through the JCS process. Subservient document will consider the nature and form of the allocations within a

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11074 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535]	Support	<p>Support the policy subject to strategic employment locations including a business park adjacent to the airport.</p> <p>The airport business park should be extended to include the site known as Manor Farm Horsford as the strategic site for the new business park. The site is suitable because of its proximity to the airport, major transport links, park and ride and position inside the NNDR. It</p>	<p>Broad but caveated support for the policy is noted.</p> <p>The GNDP does not intend to comment in detail about any specific area of land that is current being promoted through the JCS process. Subservient documents will define the exact nature and form of the allocations within the broad but enabling framework set out in the JCS.</p>	No action necessary.
9889 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] 8717 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Support	<p>The GNDP need to understand why the needs of small businesses are so rarely addressed in development plans for villages. Can the provision of buildings for employment purposes alongside housing.</p> <p>The recommendations of the report by Matthew Taylor MP should be put into practice through the JCS.</p>	<p>The settlement hierarchy policies, policies 6 through 10, provide some further illumination into the types of development that will be promoted within the different settlements in the GNDP area. Clearly employment within the towns, villages and wider rural area outside of Norwich and its immediate hinterland will be a key element of achieving the potential of the GNDP area and creating a better relationship between homes and jobs.</p> <p>Although the GNDP, through the medium of planning policies, could seek to require the provision of land for employment purposes through allocation of obligation to a house builder it is a falsehood to expect that this will necessarily mean that there will be more economic activity within the rural area. Although land, or indeed buildings, could be required it is not possible to guarantee that an employer would seek to locate, or re-locate to that area. Ultimately, within a competitive economy that operates at least a regional if not national or international market it will be important to work with employers to ensure that development is achieved. In addition, within the context of the tackling climate change it will be important to ensure that excessive development does not take place in locations that have little or no chance of being environmentally sustainable from a transport perspective and this needs to be considered alongside the need to promote development within the rural area.</p> <p>The GNDP is aware of the report by Matthew Taylor MP. It is the view of the GNDP that the strategy promoted, subject to changes that might result from this consultation, is the most appropriate when considered against all the other options. Clearly this position will be kept under review up to the submission of the document and then thereafter when the effectiveness of the plan will be continually tested.</p>	No change necessary.

Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10746 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Support	Support Policy	Support for policy is welcomed.	No change necessary.
8578 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]				
9199 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]				
9050 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]				
8241 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]				
10227 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
8823 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]				
9943 - John Heaser [7015]				
9128 - Mr John Osborne [7111]				
9369 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]				
10522 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]				
10779 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]				
8167 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]				
8281 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]				
8306 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]				
8419 - Ed King [7965]				
8480 - Mr C Skeels [8016]				
8554 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]				
8667 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]				
8691 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]				
9686 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]				
8745 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]				
8798 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]				
8850 - Mr John Nelson [8064]				
8987 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]				
9134 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]				
9178 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]				
9399 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]				
9465 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]				
9496 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]				
9612 - Mrs Sandra Osborne				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10990 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] 9838 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 10005 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10039 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10064 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] 10115 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] 10152 - R Smith [8243] 10190 - Commercial Land [8246]				
10443 - Mr J E Youngs [8308] 10547 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]				
10626 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]				
9806 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Support	Broadlay agree [RB]	Noted [RB]	No Change [RB]
10275 - Norwich HEART (Mr Michael Loveday) [960] 10260 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	Support	<p>The policy is supported as it will encourage tourism, leisure and cultural industries. The creative industries are the UK's fastest growing sector. The promotion of a theatre use as part of a relatively small development may make a strong contribution to the character of a town and enhance visitor experience.</p> <p>The current JCS fails in a major way to focus on the economic potential of the area. The two world class selling points that the area offers are knowledge based industries and cultural heritage/creative industries. Attention should be focused on these areas.</p> <p>It is important to create better connections between Norwich and the rest of the world. These connections should not just be physical but also commercial and cultural. Norwich should aspire to be part of a connected network of global knowledge hubs and part of an international network of cultural heritage cities.</p>	<p>In addition to the references in Policy 15, Policy 18 provides general support for cultural industries and support is provided for elements of cultural heritage across a range of other policies.</p> <p>Policy 15 recognises the particularly important of enterprise hubs at Norwich Research Centre, EPIC and Hethel. The economic policy is based upon detail professional research carried out for the GNDP and is in line with regional planning and economic policy. The GNDP maintains that, subject to changes made as a result of this consultation, this economic strategy is the most appropriate when considered against alternatives.</p> <p>It is clear that in order to achieve its full economic potential Norwich will need to concentrate upon the development of all of its key industries alongside the enhancement of smaller local and regional businesses.</p> <p>Although the principle of the development and enhancement of particular industries is supported this needs to be undertaken alongside supporting diversification of the economic base, which will make</p>	Consider whether the explanation of connectivity could usefully be expanded to include cultural and commercial linkages.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9247 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
 9787 - East Carleton Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1997]
 9278 - Mrs Gray [5927]
 10389 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]
 9648 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]
 8956 - City College Norwich (Mrs Corrienne Peasgood) [8090]

Support The policy should be more specific about which sectors will be supported and encouraged. Education and training facilities should be co-located, but it needs to be recognised that there will need to be a "critical mass" of similar sectors for clusters to work effectively. Policy needs to be more specific. Large national companies, such as Tesco, should be discouraged. The policy does not sufficiently illustrate how opportunities will be delivered. There is not sufficient guidance on what sustainable growth means in sectoral terms.

The comments regarding the specificity of the policy are noted. It is recognised that at the moment the policy does not set out the exact level and distribution of land that will be provided for employment purposes.

Whilst it is recognised that this may be a useful addition to the policy the GNDP is also conscious that an overarching policy should also be sufficiently flexible so that it can adapt to changing circumstances. In order to maintain this flexibility the GNDP is reluctant to become over prescriptive in terms of the level and nature of provision. Notwithstanding the above, the GNDP will consider whether there is any scope to be more specific in terms of the level and distribution of employment land.

Large national and multi-national companies will play an important role in the economic development of Greater Norwich and it is not considered appropriate for this policy to seek to restrict specific companies. However, it is also important to recognise that regional and local employers will also play a key role in achieving the economic potential of the area. The importance of smaller companies is specifically identified within the policy text.

It is noted that the policy is currently silent on specifics of what sustainable growth means in sectoral terms. Although the GNDP would not want to create an overly restrictive framework that constrains innovation, consideration will be given to the possibility of providing further guidance on this issue.

The GNDP is conscious that further work needs to be undertaken to explain the key dependencies of growth within key sectors and locations. The GNDP will seek to bring forward in its submission version an identified schedule of infrastructure dependencies alongside an identification of delivery mechanisms and funding streams. It would be worth bearing in mind that explicit detail of delivery mechanisms may be better accommodated within subservient development plan documents, which will address these specific issues.

Consider whether the policy could usefully be given more specificity in terms of the distribution and scale of employment land across Greater Norwich.

Consider providing guidance within the supporting text about what sustainable might mean for employers in sectoral terms.

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

Decision on (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

Consider whether more specificity could usefully be incorporated in to the policy.

Consider whether the explanation of connectivity could usefully be expanded to include cultural and commercial linkages.

Consider providing specific recognition of agricultural industries across the GNDP area, the potential for a "food hub" or "food industry cluster" and links between this industry and existing industry and key educational institutions.

Consider whether the policy could usefully be given more specificity in terms of the distribution and scale of employment land across Greater Norwich.

Consider providing guidance within the supporting text about what sustainable might mean for employers in sectoral terms.

Continue to support Hethel, but for particular sectors[RB]

Consider whether Harford Bridges should be recognised as a strategic employment location.

Consider providing specific support for existing business within Policy 15.

Consider whether additional policy restrictions need to be put in place to avoid conflicts between existing intrusive industry and further more "sensitive land uses".

Consider whether sufficient regard has been given to the County Minerals and Waste Strategy.

Consider whether further references to incorporation of churches and faith groups could usefully be incorporated into policy 15 or elsewhere in the JCS.

Consider making stronger references in the policy to the link between the UEA and the development of the high knowledge economy.

Consider giving greater acknowledgement in the policy to the important of the Broads in respect of local tourism and potential opportunities generated.

Also consider giving greater acknowledgement to the importance of protecting historic and locally distinctive settlements to the tourism economy of the Greater Norwich Area.

Consider provide more detail on the role of the knowledge economy and cultural industries. Consider including references to the Economic Strategy. Consider strengthening the wording of the Tourism policies.

(Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

9069 - Ms Penny Tilley [8108]	Comment	Use smaller and more economic buses	Strategy promotes a significant shift towards the use of public transport. The specification of vehicles required to fulfil the objectives have yet to be determined.	No change
9409 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Comment	How will people be made to use PT	People cannot be made to use public transport. However investment in the system will ensure that public transport becomes a realistic alternative to the car. Investment in infrastructure will need to be supported by information and prop motion.	No Change
8780 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Comment	I think you are trying to turn Norfolk into a mini London	The transport strategy seeks to ensure that growth is sustainable and founded on a high quality public transport system. As such it represents a significant commitment to improving public transport that aims to provide a well used system appropriate to Norwich	No Change

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9818 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509]	Comment	The plan is dependent on significant infrastructure - NDR, A47 Blofield, Long Stratton Bypass. Last 2 do not have regional funding identified	Growth promoted in the plan is not dependent on the improvements to A47 at Blofield. Consequently the scheme not being included in this round is not fundamental to the delivery on the plan. Long Stratton Bypass is a prerequisite for development in Long Stratton. Growth in that location is being promoted at a scale that deliver a bypass for the village, therefore the bypass not currently being identified for regional funding is not a threat to the	Revise wording to reflect current status of schemes and clarify the impact on deliverability of the
8602 - Mr M Read [8024]	Comment	Brownfield sites only	Other policies in the Plan consider the siting of new development	No Change
7880 - Mr Paul Mallett [7783]	Comment	Whole of A11 corridor MUST be dualled Northern Bypass must be dualled and connected at both ends with Southern bypass.	A11 dualling in regional programme. NDR is planned as a dual c/way. The alignment and terminal connections of the NDR have been assessed and found to be the best balance between environmental traffic considerations.	No change
10724 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Comment	Need to ensure NDR not a barrier to walking and cycling.	Layout of growth in NE has yet to be determined. Comments noted and are important to the successful development of the area.	Review policy for NE to ensure that policy looks to have strong walk and cycle links.
10153 - R Smith [8243]	Comment	Blofield has good accessibility and serviced and should be a key service centre.	The comments in respect to the accessibility of Blofield are noted. It is included as a key service centre and this is considered in policy 7. The response is not relevant to the context of policy 16.	No Change
7920 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	Comment	Buses and trains too expensive	Plan seeks to create the conditions for enhanced PT use. It does not set fare structures	No change
11021 - Norwich Chamber Council (Mr Don Pearson) [8371]	Comment	Whole of A11 corridor MUST be dualled NDR fully supported	Comments noted A11 dualling in regional programme. NDR is identified in the plan as a key component of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy environmental traffic	No Change
11106 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	Support the policy and contend that Loddon fits the requirements and can meet the objectives.	Loddon is identified in policy 7 as a key service centre based on its range of local services and public transport accessibility.	No Change
10920 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Comment	Wymondham is a good location for growth to meet objectives of Policy 16.	Wymondham is identified in the strategy as a location for large scale growth as it can achieve plan objectives.	No Change
10269 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068]	Comment	NDR should link to A47 in west	NDR is planned as a dual c/way. The Alignment and terminal connections of the NDR have been assessed and found to be the best balance between environmental and traffic considerations. Whilst there may be a desire to cross the river valley, the work done assessing the NDR has included growth and has not shown this to be a necessary link. There is no basis for requiring the A47 A1067 link to be a requirement of the joint core strategy. Clearly they may be local benefits of a link but it is not for the plan to Promote infrastructure that is not a requirement or consequence of its delivery.	No Change
10642 - Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333]	Comment	Cohousing will reduce care	Such schemes may reduce car use and the comment is noted.	No Change

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9466 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	Comment	As rep	The comments made are broadly in line with the draft policy. The exception is the consideration of freight where it is suggested that the plan should do more to promote rail freight. The consultation document is recognised as having little content on freight and this element of the strategy needs to be strengthened to understand the local	Be more explicit in the plan about promoting sustainable freight and describing the context for promoting of freight infrastructure.
9065 - Mr Alex Kuhn [8106] 11035 - Mr Stan Sabberton [8373]	Comment	Pedestrianise the city centre and develop a tram system supported by high quality bus services.	Previous studies have shown that the scale of Norwich (even considering growth) would not make a tram system viable. A bus rapid transit is being promoted. BRT should achieve similar levels of service for less investment in infrastructure. The NDR is a key element of the transport strategy allowing the implementation of BRT along existing roads.	No change
8634 - University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]	Comment	Cross valley link essential	A cross valley link is something to be considered in the layout of NRP/UEA. Whilst such considerations are important it is a matter for masterplanning and the implementation of a high quality public transport system rather than the Joint Core Strategy.	No Change
8912 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	Comment	Fails to mention improvements to A146	There is no large scale growth on A146 and hence no strategic improvements are identified. Smaller scale improvements may arise from local and site specific growth proposals.	No change
11080 - Residents of Gibbs Close, Little Melton [8385]	Comment	Background transport report only considers buses.	The report referred to is a report on public transport only. The wider considerations of traffic, public transport and their interaction are the subject of area wide traffic modelling for the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy. This work is ongoing and will inform the implementation of transportation improvements across all modes. Once that work is finalised it will be published.	No Change
10390 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Comment	Commitment to rail noted, but will commitments to improved bus and rail appear in policy. Clarity should be given on significance and priority of transport improvements identified. Transport infrastructure requirements should flow from a public transport orientated approach to development. NATS policy predates the joint core strategy and may not reflect national and regional policy.	Policy 5 provides a context for transport enhancements associated with large scale growth. The supporting text set out in Appendix 0 describes in more detail the key dependencies. The plan is being revised to include an infrastructure delivery framework to help identify priorities and phase infrastructure. The potential for delivery of high quality public transport has been a significant determinant in developing the strategy for large scale growth. It is inevitable that transport impacts arising from 21,000 new homes some highway capacity improvements will be required to cater for the travel. Likely improvements have been identified however the design will be influenced by the extent to which demand management and public transport interventions can be implemented. It is recognised that NATS policy predates the growth strategy. The county council is refreshing the current version of the strategy, one of the policy influences being the joint core strategy. There is to be public consultation on the strategy towards the end of 2009.	Include in the plan a section on infrastructure requirements and identify a mechanism for prioritisation and delivery. Be clear in policies for places that the transport infrastructure is an integrated approach to providing for travel demand and is not predict and provide. Transport policy is informed by NATS and other sources. It is for the County Council to update and review that strategy.

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9748 - Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155]	Comment	Support NDR. Buses trains Pedestrian crossings and shared surfaces need to consider requirements of the blind and partially sighted.	There is no doubt that these are important issues. However this level of detail is too great for a core strategy. It is acknowledged that the plan needs to ensure the needs of the blind and partially sighted are catered	Ensure that policy acknowledges the requirements of disabled groups.
10708 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Comment	Road infrastructure should avoid flood zones	Comments Noted	No Change
9663 - Ms E Riches [8165]	Comment	Needs to be specific wording in policy requiring a bypass as a prerequisite to growth in Long Stratton	Policy 5 refers to appendix 0 which clearly identifies that a bypass is a prerequisite for growth	No change
8131 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	Comment	A47 improvement should be a high priority	The A47 provides strategic access to the west and the authorities support and press for its improvement. Improvement is not required to deliver the objectives of the plan	No Change
9813 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Comment	Funding for the Long Stratton bypass should come from central government, not be raised from house building.	This policy considers strategic transportation issues. This policy promotes a Long Stratton bypass, consistent with the Local transport plan but does not specifically promote growth at that location. Growth at Long Stratton is promoted in policy 5 and includes the justification for doing	No Change
9082 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	Comment	Is NDR necessary? Run P&R through the city.	The NDR is a key element of the transport strategy allowing the implementation of BRT along existing roads. P&R is to intercept rural car based trips before they enter the city. BRT is a high quality bus network linking the city centre, strategic growth locations and employment areas.	No change
7897 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	Object	Object as better transport networks can improve environment.	The policy promotes appropriate improvements.	No comment
10687 - Mr P Baker [8350]	Object	Agree - but should be a priority added for longer distance cycle routes.	The strategy promotes walking and cycling. Longer distance cycle routes do have some value but for the distances involved that majority of non car trips would be made by public transport which is where the plan priority should be. The longer distance cycle routes are a worthy objective, but cannot be seen as a requirement of planned	No Change
9944 - John Heaser [7015]	Object	Object as the policy is not strong enough on providing cycling infrastructure	The policy promotes walking and cycling as the primary means of travel for new developments. The list of infrastructure includes large strategic schemes some of which will include cycling provision. There are no specific cycle schemes in that list but this does not mean that they are not important, simply that the links cannot be clearly described until the layouts of growth locations become clearer.	Strengthen supporting text to clarify commitment to promotion
9972 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Object	Policy is incompatible with the vision and has too much emphasis on long distance travel. The policy should have an aim to reduce reliance on the car.	Good long distance connections are vital for the continued economic success of the area. A weak local economy will harm local employment opportunities giving rise to longer commuting and increased deprivation. The policy includes the objective to minimise the need to use the private car and the list identifies ways that this can be achieved.	No Change

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7975 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 7936 - mr paul newson [7812]	Object	Poor external transport links keeps Norfolk what it is	The plan promotes better linkages beyond the county to support inward investment and meeting jobs growth	No change
9310 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Object	As rep	This policy does not promote growth at Long Stratton. The merits and infrastructure requirements of growth at Long Stratton are identified in policy 5	No Change
10471 - Mr David Smith [8309]	Object	As rep	The plan promotes new and improved road links within the area and beyond to provide necessary supporting infrastructure for the planned housing and jobs growth targets set regionally. Maintenance of the existing local highway network is the responsibility of the County Council and not an issue for delivery of the plan	No Change
10572 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Object	As rep	Previous studies have shown that the scale of Norwich (even considering growth) would not make a tram system viable. A bus rapid transit is being promoted. BRT should achieve similar levels of service for less investment in infrastructure. The NDR is a key element of the transport strategy allowing the implementation of BRT along existing roads.	No Change
9510 - South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142]	Object	Insufficient weight given to Norwich International Airport and improvement of rail link to Stansted.	The policy promotes Norwich International Airport. It is not the place of the core strategy to detail how the airport will develop. This will be considered in subsequent, more detailed plans. In the production on the strategy no evidence has been presented to demonstrate why a rail link to Stansted should be an objective of the plan.	No Change
11090 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	Object	Support some elements. Use of rail, IT, improved public transport and location of development close to essential services. Reducing climate change is incompatible with the promotion of the airport and reducing the need to travel inconsistent with promotion of the NDR. Continued reliance on the private car in rural areas would be eased by more investment in public transport. Conflict with spatial objectives on climate change and reducing the need to travel. Does not include Behavioural change elements Does not reflect policy NR1 BRT not given policy weight The policy context for NATS is out of date. Policy considered to be unsound.	The plan seeks to balance housing and economic growth . Good strategic access including air travel is vital to the local economy. An imbalance between housing and jobs would lead to greater out commuting from the area. Investment in the NDR is investment in an element of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy. Its primary functions are; Removing through traffic from the northern suburbs of Norwich Allowing the enhancement of public transport and implementation of BRT along existing roads Providing strategic access to areas to the north and north east of Norwich It is recognised that NATS policy predates the growth strategy. The County Council is refreshing the current version of the strategy, one of the policy influences being the joint core strategy. There is to be public consultation on the strategy towards the end of 2009.	Adjust policy wording to reflect commitment to BRT as well as other public transport enhancements. Amend wording to ensure travel planning and smarter choices are drawn out as means of minimising car use and managing travel demand Be clear in policies for places that the transport infrastructure is an integrated approach to providing for travel demand and is not predict and provide. Transport policy is informed by NATS and other sources. It is for the County Council to update and review that strategy.
9531 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140] 9856 - Mr Paul Johnson [8207]	Object	Infrastructure needed now	There may be existing deficiencies. However the plan looks to identify improvements required to meets its	No change

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11151 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	Object	Improvements to A11 and A47 are important but should be supported by public transport improvements on the A11 corridor. Support promotion of the use of the local rail network. Growth in Long Stratton is inconsistent with the policy. The bypass will reduce congestion in Long Stratton and make longer journeys more attractive. Housing in this location will lead to unsustainable commuting and not be supported by high quality public transport.	The policy sets the strategic context for transport and is not intended to identify in detail the entire infrastructure required. Policy 5 and its supporting text identifies infrastructure required for each location and includes more clarity on Public Transport Improvements on the A11 corridor. This policy does not specifically promote growth in Long Stratton. The comments relate to the identification of Long Stratton Policy 5 and are not directly relevant to this policy.	No Change
8255 - R Barker [6805]	Object	There should be no growth in Long Stratton.	This policy considers strategic transportation issues. This policy promotes a Long Stratton bypass, consistent with the Local transport plan but does not specifically promote growth at that location. Growth at Long Stratton is promoted in policy 5 and includes the justification for doing	No change
9621 - RW Kidner [8163]	Object	Policy should promote a balanced approach to housing and employment in rural areas.	Policies 7,8,9 and 10 consider appropriate development in smaller communities supported by transport policy	Check consistency between rural and transport policies.
10863 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Object	Public transport improvements should be prioritised over the NDR. NDR will create severance of growth in the North East.	The NDR is a key element of the transport strategy to support growth. Its primary functions are; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ Removing through traffic from the northern suburbs of Norwich â€¢ Allowing the enhancement of public transport and implementation of BRT along existing roads â€¢ Providing strategic access to areas to the north and north east of Norwich. Funds are allocated on a scheme by scheme basis and cannot be simply transferred from one project to another.	No Change
10329 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Object	The policy contains contradictions. Reducing climate change is incompatible with the promotion of the airport and reducing the need to travel inconsistent with promotion of the NDR. Continued reliance on the private car in rural areas would be eased by more investment in public transport.	Design of the Large scale growth locations will be subject to an accredited design process to ensure that there are good pedestrian and cycle links and barriers created by road and railway lines can be overcome. The plan seeks to balance housing and economic growth. Good strategic access including air travel is vital to the local economy. An imbalance between housing and jobs would lead to greater out commuting from the area. Investment in the NDR is investment in an element of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy. Its primary functions are; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing through traffic from the northern suburbs of Norwich Allowing the enhancement of public transport and implementation of BRT along existing roads Providing strategic access to areas to the north and north east of Norwich. 	No Change
9336 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	Object	Long Stratton Bypass needs to be a higher priority	The policy lists the high transport priorities. The list is in no particular order and includes a bypass for Long Stratton. Policy 5 refers to Appendix 0 which clearly identifies that a bypass is a prerequisite for growth.	No Change

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10650 - Ms Lucy Hall [8295]	Object	The policy contains contradictions. Reducing climate change is incompatible with the promotion of the airport.	The plan seeks to balance housing and economic growth . Good strategic access including air travel is vital to the local economy. An imbalance between housing and jobs would lead to greater out commuting from the area. Investment in the NDR is investment in an element of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy. Its primary functions are; Removing through traffic from the northern suburbs of Norwich Allowing the enhancement of public transport and implementation of BRT along existing roads Providing strategic access to areas to the north and north east of Norwich	No Change
8505 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Object	Looks good but will the policy be effective?	The strategy needs to set the appropriate context for improvements to the transport network. Delivering the improvements will be dependent on future funding decisions. The plan should support and promote future bids for funds.	No Change
9255 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 9580 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] 8531 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8953 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] Providing strategic access to areas to the north and north 9270 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] 9401 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124] 9589 - Mr R Harris [8146] 10116 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] 10685 - Ms Natalie Beal [8349] 9179 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	Object	NDR not required.	The NDR is a key element of the transport strategy to support growth. Its primary functions are; Removing through traffic from the northern suburbs of Norwich Allowing the implementation of BRT along existing roads east of Norwich Funds are allocated on a scheme by scheme basis and cannot be Simply transferred from one project to another.	No change
	Object	No specific provision in policy for the disabled.	There is no doubt that these are important issues. However this level of detail is too great for a core strategy. It is acknowledged that the plan needs to ensure the needs of the disabled are catered for.	Ensure that policy acknowledges the requirements of disabled
8320 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922]	Object	How will NDR improve quality of life?	The NDR is a key element of the transport strategy Removing through traffic from the northern suburbs of Norwich Allowing the implementation of BRT along existing roads Providing strategic access to areas to the north and north east of Norwich	No change
10799 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] 10814 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Object	Car sharing should be promoted as rural transport	Car sharing may be part of a package of sustainable transport measures. The policy and text should indicate that a range of measures could be promoted.	Amend wording to ensure travel planning and smarter choices are drawn out as means of minimising car use and manging travel demand.

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10139 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	Object	Expand the bullet point on rail to be more specific that it includes the under utilised Bittern Line Need to include highway improvements identified in extant Local Plans including the Broadland Business Park link between Plumstead Road and A47.	This is a strategic policy and sets a context for local rail improvements. It should be noted that the Bittern Line currently runs to a very tight timetable, and is at capacity at peak times. Enhanced use of the Line will require investment in infrastructure. The highway link referred to is important but related to the North East growth location. The text describing infrastructure requirements in the North east could be clearer.	Change text supporting favoured option to include clear references to the Broadland Business Park link between Plumstead Road and
9712 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	Object	Policy does not identify full range of measures required for Long Stratton.	The policy lists the high transport priorities. The list is in no particular order and includes a bypass for Long Stratton. Policy 5 refers to Appendix 0 which clearly identifies that a bypass is a prerequisite for growth.	No Change
10901 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Object	General support for the policy. The objectives should be expanded to state enhancements will also benefit existing communities. The North East of Norwich is a good location for large scale growth and can come forward in a form that achieves the objectives of the policy. Need to include highway improvements identified in extant Local Plans including the Broadland Business Park link between Plumstead Road and A47 and the Link between Wroxham Road and Salhouse Road.	The supporting text is clear that transport improvement will be promoted for new and existing travel patterns. The North East of Norwich is identified in the strategy as a location for large scale growth as it can achieve plan	Change text supporting favoured option to include clear references to the Broadland Business Park link between Plumstead Road and A47 and the Link between Wroxham Road and Salhouse
10595 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	Object to growth. Current infrastructure insufficient for current needs	The plan promotes new and improved road links within the area and beyond to provide necessary supporting infrastructure for the planned housing and jobs growth targets set regionally. The plan has to be able to demonstrate deliverability and show a mechanism for doing so.	Include in the plan a section on infrastructure requirements and identify a mechanism for prioritisation and delivery.
10838 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	Object	General support for the policy. Growth in North East Wymondham offers the best opportunity to maximise rail use and will encourage walking and cycling.	Wymondham is identified in the strategy as a location for large scale growth as it can achieve plan objectives	No Change
8646 - Mr Pat Gowen [8034]	Object	Object to the NDR on cost, increasing CO2, additional traffic in Hellesdon and other lower cost improvements could be made	The NDR is a key element of the transport strategy to support growth. Its primary functions are; Removing through traffic from the northern suburbs of Norwich Allowing the implementation of BRT along existing roads Providing strategic access to areas to the north and north east of Norwich Funds are allocated on a scheme by scheme basis and cannot be Simply transferred from one project to another.	No Change
10171 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]	Object	Policy fails to mention strategic nature of rail and water freight assets. A freight policy needs to be integrated into this policy to achieve long term sustainable economic	It is recognised that the plan fails to be very explicit on freight. There is currently no evidence to support specific new facilities, however there needs to be a policy context to enhance and promote sustainable freight facilities.	Add section on freight into policy.

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8923 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] 9209 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 9279 - Mrs Gray [5927] 8371 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 8096 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] the plan area including wider environmental objectives. 8217 - Mr P Anderson [7901] 8960 - MR Richard Edwards [7925] 8341 - e buitenhuis [7951] 9632 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] 8408 - paul eldridge [7987] 8435 - Helen Baczkowska [8000]	Object	Policy too road focused	Whilst the policy clearly promotes some road improvements and recognises that in rural areas the car will be an important means of travel, it has a balanced approach and seeks to reduce reliance on the private car by promoting services accessible by walking and cycling, home working and a high quality public transport system. The balance of the policy reflects the challenges faced in This policy is not intended to identify in detail what all the improvements and interventions may be. Some interventions have been identified in the section of the plan that looks in more detail at the spatial distribution of growth. The policy defines objectives that more detailed work on specific sites will have to meet.	No change
8443 - Dr Tim Rayner [8006] 8451 - Ian Harris [8007] 8635 - Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030]				
8702 - mrs jane fischl [8031] 8858 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] 8946 - Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] 8955 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]				
9917 - Miss Lynda Edwards	Object	Object to the NDR as it will make traffic conditions worse. The money would be better spent on public	The NDR is a key element of the transport strategy to support growth. Its primary functions are; Removing through traffic from the northern suburbs of Norwich Allowing the enhancement of public transport and implementation of BRT along existing roads Providing strategic access to areas to the north and north east of Norwich. Funds are allocated on a scheme by scheme basis and cannot be simply transferred from one project to another.	No Change
10499 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	Poor external transport links keeps out crime. No large scale growth.	The plan promotes new and improved road links within the area and beyond to provide necessary supporting infrastructure for the planned housing and jobs growth targets set regionally.	No Change
10019 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]	Support	Agree and endorse park and ride	Comments note	No Change
8613 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]	Support	Support - reopen rail stations.	Support noted. Reopening stations will lengthen journey times to London that are already considered slow and will only serve small catchments.	No Change

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10747 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Support	Support	Support noted	No Change
9248 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]				
8579 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]				
9890 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]				
11138 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]				
10057 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]				
8242 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]				
8193 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]				
10228 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
8824 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]				
9129 - Mr John Osborne [7111]				
9370 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]				
10523 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]				
10780 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]				
8432 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]				
8013 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]				
8168 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]				
8282 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]				
8307 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]				
8420 - Ed King [7965]				
8481 - Mr C Skeels [8016]				
8555 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]				
8668 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]				
8692 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]				
9687 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]				
8746 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]				
8799 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]				

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9439 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]				
9498 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139] 9613 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] 9738 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] 10991 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] 10006 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10040 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10191 - Commercial Land [8246]				
10444 - Mr J E Youngs [8308] 9807 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Support	Support but need to be specific about enhancing rural public transport.	It is important to ensure that rural areas have good public transport accessibility to key services and employment opportunities.	Add additional text to explain the challenges in delivering rural public transport.
10376 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] 9649 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Support	Policy is aspirational and lacking in detail of actual improvements and phasing	Policy is to set a strategic context and identify the major transport interventions required to support the plan. It is not intended to detail ever intervention or describe its design or phasing. The sections looking at growth locations give more information on supporting transport infrastructure. The Plan will contain a delivery framework that will identify in more detail the infrastructure and phasing requirements of the plan.	Delivery framework to be as clear as possible over infrastructure requirements.
7956 - Colin Mould [7809]	Support	Transport policy should be more important. Contents	As the plan continues to develop the layout and order of the content will change.	No Change
10353 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] 9051 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Support	NDR and rail to London should be the priorities Support, but greater emphasis could be placed on the use of rail.	Comment noted however this list as drafted has no priority inferred in the order. Whilst the policy clearly promotes some road improvements and recognises that in rural areas the car will be an important means of travel, it has a balanced approach and seeks to reduce reliance on the private car by promoting services accessible by walking and cycling, home working and a high quality public transport system. The balance of the policy reflects the challenges faced in the plan area including wider environmental objectives.	Consider list order. This policy is not intended to identify in detail what all the improvements and interventions may be. Some interventions have been identified in the section of the plan that looks in more detail at the spatial distribution of growth. The policy defines objectives that more detailed work on specific sites will have to meet.

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9839 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	Support	NDR should be a priority. There should be no growth unless infrastructure is provided.	The NDR is identified along with other infrastructure as a key dependency of growth. The NDR is a key element of the transport strategy to support growth. Its primary functions are; Removing through traffic from the northern suburbs of Norwich Allowing the implementation of BRT along existing roads Providing strategic access to areas to the north and north east of Norwich The plan has to be able to demonstrate deliverability and show a mechanism for doing so.	Include in the plan a section on infrastructure requirements and identify a mechanism for prioritisation and delivery.
7901 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	Support	As rep	Comments noted	No Change
10627 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	Support	Support but would like a tram system and less defined route for NDR	Previous studies have shown that the scale of Norwich (even considering growth) would not make a tram system viable. A bus rapid transit is being promoted. BRT should achieve similar levels of service for less investment in infrastructure. The NDR is a key element of the transport strategy allowing the implementation of BRT along existing roads. A scheme has been prepared and is consistent with and being promoted as a part of the	No Change
9904 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	Support	How will BRT work, when there is already congestion to be exacerbated by growth? What local rail network?	The Norwich area transportation strategy promotes BRT as an element of the measures to improve public transport across the area. A further key element is the NDR that provides an alternative route for through city traffic allowing measure to be put in place to deliver high quality public transport. The local rail network as described includes the Bittern and Wherry lines.	No Change
10419 - Mr Alan Ives [8299]	Support	Agree with policy but should be stronger on strategic links to the west and north. Cycle policy weak.	The policy promotes enhancement to strategic links. Improvements will assist with economic growth, but are not key dependencies of the plan. The policy promotes walking and cycling as the primary means of travel for new developments. The list of infrastructure includes large strategic schemes some of which will include cycling provision. There are no specific cycle schemes in that list but this does not mean that they are not important, simply that the links cannot be clearly described until the layouts of growth locations become clearer.	Strengthen supporting text to clarify commitment to promotion
11122 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Support	A140 is and important strategic corridor in Norfolk and welcome the identification of a bypass at Long Stratton as an element of the enabling infrastructure for the favoured spatial distribution of growth.	Comments noted	No Change

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	Decision on (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Delivery framework to be as clear as possible over infrastructure requirements.		
	Change text supporting favoured option to include clear references to the Broadland Business Park link between Plumstead Road and A47.		
	Add additional text to explain the challenges in delivering rural public transport.		
	Review policy for NE to ensure that policy looks to have strong walk and cycle links.		
	Ensure that policy acknowledges the requirements of disabled groups.		
	Revise wording to reflect current status of schemes and clarify the impact on deliverability of the plan.		
	Add section on freight into policy.		
	Change text supporting favoured option to include clear references to the Broadland Business Park link between Plumstead Road and A47 and the Link between Wroxham Road and Salhouse Road.		
	Amend wording to ensure travel planning and smarter choices are drawn out as means of minimising car use and managing travel demand.		
	Check consistency between rural and transport policies.		
	Strengthen supporting text to clarify commitment to promotion of cycling.		
	Strengthen supporting text to clarify commitment to promotion of cycling.		
	This policy is not intended to identify in detail what all the improvements and interventions may be. Some interventions have been identified in the section of the plan that looks in more detail at the spatial distribution of growth. The policy defines objectives that more detailed work on specific sites will have to meet.		
	Include in the plan a section on infrastructure requirements and identify a mechanism for prioritisation and delivery.		
	Be clear in policies for places that the transport infrastructure is an integrated approach to providing for travel demand and is not predict and provide. Transport policy is informed by NATS and other sources. It is for the County Council to update and review that strategy.		
	Include in the plan a section on infrastructure requirements and identify a mechanism for prioritisation and delivery.		
	Be more explicit in the plan about promoting sustainable freight and describing the context for promoting of freight infrastructure.		
	Include in the plan a section on infrastructure requirements and identify a mechanism for prioritisation and delivery.		
	Adjust policy wording to reflect commitment to BRT as well as other public transport enhancements.		
	Amend wording to ensure travel planning and smarter choices are drawn out as means of minimising car use and managing travel demand Be clear in policies for places that the transport infrastructure is an integrated approach to providing for travel demand and is not predict and provide. Transport policy is informed by NATS and other sources. It is for the County Council to update and review that strategy.		
	Ensure that policy acknowledges the requirements of disabled groups		

Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>(Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</i>				
10921 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Comment	With 21,000 new houses to be found on mainly Greenfield sites, it is clearly going to need responsible planning to ensure existing environmental assets are not harmed. For this reason any growth option within the Favoured Option should demonstrate that development would not harm the environment as a whole, including ecology and landscape.	Comment noted. Agreed that the Favoured Option will have to take careful account of environmental considerations, including landscape and ecology.	No change to plan
9650 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Comment	The aims behind Policy 17 need to be justified after having considered why it remains important for areas of environmental importance to be retained and protected. Having not considered all reasonable alternatives to possible areas for growth the proposed policy has not been justified. This is a critical area for the CS and its	Comment noted. The green infrastructure study and national and local designations identify areas of the highest value for environmental protection.	No change to plan
10020 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]	Comment	While the principle behind this policy is to be supported, it is important that the individual authorities take a fresh look at existing designations	Comment noted	No change to plan
8218 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	Comment	This really does not stack up with the proposed scale of development proposed overall. You will spoil what the area is now and there is great uncertainty you achieve the proposals in the time scale now in any case.	The policy aims to ensure both that existing environmental assets are protected from development and that new development contributes to environmental enhancement through the provision of green infrastructure.	No change to plan
11022 - Norwich Chamber Council (Mr Don Pearson) [8371]	Comment	Believe growth and the development of infrastructure to enable growth, must be the priority and that this can be managed to minimise any adverse impact.	Comment noted. The purpose of the green infrastructure study is to ensure new development can be designed to respect and enhance the environmental assets of the area	No change to plan
8603 - Mr M Read [8024]	Comment	Brownfield sites only	The development of brownfield sites is prioritised by the plan, but there are insufficient sites to meet all growth needs and greenfield sites will therefore also be required.	No change to plan
10279 - Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266]	Comment	The Church of England is keen to continue to develop the use of our buildings for cultural and tourism purposes alongside their prime purpose as places of prayer and worship.	Comment noted	Consider in relation to community and culture section
9073 - Wymondham Heritage Society (Ms Irene Woodward) [1003]	Comment	Expansion of Wymondham town centre could be in conflict with this policy.	Any expansion of Wymondham town centre would have to follow design and environmental policies in the plan to ensure that it takes account of the townscape of the area.	No change to plan
9973 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Comment	No comment	None	No change to plan
8636 - University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]	Comment	Given the direct access the Colney Lane Bus Link will provide between Norwich Research Park West and East (UEA) it has the potential to contribute to environmental well-being as a consequence of carbon reductions in public transport.	Noted. This strategic plan promotes greater use of public transport and identifies main corridors for bus rapid transport, including to the Research Park. However, it does not deal with specific site detail, which will be through Site allocation plans.	No change to plan

Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11107 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	PJH supports view that any new development should protect environmental assets and has demonstrated through their analysis of George Lane, Loddon that the proposed development site would not jeopardise ecology and landscape.	Noted. This strategy does not identify specific sites for development.	No change to plan.
10252 - Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260]	Comment	Welcome this policy and its inclusion of geology as an asset. I think that as worded this section does provide the policy needed to protect the geodiversity of the region, but it does read rather in the negative terms of where not to develop, rather than in positive protection and enhancement terms.	Comment noted. The policy is intended to cover both protection and enhancement of geodiversity assets.	No change to plan
10573 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Comment	8.23 Suggest amend geo-diversity to geodiversity Every open space, green field or park should be saved for our future generations.	Open spaces and parks are identified in the green infrastructure study and will be protected through Site Allocation plans. Since there is insufficient brownfield land to meet all housing need, greenfield development will be required. The strategy requires new development to provide open spaces to serve that development.	No change to plan
8924 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Comment	Not possible to protect and enhance environmental assets with amount of growth required.	The growth requirement is set out in the East of England plan. Policies in this plan seek to protect existing environmental assets and ensure that enhancements are made through new provision of green infrastructure to serve development.	No change to plan
10725 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Comment	1. Please look at the asset that is White House Farm in Sprowston. 2. Support for community gardens in urban areas	1. White House Farm is within the potential growth area in the north east of Norwich. It will be considered through the Area Action Plan for that area. 2. The strategy promotes green infrastructure associated with development. This could include community gardens.	No change to plan
8914 - ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620]	Comment	agree but assets could be protected by clearly stating in policy as per PPS3 that brownfield land MUST be developed before greenfield.	The strategy promotes brownfield housing development. However, the scale of development required means that significant green field development will also be required.	No change to plan
9688 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	Comment	Yes, but has tourism been fully addressed as a local industry? The effect of inappropriate siting of housing could alter the character and quality of life of certain areas, therefore cease to be attractive to tourists, thus having a detrimental effect on the local economy.	The policy requires the protection of existing environmental assets and the provision of new green infrastructure to serve new development. Both of these approaches should be of benefit to tourism. Tourism is addressed directly in other policies.	No change to plan
9083 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	Comment	Concern about Green spaces and their proper care at the present time	Noted. These are management issues that can not be addressed in a strategic plan	No change to plan
10709 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Comment	Recommend Water Framework Directive requirement to ensure that there is no deterioration within our Water Bodies and indeed that their condition, in terms of biology, chemistry and hydromorphology, improves.	Comment noted.	Consider amending policy to include water quality.

Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9590 - Mr R Harris [8146] 10117 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	Object	Policies should limit damage associated with	Noted. This is the approach taken through the strategy. Well designed green infrastructure associated with development can bring significant environmental benefits.	No change to plan
9312 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] 9410 - Mr E Newberry [8120] 10472 - Mr David Smith [8309]	Object	Do not want this growth which will destroy the environment of Norfolk.	Objection noted. The amount of growth required has already been established through the regional plan. The homes are required to meet the need of local residents as well as population growth as household size is decreasing. This plan identifies where the growth should go and attempts to ensure that it does not have a negative effect on the environment..	No change to plan
10864 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Object	The current emphasis on dispersed settlements served by an expanded road network will fragment the natural environment. Many of the green links, or green 'stepping stones', that are proposed are simply not continuous enough for effective species interchange eg extension of Mousehold Heath. Brownfield sites are also important in terms of wildlife and can often be an improvement on intensive agricultural land. Blanket encouragement to develop on brownfield should therefore be tempered with detailed environmental assessments and protection of key sites. Climate change, these could be very rapid and are particularly hard to predict. Some measures, such as the planting of trees more suitable to a warmer climate, are relatively achievable. However, this must be done in conjunction with making every effort to preserve current species of flora and fauna which may include extensive research and cooperation on a national or, even, international level to assist in possible solutions	Objection noted. The Green infrastructure strategy sets out how linked habitats can be created, though it is accepted that there may be difficulties linking to Mousehold Heath. The plan requires landscaping of brownfield sites to enable retention and enhancement of biodiversity. It is accepted that climate change adaptation will require careful and detailed consideration which can not be	No change to plan
10596 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	Please go to Question 28 for our representation.	See question 28	See question 28
10839 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10902 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Object	The conservation, management and enhancement of the natural and built environment, which is of intrinsic value to the local area and beyond is an important consideration in planning for growth. Management mechanisms for green infrastructure must be established. It will be important in developing a landscape character for the new growth areas to recognise a fundamental shift in the character of the area, from urban fringe towards becoming an integral neighbourhood(s) within the fabric of the town. While the preservation and enhancement of natural features will be essential in establishing a high quality environment, such features must respond to a changing role in landscape, environmental, recreation and leisure conditions within the geography of Wymondham and around Norwich.	Objection noted. The plan seeks to ensure new development takes account of existing landscapes and enhances the local environment where possible. Site specific considerations will be addressed in subsequent	No change to plan

Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7937 - mr paul newson [7812]	Object	all towns and cities should have defined greenbelt not to be built on in any circumstances	Objection noted. Norwich does not have a green belt. Green infrastructure promoted in the plan is intended to provide both green links and strategic gaps between settlements. It is not possible to focus all the development required in the area on brownfield sites.	No change to plan.
8532 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8859 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	Object	Object to NDR which makes environment policy bogus.	Objection to NDR noted. Policy relates to protection of environmental assets and promotion of green infrastructure rather than the NDR. The NDR will have to minimise negative impact on environmental assets.	No change to plan
9581 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	Object	Object as already stated	None	No change to plan
10688 - Mr P Baker [8350]	Object	More cycle lanes - e.g. A140 Aylsham-Norwich.	Noted. The strategy does promote improvements to cycling facilities but as a strategic document does not identify detailed specific schemes.	No change to plan
9205 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	Too weak. In any case all your other policies will be allowed to over-ride this one, clearly.	All policies in this strategic plan will have to be considered in subsequent plans and Development Management	No change to plan
10330 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Object	'Ordinary' countryside is of equal value to designated sites, and one of Norfolk's most important 'Environmental Assets'. Scale of greenfield development that the strategy proposes will impact heavily on the 'largely rural character and high environmental quality' that the Policy recognises (8.21). This Policy is a message of damage limitation that we do not accept. CPRE Norfolk has grave concern that the landscape character of areas will be greatly impacted by the suburbanising effects of development, and the historic character of towns such as Wymondham will be homogenised by housing extensions. In our view, protection of the countryside is fundamentally more essential than the provision of pseudo green infrastructure	Objection noted. The housing requirement set out in the regional plan must be met. Greenfield development will be needed to achieve this. Policies in the plan attempt to ensure that this development takes place in the most sustainable manner possible.	No change to plan
8014 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	Support	do not think environmental policies go far enough - homes should be more built more environmentally "friendly"	Support noted. Building homes to high environmental standards is covered in policy 13	No change to plan
9440 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	Support	A qualified yes if there has to be increased development then the proposals outlined are fine	Noted	No change to plan
7976 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 8283 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]	Support	Support policy.	Support noted	No change to plan

Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10420 - Mr Alan Ives [8299]	Support	<p>This section is not as determined as it should be. The commitment should be to avoid all but the absolute minimum detracting of greenfield by use of brown field. There should be precise plans for protecting more landscapes as with the national parks, such as Broadland.</p> <p>Linked and continuous green routes for wildlife is a proven MUST.</p> <p>Clear plans to manage tidiness in the countryside should</p>	<p>The plan focusses as much growth on brownfield sites as there is capacity for. Nationally and locally designated landscapes are protected through the plan and green infrastructure is required to serve new development. The plan promotes appropriate waste disposal, but countryside tidiness is a more specific management issue addressed elsewhere.</p>	No change to plan
9403 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	Support	<p>New Whittingham Broad at Thorpe St Andrew would be much more attractive without the 3 Rottweiler's on one of the boats tied up there!</p>	<p>Noted. This is not a strategic planning issue this plan can address.</p>	No change to plan

Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10748 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Support	Yes	Noted	No change to plan
9249 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]				
8581 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]				
10377 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]				
9210 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]				
9891 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]				
9052 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]				
9256 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]				
8243 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]				
8194 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]				
9713 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]				
10229 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
9280 - Mrs Gray [5927]				
8825 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]				
8372 - Alyson Lowe [6992]				
9945 - John Heaser [7015]				
9130 - Mr John Osborne [7111]				
9371 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]				
10524 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]				
9808 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]				
10781 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]				
7898 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]				
8132 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8169 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]				
8308 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]				
8482 - Mr C Skeels [8016]				
8506 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]				
8556 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]				
8669 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]				
8693 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]				
8807 - Ms K Dunn [8045]				

Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8853 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 8935 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081] 8989 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9136 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111] 9180 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] 9338 - Ms Celia Viner [8123] 9467 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134] 9499 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139] 9532 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140] 9614 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] 9739 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] 10992 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] 9840 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 10007 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10041 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10140 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10192 - Commercial Land [8246] 10354 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] 10445 - Mr J E Youngs [8308] 10549 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]				
7902 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	Support	But this can be done better if the road and rail infrastructure was improved by concentrating vehicles down fast moving arteries.	Support noted. Comment relates to transport issues.	No change to plan
9633 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Support	The Broads Authority strongly supports this policy. Paragraph 8.21 should be re-worded to clarify that the Broads lie outside of the Joint Core Strategy area.	Support noted.	Ensure wording in document clarifies that the Broads lie outside of the Joint Core Strategy area.

Decision on (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>(Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</i>				
10257 - South Norfolk Rural Deans consultation group (The Venerable Archdeacon David Hayden) [2801]	Comment	Concern there is no mention under 'quality of life' about the role of our many churches.	Comment noted	Consider how to cover the church and other faith groups in plan
11033 - Mr Bernard Godding [8372]	Comment	There are currently too few non-commercial locations for groups to meet - thus the needs of teenagers for club & society venues seems to be an increasing issue. There appears to be competition for available space in some communities, where early years childcare is in contention with groups of older people.	Comment noted. The intention of the policy is to reduce such problems in new developments.	No change to plan
9651 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Comment	It is principally aspirational with no substance. There is no indication that the proposed strategy is capable of being delivered by whom, or when.	Noted. Further work will be done to confirm the contents of the Implementation section of the document which will identify when and by whom the strategy will be delivered.	Ensure Implementation section of plan is clear.
9974 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Comment	No comment	None	No change to plan
11030 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	Comment	The viability of developments is critical and necessary flexibility should be built into these policies to enable negotiation and revision dependant on the market conditions at that time.	The Implementation section of the document allows for open book accounting to ensure that contributions are related to market conditions.	No change to plan
9281 - Mrs Gray [5927]	Comment	Footpaths (not pavements) are needed from housing on edge of town to town centre so people don't have to use cars to go out of town.	Noted. Green infrastructure, which includes footpaths, will be provided to link new development to the open countryside and the city.	No change to plan
11108 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Comment	PJH support social inclusion and believe they can demonstrate that proposals in Loddon will be built to meet the needs of the whole community.	Support noted. Site allocations for Loddon will be dealt with through the South Norfolk Site Allocation Plan.	No change to plan
8925 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Comment	Aspirations are fine however high levels of growth will produce the opposite effect to those desired. Please do not equate 'well designed safe and accessible spaces' with the provision of lighting. Norfolk's dark sky need	Noted. This plan does not set the growth levels, which was done in the regional plan. The JCS aims to ensure that the growth can be accommodated without negative environmental impacts. Light pollution in rural areas is a consideration in relevant planning applications.	No change to plan
10550 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Comment	fine words but won't happen as there are too many separate agencies involved	A purpose of spatial planning is to provide a focus for different agencies to agree their investment plans for the future, taking account of new development requirements.	Ensure implementation element of plan provides agreed focus for spending by agencies involved.
9664 - Ms E Riches [8165]	Comment	If developers at Long Stratton are funding the bypass and infrastructure; how will they also fund these	It is accepted that alternative approaches may have to be taken at Long Stratton to ensure other facilities are provided given the requirement to supply a road to support development there.	Ensure issue of facilities at Long Stratton is covered.
9412 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Comment	With maximum number of houses per acre there is less space for gardens, green space. There are not enough allotments which provide exercise, healthy produce (therefore healthier life styles). Developers are only interested in profit.	Higher densities are likely to reduce garden sizes but good design can enable more land to be given over to green space whilst still making effective use of land. Allotments, and other forms of green space, are required by the plan to serve new development.	No change to plan

Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10922 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Comment	Support approach on social infrastructure. Proposals in Wymondham will be built to meet the needs of the whole community. Increased levels of affordable housing and community facilities will ensure that this represents a development for all.	Support noted. Site specific allocations in Wymondham will be considered in South Norfolk site allocation plan.	No change to plan
10391 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Comment	Encourage more spatially specific proposals for inclusion in the submission draft DPD, and to inform the implementation framework.	Comment noted	Consider inclusion of more spatially specific proposals
8345 - Age Concern Norwich (Phil Wells) [7957]	Comment	Community cohesion is only discussed in the context of new arrivals. Cohesion between generations is essential and efforts need to be made here too. Community functioning is depending on facilities such as pubs, shops and community buildings as on GPs, schools and	Noted. The plan requires the provision of the new facilities outlined above to support new development. Many new facilities will be of benefit to existing residents. Provision of such facilities will create locations for community activities, which may be cross generational.	No change to plan
10331 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Comment	It is noted that the planning system can only have a limited influence in meeting many of the 'softer' aspirations expressed here.	It is agreed that in some cases the planning system has limited control over facilities for communities and culture. Part of the role of spatial plans is to provide an agreed framework around which various agencies can agree and co-ordinate their forward funding plans.	No change to plan
10162 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	Comment	Viability of developments is critical and again the necessary flexibility should be built into these policies to enable negotiation and revision dependent on the market conditions at that time.	Viability of development is addressed in the Implementation section of the plan	No change to plan
9072 - Wymondham Heritage Society (Ms Irene Woodward) [1003]	Comment	Document doesn't outline how necessary infrastructure improvements for Wymondham will be achieved. It will be difficult to expand the town centre because of its enclosed nature.	Implementation section sets out infrastructure requirements, but more detailed needs for each settlement will be set out in subsequent plans.	No change to plan
9784 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	Comment	The Parish Council agrees with the proposals in this policy. However, there are conflicts with other policies in the consultation.	Support noted. Certain conflicts are inevitable between different planning aims. Sustainability Appraisal helps to address and reduce such conflicts within plans. Case by case decisions based on individual planning applications will have to take account of any conflicts.	No change to plan
8219 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	Comment	Will be difficult to achieve as unlikely to get backing from developers and government in the present	Noted. The plan requires developers to provide such facilities to support their developments, though it is accepted that present economic circumstances may create problems in the short term.	No change to plan
10643 - Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333]	Comment	Cohousing schemes promote well-being through knowing one's immediate neighbours and having opportunities to stop and chat. They are particularly beneficial for the needs of young and old people, those with physical and mental disabilities or those with mental health issues, because they provide a safe and supportive community.	Comment noted. Policies in the plan encourage greater community cohesion	No change to plan
8433 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	Comment	Leisure facilities both new and current need to be strategically developed ensuring the sporting governing bodies are consulted from the outset.	Noted. Existing and future need for leisure and sport facilities have been included in the evidence base for this and subsequent plans. Sporting bodies have been involved in this process.	No change to plan

Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10307 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	Comment	Object to development of natural open spaces around Hethersett	Comment relates choice of growth locations	No change to plan
8954 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	Object	The proposals currently omit the need to provide jobs near where people live to avoid commuting.	The strategy aims to focus development in existing settlements where possible with access to existing and new employment facilities and to ensure all new settlements include employment areas.	No change to plan
9714 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	Object	Good aspirations but is funding available to achieve it. The current hospital has insufficient beds. There is no mention of expanding it or providing cottage hospitals to cope with population increase.	Funding will need to be committed by relevant bodies through the implementation plan, as well as developers where appropriate. Health provision is a consideration in the plan.	No change to plan
10501 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	Development and destruction of the countryside will not maintain or enhance our quality of life. It will ruin all our lives because we choose to live here in rural Norfolk, otherwise we would move to London or Birmingham.	Objection noted. The plan attempts to ensure that new development will minimise its impact on the countryside. New housing is required to serve local people as well resulting from economic growth and is required by the	No change to plan
8860 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] 8861 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	Object	Object- by suburbanising villages and rural areas, you will be subjecting them inevitably to crime, anonymity and ennui, exactly the opposite of what you pretend.	Objection noted. A main purpose of ensuring community facilities are provided is so that the existing and new residents of the settlements will not suffer from increased anonymity, crime or ennui.	No change to plan
10574 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	Object	People are individually responsible for all the above and have enough of these facilities, excepting shortage of hospital places, quick access to doctors and NHS dentist.	Facilities need to be provided to serve the residents of new developments.	No change to plan
9206 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Object	Health- promoting of healthier lifestyles requires a serious change in travel behaviours Design- design must not work against pedestrians and cyclists Culture- most cultural diversity is small scale and does not sit well with big projects and red tape Leisure- need to enhance access to green space, there are too many night clubs Cohesion- will believe it when I see it- little evidence of this approach so far.	The plan promotes development to incorporate green infrastructure to promote healthy travel options and leisure activities.	No change to plan
10597 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	See question 28	See question 28	See question 28
9211 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]	Object	There is only a mention about cycling and walking - A dedicated cycle network needs to be established.	Cycling and walking are identified throughout the strategy as key forms of transport. New green infrastructure will provide improved routes and NATS will identify specific cycle routes for improvements.	No change to plan
10118 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	Object	Another reason for development within Norwich on brownfield sites and at a new town in Long Stratton - to do the current option would be hugely expensive. Concentrating the development in 2 areas means less investment	Evidence shows the capacity of brownfield sites is insufficient to meet growth needs. The strategy attempts to balance the benefits of concentrating development with ensuring sufficient housing and employment land will be available for development and will be delivered.	No change to plan

Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10757 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048] 8936 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust (Mr Lewis Dunham) [8083] 10280 - Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266]	Object	No reference to places of public religious worship or provision for faith groups to operate in locations where a need is established.	Noted. Whilst not specifically identified, facilities for faith groups are classified as community facilities.	Consider whether facilities for faith groups should be identified and required separately from other community facilities
9257 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	Object	Object (No reason/alternative given)	Objection noted	No change to plan
9415 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	Object	Integration between new and existing will be difficult. There is emphasis on walking and cycling but they need to be footpaths and cyclepaths.	The strategy, and NATS, promote foot and cycle paths in new development and to link to existing development.	No change to plan
10417 - Honeyview Investments Limited [8298]	Object	The spatial planning objectives should be expanded upon to further emphasise the need for additional leisure and tourism provision within Norwich. We consider that the Policy does not go far enough in setting a policy framework to protect, enhance and deliver leisure and tourism sites and facilities.	First objection noted. This plan does not allocate specific sites for development.	Consider the need for a more detailed framework for leisure and tourism development in the plan. Ensure Barnard Road bowling Alley issue is considered through the Norwich Site Allocation plan.
9582 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	Object	Object to Barnard Road bowling site being allocated as employment land within the Core Strategy, or any subsequent document within the LDF. We cannot see how this policy can be achieved please enlighten us	The policy will be delivered through the design of new developments, the provision of facilities and through the agreement of the involved agencies and developers to fund relevant elements of the plan.	No change to plan
10473 - Mr David Smith [8309]	Object	We do not want to trade our countryside for some silly artificial dream. We want everything left as it is. For years people have put up with low wages for the quality of life. We must think of the environment.	Objection noted. The plan attempts to ensure new development will minimise its impact on the environment and green infrastructure will bring some environmental improvements. Economic growth should bring greater prosperity.	No change to plan
8309 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	Support	Support. Police should be able to prosecute littering offenders and power given to the environmental teams to issue fixed penalty notice to take away premises whose packaging is littering the environment.	Support noted. This plan can not identify enforcement powers for the police or environmental teams.	No change to plan
8195 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	Support	Support. Education facilities should be kept local so children can walk, cycle to school.	Support noted	No change to plan
9857 - Mr Paul Johnson [8207]	Support	Any increase in populations/ additions to communities must be carried out with understanding as to current nature of that community. Perhaps a questionnaire of current residents may assist in this.	Noted. Consultation has taken place on this strategic plan. Further consultation, which may include such questionnaires, will be a part of the more detailed plans which will deal in detail with development in specific areas.	No change to plan

Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10749 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	Support	Yes	Support noted	No change to plan
9250 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]				
8582 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]				
10378 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]				
9892 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]				
10270 - Sport England (East Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986]				
9053 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]				
8244 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]				
10230 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]				
8826 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]				
8374 - Alyson Lowe [6992]				
8373 - Alyson Lowe [6992]				
9946 - John Heaser [7015]				
9131 - Mr John Osborne [7111]				
9372 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]				
10525 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]				
9809 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]				
10782 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]				
7899 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]				
7938 - mr paul newson [7812]				
8533 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]				
8097 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]				
8134 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]				
8284 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]				
9634 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]				
8483 - Mr C Skeels [8016]				
8507 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]				

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

8670 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
8695 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
9689 - Wroxham Parish Council
(Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
8748 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]
8854 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
8990 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9137 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9337 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
9441 - Swannington with Alderford
& Little Witchingham Parish
Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9468 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
9500 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]
9615 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
[8162]
9740 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson
[8174]
10993 - Howard Birch Associates
(Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
10008 - The Bunwell Partnership
(Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
10042 - The London Planning
Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)
[8230]
10193 - Commercial Land [8246]

10355 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole
Williams) [8293]
10446 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]
10639 - Mr Alan Ives [8299]

Support Most of this is motherhood and apple pie, and will be impossible to deliver in our country with the existing culture.
At least start by saying MORE about responsibility of all

Support Support but additional infrastructure needs to be of a very high standard.

Support Support need for new social infrastructure.
The delivery of such infrastructure requires the coordination of a range of public sector organisations and the private sector.

Support Support. Current facilities are over stretched and S106

The plan addresses crime as far as a strategic, spatial plan can, by addressing the need to ensure development is designed to attempt to reduce criminal behaviour.

Noted. Thew Implementation section sets out the infrastructure required, which will have to be provided to agreed standards.

Support noted

Support noted.

No change to plan

No change to plan

No change to plan

No change to plan

agreements are not enough to compensate for added burden.

Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10141 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	Support	Broadly support - social infrastructure requirements should be identified through the master planning process	Broad support noted	Take account of amendment suggested re crime
10261 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	Support	Delete second clause of crime section relating to Support for existing leisure facilities being protected and enhanced. The protection of theatres is essential for future generations.	Support noted	No change to plan
7903 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	Support	Support but also need for good transportation system so villages are not cut off from community facilities.	Noted. Plan also promotes good quality access to community facilities.	No change to plan
9318 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Support	Support. Need more funding for care service both in institutions and private homes. More funding and encouragement for the arts- many ancient buildings are still empty and not realising their full potential.	Support noted. The policy encourages cultural use of historic buildings. Care services are provided through the	No change to plan
9181 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	Support	Support but CCTV should be used on all public buildings i.e. community centres to stop crime and anti-social behaviour.	Noted. The plan requires all new development to be designed to be safe. CCTV could be a key element of this in many cases.	No change to plan
8170 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	Support	Support. Need to preserve and develop culture.	Support noted	No change to plan
10865 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Support	Priorities needs of children and teenagers for sports and community facilities. Provide more facilities and activities in residential areas Promote constructive and mutually supportive relationships between the public and private sectors in	Comments noted. The plan requires facilities to be provided to meet the needs of all potential users and to be located to serve new development. The implementation plan supports constructive and mutually supportive relationships between the public and private sectors in	No change to plan
8821 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Support	Support so long as councils engage with existing communities about any developments proposed.	Noted. This will be done through the planning application process.	No change to plan.
9591 - Mr R Harris [8146]	Support	There are design weaknesses in new developments which should not be allowed in the future e.g. there should be no further development in Rackheath. If it goes ahead the centre of the village should contain the school, medical and community centre, individual shops and parkland space. The housing should surround the centre and be bounded by green belt land and farms. At Sprowston there is an ugly supermarket surrounded by car parks. Dussindale is a mass of maze-like roads with	Good design of new developments is a key element of the plan. Major new developments will be masterplanned to ensure facilities such as schools and shops are located to be easily accessible and green space must be provided to serve all new developments.	No change to plan
9533 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Support	Support, required regardless of growth	Support noted	No change to plan
9540 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149]	Support	Support but policy also needs to make good any current shortfalls in community facilities.	Support noted. Developers can only be required to provide facilities to serve their developemnt. This sometimes involves improving existing facilities.	No change to plan
8801 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	Support	Support- have explained where have doubts.	Support noted	No change to plan

Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9841 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	Support	Development opportunities which can come forward now and fit easily into existing communities whose health, crime, education, culture, leisure and community cohesion benchmarks are already established, should be encouraged. The key issues over the next 5 years will be employ,emt opportunities - a lack of jobs will have a corrosive effect on communities.	Support noted	No change to plan
9314 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Support	All needs to be in place before large scale development takes place. Need for another hospital.	Environmental improvements are likley to be part of the early stages of new developments. Accepted that there may be a need for new facilities at the hospital.	No change to plan
10903 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Support	The BLT broadly support this policy acknowledge the need for social infrastructure. The delivery of such infrastructure requires the coordination of a range of public sector organisations and the private sector.	Support noted	No change to plan

Decision on (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

Ensure implementation element of plan provides agreed focus for spending by agencies involved.

Ensure issue of facilities at Long Stratton is covered.

Ensure Implementation section of plan is clear.

Consider inclusion of more spatially specific proposals

Consiedr whether facilities for faith groups should be identified and required separately from other community facilities.

Consider the need for a more detailed framework for leisure and tourism development in the plan. Ensure Barnard Road bowling Alley issue is considered through the Norwich Site Allocation plan.

Consider how to cover the church and other faith groups in plan.

Take account of amendment suggested re crime.

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9. Implementation and monitoring (Q27)				
<i>(Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</i>				
10283 - Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrold)	Comment	There is a need for a much clearer implementation strategy relating infrastructure to development to ensure it is provided as needed [RB]	Accepted [RB]	Redraft the policy and supporting text to cover current means of securing developer contributions and the intention to actively consider CIL once introduced by the Government. The plan also needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need. [RB]
9084 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	Comment	Maintenance of existing infrastructure needs to be sorted out before new infrastructure is considered [RB]	While maintenance is important, it is undeniable that the scale of development which the area is required to plan for will need new infrastructure. [RB]	No change [RB]
9975 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Comment	No comment [RB]	Not applicable [RB]	Not applicable [RB]
9986 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	Comment	Concerned that the policy appears to commit to a CIL ahead of regulations. Suggests that the policy should commit only to investigate a CIL at this stage and follow-up, if a CIL is to be adopted, with a future development plan document. [RB]	The footnotes to the policy make it clear that the policy and supporting text are drafted on the assumption that the CIL is introduced. At the time this was originally drafted, it seemed a reasonable supposition, but it is clear that a CIL will not now be introduced before the expected submission date of the plan. [RB]	Redraft the policy and supporting text to cover current means of securing developer contributions and the intention to actively consider CIL once introduced by the Government. The plan also needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need. [RB]
10551 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Comment	Express concern about the maintenance of future infrastructure [RB]	The concern is a reasonable one. That is why the policy as drafted requires arrangements to be made for the future maintenance of all infrastructure. Note this has been challenged by others, but it is accepted that future maintenance is an important consideration [RB]	No change needed, but ensure that the final implementation strategy does address the question of future maintenance of infrastructure [RB]
9469 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	Comment	Compulsory purchase acceptable if it means removal to a similar location [RB]	Not clear what this means. Compulsory purchase would be used in extreme circumstances to enable the development to go ahead as planned, and in the place it was planned. [RB]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11123 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Comment	The representor has several reservations about the concept and detail in policy nineteen, but recognizing it is written in advance of regulations governing a possible CIL, will reserve judgment [RB]	Noted [RB]	No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. [RB]
9319 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Comment	Support for suggested pedestrian and cycle links as promotion of healthy lifestyle - Spixworth to Old Catton link a good example [RB]	Support welcome [RB]	No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]
9413 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	Comment	It is important that the highest standards of planning are maintained, and enforced [RB]	Noted [RB]	No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]
9316 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Comment	Is CPRE to be involved? [RB]	CPRE is one of the many bodies consulted in the preparation of the plan and they have made representations [RB]	No change needed [RB]
9715 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] 7978 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Object	Infrastructure needed before the housing [RB]	While the sentiment may be understandable, different elements of infrastructure are needed at differing points in the course of a development. For example it may be unrealistic to provide a school at the outset, when there would be insufficient children to enable it to function effectively. It is essential that infrastructure is provided in tandem with development, and in the case of certain key items of infrastructure, that there is certainty they can be provided [RB]	No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9054 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] 11059 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] 11152 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] 8396 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] 11031 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] 8641 - The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569] 8220 - Mr P Anderson [7901] 10866 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] 8671 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 9417 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124] 9592 - Mr R Harris [8146] 10142 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10163 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] 10653 - Jim Smith (Mr Jim Smith) [8342] 10654 - Jim Smith (Mr Jim Smith) [8342] 10710 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] 10841 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10904 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Object	<p>These representations are broadly supportive, though they raise a number of caveats about the operation of the policy rather than its principle. These include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is important that developer contributions take account of viability, otherwise it delivery of housing and infrastructure will be thwarted. • The need for any arguments by developers for an easing of contribution requirements to be rigorously examined • the need to coordinate with other investment strategies including those of utility providers, particularly those related to water infrastructure in view of the need for investment to be programmed • the importance of green infrastructure as part of place making. • One representation suggests the extensive infrastructure will have an impact on house prices • One representation supports, particularly the inclusion of waste management/ recycling/composting with a requirement for security of future maintenance and stresses this is essential in the final version of the strategy • Need for more information on the democratic accountability of any local infrastructure management bodies, and their relationship to potential unitary local government • Questioning the uniform rate of CIL which may discourage use of previously-developed land <p>[RB]</p>
--	--------	---

The concerns are noted. It is accepted that viability will remain a major consideration, particularly in the setting of any CIL or tariff. The work on infrastructure needs and potential funding sources currently being undertaken by EDAW includes an examination of current market conditions. Paragraph 9.4 of the consultation document acknowledges that CIL could not be set at a level which would threaten viability. It is equally important however that the final strategy includes a requirement for assessing any such claims and ensuring they are valid.

The work by EDAW includes a dialogue with utility providers, and is also based on a water cycle study. The pre submission publication version of the joint core strategy will need to include an implementation strategy endorsed by those responsible for providing infrastructure and including utilities, transport infrastructure, green infrastructure and social infrastructure.

The impact of infrastructure contributions required from a development generally falls on the land owner rather than the ultimate purchaser, as the houses built are competing in the wider market, including with previously occupied properties. This tends to set the sale price.

Detailed proposals for any Implementation Board will need to be worked up and agreed by the partner authorities of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership. Good practice suggests that the membership of local strategic partnerships, which often include infrastructure providers, should be actively involved in the implementation of the plan, since much will depend on their investment strategies. It is accepted there is a challenge to ensure full democratic accountability, particularly where the disbursement of funds gathered through the democratically controlled planning process are involved

The question of a uniform CIL has been the subject of some debate, and is currently being investigated through the infrastructure and funding study being undertaken by EDAW. The point made by the representation is fully understood, but not all previously-developed land will incur the same exceptional costs. Ideally, a site by site judgment would need to be made on the basis of the conditions of particular sites, but this would be onerous, and some compromise between such a fine grained approach, and the blunter instrument of the uniform CIL will need to be worked out. It is possible that the final guidance on CIL will resolve this issue. [RB]

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. This, however, needs to include a mechanism for assessing any arguments concerning viability to demonstrate in an open and transparent way that any variation in the normal level of contribution is fully justified. This will also need to take account of the issue of green field sites compared with previously-developed land. An implementation strategy will also need to be included. [RB]

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9534 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Object	Cuts in public spending likely, already too much public money spent on bureaucracies. Need services delivered without cumbersome public sector infrastructure that accompanies them [RB]	Cuts in public spending are likely and innovative approaches to secure funds and to minimize the costs of services are likely to be needed. It is not clear what is meant by the second part of the representation - infrastructure is undoubtedly needed, and much of it, e.g. water utilities is provided by the private sector [RB]	No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]
10271 - Sport England (East Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986] 9340 - Ms Celia Viner [8123] 10262 - The Theatres Trust (Ms	Object	The policy contains inadequate information on implementation and monitoring, including green --animplementation strategy needs to be included, and a There should be a separate policy for planning publications/CIL indicating infrastructure needs for strategic sites. Details could be set out in a supplementary planning document It is not clear in the policy whether the bullet point dealing with community and recreation facilities includes health, welfare, social, educational, spiritual, leisure and cultural needs Sport England make a similar point about the need for clarity as to what is covered in community and recreation facilities Concerned that theatre buildings do not benefit appropriately under terms of section 106 and other agreements [RB]	Some of the points made are valid; in particular schedule to indicate key table of monitoring targets added --it may be better to include in a policy a bullet point referring to community and recreation facilities, but itemise what might be included with this in lower case text. This should embrace health, welfare, social, recreational, educational, spiritual leisure and cultural needs. However the list of bullet points in the policy referred to is specifically related to future maintenance, which accounts for some of the omissions, for example it is not normal for developers to make arrangements for future maintenance of schools. Instead they are conveyed to the local education authority. It is accepted however that there needs to be more clarity about how the plan will address cultural and spiritual needs. This may be better addressed through a revised communities and culture policy --it is an accepted that major development should make provision for spaces suitable for performances, but under the present section 106 regime, a clear causal link needs to be demonstrated between the consequences of a development and the contributions made by it. This is not generally easy in the case of theatres. [RB]	. The plan needs an implementation and infrastructure infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need. This also needs to address arrangements for future maintenance Redraft the communities and culture policy and supporting text including greater emphasis on the need for space suitable for performances, and suitable for the accommodation of faith groups, and a greater clarity about what is included within the definition of Community and Recreation facilities.. [RB]
7883 - Mr Paul Mallett [7783] 8830 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Object	The whole plan should be abandoned as events have overtaken it. Concerned about lack of any plans to expand the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital	The plan is looking ahead to 2026, and it is conceivable that, following a recovery, development will "bounce back" and make up any short term deficit. In any event, the plan must cater for that eventuality, otherwise it would be open to challenges promoting further allocations, and would be likely to be found unsound. The current investigations into the infrastructure needs and potential funding sources being undertaken by EDAW include an assessment of acute hospital bed capacity.	No change needed [RB]
10474 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10502 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	Object	Oppose the northern distributor road, eco town and major development. [RB]	The scale of growth is required by the East of England Plan, and the northern distributor road is an integral part of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy - it is not intended solely to facilitate development. [RB]	No change needed [RB]
8647 - Mr Steve Dowall [8033]	Object	the representation raises site specific issues in Broadland [RB]	Not applicable [RB]	Not applicable [RB]

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8926 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] 8171 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 9741 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] 10119 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] 10598 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Object	Oppose the scale of development in principle. One representation challenges of the favoured distribution, arguing solely for the use of previously-developed land in Norwich, and a new town at Long Stratton. [RB]	Noted. However the scale of development is set by the East of England Plan, and to fail to plan for it would be likely to lead to further representations promoting development, and would likely result in the plan being found "unsound" The scale of development necessitates green field allocations, and delivery/risk considerations would prevent	No change needed [RB]
8135 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888] 9138 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]	Object	Question extent of Government commitment to fund; question what "innovative approaches to capital investment" means. If there is a reduction in developer contributions, more public funding will be required not less Unreasonable that developers of major growth locations should be expected to support community development Don't believe infrastructure can be provided with houses at a price people can afford Not convinced sufficient funding will be available, concern about excessive debt if borrowed funding is used Concerned that developers will be unable to fund and the	Government funding is always subject to review at intervals. Innovative measures may include, for example prudential borrowing, or tax increment financing provided financial regulations permit. It may also involve service providers in looking at different models for providing services to achieve economies e.g. co-location, sharing of administrative support etc Many would see community cohesion as an integral part of meeting the development needs of the area. While it may be unreasonable to expect developers to undertake this role in perpetuity, for the duration of a development, some contribution may well be appropriate, and may even be to the benefit of the developer if it helps attract potential purchasers through making the new community amore desirable place to move to. Nonetheless, it must be acknowledged that times are difficult for the development industry. This makes exploring innovative approaches all the more important. [RB]	Redraft the policy and supporting text to cover current means of securing developer contributions and the intention to actively consider CIL once introduced by the Government. The plan also needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need. [RB]
9583 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] 8375 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	Object	Cannot see how everything can be achieved in current climate. Strategy assumes a community infrastructure Levy. What happens if this is not introduced? [RB]	The difficulties imposed by the current economic climate and the likely restraints on public spending are fully recognized. Nonetheless, there are mainstream public funding sources which should be fully utilized, along with innovative approaches to increasing funding, or reducing costs by amending the service delivery model in some cases (for example co- location, sharing support costs) The representation is right, at the time the policy was originally drafted, it seemed probable that the CIL would be introduced, though it is now clear this will not happen before submission of the joint core strategy. A revised policy will need to take account of this. [RB]	No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. [RB]

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9842 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]

Object

The CIL is simply another tax adding to an over complicated and costly planning system [RB]

The CIL is an alternative mechanism proposed suggested by the government for collecting contributions from developers required to meet the consequences of development. Paragraph 9.5 of the consultation document makes it clear that the CIL and it's interaction with planning obligations will need careful development. While this may not have been sufficiently explicit, it is intended to assure people that there is no will on the part of the GNDP or constituent local authorities to "double count". It is highly probable that any regulations governing the introduction of CIL would guarantee this. [RB]

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. [RB]

9785 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]

Object

The broad approach to infrastructure funding is supported but needs more detail on the cost of infrastructure and potential charges. There is a need for an implementation strategy This needs to be included in a development plan document rather than a supplementary planning document

Agree there is a need for an implementation a strategy, itemising infrastructure needed, responsibility, timing, and potential funding sources to be prepared and subject to testing at the public examination into the joint core strategy

Include an implementation strategy, and clear monitoring targets in the pre submission publication version of the joint core strategy

10392 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]

8534 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]

9635 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]

This will lead to identify specific utilities, transport, social and community infrastructure requirements, the timing and "criticality" of schemes to the delivery of a strategy and expected funding sources.

The strategy seems a very dependent on the development of the road network including the Norwich Northern Distributor Road

The policy refers to quality of new developments but does not adequately address the issue

There is an inconsistency between the policy and supporting text regarding support for community development. The policy requires it until the development is built and first occupied, and the supporting text (para. 9.11) refers to an ongoing commitment

There is a need for clear monitoring targets [RB]

The strategy is dependent on the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy, of which the Norwich Northern Distributor Road is a key element, but by no means the only element. It also proposes improvements to public transport, walking and cycling networks, and the NDR is seen as critical in creating the conditions where these can be introduced.

Clearly infrastructure will need arrangements to be made for its long-term maintenance, for example through commuted sums. Other infrastructure, such as schools has traditionally been conveyed to the local education authority, but with maintenance funding being secured through the normal mainstream funding formula taking into account population growth. Community development does not neatly fit into either of these categories, and the completion and first occupation of the development is probably a more realistic requirement

There is a need for clear monitoring targets to be included in the final plan [RB]

Clarify that any developer commitment to community development should endure to the completion and first occupation of the development, but not beyond. [RB]

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7921 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] 9905 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219] 10308 - Mrs Lisa Ford [8282] 10726 - Ms S Layton [8354] 11038 - Norwich Design Quality Panel (The Manager) [8375]	Object	The policy touches upon quality of design but without identifying a clear mechanism. One representation focuses particularly on the lack of footways in some recent developments Another quotes an example in Hethersett, claiming the form of development is inappropriate in the locality, and criticizing the standard of design of social housing on the site [RB]	These representations make a fair point. The issue of quality has always been important, but has not featured prominently enough. A new policy on design quality could be introduced. The issue of footways is not straightforward. While safety is clearly a paramount consideration, it can in part be achieved by reducing vehicle speeds, and much recent design, including developments lacking conventional footways is consciously aimed at safety, albeit by a non traditional approach. Such approaches to have a need to be the results of a conscious design decision, based on the best available information. The masterplanning approach advocated for major developments should enable consideration of the characteristics of the locality [RB]	Add a new policy and supporting text focusing on the environmental quality of new development [RB]
8718 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Object	Consider the CIL as currently proposed is potentially open to abuse of power by politicians and planners [RB]	Final regulations for the Community Infrastructure Levy have yet to be published. There is no reason to believe that there will not be framed in such a way as to ensure transparency [RB]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

11139 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]
 10058 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]
 9652 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]

Nature Representation Summary

Object Support the principle of a Community Infrastructure Levy as this would provide more certainty to developers and should spread contributions across a wider range of development.

Particular concerns are
 --the level must be realistic
 --the charging schedule must be fully consulted upon and examined independently as part of the LDF process
 --concern that developers and may be required to guarantee development in full
 -- concern that there may be an obligation to guarantee long-term maintenance of physical and social infrastructure

One representation expresses particular concern about the funding gap between the cost of infrastructure on the one hand and the sum of likely developer contributions and mainstream funding on the other identified in the earlier EDAW study.it goes on to argue that as this conclusion was drawn on the basis of two scenarios, the

Council's Assessment

It is fully accepted that the level must be realistic.

It has not been possible to prepare a charging schedule until the work being done by EDAW on the infrastructure costs of the favoured option is complete. This will be available for examination, and while it would have been preferable to have been in a position to include such detail in the regulation 25 consultation document, it was simply not possible.

The concern about the need for comfort that the whole development will be completed does present a dilemma. Clearly as time goes by and circumstances change, there may well be scope for variations to an agreement by mutual consent. Nonetheless the local planning authorities will need some comfort that development will not simply proceed until some major investment is required, only to see the developer "walk away" leaving it incomplete, and potentially lacking some infrastructure required to serve the whole development but programmed for a slightly later stage.

It is common for the future maintenance of infrastructure to be secured by adoption by a suitable public body, and this is not precluded. This however is not always of the favoured approach of a developer and the policy is written to allow such options. This may become more prevalent if less conventional infrastructure is involved, for example local energy generating infrastructure which might, for example, be operated and maintained in future by a local energy supply company.

The question about the scenarios tested by EDAW is based on a misconception, and has been responded to more fully elsewhere. The scenarios were hypothetical and created purely to enable a high level assessment of infrastructure needs comparing the costs of an urban extension and a new settlement. The favoured option has taken account of other evidence including dialogue with service providers, and it is this that is now being tested through more detailed work by EDAW to enable an appropriately evidenced implementation strategy and

Action

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. The pre submission plan will also need to include an implementation section including an infrastructure schedule. [RB]

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9251 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
 9622 - RW Kidner [8163]
 10923 - Allied London Properties [8367]

Object Favour the current approach under Section 106. Need to see evidence of the infrastructure costs which would underpin any developer contribution requirement (presumably whether Section 106 or CIL). There is considerable concern that early work by EDAW appeared to show a gap between the costs of infrastructure needed, and the sum of mainstream funding and potential developer contributions. It is important that developer contributions are realistic and do not threaten viability.

The concern with the CIL is that it will effectively charge all developments for infrastructure primarily needed for particular developments - examples quoted are the Norwich Northern Distributor Road which will primarily serve the north east, and the Long Stratton bypass which will primarily serve long Stratton. Under CIL all other developments would contribute towards these, including those at Wymondham

A separate representation acknowledges the need to provide social infrastructure but argues that the current tests relating the requirement to the specific development must be passed

One representation suggests that Community Infrastructure Levy should be used only in the locality where it is derived [RB]

Agreed developer contributions need to be realistic.

The benefit of CIL, as pointed out by other representations, is that there are certain elements of strategic infrastructure which will serve the entire area, but which may be difficult to directly link to particular developments. A further benefit is that all development, even small scale development which can cumulatively impose a considerable burden on infrastructure will contribute; this is frequently not the case under Section 106. As such, the CIL would break the existing strict requirement for contributions to be directly related to the development in question. This however is a conscious course of action being considered by the Government

With regard to the particular examples quoted, though the Long Stratton bypass is primarily directed towards achieving local environmental improvements, the Norwich Northern Distributor Road is not simply proposed to facilitate the development in the north east - it is an integral part of the Norwich area transportation strategy, and critical to releasing capacity within the urban area to permit measures to reduce congestion, and promote walking, cycling and public transport.

Section 106 contributions, which are directly related to a development, do tend to focus in the area of the development. This however is often seen as one of their weaknesses, as strategic infrastructure, needed to support a wider strategy, cannot so easily be funded in this way. That is one of the Government's reasons behind proposing the community infrastructure delivery [RB]

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. [RB]

9182 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner

Support Opposed the creation of cycle links at public expense and compulsory water conservation measures [RB]

The promotion of cycling is generally seen as valuable and promoting healthy lifestyles - see other representations -and also in helping to reduce congestion and carbon dioxide emissions. They need to economize on the use of water, in one of the driest areas of the country, and an area with a number of important wetland habitats is almost universally endorsed [RB]

No change [RB]

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
10750 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] 8583 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 9212 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 9893 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] 9258 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 8245 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] need to be recognized as a factor. 8196 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 10231 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	Support	Support expressed without significant conditions	support welcome [RB]	No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will
8827 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] 9132 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 9373 - Mr Peter Rope [7113] 10526 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] 9810 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] 10783 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 8285 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8310 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915] 8484 - Mr C Skeels [8016] 8508 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] 8558 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 8696 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] 9690 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 8749 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8802 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]				[RB]
8855 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 8991 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9442 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] 9501 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]				

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
(Mr Howard Birch) [8176] 10009 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] 10043 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10194 - Commercial Land [8246]		[RB]		
10356 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] 10447 - Mr J E Youngs [8308] 10630 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] 8016 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	Support	Funding should be borne by landowners and developers who make profit from the development [RB]	A considerable amount is paid by developers, either as direct contributions, or, for example, as connection charges for utilities. Nonetheless there are mainstream public funding sources which should be fully utilized. It is likely all of these sources will need to be used, and innovative approaches to increase funding or reduce costs, in view of likely restraints on public spending, and the current economic difficulties facing the development	No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]
9207 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Support	Broad support, provided funds are not spent on new roads and car parking the [RB]	There strategy is based around the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy which includes a mix of interventions. This does include new roads, but alongside proposals for improved public transport, cycling and walking. Some parking will undoubtedly provided on site, but there is no proposal in NATS to significantly increase parking in Norwich to promote commuting. The only likely increase in capacity is in the context of expanding the park and ride service. [RB]	No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Decision on (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. [RB]

The pre submission plan will also need to include an implementation section including an infrastructure schedule. [RB]

Redraft the policy and supporting text to cover current means of securing developer contributions and the intention to actively consider CIL once introduced by the Government. The plan also needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need. [RB]

The plan needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need.

This also needs to address arrangements for future maintenance.

[RB]

Redraft the policy and supporting text to cover current means of securing developer contributions and the intention to actively consider CIL once introduced by the Government. The plan also needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need. [RB]

Clarify that any developer commitment to community development should endure to the completion and first occupation of the development, but not beyond. [RB]

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. [RB]

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. An implementation strategy will also need to be included. [RB]

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

<p>8197 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 9906 - Mr Anthony Springall [8220] 10243 - Mr Duncan Smith [8257] 11018 - Mrs S Plaw [8370] 11039 - Norwich Design Quality</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>These representations concern matters of design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Norwich Design Quality Panel criticizes the absence of a clear, explicit and comprehensive aspiration for design quality, and the scant attention given to carbon impact. Others share these views • urge the use of brownfields where possible • plea for reasonably sized gardens • Oppose Yare valley crossing linking Norwich Research Park and UEA • Agricultural self sufficiency should be encouraged on a county/country scale • Avoid flood plains • Ensure services can cope before housing • Ensure adequate parking 	<p>It is accepted that the consultation draft does not give adequate policy attention to design matters, even though it has always been one of the GNDP's concerns. Significantly improved policy content is needed in this area.</p> <p>More policy attention should be devoted to reducing carbon impact. This however needs an evidence base, and the study into the renewable energy potential of the area has only just been completed. Stronger policies on climate change should be added.</p> <p>The strategy seeks to accommodate as much as possible within the urban area of Norwich, and also focuses development in the rural parts of the area on market towns, where brown field development potential is most likely. In the case of the Norwich urban area, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment confirms the strategy's broad assumptions about the potential offered by previously developed land. However the scale of development required by the East of England Plan necessitates large scale green field land allocations.</p> <p>Larger gardens imply lower density, and the consumption of more green fields. There is clearly a balance to be struck</p> <p>Links between the UEA and Norwich Research Park will need to be resolved through a transport strategy as part of a masterplanning exercise, but are beyond the scope of the joint core strategy</p> <p>Agricultural policy is a matter for national government.</p>	<p>Add new policies on design and on energy/climate change issues [RB]</p>
---	----------------	---	--	--

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8424 - M Harrold [7966] 8386 - Mr M Buckingham [7968]	Comment	The plan places too much reliance on large housing allocations [RB]	<p>The plan includes allocations ranging from a large strategic scale to the north east of Norwich to large allocations of around 2000 dwellings at Wymondham and Long Stratton and medium sized ones of around 1000 at a number of locations in South Norfolk. The unidentified requirement for sites to accommodate a further 1800 dwellings in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area, and 2000 dwellings in the Broadland part are likely to include a number of smaller allocations. The scale of allocations in the rural settlements is generally more limited. It should also be noted that where the plan proposes allocations of, for example 1000 dwellings at a particular strategic location, the identification of sites to meet this need will be undertaken through the site specific allocations DPD and may well involve a number of sites.</p> <p>It is not accepted that the plan is unduly rigid - it offers a balanced portfolio of scales of development, a strategy supported at the issues and options stage by a number of development interests. [RB]</p>	No change [RB]
8856 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 10711 - Hethersett Consortium [8353]	Comment	<p>Representations focus on Hethersett</p> <p>The sustainability appraisal work to date points to a different conclusion from the favoured option. Broadly support the sustainability appraisal's conclusions, but disagree with the favoured option -significantly greater growth could be accommodated at Hethersett</p> <p>Others comment that the growth of Hethersett proposed is excessive compared to that proposed elsewhere</p>	<p>Comments relating to the sustainability appraisal are being examined independently.</p> <p>The sustainability appraisal is one of factor in determining the appropriate strategy, along with evidence gathered and consultation responses. The consultation responses in particular have challenged the notion that Hethersett is a suitable location for major growth. This has prompted further examination of the form and character of settlements in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area. The growth proposed at Hethersett is significantly less than in some earlier options [RB]</p>	No change [RB]

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
11024 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425] 10232 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] Wymondham as a location that can accommodate 8904 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] 9584 - South Norfolk Council (Cllr Robert Savage) [8151] 11065 - Wymondham Consortium of Landowners [8218] 10200 - Hopkins Homes Limited	Comment	<p>These representations mainly relate to Wymondham</p> <p>Hopkins Homes support the identification of significant growth, but believe in the scale of growth could be greater than proposed in the consultation document. Hopkins believe the lower order settlements such as Hetherset, Cringleford and Long Stratton cannot accommodate the housing levels proposed. Promote a site to the south west of Wymondham.</p> <p>Believe the favoured option is not compliant with the national planning guidance in PPS3 or PPS 12, or the East of England Plan and as a result is unsound.</p> <p>Propose instead the core strategy should be amended to allocate between 4000 and 8000 new homes in Wymondham.</p> <p>Wrenbridge support the conclusion that Wymondham is a suitable location for growth and is an established employment location.</p> <p>Wymondham Consortium of Landowners note the sustainability appraisal supports Wymondham as a sustainable location but challenge several of the conclusions.</p> <p>Request that the landscape of the Tiffey valley near Chapel Lane should be protected from development, and that development at Wymondham should take the form of a number of smaller allocations. Other concerns include flooding, and transport</p> <p>Strategy is weak on protection of the setting of historic buildings - suggest an exclusion zone of 400m on all sides of historic buildings</p> <p>Not convinced the town centre of Wymondham can be expanded without damage to historic fabric [RB]</p>	<p>Issues relating directly to the sustainability appraisal are being examined independently</p> <p>It is noted that other representations have suggested the joint core strategy is too reliant on larger sites, and this suggestion by Hopkins would increase this reliance.</p> <p>One of the concerns about such a strategy would be that, because the growth triangle to the north east is dependent on some critical infrastructure, in particular the Norwich northern distributor road, there is a reliance on other locations, including those in South Norfolk, to deliver housing in the medium term, and an excessive reliance on one location could increase the risk of failure in this regard.</p> <p>The sustainability appraisal, evidence gathered and consultation responses are all factors in determining the appropriate strategy. The consultation responses in particular have challenged the notion that Wymondham should accommodate larger growth, as proposed in some of the earlier options considered. This has prompted further examination of the form and character of settlements in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area.</p> <p>Support by Wrenbridge and the Wymondham Consortium of Landowners welcomed</p> <p>The selection of sites will be undertaken through the site specific allocations development plan document, and will need to take account of factors such as flooding, access and landscape</p> <p>Believe there are opportunities to expand the town center of Wymondham while respecting its historic character, but recognize the constraints</p> <p>The issue of design is one of the weaknesses of the consultation draft, and stronger policy content needs to be added. This needs to recognize the importance of the setting of historic buildings, though a 400m exclusion zone is not supported. Such detail would need to be included in a development management development plan document, but in any case such a rigid approach would not reflect the diverse nature of the area, for example a similar exclusion zone in the central Norwich where there are</p>	<p>No change, other than the addition of a new design policy as recommended elsewhere [RB]</p>

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

9976 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]
 10233 - Mrs T P S Cane [7147]
 8286 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]
 8286 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]
 8961 - MR Richard Edwards [7925]
 8703 - mrs jane fischl [8031]
 9320 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]
 9443 - Ms Valerie Chipperfield [8128]
 11067 - RSPB (East of England Regional Office) (Dr Philip Pearson) [8268]
 10357 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]
 10947 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]
 10971 - Mr William E Cooper [8369]
 11091 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]

Nature Representation Summary

Comment
 t

These focus on transport issues

The Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group raise a number of issues

1. governance issues the around the GNDDP -meetings not open to public and failure to publish minutes
2. Incomplete evidence base on the GNDDP web site - housing market assessment only extends to 2016 -strategic housing land availability assessment final report not posted - infrastructure need and funding study does not correspond with the JCS plan period, and housing figures only running to 2021 -transport modeling not fully reported, in particular comparative modelling of the various growth options. These deficiencies make it difficult to assess the evidence base for the JCS
3. Criticisms of sustainability appraisal
4. Is an appropriate assessment needed?

Other representations comment on

- â€¢ current operation of bus services, in particular commenting on the arrangements in St Stephen's/Castle Meadow, and services in the Thorpe area,
- â€¢ the need for stricter pedestrian only facilities in parts of the city centre
- â€¢ trams or at least light rail should be introduced
- â€¢ Need for more public transport in rural areas including services running into the late evening, and many interchange points where bus routes cross
- â€¢ Need to curb air pollution from traffic in central Norwich
- â€¢ RSPB challenge the need for the northern distributor road and state alternative options and must be considered in the sustainability appraisal. Their opposition is echoed by others.
- â€¢ Comments about the detailed design of NNDR - support dual carriageway, oppose limited access arrangements, including at-grade roundabout junctions
- â€¢ Density and design should promote bus use. Support for terraced houses
- â€¢ Only affordable housing in Harleston for local people -definition of affordable should be related to the average wage of a single Norfolk person
- â€¢ New stations should be included at Thorpe St Andrew and Long Stratton parkway
- â€¢ New access needed for Whittingham sewage treatment works
- â€¢ Excessive emphasis on long distance travel- most journeys are short and therefore there is a good deal of potential for switching car trips to walking and cycling
- â€¢ Transport policy should also refer to travel planning (work based and school based) and parking policies and

Council's Assessment

1. The GNDDP is not a formally constituted body. Ultimate decisions rest with the individual local authorities whose meetings are open and minuted.
2. The evidence base is evolving, but some of the specific criticisms are unfounded. The housing market assessment extends only to 2016, because the methodology for such assessments becomes unreliable more than about five years ahead. Indeed a refresh of the work undertaken in 2006 is under way, and it is likely that a future Housing Market Assessment will need to be undertaken, led by the greater Norwich Housing Partnership, in the near future. It is for this reason in particular that some policies, notably those governing affordable housing, are caveated by the need to pay regard to future assessments. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment has taken longer to prepare than anticipated. This is largely due to the need for viability assessment of a large number of potential sites. However the SHLAA is intended primarily to ascertain whether there is enough land in acceptable locations to deliver the strategy, rather than being a precise determinant. Significantly the outcome of the assessment is that the assumptions made in the JCS about the scope for further development within the urban area are broadly substantiated. This is critical as it helps to determine the scale of green field allocations needed. The infrastructure needs and funding study was based on the regional spatial strategy which looked to 2021. It was commissioned shortly after PPS 3 was published, requiring DPDs to look 15 years ahead but before the formula for extending the life of DPD s was incorporated in the East of England Plan. The updated work being undertaken by EDAW takes on board this extended time horizon. The strategy has been informed by the location of growth areas to strategic employment opportunities (including the city centre) and the ability to deliver high quality public transport links to the city. Transport modelling is underway. Modelling is not being used to test different growth options but is being used to determine an effective transportation implementation plan to support the distribution of growth.
3. Questions relating to the sustainability appraisal are being examined independently
4. An appropriate assessment is being undertaken. This can only be undertaken on the basis of the favoured option. It is being undertaken in dialogue with statutory bodies including Natural England. At present (June, 2009) task 2, looking at appropriate mitigation, is being undertaken.

Comments on the precise arrangements for buses in the

Action

Ensure the transport policy or supporting text makes appropriate reference to parking strategy and also to the benefits of travel planning. Ensure any reference to density in new developments seeks to focus high density on locations near centres in order to encourage bus patronage

pricing mechanisms. [RB]

city centre, services in Thorpe, or regulations concerning pedestrian zones in the city centre are beyond the scope of the core strategy

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

[RB]

The northern distributor road is part of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (though only a part). Environmental assessments have been carried out as part of the case for the road in principle. The detailed design of the road is beyond the remit of the joint core strategy, provided it complements the favoured strategy. The need for NATS and the NDR is not based specifically on future growth although the principles need to accord with regional policy NR1. The NDR is a feature of the existing transportation strategy, but is seen as an essential element of the strategy to accommodate future growth even if the growth does not happen as quickly as forecast because of the recession.

It is considered critical to create the conditions for improved public transport walking and cycling opportunities that are also an important part of a strategy.

Public transport provision is difficult in rural areas. One of the benefits of the strategy of focusing a large amount of growth in the north east, and a number of locations served by the A11 corridor is that it creates the critical mass of population to sustain high quality public transport services. Conventional bus services are very expensive in rural areas, and the approach most likely to succeed is based around demand responsive transport. Similarly, interchange points which are not themselves a major destination (for example a main town) can deter public transport use.

Air pollution is a matter for some concern in central Norwich, but the transportation strategy in the recent past has been successful in curbing traffic growth in the central area and schemes have been devised to combat known areas of poor air quality.

Trams/light rail have been examined in the past, but the conclusion has always been that the urban area of Norwich does not provide the critical mass to support this mode. There is a possibility, subject to the outcome of trials elsewhere, that tram train could be used on the part of the Bittern Line as part of the eco community proposals

The masterplanning and design of major growth locations should promote bus use, and density is an issue in this.

The scale of development proposed at Long Stratton is unlikely to justify a parkway station on the main line. However, it may be possible to encourage more use of the Bittern Line, possibly including new rail stations if the existing infrastructure is upgraded and tram trains can be introduced.

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9541 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149]	Comment	This relates to Marsham promotes a site at the Marsham which could incorporate recreational facilities to address a local deficiency	<p>There is some flexibility in the allocation of affordable housing, and the tenure offered, but broadly, income and savings are included in the assessment.</p> <p>The current access is considered adequate for Whitlingham sewage treatment works. Direct access from the trunk road is unlikely to be acceptable</p> <p>Parking policy, including pricing has long been part of a strategy to discourage commuting into the city centre, while maintaining access for commerce. While this is not new, it is reasonable for the strategy to be explicit about this, and about the benefits of travel planning [RB]</p> <p>Representations at the technical consultation stage indicated that the settlement hierarchy was too rigid. There appears to be a strong case for reviewing it, but it should still take into account the range of services in villages. In the consultation draft, Marsham was a service village, but it is understood that since then it has lost its food store. If it is retained as a service village, the selection of a particular site will be undertaken through the site specific allocations development plan document. [RB]</p>	Review the policies relating to the settlement hierarchy, particularly service villages and other villages, and consider the appropriate category for Marsham. [RB]
11076 - Redenhall with Harleston Town Council (Ms Margot Harbour) [8383]	Comment	<p>These comments relate to Harleston</p> <p>Redenhall with Harleston Town Council express concerns about the proposal to allocate 300 dwellings, arguing that current commitments should be assimilated first. Specific points raised as concerns include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ Parking â€¢ Traffic â€¢ Drainage/flooding â€¢ Health facilities â€¢ Limited employment â€¢ Schools â€¢ Public transport <p>All of which could lead to the town becoming simply a dormitory in the view of the Town Council. Any allocation should be conditional upon ensuring further expansion will contribute to the town's integrity, solving drainage/ flash flood problems, major campaign to encourage less car</p>	<p>Children's Services have indicated they do not see a fundamental problem, though additional primary school capacity may be needed.</p> <p>NHS Norfolk have expressed support for the strategy regarding main towns</p> <p>Any new development proposed will need to include an appropriate drainage strategy to avoid exacerbating any problems. If there are existing drainage problems in the area these will need to be taken into account, and it may be possible for new development to help in dealing with them.</p> <p>With regard to transport issues, and the need to avoid car dependency, this could be a feature of any site specific allocations work which needs to be undertaken. Harleston has hourly buses to Diss, Beccles and Yarmouth and work and shoppers services to Norwich [RB]</p>	No change needed [RB]

dependency and a study of parking capacity and patterns
[RB]

9070 - Ms Penny Tilley [8108]	Comment	The need for more new homes could be reduced if second homes were eliminated [RB]	Such an outcome could only be achieved through strong central government direction [RB]	No change needed [RB]
8614 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]	Comment	Support [RB]	Support noted [RB]	No change needed [RB]

Page 375 of 392

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

11069 - Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrod)	Comment	<p>The Norwich Economy Round Table make a variety of points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on utilities infrastructure rather than a place in shaping focus • Needs more local distinctiveness - a greater emphasis on local businesses • The policy on the economy is inconsistent, broad in places and detailed in others. Allocation of employment land needs to have flexibility to allow for small-scale employment use e.g. farm shops in rural areas. Policy 15 ignores the two biggest areas of opportunity for Greater Norwich, knowledge economy and creative/cultural industries • Surprised by a lack of references to transport which is key to the local economy including rail times to London • Needed to acknowledge the GNDP economic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many see utilities as a key issue. However a number of people have said there is an insufficiently clear vision • Cannot see a fundamental inconsistency in policy 15. It is unrealistic to expect allocations for farm shops, or similarly small-scale developments, but these are supported in policies 8, 9, 10. • With regard to the knowledge economy, policy 15, bullet point 2 refers to increasing the proportion of higher value knowledge economy and jobs. Policy 2 on the strategy for growth in the Norwich policy area includes significant expansion of health, higher education and science park activity at UEA/Norwich Research Park and an expansion of activity at Hethel relating to automotive and high tech engineering • Transport is dealt with in policies 16, and its supporting text. There is a specific reference to the rail service to London • It is agreed that there should be a review of related strategies, and this should be rectified, perhaps as an appendix [RB] 	<p>Reexamine the vision to see if more local distinctiveness, and a clearer picture can be presented</p> <p>Add an appendix identifying relationships to other strategies, including the Greater Norwich Economic Strategy [RB]</p>
8844 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	Comment	<p>Relate to Gypsy and traveller issues</p> <p>Points made include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Norfolk Gypsy and Traveller DPD should not precede the JCS [RB] 	<p>The total scale of Gypsy and traveller sites required is set by the recent single issue review of the East of England Plan, currently nearing completion. This sets targets to 2011, but also includes a formula to extrapolate them for long stay and transit pitches for Gypsies and travellers, and also for sites for travelling show people.</p> <p>South Norfolk council have progressed their Gypsy and Traveller DPD early because of the need to resolve particularly pressing problems. [RB]</p>	<p>No change in direct response, but update the policy reference to Gypsies and travellers to show extrapolated figures, for long stay and transit pitches for Gypsies and travellers, and additional accommodation for travelling show people [RB]</p>

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>10379 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]</p> <p>8376 - Alyson Lowe [6992]</p> <p>9374 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]</p> <p>9811 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]</p> <p>8059 - Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870]</p> <p>8259 - pulham market parish council (mr laurence taylor) [7907]</p> <p>8403 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]</p> <p>9085 - Ms R Pickering [8109]</p> <p>9418 - Mr E Newberry [8120]</p> <p>10423 - Ms Barbara Lockwood [8306]</p> <p>10631 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]</p>	<p>Commen t</p>	<p>These refer to the effects of the current recession</p> <p>Particular points made include</p> <p>â€¢ The plan is highly dependent on capital investment</p> <p>â€¢ Support for the aim of improving economic performance</p> <p>â€¢ Believe the Norwich northern distributor road will be needed one day, but not now</p> <p>â€¢ Likely future public spending restraint</p> <p>â€¢ More open governance by the GNDP would give more credibility</p> <p>â€¢ Power will be a problem as zero carbon technology will not be able to cope</p> <p>â€¢ Infrastructure needs to be in place before development</p> <p>â€¢ The plan contains a very little in relation to cost, though it does identify some agencies which will be crucial</p> <p>â€¢ The plan does not acknowledge the fundamental fragility of the economy and possible long term impacts</p> <p>â€¢ Note that growth point funding has been focused on the city centre to date - assume it will spread wider</p>	<p>â€¢ Acknowledge the plan depends on capital investment, and the difficulty of the current circumstances. It will be important that the investment implementation strategy acknowledges this and promotes the use of innovative funding, and innovative methods of service delivery to save cost where possible, and obtains the support of the organizations chiefly responsible for service provision. The duration of the recession is not known, but the current economic downturn does not constitute a reason for not planning.</p> <p>â€¢ It is acknowledged that there is little about cost. The level of expected infrastructure, costs of providing it and potential funding sources are the subject of current work being undertaken by EDAW. In order to fully appreciate the factors of spare capacity or shortfalls in infrastructure in particular locations, this work could not be finalized until a favoured option has been derived. The pre-submission publication version of the strategy will need to include or be accompanied by a costed implementation strategy</p> <p>â€¢ The GNDP does not have a legal decision-making constitution, and all decisions must be ultimately taken by the constituent local authorities, which are fully accountable. There is there for a difficult balance to be struck between publicizing the cooperative working epitomized by the GNDP, and the role of the individual constituent councils.</p> <p>â€¢ Research suggests that there is the potential to meet all the area's electricity requirements by carbon free means,</p> <p>â€¢ It is important that infrastructure is provided as needed, and some will no doubt be needed at the outset of a development. This does not apply to all, however, for example a school may be needed part way through a development. Providing it earlier may not result in sufficient children to make it viable to operate.</p> <p>â€¢ Growth Point funding has up to now been spent on schemes "ready to go", but as the strategy and implementation strategy progress it will be used more widely. Priorities are likely to include the western public transport corridor along Dereham Road, and access improvements to Norwich Research Park. Similarly, a bid has been made to the Community Infrastructure Fund to help resolve the current difficulties at the Postwick junction</p> <p>â€¢ Public transport and affordable housing are likely to be priorities in the implementation strategy, but the strategy still needs to maintain a balanced portfolio of priorities. It is important to recognize that the first call will be on mainstream funding sources rather than developer contributions, particularly in difficult economic times, and these mainstream of sources need to be used as fully and</p>	<p>Develop implementation strategy for inclusion in the pre-submission publication of version of the strategy, and seek the commitment of principal service providers [RB]</p>

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

11156 - English Heritage (Eastern Region) (Ms. Katharine Fletcher) [905]

Comment

This representation asks that comments made at earlier stages of consultation be taken into account. It also asks for further work into the characterisation of the historic environment.

Where comments have been made at an earlier stage, they have been separately recorded, and considered in the preparation of a draft pre-submission document, and separately presented for Members' consideration. Further work into the historic characterisation of the area has been completed

Findings of the historic characterisation study to be taken into account

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9749 - Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155]
 9819 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509]
 10332 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]
 8311 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
 9636 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]
 10240 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]
 8992 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
 9066 - Mr David Wrigley [8107]
 9341 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
 9742 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]
 9751 - Mr David Holliday [8178]
 10651 - Ms Lucy Hall [8295]
 11060 - Mr Mark Champion [8376]

Comment These comments are primarily concerned with matters of process

â€¢ Comments about the lack of advertising/publicity around the joint core strategy and the consultation exercise

â€¢ The language used in the document is too complex, and will exclude residents, the primary audience, from making clear judgments about while the proposals entail, who undermining the purpose and politically of the public consultation

â€¢ The timing of exhibitions is criticized - apart from the opening exhibition at the Forum all were on weekdays when many people are at work

â€¢ Schools should be involved in consultation, it is future generations who will direct experience the consequences of current planning

â€¢ Need for monitoring

â€¢ Who is funding all the consultation?

â€¢ Question concerning local press reports about the loss of grant for a new bridge connecting Whitlingham to Norwich

â€¢ The pre-submission publication stage should extend beyond September to avoid the holiday period.

â€¢ The two stage consultation process under regulation 25, without the documents being fully updated between the two stages is disjointed and confusing

â€¢ Paragraph 1.2 of the plan says the core strategy is "a plan..... that will guide future housing growth..." This is an excessively narrow

â€¢ There is nothing about the resultant size, distribution or structure of population in particular localities as a consequence of the plan or changes in patterns of movement

â€¢ Criticisms regarding the sustainability appraisal

â€¢ Question whether an appropriate assessment is needed

â€¢ Suggestions of a large number of places in the document where it should be made clear that the Broads area falls outside the JCS area

â€¢ Would have preferred to submit a form rather than on line

â€¢ The core strategy needs to be consistent with the Greater Norwich Integrated Development Programme and Community Infrastructure Fund bids for the growth point.

â€¢ The Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind stress it is important that organizations such as the NNAB are consulted on detailed planning issues.They also raise points about the operation of public buildings, and the need for those providing services to have visual

Comments relating to the sustainability appraisal are being examined independently

There was a campaign of publicity surrounding the exhibitions and opportunities to comment, including a series of press adverts and posters. Although there was not a specific mail out of a leaflet, articles were included in Council newsletters. One representation complaints about a lack of publicity while acknowledging there were made aware through an article in the Broadland newsletter.

Although the exercise was a public consultation, the representation suggesting the public is the specific audience is misguided. This is a consultation draft of a document which has a number of audiences, including the public, but also including developers, planning officers, service providers, planning inspectors, and will therefore inevitably be the subject of examination by legal advisers in cases of dispute. Regrettably therefore it cannot be written specifically in language to suit the public without regard to these other audiences.

There were a number of exhibitions, including more than one at the Forum on a Saturday. Many of those held during the week extended into the evenings so that people returning from work would have the opportunity to attend. To hold a wide a range of exhibitions in widely differing locations on weekends would not be practical given staff limitations, unless the consultation period, and hence plan production period were extended by an unreasonably long time.

Schools have been contacted, and some have availed themselves of the offer of a visit to explain proposed plans for the future

Agreed the monitoring targets need to be articulated

The consultation is funded by the County Council and three local planning authorities. The preparation of a local development framework, including consultation, is a statutory requirement

The Whitlingham to Norwich bridge is not a proposal in the JCS, but would be compatible with it

The duration of pre submission publication is set by regulation, but every effort should be made to avoid the holiday season.

Online submission is helpful as it saves time, and ensures

Include monitoring targets in pre submission publication version

Include in introductory section a clear statement of the area to be covered by the plan and that it excludes the Broads. Clarify on key diagrams, including any more detailed insets for the Norwich policy area and city centre that the area shown as the Broads authority area is excluded from the JCS.

Amend paragraph 1.2 to refer not only to housing, but also to employment and supporting infrastructure

Give further consideration to including estimates of the population in total, and infrastructure likely to result from major developments, but with appropriate caution given the difficulties of such forecasts at a local scale. [RB]

The main purpose of the regulation 25 technical

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

consultation was to assist in formulating the preferred option to accommodate major growth in the Norwich area. The intention was that, once this had been achieved, public comment should focus on a similar document.

As regards the population of new neighbourhoods, an indication of the total population expected, and some idea of its composition might be possible, but at a relatively small geographical scale this is a difficult and imprecise. However further examination should be given to this.

The scope of the plan does extend beyond guiding housing, and paragraph 1.2 should be amended to refer to employment and supporting infrastructure as well

An Appropriate Assessment is being undertaken, but could not be done until there was a favoured option to test.

The plan is considered consistent with the IDP and the CIF bid for improvements to the Postwick interchange

The concerns of the Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind are noted. It is particularly important that such organizations are consulted on site specific development plan documents including Area Action Plans, and also in masterplanning. The other points made are valid but beyond the scope of the joint core strategy. [RB]

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9653 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]

Comment
 The representation challenges the evidence base, and offers critical comments on some of the locations selected for development.

Do not consider Rackheath fits the description of an "urban extension" particularly if historic parkland is to be conserved. Note that the level of development proposed will be retained irrespective of whether or not the eco town status remains. No indication given as to the timing of the northern distributor road, which is critical for the north east. The road bisects the proposal and suggests it is not a cohesive whole.

No explanation for why the Yare valley renders a large scale urban extension inappropriate in South Norfolk. Growth in South Norfolk spread more thinly; difficult to see how this will provide necessary infrastructure and services

No explanation why some public transport provision appears to be prioritized for improvement in advance of the selection of the favoured growth option

Noted that in virtually all of the locations within the "favoured option" in South Norfolk, it remains to be determined how requirements for secondary education are to be met. Therefore difficult to see how the joint core strategy can " shape the delivery of education and transport" as suggested on page 66 of the consultation documents.

No indication in the present document about whether any of the land in the favoured option has been secured for development.

Wymondham - no indication why strategic gap so important, or how town centre is to be expanded. Secondary education remains unresolved. Doubt whether level of development will support infrastructure costs

Hethersett -not clear if 1000 houses will support additional levels of service. Where are employment opportunities to be created? Likely to become even more of a dormitory. Not clear if necessary improvements to Thickthorn junction will be viable or what form these might take. These are critical to facilitate the proposed growth areas

Cringleford - similar comments to above, and the impact of additional development of the Yare valley appears to be glossed over in an attempt to include this location

In the north east, the strategy envisages the creation of three distinct communities with their own identities, but whose collective critical mass will deliver certain key shared infrastructure. The eco town proposals are being pursued under a specific government initiative. The plan simply makes it clear that development would be proposed in this location in any event. The higher standards established through the eco towns programme are welcomed, and add to the strength of the strategy. The northern distributor road is seen as critical to the totality of growth in the northeast. The strategy of a number of modest allocations in South Norfolk will help to ensure medium term delivery.

The Yare valley has long been seen as an important landscape element, dating from the former structure plan, and supported by the structure plan Examination in Public panel. This limits the potential for an extension directly adjacent to the existing built-up area in a way not directly paralleled in the north.

The western public transport corridor has been identified as one where improvement should be prioritized based on current needs.

The consultation document acknowledged the uncertainties around secondary education in the west and south west. There has been ongoing dialogue with Children's Services to assess the best approach. In this respect, the strategy is guiding the education solution. The alternative would be simply to look at a predetermined education solution and plan the growth around that.

There is significant developer interest in a number of the locations proposed. Representations reported elsewhere confirm this.

The earlier infrastructure study undertaken by EDAW did not look at predetermined distributions of growth - it looked at hypothetical scenarios created specifically for the purpose of assessing the scale of infrastructure needed at a high level. There are clearly local factors influencing the actual infrastructure need depending on the precise distribution of growth, and it is for this reason that EDAW are extending the work on the basis of the favoured option. Their work however is concerned with assessing infrastructure needs and potential funding sources, and not in guiding the strategy for the distribution of growth.

With specific reference to Long Stratton, dialogue continues with promoters of the development to assess

No change needed [RB]

Long Stratton - document indicates the bypass is a prerequisite, meaning the road must be provided before

the viability of a bypass being delivered by the scale of development proposed, and taking into account any other public funding which might be available without impacting

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

development. Not clear if the level of growth proposed is sufficient to finance the road. Unclear how the centre of Long Stratton can be enhanced or expanded.

Conclusion - believe that the case for the JCS is not proven. It represents a predetermined outcome with no reasonable alternatives assessed and there is a lack of an evidence base to justify the favoured option. [RB]

on the rest of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy.

It is not true that no reasonable alternatives have been considered. At the issues and options stage, ten distinct locations were assessed as potential locations for growth within the Norwich policy area. Three potential packages were discussed and presented for comment at the Regulation 25 technical consultation stage. [RB]

9691 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]

Comment Wroxham Parish Council argue that Wroxham should be subject to a separate consultation process and should not be part of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership consultation exercise [RB]

Wroxham is within the plan area, and therefore an integral part of the plan and should be included in any consultation work [RB]

No change [RB]

10527 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]

Comment These representations relate mainly to the urban extension proposed in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle

Support noted and welcomed. It is particularly important in view of some elements of strategic infrastructure needed that the promoters are willing to cooperate with promoters of other parts of the growth of triangle. Appendix 0 in the consultation document notes that the structure of the local geography suggests a new community will take the form of a series of inter-related new quarters. The approach seems consistent with that aspiration, but will need to extend to promoters of other parts of the area as well. The similar sentiments expressed by Broadland Land Trust are welcomed.

No change needed [RB]

10143 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]
10905 - Broadland Land Trust

Lothbury support the proposal, it is the most sustainable option for major growth in an ideal location to meet future housing needs with the potential for very good access to Norwich. The company is committed to developing long-term solutions in the area meeting the needs of existing and future communities, and working in partnership with stakeholders including the GNDP. They proposed to pursue an Enquiry by Design process as a master planning tool to help develop proposals for the area. They are looking to work closely with the promoters of the Rackheath eco community development with regard to social and physical infrastructure required to serve the wider area.

Broadland Land Trust (which comprises a number of landowners committed to working together) make similar points and have been involved alongside Lothbury in the Enquiry by Design process scoping exercise already undertaken. BLT comment that as this exercise progresses it will be necessary to supplement the current representation.

Appendix 0, which describes the favoured option is clear that a major development in the north east is dependent on the implementation of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road, (and which is itself dependent on resolution of the Postwick junction limitations). If the proposed option at the pre-submission stage includes the north east as a major growth location, these requirements should be incorporated into policy, [RB]

Major growth north east of Norwich should not be contemplated without improvements to the Postwick interchange and the northern distributor road. [RB]

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

<p>8828 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] 9844 - Mr John Martin Shaw [7544] 8829 - Trowse Primary School (Mr James Macdonald) [7608] 8919 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620] 8968 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706] refers to Trowse as a service village, whereas 8559 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>These relate to the settlement hierarchy and the definition of the Norwich policy area</p> <p>â€¢ Infill only is acceptable in view of the village's character. School facilities and road network could not cope with more</p> <p>â€¢ Current hierarchy is too rigid and prescriptive. Sustainable locations along A 140 include Tasburgh which could accommodate up to 200 new homes</p> <p>â€¢ Concern that the technical consultation document public consultation document seems to treat it as a part of urban fringe. Concerned about large scale growth.</p> <p>â€¢ Suggest that Honingham should be included within the Norwich policy area - next to Easton and has good access to the trunk road</p> <p>â€¢ Marlingford and Colton should be excluded from the Norwich policy area [RB]</p>	<p>â€¢ In response to representations at the technical consultation stage, it has been agreed that there should be a review of the settlement hierarchy. At the public consultation stage, Tasburgh was categorized as a "service village".</p> <p>â€¢ Development on the scale of 200 dwellings would imply moving Tasburgh up to the level of a key service centre.</p> <p>â€¢ The Technical Consultation document was inconsistent in that Trowse was described as a service village based on its own facilities. It was also, elsewhere in the document, described as part of the urban fringe. Given its close relationship to the urban area, the latter description is considered more appropriate. The scale of development proposed at different locations in the urban fringe will be undertaken through the Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document</p> <p>â€¢ The Norwich policy area is not determined solely by road capacity, and availability of the trunk road for access to Norwich is not considered persuasive. The Highways Agency are concerned about increasing use of trunk roads for local traffic, and this would be likely to face opposition, given current difficulties on that stretch of the road, and the recent junction improvements which have been prompted by an accident record. Honingham has very few facilities, and is not currently categorized as either a "service village" or an "other village". Any development would therefore need to be of a magnitude to provide a whole range of services. This implies very large scale development.</p> <p>â€¢ The inclusion of Marlingford and Colton within the Norwich policy area does not appear particularly anomalous, -- it borders Easton and Great Melton, and almost has a border with Bawburgh. The nature of the particular settlement has been reflected through its</p>	<p>Review the settlement hierarchy before pre-submission publication version of the strategy. Retain Trowse as an urban fringe parish. No change to the Norwich policy area boundary [RB]</p>
---	----------------	---	---	---

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10877 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]

Comment Responses relate mainly to Costessey
Support the identification of Costessey as a potential location for growth in the favoured option, but oppose the link with Easton in all policy preferences. Costessey has significant advantages over Easton in every respect, including the settlement hierarchy, proximity to employment, proximity to services, and better access to the urban area, including public transport access, not being separated by the Norwich southern bypass and Longwater junction.

While many of the points made by the representation very sound, there could equally be local benefits to Easton, and the selection of a site within this broad area will be undertaken through the site specific allocations development plan document [RB]

No change [RB]

Concern about reports made to the GNDP policy group in late 2008 referring to the loss of "some of the benefits to Easton College of nearby development". The benefits to a particular organization should not be taken into account.

Paragraph 38 of PPS 3 identifies the criteria to be used when identifying locations for new housing. This includes the creation of communities of a sufficient size and mix to justify the development of and sustain community facilities, infrastructure and services. This can be much better achieved at Costessey.

Believe therefore the core strategy should propose an allocation of at least 1000 dwellings at Costessey -representation promotes a site at Lodge Farm [RB]

8757 - Mrs Anita Turpin [8058]
10253 - Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260]
11066 - Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8382]

Comment These representations concern biodiversity/green infrastructure
Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership criticize the sustainability appraisal document, offering suggestions for its improvement.
Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership say Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites should be referred to within the document
Others comments that the Broads offer huge potential for tourism.The Broads Tourism Forum seeks to raise visitor numbers, and sustainable transport links to facilitate this are essential [RB]

Comments on the sustainability appraisal are being examined independently

No change needed [RB]

Policy 17 deals with environmental assets. The supporting text at paragraph 8.22 states "these assets include..... geodiversity (geological features)"

Sustainable transport links to the Broads may feature as part of the green infrastructure for the major growth to the north east of Norwich. However some caution needs to be applied as one of the concerns raised by the Appropriate Assessment task 1 is the need to avoid undue pressure on the Broads SPA [RB]

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9055 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]

Comment
 Keymer Cavendish, who propose development in part of the north east question three factors
 • Sustainability of Long Stratton and Wymondham for major development
 • Lack of detail concerning rail
 • The impact of economic climate on the viability of strategic housing development [RB]

• The selection of locations for development has been subject to sustainability appraisal. Wymondham is widely seen as a suitable location for strategic growth, with good access to local employment, a wide range of services and, subject to improvements to the Thickthorn junction, good access to the best current public transport corridor. It also has rail access to Norwich and Cambridge.
 • For local journeys, Wymondham has access to rail. There is currently a station at Salhouse, but this is not particularly well related to proposed growth locations. However appendix 0, describing the favoured option, refers to a proposal for a new rail hall at Rackheath. Any such proposal will be subject to the cooperation of Network Rail and the train operator. The potential value of the service may be increased if tram train can be operated alongside heavy rail. This is currently not possible, but may become possible subject to the outcome of experimental services elsewhere on the network.
 • The economic climate is clearly having an impact on delivery, but the duration of the recession is not known, and the plan extends to 2026. It is important that the quality of development is not compromised in the interests of economy, but equally, the implementation strategy will need to focus on mainstream funding sources and secure the commitment of service providers. Some innovative approaches to the provision of services may help to reduce costs. [RB]

No change needed [RB]

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10699 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]
10208 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]

Comment
t
These representations principally concern Aylsham

Kier Land Limited have submitted two representations. The first challenges the sustainability appraisal, and it's iteration alongside the evolving joint call strategy.

The same representation goes on to challenge the results of the water cycle study. It suggests undue emphasis has been placed on current limitations at the sewage treatment works. It also comments that the water cycle study stage 2 A does not include an assessment of the scale of investment needed to cater for the allocations proposed in the joint core strategy. Extrapolating from other sources, and the comments on other settlements in the water cycle study, the representation argues that the costs of overcoming problems at Aylsham would not be excessive.

The second representation focuses entirely on the sustainability appraisal, commenting that it does not appear to have developed in parallel with the joint core strategy, the significant changes to the sustainability appraisal being only in connection with the favoured option to accommodate growth in the Norwich policy area.

The comments on the sustainability appraisal are being examined independently.

The issue highlighted in the water cycle study is not simply one of cost, though the cost of upgrading Aylsham sewage treatment works is very significant. It also concerns the fact that an expansion of the sewage treatment works is dependent on consent from the Environment Agency for additional discharges. These would be into a particularly sensitive water environment, and there is no certainty that this can be overcome, since the Environment Agency's review of consents is not yet complete.

The situation is being tested through stage 2 B. of the water cycle study which is examining the consequences of a notional allocation of 300 dwellings at Aylsham.

Amend the joint core strategy to show an allocation at Aylsham of 300 dwellings to be implemented subject to the capacity limitations of the sewage treatment works being overcome. [RB]

8642 - The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]

Comment
t
These comments relate to matters to be considered for inclusion in a Community Infrastructure Levy, or other forms of developer contribution.

1. Representations on behalf of Norfolk Environmental Waste Services note the reference to waste in policy nineteen, but consider it's omission from tables 1 and 2 covering developer contributions and CIL as a serious omission

It is also important that the strategically important waste management facility such as the one at Costessey should not have the development encroaching upon it. [RB]

Given the situation with the Environment Agency's review of consents, but Anglian Water's apparent willingness to contemplate investment post 2015, coupled with the inherent suitability of the Aylsham to accommodate some growth, as the largest rural service centre in the northern part of the plan area, and sufficient forecast capacity in schools, an appropriate response would be to indicate an allocation, of, say 300 dwellings subject to constraints at the sewage treatment works being overcome. In common with all allocations, this should be seen as a minimum, not a maximum. [RB]

1. Waste disposal is being considered through the infrastructure needs and funding sources work being undertaken by EDAW. Subject to the outcome of that work, it is suggested that it should be included within the scope of any developer contributions, where it can be demonstrated that additional investment is needed as a consequence of the overall growth planned in the Greater Norwich area.

The minerals and waste local development framework is likely to include consultation zones around installations such as the waste management facility to ensure that its operation is not compromised. At this stage, it is important that the joint core strategy is satisfied that there is scope for the development of at least 1000 houses (or whatever allocation is finally proposed) in the Costessey/ Easton area, without infringing any such constraints. The precise boundaries of any allocation will need to take into account any such consultation or safeguarding zone when they are defined in the site specific allocations DPD [RB]

1. Subject to the outcome of the infrastructure needs and funding study being undertaken by EDAW, include waste management within the implementation strategy. [RB]

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9843 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]

Comment
The representations mainly concern Taverham
Believe the strategy should take account of the proposed changes to PPS 6, the Government's latest view on retail planning policy. This no longer requires a formal assessment of "need". Instead, planners should consider wider impacts of new retail development such as economic and physical regeneration, creation of jobs and the drawback of trade outside the catchment area. Believe it is appropriate to include within the joint core strategy guidance on how future development of the site at Fir Covert Road, Taverham can come forward. Representation summarizes how the proposers see the proposal aligning with the objectives of the joint core strategy. [RB]

The first point to make is that draft PPS 4 is not yet Government policy, but is a consultation document. While it is true it seeks to move away from the "need" test included in current PPS 6, it is still very much focused on guiding development to centres. Other local centres in that part of the Broadland could be put at risk by a major new retail centre at this location (specifically those that Drayton and local, street corner centres in Taverham)

Draft policy EC. 7.1 in the draft PPS 4 talks about site selection for town centre uses, which includes retail. This does say that account should be taken of the identified need, and apply the sequential approach to site selection, assess impact on existing centres and ensure locations are accessible and well served by a choice of means of transport. It is only after addressing the above requirements that physical regeneration, employment opportunities increased investment in an area etc may meet material to the choice of appropriate locations. Therefore, in the absence of any need for additional shopping floorspace in the outer part of the urban fringe, and the potential risk to local centres currently defined in the local plan, there does not appear to be a strong case for proposing a new retail facility at this point. [RB]

No change [RB]

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9317 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]
 9716 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]
 7979 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]
 10254 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Glyn Davies) [7725]

Object Representations focus on Long Stratton

Challenge to aspects of the sustainability appraisal

Support Long Stratton as a major growth location. Believe that the settlement has the capacity to accommodate more than 1800 dwellings, in association with provision of the bypass and regeneration of the settlement as a whole, and could therefore contribute to meeting increased growth targets to 2031. The bypass incorporated in the favoured option will bring environmental improvements, improving amenity for existing residents and the A140 as a key link between Ipswich and Norwich.

One representation goes on to challenge aspects of the sustainability appraisal.

Welcome the bypass but oppose scale of development - returned to Norfolk two years ago -change to national immigration policy will reduce the need for housing - encourage living over shops

Concerned about lack of employment proposals in Long Stratton

Comment on the demographic forecasts and how the underlying housing provision is derived

Question the sequence of the delivery between bypass and houses [RB]

Comments relating to the sustainability appraisal are being examined independently.

No change [RB]

The scale of development to be planned for is driven by the East of England Plan(where the scale of housing proposed was subjected to rigorous debate at the Examination in Public), and is not solely a response to international migration - much of the need for housing is due to migration within the UK, as the representation illustrates. Typically, in the Norwich policy area in the past, approximately half housing need has been a consequence of demographic change within the current population, the rest being mostly a consequence of migration - principally within the UK.

Living above shops is supported, and any dwellings achieved this way will contribute towards meeting the total

It is likely that the bypass and houses which will fund it will be provided in parallel. While it is not realistic to expect the bypass to be completed ahead of the housing commencing, it is reasonable to expect certainty that it will be provided.

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8099 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] 8221 - Mr P Anderson [7901] 8604 - Mr M Read [8024] 9208 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] 10686 - Ms Natalie Beal [8349] 11034 - Mr Bernard Godding	Object	<p>These representations concern climate change issues examined independently One representation includes criticism of the sustainability appraisal</p> <p>It also questions whether the vision has a specific section relating to climate change.</p> <p>Many go on to argue that the strategy does not take a meaningful and effective view of climate change and the need for a low carbon economy</p> <p>Others comment that there is no reference to standards such as those in the Manual for Streets, BREEAM, or Building for Life.</p> <p>Some comment that the transport strategy is excessively roads based</p> <p>One representation suggests that when infrastructure needs are identified, roads are identified ahead of walking and cycling - this sends the wrong message. [RB]</p>	<p>Comments relating to the sustainability appraisal are being energy generation and addressing</p> <p>The vision in the consultation draft does include a section on climate change, on page 9 under the bold heading "climate change and sustainability"</p> <p>However, it is agreed that the plan does not give adequate policy coverage to carbon reduction and climate change.</p> <p>More policy attention should be devoted to reducing carbon impact. This however needs an evidence base, and the study into the renewable energy potential of the area has only just been completed. Stronger policies on climate change should be added. In the case of buildings, it would be helpful to refer to BREEAM, or the Building for Life criteria promoted by CABE, as these provide an independent yardstick.</p> <p>While the sentiment concerning the way infrastructure need is presented is noted, it does not imply any lack of commitment to public transport, walking or cycling. However in many cases, specifically the northern distributor road, this investment is seen as the key to providing scope to improve conditions for non car modes within the urban area. [RB]</p>	<p>Add new policies relating to local climate change, and including the use of BREEAM and Building for Life criteria in policies regarding the performance of buildings.</p>
9921 - stephen eastwood [7962] 8648 - Mr Steve Dowall [8033] 8761 - Ms Sarah Smith [8059] 9000 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093] 9004 - Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094] 9008 - Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095] 9015 - Mr KD White [8097] 9019 - Mr Robert Hall [8098] 9023 - Mr and Mrs Peter Tann [8099]	Object	<p>A number of representations raise site specific issues relating to Lingwood, [RB]</p>	<p>These appear to be a response to an invitation to comment on sites suggested following a "call for sites" in relation to the Broadland site specific allocations development plan document [RB]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9252 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
 8927 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
 8017 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]
 8452 - Ian Harris [8007]
 8485 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
 8509 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
 8948 - Miss Marguerite Finn [8087]
 9275 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]
 9444 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]
 localities should be free to determine the level of
 9535 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]
 9593 - Mr R Harris [8146]
 10121 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]
 10120 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]
 10248 - Mrs Angela Garner [8258]
 Poor feedback
 10424 - Morningthorpe Parish Council (Mr P Rodger) [8307]
 10475 - Mr David Smith [8309]
 10503 - Mr I T Smith [8310]
 10552 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]

Object These representations question the principle of planning for large scale development

Points made include

- Promotion of dualling the A. 11 will encourage development along the corridor
- Regret at the loss of green fields, and agricultural potential
- Growth in population will require significant investment in facilities, and in employment
- Energy requirements must be minimized, and low carbon solutions such as wind farms and community CHP promoted.
- Several representations argue that government targets should be questioned, and some arguing that of growth.
- The " audacity" of including a glossary of everyday words
- The strategy should be confined to brownfields within Norwich and a new town in Long Stratton
- Others support maximum use of brownfields
- A number of detailed points relating to Sprowston
- Comments about the takeover by supermarkets of small convenience stores
- is no prospect of it being turned back into a quiet local
- Need to protect existing open spaces and sports facilities
- Question whether there will be a greater incidence of crime in the city centre due to the concentration of nightlife facilities there, and crime and disorder in general funding sources.
- Need for infrastructure to be provided as development progresses
- Challenge earlier assumptions about the potential for retail growth
- Need for local facilities e.g. community hospitals
- Fund small railways to provide local service
- Little said about medical facilities particularly NNUH - major new growth areas will require facilities. How will this be funded?
- Little said about integrating traveller sites into the locality and how these will be monitored
- Will local people be involved on "implementation boards"?
- Needs to be a balance between housing numbers and village capacity/ character
- Hope the Government will review targets
- The plan ignores the potential for new technology to change perceptions of sustainability to the benefit of rural areas [RB]

The scale of development is set by the requirements of the East of England Plan. This was only adopted after an Examination in Public, and a robust debate about the validity of population and housing targets. To plan for a lower level of growth would invite representations promoting other sites in less acceptable locations, and would be very likely to result in the strategy being found unsound. The evidence base for the housing market assessment undertaken on behalf of the Greater Norwich Housing Partnership suggests a similar level of overall housing requirement, although this only looked a short distance into the future. In response to some of the specific points made

- The strategy seeks to accommodate as much as possible within the existing urban areas, but it must be acknowledged that significant green field allocations will be needed. One of the considerations in selecting areas for development is to try and avoid the most productive agricultural land
- Focusing all the Greenfield allocations on Long Stratton would limit choice, and threaten delivery. It would also fail to make the best use of potential for public transport, or access to local services and jobs
- The A. 11 is already largely dualled and is a critical factor in the area's connection to the rest of the UK. There road.
- It is important that infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure is provided. Work is currently being undertaken by EDAW in dialogue with service providers to quantify the infrastructure needed and to identify potential
- Economic modelling undertaken for the GNDP by Arup suggests that job targets derived from the East of England Plan are achievable. It is acknowledged that the national economy has entered a deep recession since the East of England Plan was adopted, and since the economic forecasting work was done, but evidence in the early part of the plan period supports the belief that the local economy can grow, and over the lifetime of the plan, it is reasonable to expect that economic growth will once more take place
- It is acknowledged that the consultation draft says little about low energy, but completion of the evidence base will permit the introduction of more robust policies in the pre submission version
- The glossary is considered useful. It is noteworthy others have complained that the language used is too complex.
- Green infrastructure will be needed as part of new developments, and in general, publicly accessible

No change in the respect of the scale of housing or employment growth to be planned for, but adopt a cautious approach to the potential for retail growth

Indicate that long stay traveller sites, and an additional site for travelling show people should be included within strategic growth locations through the master planning process, unless it can be demonstrated that need has already been met, with appropriate proposals for their maintenance. [RB]

recreation areas will retained or replaced unless it is demonstrably surplus to requirements
â€¢ The city centre does require intensive policing. One of

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10575 - Mr G P Collings [8318]
10599 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]
10681 - Mrs Lyn Robertson
[8348]

the issues being looked at in the infrastructure needs and funding assessment currently being undertaken by EDAW involves community safety resources this work should also be instrumental in shaping the implementation strategy by identifying the stage at which new infrastructure is needed
â€¢ The same study also looks at the need for primary care, and acute care medical facilities and will help to inform the implementation strategy
â€¢ One aspect of infrastructure which has been examined is the potential for new retail floorspace. The study undertaken suggested that there is potential for significant growth, but as retail has been particularly hard hit by the recession, there is a legitimate doubt over the continuing validity of that assessment
â€¢ Significant growth is well related to a railway so that it could take advantage of light rail or tram train if that were feasible. The creation of new railways would be prohibitively expensive unless massive development were involved.
â€¢ The point about future management of Gypsy and traveller sites, and the need to integrate the occupiers into the community is well made. It may be appropriate to indicate that provision should be planned alongside major residential provision, at least for long stay sites, and travelling show people
â€¢ The precise mechanism for implementing the plan still needs to be refined, but should incorporate formal input from service providers. However democratic accountability would limit the scope for others who are neither responsible for service provision, nor responsible to the electorate.
â€¢ The strategy must meet the numbers set out in the East of England Plan to avoid the risk of unsoundness. It does however seek to reconcile as far as possible growth and the form and character of villages through the approach to defining a settlement hierarchy.
â€¢ The indications from the current review of the East of England Plan are that targets are unlikely to fall
â€¢ The plan must work within known technologies. If new technologies bring about a fundamental shift in sustainability, that can be taken into account in future reviews. [RB]

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10751 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]
 9276 - Blofield Parish Council (Mrs D Wyatt) [1781]
 9777 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mrs D Wyatt) [1823]
 11154 - Coal Authority (Miss Rachel Bust Planning and Local Authority Liaison) [7444]
 8172 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]
 8287 - Diane Flynn [7914]
 8672 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
 8750 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]
 9183 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]
 9502 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]

Support This group of representations deal with a number of miscellaneous matters, including references to comments made elsewhere, no comment, need for updates, or comments which relate to site specific allocations documents or the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

 Bidwells on behalf of Mr. Kidner state that comments made at the earlier technical consultation stage still apply [RB]

The comments are noted, but do not necessitate any change. Where comments have been made at an earlier stage, they have been separately recorded, and considered in the preparation of a draft pre-submission document, and separately presented for

No change needed [RB]

Decision on Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability

No change to plan - all suggestions covered elsewhere.

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25

Public Participation Report

5. Spatial vision (Q1)

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations

Action

5. Spatial vision (Q1)

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

8866 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	No change.
9745 - Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155]	No change.
10380 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Consider amendments to take account of GO East comments on: 1. Content of portrait 2. Links to other plans 3. Links between carbon reduction and 4. transport and strengthening of economic vision clearer reference to eco town potential reduce detail of vision eg on rural areas 4. Reference to ecotown potential 5. Avoiding repetition
10712 - Ms S Layton [8354]	No change to plan
10263 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson)	No change.
8108 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	No change
9470 - Louisa Young [8135]	No change.
9814 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509]	See response to policy 5
9667 - Mr Quinton Biddle [8166]	No change
11036 - Norwich Design Quality Panel (The Manager) [8375]	Ensure importance of high quality design is emphasised more fully in the vision and throughout the plan.
9848 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	No change.
9086 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Consider amendments to vision and objectives to give greater focus on what type of place the plan seeks to create/enhance. Consider general rewording re Broads and greater emphasis on environmental protection
9056 - Mrs CA Gilson [8102]	No change
8627 - University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]	Amend text in vision, objective 7 and strategic policy to refer to the need for investment in higher education, including UEA.
9060 - Chenery Drive Residents Association (Mr R. Craggs) [3412]	No change
9074 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	No change
10144 - R Smith [8243]	Ensure revised policies is clear about the strategic criteria to be used in deciding how and where new homes on smaller sites will be determined.
9654 - Ms E Riches [8165]	No change to plan
11019 - Norwich Chamber Council (Mr Don Pearson) [8371]	No change
11097 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	To develop and update section on delivery.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations***Action***

10682 - Ms Natalie Beal [8349]	No change.
10906 - Allied London Properties [8367]	No change.
10412 - Honingham Thorpe Farms Limited [8296]	Consider incorporating specific wording amendments to vision re support and growth of agricultural sector
10065 - The Greetham Trustees [7606]	Ensure revised policy reinforces services in smaller settlements, and peoples' access to them.
10245 - Mrs Angela Garner [8258]	No change.
10281 - Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrold)	Ensure in editing, that the strategy succinctly and directly identifies what sort of place Norwich will be in the future, rather than being led by infrastructure proposals.
10405 - Easton College [3570]	Consider adding further wording in vision re promoting agriculture
10249 - Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260]	Spatial Portrait, para. 4.2 'Natural Environment, landscape and diversity'. Amend to include a brief outline of the region's rich geodiversity, correcting the way in which 'geology' is referred to . Add 'Geodiversity' to the title.
	Objective 8: revise next to last sentence to read "Biodiversity, geodiversity and locally ..."
9980 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	No change to plan
10209 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	No change.
9064 - Mr Alex Kuhn [8106]	No change.
8064 - Miss Janet Saunders	No change
8342 - Age Concern Norwich (Phil Wells) [7957]	Ensure the vision, objectives and relevant policies are specific about the needs of an ageing population. Ensure the implementation plan is also specific about these
8321 - Mr Geoffrey Loades	No change.
10700 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Consider amendments to objectives to reflect EA advice
11025 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	No change.
7910 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	No change
7922 - mr paul newson [7812]	No change.
9911 - Miss Lynda Edwards	No change.
8929 - Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079]	No change
10842 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Consider greater emphasis on promotion of equity in vision.
9222 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	No change.
8136 - Mr Alan Fairweather [7889]	No change
9027 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change.
11140 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	No change
10310 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	No change to plan
8945 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	No change
9719 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	No change.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations***Action***

9788 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	No change to plan
11081 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	Consider suggested amendments to vision.
8957 - MR Richard Edwards	No change.
10784 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360]	To consider the ordering of objectives, possibly as a sequential approach to sustainable communities in greater Norwich.
8869 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	No change
8891 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change.
8831 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	No change.
8486 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	No change.
10576 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	
8337 - Mr Geoffrey Loades	No further change needed.
9321 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	No change
9259 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	No change.
10165 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]	Consider need for vision cover minerals and waste sites and to further promote rail freight.
10080 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	No change.
8198 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	No change
9542 - Mr R Harris [8146]	No change.
7944 - Colin Mould [7809]	No change
8256 - R Barker [6805]	No change
8377 - M Harrold [7966]	Amend text as soon as the Water Cycle Study stage 2b is completed.
8704 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	No change
10647 - Ms Lucy Hall [8295]	No change.
8397 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]	No change
7991 - Michael Gotts [7844]	No change
10298 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	No change.
10800 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Consider reordering objectives
8441 - Dr Tim Rayner [8006]	No change
9559 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	No change.
9184 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	No change.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations***Action***

9339 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	No change
8938 - Miss Marguerite Finn	No change.
11040 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	Development of the strategy needs to made sure policy requirements are viable, and based on evidence.
8707 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	No change.
8734 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]	No change
10553 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	No change.
9907 - Christopher Webb [8019]	No change.
7957 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	No change
10335 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	No change.
9954 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Consider suggested amendments to wording of objectives.
9509 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	No change.
8584 - Mr M Read [8024]	No change.
8638 - The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]	Amend text of the vision to refer to waste management
10529 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	No change.
8327 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	
8444 - Ian Harris [8007]	No change
9284 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	No change.
8312 - Marion Amos [7919]	No change.
9347 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	No change
9894 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	No change.
9693 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	No change.
8043 - Shane Hull [7857]	No change
8350 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	No change.
8630 - Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030]	No change
8062 - Mr Terence George Stanford [7873]	No change
8338 - e buitenhuis [7951]	No change
9282 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	No change.
8462 - Mr C Skeels [8016]	No change
8694 - mrs jane fischl [8031]	No change.
10448 - Mr David Smith [8309]	No change.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations***Action***

9376 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	No change
9420 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	See Q28
10752 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048]	Amend policy 18 to ensure community infrastructure includes new Places of
10632 - Ms Jane Chittenden	No change.
8260 - Miss Claire Yaxley [7908]	No change
8288 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	Amend descriptions in the text regarding: a) which side of the A11 employment will be at Wymondham; and b) clearer definition of 'Wymondham/A11 corridor'.
10995 - Mrs S Plaw [8370]	No further change beyond current editing.
8173 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	No change
10815 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	No change to plan.
9860 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	No change.
9865 - Hill Residential [8215]	No change to plan
10867 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	
10878 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	
9265 - Mrs Gray [5927]	No change
8053 - Mrs Charlotte Wootten [7861]	
8078 - Mr S Buller [7879]	
8083 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	
8411 - Ed King [7965]	
9140 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]	
9755 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]	
10060 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232]	
10070 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	
10157 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	
10258 - The Theatres Trust (Ms 10358 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020])	No change.
7994 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	No change
8803 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	No change.
8605 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]	No change
8148 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	No change

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations

9213 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
 8560 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]
 9144 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
 9870 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]
 10044 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]
 8222 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

10010 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]
 8387 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]
 9923 - John Heaser [7015]
 9094 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
 9024 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535]
 8962 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]

8512 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]
 7985 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843]
 8082 - Mr S Buller [7879]
 8262 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]
 8536 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]
 8616 - Kay Eke [8025]
 8615 - Thorpe St Andrew Town Council (Mr Steven Ford) [8027]
 8617 - Thorpe St Andrew Town Council (Mr Steven Ford) [8027]
 8649 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
 8673 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
 9668 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
 8723 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]
 8768 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

8969 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
 9096 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
 9461 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
 9479 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]
 9536 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149]
 9585 - Mr Ashley Catton [8157]
 9594 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162]
 9717 - Ingleton Wood LLP (Nicole La Ronde) [8172]
 9820 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]
 9947 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd [8222]
 9987 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
 10021 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]
 10097 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]
 11109 - The Leeder Family [8390]

Action

No change to plan

Consider recommended amendment to the wording of vision concerning zero carbon development.

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations***Action***

10727 - Aylsham Town Council
 (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)
 [1776]
 11125 - Persimmon Homes
 (Anglia) [2373]
 10504 - Postwick with Witton
 Parish Council (A R Woods)
 [7215]
 11070 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie
 Carpenter) [7535]
 10758 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
 Elliott) [7666]
 10972 - Howard Birch Associates
 (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
 10393 - Acle Parish Council (Ms
 Pauline James) [8294]
 10425 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]
 10476 - Mr I T Smith [8310]
 10652 - Jim Smith (Mr Jim
 Smith) [8342]
 10658 - Mrs Lyn Robertson
 [8348]
 10924 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]

None

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations**Action****Q1 ACTIONS SUMMARY**

Decision on (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Consider amendments to objectives to reflect EA advice.

The objectives have now been amended to add more emphasis on previously-developed land and water resources. The infrastructure objective is now entitled transport infrastructure, while other aspects of infrastructure in e.g. health, education etc are incorporated throughout other objectives

Amend text as soon as the Water Cycle Study stage 2b is completed.

This refers to Aylsham and allocation is now propose subject to resolution of sewage treatment issues

Amend text in vision, objective 7 and strategic policy to refer to the need for investment in higher education, including UEA.

The UEA is referred to in the vision, and in the community policy

Consider greater emphasis on promotion of equality in vision.

The vision/ objectives have been redrafted, with a reference to equality

Amend descriptions in the text regarding:

- a) which side of the A11 employment will be at Wymondham; and
- b) clearer definition of 'Wymondham/A11 corridor'.

Objective 3 now refers to Wymondham/ Hethel, but the reference to a precise location would be inappropriate in a core strategy

Ensure in editing, that the strategy succinctly and directly identifies what sort of place Norwich will be in the future, rather than being led by infrastructure proposals.

The vision has been redrafted

Consider suggested amendments to vision.

The representation, from NNTAG, sought a number of amendments, many shifting the focus of the transport strategy. The vision and objectives still retain references to the transport strategy as proposed, but some amendments have been made as suggested by NNTAG, particularly in reference to information and communications technology

See Q28

Not applicable – see question 28

Ensure revised policies is clear about the strategic criteria to be used in deciding how and where new homes on smaller sites will be determined.

The representation sought clarity between the differing approaches to key service centres in the Norwich policy area and outside it. The policy now clarifies while lower allocations are proposed at Hingham, Brundall and Blofield, than in other key service centres

Spatial Portrait, para. 4.2 'Natural Environment, landscape and diversity'. Amend to include a brief outline of the region's rich geodiversity, correcting the way in which 'geology' is referred to . Add 'Geodiversity' to the title.

Geodiversity is referred to in the supporting text to the policy on environmental assets

Objective 8: revise next to last sentence to read "Biodiversity, geodiversity and locally ..."

Geodiversity is referred to in the supporting text to the policy on environmental assets, although not the text of the objective

To consider the ordering of objectives, possibly as a sequential approach to sustainable communities in greater Norwich.

Some reordering has taken place, with the objective relating to the environmental concerns first

Consider reordering objectives

Some reordering has taken place, with the objective relating to the environmental concerns first

To develop and update section on delivery.

Following further work on infrastructure needs and funding by EDAW completed in 2009, an implementation framework has been added itemizing the key elements of infrastructure needed. In July 2009, the government published draft proposals for a Community Infrastructure Levy. The implications of this are that, if any CIL is to be charged, separate charging schedules will need to be submitted for consideration at an independent examination, following a period of consultation

Amend policy 18 to ensure community infrastructure includes new Places of Worship.

A reference has been added in the communities policy

Ensure importance of high quality design is emphasised more fully in the vision and throughout the plan.

There has been considerable strengthening of the design and quality content in the policies for the proposed pre-submission version

Consider amendments to vision and objectives to give gretaer focus on what type of place the plan seeks to

create/enhance.

There's been considerable redrafting of the spatial portrait, vision and objectives

Consider general rewording re Broads and greater emphasis on environmental protection

The policy on the broads has been expanded and strengthened

Consider adding further wording in vision re promoting agriculture

There are references to the significance of agriculture in the spatial portrait and objectives, and a reference to a proposed food and farming hub in the supporting text into the economy policy

Ensure revised policy reinforces services in smaller settlements, and peoples' access to them.

Following the technical consultation, and subject to the outcome of the public consultation, considerable work was undertaken to reexamine the role and function of villages based upon updated information on village services. The revised policies in the proposed pre-submission version reflect this work

Consider incorporating specific wording amendments to vision re support and growth of agricultural sector.

There are references to the significance of agriculture in the spatial portrait and objectives, and a reference to a proposed food and farming hub in the supporting text to the economy policy

See response to policy 5.

see policy five

Consider need for vision cover minerals and waste sites and to further promote rail freight.

Minerals are referred to in the objectives and environment policy. Waste has been considered as part of the infrastructure needs and funding work, although it has been concluded that significant investment will not be needed. The need for recycling facilities to be expanded at Wymondham and incorporated into the Old Cutton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle have been added. Rail freight facilities are referred to in the transport policy, though not blanket protection.

Ensure the vision, objectives and relevant policies are specific about the needs of an ageing population. Ensure the implementation plan is also specific about these needs.

The specific reference to housing with a care has been added to the housing policy

Amend text of the vision to refer to waste management.

A reference to good waste management practices is included in the vision

Consider amendments to take account of GO East comments on:

1. Content of portrait

There has been more emphasis on description of local character

2. Links to other plans

Considerably expanded reference to other related strategies has been added

3. Links between carbon reduction and 4. transport and strengthening of economic vision

clearer reference to eco town potential

reduce detail of vision eg on rural areas

The environmental protection and climate change policy includes reference to carbon reduction, and more explicit references to the eco proposal

4. Reference to ecotown potential

There is more explicit reference to the eco proposal

5. Avoiding repetition

Spatial portraits and vision and objectives have been redrafted

6. Ordering of objectives

The objectives have been ordered, not in importance, but to match the ordering of the policy content of the plan

(Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Representations

Action

Development of the strategy needs to make sure policy requirements are viable, and based on evidence.
The strategy has had regard to evidence, including the assessment of infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW and completed in 2009. It must also however have regard to the views of the residents of the area as expressed through consultation

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Representations***Action******6. Spatial Strategy (Q2)******(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?***

9637 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Consider delivery vehicle to ensure implementation of the plan.
8628 - University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]	No change to plan
10381 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Consider including BRT in list of critical infrastructure
9669 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	No change to plan
10246 - Mrs Angela Garner [8258]	No change to plan
8871 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	No change to plan
9471 - Louisa Young [8135]	Ensure plan gives greater emphasis to health facilities.
9743 - Great Yarmouth Borough Council (Mr David Glason) [6974]	No change to plan
9655 - Ms E Riches [8165]	No change to plan
8708 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	No change to plan
9087 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	No change to plan
11098 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	Ensure plan takes account of the findings of the Water Cycle Study and transport requirements are set out in NATS.
10907 - Allied London Properties [8367]	
10701 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Include more detail on water infrastructure requirements reflecting the findings of the Water Cycle Study.
8109 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	No change to plan
10601 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	No change to plan
9342 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	No change to plan
8328 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	Ensure the issues of water efficiency and sewerage are covered in more detail.
9543 - Mr R Harris [8146]	No change to plan.
10264 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068]	No change to plan
8054 - Mrs Charlotte Wootten [7861]	
8137 - Mr Alan Fairweather [7889]	
8454 - Mr Peter Sergeant [7993]	
8832 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	
9480 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]	No change to plan
9694 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	No change to plan
8893 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change to plan

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Representations***Action***

10728 - Aylsham Town Council
(Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)
[1776]
8561 - Bressingham & Fersfield
Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer)
[1976]
9145 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish
Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
9871 - Swardeston Parish Council
(Carole Jowett) [2058]
11126 - Persimmon Homes
(Anglia) [2373]
10045 - Persimmon Homes
(Anglia) [2373]
8223 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

No change to plan

10210 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

8804 - Marlingford & Colton
Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)
[6869]
10011 - notcutts Limited (Mrs
Erica McDonald) [6911]
8388 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]
9095 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
10505 - Postwick with Witton
Parish Council (A R Woods)
[7215]
8963 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]

8264 - Rockland St Mary and
Hellington Parish Council (Mr
Dennis Passingham) [7912]
8412 - Ed King [7965]
8379 - M Harrold [7966]
8422 - M Harrold [7966]
8463 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
8537 - Mrs Patricia Robertson
[8021]
8724 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]
8970 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9097 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9141 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner
[8112]
9421 - Swannington with Alderford
& Little Witchingham Parish
Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9595 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
[8162]
10973 - Howard Birch Associates
(Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
9756 - Damien van Carrapiett
[8184]
9821 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]
9988 - The Bunwell Partnership
(Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
10022 - The London Planning
Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)
[8230]
10098 - Kimberley and Carleton
Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane
Fraser) [8239]
10173 - Commercial Land [8246]
10843 - Norwich Green Party (Mr
Stephen Little) [8018]

Ensure the findings of the Water Cycle Study inform the plan.

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Representations***Action***

9260 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	No change to plan
8513 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	No change to plan
9504 - South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142]	No change to plan.
8639 - The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]	Consider the need for reference to waste management in this plan.
10071 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10879 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Consider including reference to rail halts, tram train potential and inner link road
10166 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]	Consider including the long term protection an enhancement of the area's intermodal materials handling facilities through the plan.
9028 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] 9924 - John Heaser [7015] 8631 - Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030]	No change to plan
8650 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8674 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	
9895 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	No change to plan
10554 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	No change to plan
9283 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] 9912 - Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] 10759 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah	Include greater emphasis on hospital/healthcare facilities, taking account of the findings of the EDAAW study.
10785 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] 10801 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Ensure the plan promotes broadband improvements.
10816 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	No change to plan
9226 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 7958 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 7923 - mr paul newson [7812] 8056 - Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870] 8063 - Mr Terence George Stanford [7873] 8199 - Mr P Anderson [7901] 8313 - Marion Amos [7919] 8958 - MR Richard Edwards [7925] 8339 - e buitenhuis [7951] 8442 - Dr Tim Rayner [8006] 9908 - Christopher Webb [8019] 8697 - mrs jane fischl [8031] 8939 - Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] 8947 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	No change to plan
9185 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] 9322 - Ms Celia Viner [8123] 9377 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Representations***Action***

9214 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8351 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 8868 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] 9075 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	No change to plan
8585 - Mr M Read [8024]	No change to plan
10577 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	See question 28
10648 - Ms Lucy Hall [8295] 10659 - Mrs Lyn Robertson	No change to plan
8398 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978] 10449 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10477 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	No change to plan
9955 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Consider clearer reference to water requirements.
9537 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149]	Ensure issue of infrastructure requirements from small scale development is addressed.
10530 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	No change to plan
8257 - R Barker [6805]	No change to plan
10311 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Incorporate findings of Water Cycle Study in the plan.
11082 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	See response to transport policy
9349 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	No change to plan.
8149 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 9511 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140] 9286 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	No change to plan
9720 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	No change to plan.
7946 - Colin Mould [7809] 7986 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843] 8079 - Mr S Buller [7879] 8263 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8289 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915] 8487 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] 9462 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134] 10123 - Mr David Nichols [8242]	No change to plan
8902 - Old Catton Parish Council (Mrs S Barber) [1816] 9561 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	No change to plan
8445 - Ian Harris [8007]	No change to plan
11141 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	Take account of view that growth at Long Stratton would make the strategy
10633 - Ms Jane Chittenden	No change to plan
8261 - Miss Claire Yaxley [7908]	No change to plan

(Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Representations***Action***

8619 - Kay Eke [8025]	No change to plan
8174 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 7992 - Michael Gotts [7844] 7995 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851] 8065 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875]	
11041 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	No change to plan.
9789 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	No change to plan
8084 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	Ensure plan includes an infrastructure policy to cover drainage.
10359 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	No change to plan
8769 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	No change to plan
11110 - The Leeder Family [8390]	No change to plan.

Q2 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

Ensure the issues of water efficiency and sewerage are covered in more detail.

Water efficiency is included in the design policy in relation to the standards expected a new development. Sewerage is taken into account in the infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW and which has fed into the implementation framework

Incorporate findings of Water Cycle Study in the plan.

Taken into account in the infrastructure needs and funding study and the implementation framework

Consider including the long term protection an enhancement of the area's intermodal materials handling facilities through the plan.

The transport policy includes support for rail freight facilities, but not blanket protection

Consider including BRT in list of critical infrastructure.

BRT is included in the growth strategy for the Norwich policy area, though it cannot be treated as critical infrastructure

Include greater emphasis on hospital/healthcare facilities, taking account of the findings of the EDAW study.

There are various references to health facilities/services, for example in the communities policy, and the need for additional facilities has been taken into account in the infrastructure needs and funding work which has fed into the implementation framework in one of the appendices to the pre-submission version

Consider including reference to rail halts, tram train potential and inner link road.

Rail halts are referred to in the growth strategy for the Norwich policy area, tram train in the supporting text to the transport policy. there are no specific reference to an inner link road, but there are references to cycle and bus links from the growth triangle to the Broadland business park

Ensure plan gives greater emphasis to health facilities.

There are various references to health facilities/services, for example in the communities policy, and the need for additional facilities has been taken into account in the infrastructure needs and funding work which has fed into the implementation framework in one of the appendices to the pre-submission version

Ensure the findings of the Water Cycle Study inform the plan.

The findings of the water cycle study have been taken into account in the infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken the EDAW which has faded into the implementation framework

Ensure plan takes account of the findings of the Water Cycle Study and transport requirements are set out in NATS.

The findings of the water cycle study have been taken into account in the infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken the EDAW which has faded into the implementation framework. References to the Norwich area transportation strategy are now more prominent. Work on the development of the NATS implementation strategy is proceeding in tandem with the JCS

Consider the need for reference to waste management in this plan.

The implementation framework is based on updated infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW and completed in 2009. it concludes that major investment in waste infrastructure is not needed specifically for the JCS, but that additional recycling facilities will be needed at Wymondham and Rackheath. These are referred to in the supporting text/policy on locations for major growth in the Norwich policy area

Consider clearer reference to water requirements.

There has been considerable strengthening of the policy content relating to sustainable building standards, and to the water environment in the environmental assets policy

Ensure issue of infrastructure requirements from small scale development is addressed.

The infrastructure needed and funding study undertaken by EDAW in 2009, and which has fed into the implementation framework took account of the total anticipated level of growth, and included an allowance for windfalls

Include more detail on water infrastructure requirements reflecting the findings of the Water Cycle Study.

The infrastructure needs and funding study took into account the emerging findings from the water cycle study and these are incorporated in the implementation framework

Take account of view that growth at Long Stratton would make the strategy unsound.

There has been considerable further consideration of the strategy to accommodate major growth in the Norwich policy area. Long Stratton is still included in this, primarily in relation to local issues

See response to transport policy.

See question relating to transport policy

Ensure plan includes an infrastructure policy to cover drainage.

The implementation framework covers drainage issues. There are references to sustainable drainage in the environmental assets policy and in policies concerning the major growth locations

Consider delivery vehicle to ensure implementation of the plan.

The GNDP is the nominated delivery vehicle. However, in July, 2009, the Government published draft proposals for Community Infrastructure Levy. If implemented as proposed, this would necessitate the preparation of a charging schedule which would need to be subject to public consultation and independent examination before it could be adopted, if the GNDP partners decided to go down the CIL route

Ensure the plan promotes broadband improvements.

Included in the transport/communications policy That enhances:Cashman like

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

Representations***Action******7.Policies for Places (Q3 - Q20)******(Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?***

9638 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	None
8759 - Ms Sarah Smith [8059]	None
10689 - M Elliott [5264]	None.
9981 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	None
10145 - R Smith [8243]	None.
9909 - Christopher Webb [8019]	None
8918 - Old Catton Parish Council (Mrs S Barber) [1816]	Pass rep to BDC
11026 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	None.
7959 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	None
10299 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	None.
7980 - mr Daniel Yellop [7836]	None
8873 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	None
10713 - Ms S Layton [8354]	
11061 - Norfolk Association of Architects (Mr Michael Innes) [8378]	None.
10312 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	None.
10531 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	None.
9989 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]	None.
10099 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	None.
9350 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	None
9228 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	None
7870 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	None
7869 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	
8315 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922]	None
8586 - Mr M Read [8024]	
8894 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	None
9285 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	
10082 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Action</i>
8150 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	None
10236 - Mrs M/M Craven/Whattam [8256]	None.
10844 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	
8620 - Kay Eke [8025]	None
9853 - Mr Paul Johnson [8207]	None
9695 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	None
8706 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	None
9186 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	None
8434 - Helen Baczkowska [8000]	None
9790 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	None
8763 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	None
8200 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	None
9757 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]	
10427 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	
10450 - Mr David Smith [8309]	None.
10635 - Mr Alfred Townly [7878]	None.
9029 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	None
7947 - Colin Mould [7809]	None
8138 - Mr Alan Fairweather [7889]	
8874 - mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	
8940 - Miss Marguerite Finn [8087]	
9012 - Mr KD White [8097]	
10997 - Mrs S Plaw [8370]	None.
9753 - MRS JENNIFER HALL [8180]	None
8446 - Ian Harris [8007]	None
10637 - Mr Alfred Townly [7878]	None.
8993 - Mrs J Leggett [5263]	None
8329 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	None
9896 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	None
10337 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	None
10478 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

Representations***Action***

11083 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	None.
8675 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	None
10817 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	None.
9562 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	None
9505 - South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142]	None
9379 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	None
8488 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	None
8651 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]	None
8930 - Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079]	None
8994 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093]	Pass reps to BDC
9001 - Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094]	
9005 - Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095]	
9009 - Mr Philip Smith [8096]	
9016 - Mr Robert Hall [8098]	
9913 - Miss Lynda Edwards [6780]	None
10555 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	
7993 - Michael Gotts [7844]	None
9289 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	
9348 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	
9323 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

Representations***Action***

10046 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 9861 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	None
10211 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	
9956 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] 9925 - John Heaser [7015] 10506 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] 10066 - The Greetham Trustees [7606] 9822 - Ms Karen Drane [8198] 10255 - WM Morrison Supermarkets plc [8212] 9866 - Hill Residential [8215] 9948 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd [8222] 10023 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 10061 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] 10072 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] 10124 - Mr David Nichols [8242] 10158 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] 10174 - Commercial Land [8246]	
10395 - Acle Parish Council (Ms 10729 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] 10360 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] 9872 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] 11127 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] 11142 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] 10753 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048] 11071 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] 10760 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 10660 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] 10786 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] 10868 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] 10880 - Broadland Land Trust [8366] 10926 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368] 10950 - Mr William E Cooper [8369]	None

(Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

Representations***Action***

9215 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	None
8562 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]	
9147 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]	
8224 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	
8175 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	
8805 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]	
8352 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	
8389 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]	
9098 - Mr John Osborne [7111]	
8514 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	
7987 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843]	
7996 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	
8066 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875]	
8080 - Mr S Buller [7879]	
8105 - Mr S Buller [7879]	
8085 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	
8110 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	
8265 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]	
8290 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	
8413 - Ed King [7965]	
8423 - M Harrold [7966]	
8380 - Mr M Buckingham [7968]	
8437 - J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003]	
8464 - Mr C Skeels [8016]	
8538 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]	
9670 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	
8725 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]	
8833 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	
8971 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]	
9020 - Mr and Mrs Peter Tann [8099]	
9099 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]	
9142 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]	
9422 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	
10974 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	None.
11042 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	None
9918 - stephen eastwood [7962]	None.
10012 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]	None
9447 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	

Q3 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

Pass reps to BDC
Not applicable to joint core strategy

Page 19 of 129

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations***Action******(Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?***

10146 - R Smith [8243]	Rephrase policy 2 to avoid inconsistency, indicating that the total new allocations to be found are expressed as a minimum. [RB]
8081 - Mr S Buller [7879]	No change needed
8876 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	No change needed
7981 - mr Daniel Yellop [7836]	No change needed
8322 - Mr Geoffrey Loades	No change needed, though take account of the outcome of the further work by EDAW in defining the development strategy for the submission document
10309 - Wintersgill LLP (Mr Matthew Wintersgill) [8289]	Include in the culture and communities policy support for concept/conference facilities in the city centre, through the adaptation of St Andrews/Blackfriars Halls
10382 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	In policy 2, or supporting text, give indicative scale of development at each strategic employment location and brief description of type of activity envisaged
	Include employment allocation at Rackheath, and suggest scale of 30 hectares, rather than 50 hectares for Airport business park development [RB]
7911 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	Strengthen the policies on design to recognise the importance of the quality of development.
10406 - Easton College [3570]	Add a bullet point to policy 2 along the lines suggested, but with a caveat that resultant initiatives should not undermine mainstream locations for employment and retail provision. [RB]
10413 - Honingham Thorpe Farms Limited [8296]	
10300 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	Review and strengthen the policies on design to give more emphasis to the quality of new development
	Reconsider the way transport priorities are expressed to emphasise the linkages between road schemes and public transport schemes
	Reexamine policies on social cohesion and community building to strengthen these
8782 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	No change needed
10608 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	No change needed [RB]
8875 - mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	No change needed
10067 - The Greetham Trustees [7606]	Add to policy 2 a note that allocations to deliver the smaller sites allowance will be in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and local planning considerations.
9639 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Consider the detailed references to "innovative rail services" and include more specific implementation proposals in the light of further work undertaken by EDAW into the infrastructure needs and funding options of the plan.
8401 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]	Acknowledge the impact of the recession and possible delay in levels of retail growth, but no substantial shift in the pattern of spatial development proposed.
8719 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	
9076 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	
10714 - Ms S Layton [8354]	No change needed, other than greater emphasis on the design in the submission of document, including specific policy requirements.
	[RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations**Action**

9914 - Miss Lynda Edwards [6780]	No change needed, other than greater emphasis on the design in the submission of document, including specific policy requirements.
10313 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	
10692 - Mrs Jacalyn Collins [7797]	
10083 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	
10451 - Mr David Smith [8309]	
10479 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	
9922 - Ms Pat Brent [8065]	Strengthen the plan's content by adding policies on design and climate change.
	Reconsider the potential scale of new retail provision, taking a cautious view, but including provision for review as the plan is monitored
	Include implementation strategy, and invite relevant service providers to commit to supporting it [RB]
9353 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	No change needed, other than greater emphasis on the design in the submission of document, including specific policy requirements.
9722 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	
9758 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]	No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen the policies dealing with the design of new development, and environmental protection. [RB]
9897 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	
8390 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]	No change needed
8381 - M Harrold [7966]	
9380 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	
9513 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	No change needed
10845 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Strengthen design policy, and introduce new policies on local renewable energy, and climate change. [RB]
9292 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	Strengthen the cultural policy (policy 18) and incorporate the findings of the concert hall/conference venue study, both in terms of the venue itself and creating the environment likely to support it.
11143 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	see the relevant representations [RB]
10125 - Mr David Nichols [8242]	
10579 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	
10787 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Claburn) [8360]	
10802 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	
10100 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	No change needed [RB]
10761 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	No change [RB]/
8489 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	No change needed
8139 - Mr Alan Fairweather [7889]	Reexamine the vision to see if it can be more clearly articulated, but exercise extreme caution to ensure this still ties in with the visions of the L. S. P's
8587 - Mr M Read [8024]	No change needed
10073 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	Redraft policy 2 to be clear that allocations are a minimum, and that the growth triangle will continue developing after 2026, reaching a total of around 10,000 dwellings [RB]
10881 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	
9791 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	No change needed
9472 - Louisa Young [8135]	
9754 - MRS JENNIFER HALL [8180]	

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations**Action**

9229 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 9563 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] 7960 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 7961 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 8806 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] 7871 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	No change needed in relation to the overall scale of development, but re-examine the policies for development in service villages and "other villages" to see if it can be made more responsive to the circumstances of particular villages while still giving a clear overall strategy, and not undermining the fundamental strategy of focusing development where services exist
7925 - mr paul newson [7812] 7997 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851] 8055 - timothy watson [7866] 8086 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	
8111 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	
8959 - MR Richard Edwards [7925] 8406 - paul eldridge [7987] 8621 - Kay Eke [8025] 8699 - mrs jane fischl [8031] 8652 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8676 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] 8931 - Miss Rachel Buckenham 8709 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Reconsider how housing numbers are presented, perhaps using a single comprehensive table and more extensive cross references to it.
10818 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10869 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	No change needed [RB]
8896 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change needed
9957 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] 11084 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	Include a specific employment allocation at Rackheath to complement the development proposed there. Include a reference to parking policies designed to discourage long stay commuting into the city centre, in the policy on access and transportation. [RB]
9030 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change needed
10602 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	no change needed [RB]
8949 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	
10237 - Mrs M/M Craven/Whattam [8256]	No change needed
8201 - Mr P Anderson [7901] 8314 - Marion Amos [7919] 8316 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922] some parts of the area. Similarly, the submission plan should seek to be clearer	The scale of development is largely fixed and cannot be changed, but the spatial portrait and vision should be re-examine to see if they can acknowledge that the scale of development proposed will inevitably result in changes to the character of about the inter relationships between road schemes, particularly the NDR, and public transport priorities.
8447 - Ian Harris [8007] 8771 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] 8356 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	no change needed
9324 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	No change (RD)
10338 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	No change needed [RB]
9287 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]	No change needed

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

8340 - e buitenhuis [7951]
8633 - Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030]

9187 - Widen the Choice Rural
Transport Partnership (Mr Chris

9216 - Stratton Strawless Parish
Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
8563 - Bressingham & Fersfield
Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer)
[1976]

9148 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish
Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
8225 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

8176 - Mr Roger F. Weeks
MRICS [4796]

8355 - Alyson Lowe [6992]
9100 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
9351 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
8425 - Norfolk County Football
Association Ltd (Mr Gavin
Lemmon) [7771]

7948 - Colin Mould [7809]
8515 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]

7988 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843]
8106 - Mr S Buller [7879]

8151 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]

8266 - Rockland St Mary and
Hellington Parish Council (Mr
Dennis Passingham) [7912]

8292 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]

8414 - Ed King [7965]
8465 - Mr C Skeels [8016]

8539 - Mrs Patricia Robertson
[8021]

9671 - Wroxham Parish Council
(Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]

8726 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]

8834 - Mr John Nelson [8064]

8972 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]

9143 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner
[8112]

9506 - South Norfolk Council
(Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr
Trevor Lewis) [8142]

9873 - Swardeston Parish Council
(Carole Jowett) [2058]

Action

Review and strengthen the policies on design to give more emphasis to the quality of new development

Reconsider the way transport priorities are expressed to emphasise the linkages between road schemes and public transport schemes

Reexamine policies on social cohesion and community building to strengthen these

no change [RB]

No change needed

Review policies for service villages, other villages and the countryside to avoid undue rigidity and reconsider which villages are most appropriate in each tier, but still based on the existence of a range of services, and sustainable access.

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations***Action***

10730 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	no change needed
10361 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	
11128 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	
10047 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	
11043 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	
9926 - John Heaser [7015]	
11027 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	
10507 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]	
9448 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	
10975 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	
9771 - Mr Michael Whalley [8189]	
9823 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	
9990 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]	
10024 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]	
10159 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	
10175 - Commercial Land [8246]	
10396 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294]	
10428 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	
10610 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	
10212 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	No change [RB]
11112 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Reconsider how housing numbers are presented, perhaps using a single comprehensive table and more extensive cross references to it.
11072 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535]	Rephrase policy 2 to ensure consistency and that allocations represent a minimum
10062 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232]	Make clear that business park at the airport could accommodate uses benefiting from an airport - related location, but that genuinely airport related uses may have a
9423 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	no change needed
9101 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]	no change needed [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Action

Q4 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Review and strengthen the policies on design to give more emphasis to the quality of new development
Policy content and design and quality has been greatly strengthened.

Reconsider the way transport priorities are expressed to emphasise the linkages between road schemes and public transport schemes.
Redrafting of the transport policies has given a greater emphasis to NATS as the context for the NDR and has also strengthened references to the connection between NDR and creating conditions for improved public transport

Reexamine policies on social cohesion and community building to strengthen these.
Policy on communities and culture has been considerably strengthened

Redraft policy 2 to be clear that allocations are a minimum, and that the growth triangle will continue developing after 2026, reaching a total of around 10,000 dwellings [RB]
The policy for the development strategy in the Norwich policy area has clarified these issues. The policy on the individual growth locations within the NPA also clarifies the eventual size of the triangle

In policy 2, or supporting text, give indicative scale of development at each strategic employment location and brief description of type of activity envisaged.
This has been added to the policy for the development strategy and the Norwich policy area

Include employment allocation at Rackheath, and suggest scale of 30 hectares, rather than 50 hectares for Airport business park development [RB]
Included, and Airport allocation adjusted

Rephrase policy 2 to avoid inconsistency, indicating that the total new allocations to be found are expressed as a minimum. [RB]
Clarified

Strengthen design policy, and introduce new policies on local renewable energy, and climate change. [RB]
New policies added, based on evidence from the PPS 1 study

No change needed in relation to the overall scale of development, but re-examine the policies for development in service villages and "other villages" to see if it can be made more responsive to the circumstances of particular villages while still giving a clear overall strategy, and not undermining the fundamental strategy of focusing development where services exist.
Following a review of the settlement hierarchy, in light of consultation responses at the technical consultation stage, and subject to public consultation outcome, the policies for service villages and other villages have been redrafted, based on the form, character and function of the respective villages, and taking into account updated evidence on facilities in each village. The policies for these levels of the hierarchy have also been redrafted to add a degree of flexibility to permit account to be taken of local circumstances

Reexamine the vision to see if it can be more clearly articulated, but exercise extreme caution to ensure this still ties in with the visions of the L. S. P's
Some redrafting has taken place, and continued engagement with local strategic partnerships should ensure continued support from them

Review policies for service villages, other villages and the countryside to avoid undue rigidity and reconsider which villages are most appropriate in each tier, but still based on the existence of a range of services, and sustainable access.
Following a review of the settlement hierarchy, in light of consultation responses at the technical consultation stage, and subject to public consultation outcome, the policies for service villages and other villages have been redrafted, based on the form, character and function of the respective villages, and taking into account updated evidence on facilities in each village. The policies for these levels of the hierarchy have also been redrafted to add a degree of flexibility to permit account to be taken of local circumstances

Add a bullet point to policy 2 along the lines suggested, but with a caveat that resultant initiatives should not undermine mainstream locations for employment and retail provision. [RB]
A reference to a potential food and farming hub has been added to the economy policy. References to Easton College are included in the community development policy and the supporting text to the transport policy

No change needed, though take account of the outcome of the further work by EDAW in defining the development strategy for the submission document
Further work undertaken by EDAW on infrastructure needs and funding has been incorporated in the implementation framework in an appendix to the pre-submission version

Reconsider how housing numbers are presented, perhaps using a single comprehensive table and more extensive cross

references to it.

The table has been clarified and references and throughout the document have been checked

Strengthen the cultural policy (policy 18) and incorporate the findings of the concert hall/conference venue study, both in terms of the venue itself and creating the environment likely to support it.

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

Consider the detailed references to "innovative rail services" and include more specific implementation proposals in the light of further work undertaken by EDAW into the infrastructure needs and funding options of the plan.

Following discussion with rail interests and the promoters of the eco proposal at Rackheath, there has been a reference to tram train as a possibility in the supporting text to the transport policy

No change needed, other than greater emphasis on the design in the submission of document, including specific policy requirements.

The policy content relating to design has been considerable strengthened, with a new policy relating to design of buildings and one relating to climate change

Strengthen the policies on design to recognise the importance of the quality of development.

The policy content relating to design has been considerable strengthened, with a new policy relating to design of buildings and one relating to climate change

No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen the policies dealing with the design of new development, and environmental protection. [RB]

The policy content relating to design has been considerable strengthened, with a new policy relating to design of buildings and one relating to climate change

Acknowledge the impact of the recession and possible delay in levels of retail growth, but no substantial shift in the pattern of spatial development proposed.

In the light of the current recession, there has been a reduction in the proposed comparison goods floorspace, compared with the retail and town centres evidence study, with a proposal for 20,000 square metres up to 2016 in the city center policy/supporting text, and an early review thereafter to take account of economic circumstances prevailing at that time

Page 25 of 129

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Action

Rephrase policy 2 to ensure consistency and that allocations represent a minimum

The policy dealing with the strategy for growth in the Norwich policy area has been amended

Make clear that business park at the airport could accommodate uses benefiting from an airport - related location, but that genuinely airport related uses may have a need to be accommodated in addition [RB]

The policy dealing with the strategy for growth in the Norwich policy area and the supporting text have been amended

Add to policy 2 a note that allocations to deliver the smaller sites allowance will be in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and local planning considerations. [RB]

A note to this effect has been added

Include in the culture and communities policy support for concept/conference facilities in the city centre, through the adaptation of St Andrews/Blackfriars Halls [RB]

The reference has been added to the city centre policy/supporting text

Strengthen the plan's content by adding policies on design and climate change.

Policies dealing with the design of new development and climate change have been added

Reconsider the potential scale of new retail provision, taking a cautious view, but including provision for review as the plan is Monitored

In the light of the current recession, there has been a reduction in the proposed comparison goods floorspace, compared with the retail and town centres evidence study, with a proposal for 20,000 square metres up to 2016 in the city center policy/supporting text, and an early review thereafter to take account of economic circumstances prevailing at that time

Include implementation strategy, and invite relevant service providers to commit to supporting it [RB]

An implementation of framework has been added, based on the infrastructure needs and funding work completed by EDAW in 2009. As part of the pre-submission process, infrastructure providers could be asked to confirm their support for this

The scale of development is largely fixed and cannot be changed, but the spatial portrait and vision should be re-examine to see if they can acknowledge that the scale of development proposed will inevitably result in changes to the character of some parts of the area. Similarly, the submission plan should seek to be clearer about the inter relationships between road schemes, particularly the NDR, and public transport priorities.

There has been some redrafting of the spatial portrait and vision, though it has not emphasized the inevitable changes to the character of parts of the area. The relationship between the NDR, and the Norwich area transportation strategy of which it is a part have been strengthened, as have the connections between the NDR and improvements to public transport which it is intended to facilitate. However, there has been a new section added, entitled "Our Strategy", which more explicitly acknowledges the challenges and impacts inherent in dealing with growth on this scale.

Include a specific employment allocation at Rackheath to complement the development proposed there.

An allocation of 25 hectares has been included in the policy on the spatial strategy for the Norwich policy area

Include a reference to parking policies **designed to discourage long stay commuting into the city centre**, in the policy on access and transportation. [RB]

There is a reference to parking restraint in areas of good public transport accessibility in the policy dealing with the strategy for the Norwich policy area, but not specifically related to the discouragement of long stay commuting

see the relevant representations [RB]

This is a cross reference to representations submitted under other questions

Rephrase policy 2 to avoid inconsistency, indicating that the total new allocations to be found are expressed as a minimum. [RB]

The policy dealing with spatial strategy for Norwich policy area has been amended as suggested

No change needed in relation to the overall scale of development, but re-examine the policies for development in service villages and "other villages" to see if it can be made more responsive to the circumstances of particular villages while still giving a clear overall strategy, and not undermining the fundamental strategy of focusing development where services exist [RB]

Following a review of the settlement hierarchy, in light of the response to technical consultation, and subject to the outcome of public consultation, there has been a reappraisal of service villages and other villages based on their form, character, function, accessibility and an updated audit of village services. The policies on service villages and other villages in the proposed pre-submission version reflect this and have also been redrafted to add some flexibility at these levels in the hierarchy to permit account to be taken of the local circumstances

Strengthen the policies on design to recognise the importance of the quality of development.

New policy added

No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen the policies dealing with the design of new development, and environmental protection. [RB]

New policies on climate change and design of new development added

Page 26 of 129

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations

Action

No change needed, though take account of the outcome of the further work by EDAW in defining the development strategy for the submission document
[RB]

New work on infrastructure needs and funding has been undertaken by EDAW and has been used in the development of an implementation framework in an appendix to the pre-submission version.

Action: Review policies for service villages, other villages and the countryside to avoid undue rigidity and reconsider which villages are most appropriate in each tier, but still based on the existence of a range of services, and sustainable access.
[RB]

Following a review of the settlement hierarchy, in light of the response to technical consultation, and subject to the outcome of public consultation, there has been a reappraisal of service villages and other villages based on their form, character, function, accessibility and an updated audit of village services. The policies on service villages and other villages in the proposed pre-submission version reflect this and have also been redrafted to add some flexibility at these levels in the hierarchy to permit account to be taken of the local circumstances

The study of the local economy and sites and premises undertaken by Arup and Oxford Economics specifically suggests some additional office space in the city centre. Anecdotally one of the difficulties of the local economy is the lack of high quality city centre office space available. National planning policy sees centres as an appropriate location for such uses.

A considerable amount of development recently has taken place at high densities, particularly in the city centre. Much of this has taken the form of apartments, and there is a real concern that this sector of the market is becoming saturated. Meeting of the needs of people will mean that much of the development cannot take place at such densities, although it is expected that the major new developments proposed should seek to use land as economically as practical, in part to save greenfield land, but also to enable neighbourhoods to offer residents facilities in walking and cycling distance.

[RB]

No change to the JCS needed as a consequence of this comment

Reexamine policies on social cohesion and community building to strengthen these. [RB]

Policy content concerning communities considerably strengthened

See the relevant representations [RB]

This is a cross reference to representations submitted in response to other questions

Page 27 of 129

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Representations***Action***

(Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? R.D. advice

8877 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	Not applicable [RB]
8879 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	
11099 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	No change [RB]
10908 - Allied London Properties [8367]	
10013 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]	No change [RB]
9640 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	no change needed [RB]
7912 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	Increase illustrative material in the final document including illustrations of walking and cycling networks [RB]
8068 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875]	Clarify the education arrangements to deal with growth in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area [RB]
8152 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	
9146 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	
11044 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	No change needed directly in response to these representations, but consider an allocation of 300 dwellings at Aylsham subject to the resolution of sewage treatment problems, and confirm the status of Trowse as a fringe parish [RB]
11144 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	
10074 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	
10160 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	
10870 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	
10882 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	
9514 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	no change needed [RB]
10819 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	no change needed [RB]
9188 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	No change needed [RB]
9031 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change needed [RB]
8677 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	No change needed [RB]
8835 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	No change needed [RB]
10636 - Mr Alfred Townly [7878]	No change needed [RB]
10452 - Mr David Smith [8309]	
10480 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	
10557 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	
10101 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	No change needed [RB]
8808 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	No change needed [RB]
9294 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations**Action**

10788 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] 10803 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	No change [RB]
8202 - Mr P Anderson [7901] 8330 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	No change needed [RB]
8898 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] 9288 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]	No change needed [RB]
9564 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] 7927 - mr paul newson [7812] 7926 - mr paul newson [7812] 8490 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] 8588 - Mr M Read [8024] 8622 - Kay Eke [8025] 9262 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] 9381 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124] 9546 - Mr R Harris [8146] 9723 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] 8354 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	No change needed [RB]
10846 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Please see response to Norwich Green Party's representation on question 4
11085 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	No change [RB]
9898 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	No change [RB]
9915 - Miss Lynda Edwards	
9268 - Mrs Gray [5927] 8720 - Ms K Dunn [8045] 8932 - Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079] 9325 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	No change to the scale of development, but clarify secondary education arrangements [RB]
8317 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922]	No change needed [RB]
8653 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 9958 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] 9792 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] 9759 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184] 10084 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10533 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Not applicable [RB]
10603 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	No change [RB]
9778 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974] 10339 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	No change [RB]
10301 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	No change needed [RB]
10213 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	Opposition noted - see respondent's other submissions [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations

Action

10314 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	No change [RB]
9697 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] 7962 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	No change needed [RB]
8325 - Mr Geoffrey Loades	No change needed, other than excluding the discarded options from the final document, but consider how to address issues arising from the review of the East of England Plan [RB]
7949 - Colin Mould [7809]	No change needed [RB]
9483 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]	no change needed [RB]
10611 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations

10731 - Aylsham Town Council
(Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)
[1776]
9217 - Stratton Strawless Parish
Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
8564 - Bressingham & Fersfield
Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer)
[1976]
10362 - Keswick Parish Council
(Mr P Brooks) [2020]
9149 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish
Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
9874 - Swardeston Parish Council
(Carole Jowett) [2058]
11129 - Persimmon Homes
(Anglia) [2373]
10048 - Persimmon Homes
(Anglia) [2373]
8226 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

8177 - Mr Roger F. Weeks
MRICS [4796]
9928 - John Heaser [7015]
9927 - John Heaser [7015]
9103 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
9352 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
10508 - Postwick with Witton
Parish Council (A R Woods)
[7215]
10762 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]
8516 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]
7989 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843]
7998 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]
8107 - Mr S Buller [7879]
8087 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]

8112 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]

8267 - Rockland St Mary and
Hellington Parish Council (Mr
Dennis Passingham) [7912]
8293 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
8415 - Ed King [7965]
8382 - M Harrold [7966]
8383 - M Harrold [7966]
8466 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
8540 - Mrs Patricia Robertson
[8021]
9672 - Wroxham Parish Council
(Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
8727 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]
8973 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9102 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9424 - Swannington with Alderford
& Little Witchingham Parish
Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9449 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
9598 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
[8162]
10976 - Howard Birch Associates
(Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
9824 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]
9949 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd
[8222]
9991 - The Bunwell Partnership
(Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
10025 - The London Planning

Action

no change needed [RB]

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Representations

Action

Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)
[8230]
10176 - Commercial Land [8246]

10397 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294]
10429 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]
10662 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348]

Q5 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Action: Clarify the education arrangements to deal with growth in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich policy area [RB]

Relevant policies, particularly major growth locations for the Norwich policy area, updated, but enduring uncertainties mean that the policies still have to be expressed in terms of options to be resolved in light of circumstances prevailing at the time

Please see response to Norwich Green Party's representation on question 4 [RB]

Cross reference to other representation – see question 4

No change needed, other than excluding the discarded options from the final document, but consider how to address issues arising from the review of the East of England Plan [RB]

Pre Submission document will include only the proposed development strategy. The emerging uncertainty from the East of England plan is addressed only through a prospect of a early review, and the fact that the north east growth triangle is expected to continue after 2026. There is also a commitment to undertake a study into the potential which a new country town might offer in dealing with growth beyond the current RSS target

Increase illustrative material in the final document including illustrations of walking and cycling networks [RB]

Pre-submission version includes considerably more illustrative material than earlier drafts, with core cycling routes illustrated

No change needed directly in response to these representations, but consider an allocation of 300 dwellings at Aylsham subject to the resolution of sewage treatment problems, and confirm the status of Trowse as a fringe parish [RB]

Allocation proposed subject to a resolution of sewage treatment issues

No change to the scale of development, but clarify secondary education arrangements [RB]

Relevant policies, particularly major growth locations for the Norwich policy area, updated, but enduring uncertainties mean that the policies still have to be expressed in terms of options to be resolved in light of circumstances prevailing at the time

Opposition noted - see respondent's other submissions [RB]

The respondents submissions concern of the scale of development at Wymondham

(Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

10909 - Allied London Properties [8367] No change to plan

10315 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] No change to plan

9477 - Louisa Young [8135] No change to plan

10604 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322] No change to plan

10285 - Henderson Retail Warehouse Fund [8270] No change to plan

9367 - Mr E Newberry [8120] No change to plan

7913 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] No change to plan

10691 - Theatre Royal (Mr Peter Wilson) [54] Consider incorporating suggested amendments.

10273 - Norwich HEART (Mr Michael Loveday) [960] Consider amendments to the policy in relation to housing development and greater emphasis on historic and cultural assets.

11100 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] No change to plan

11086 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms) No change to plan

Denise Carlo) [8387]	
9425 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	See comments at q28
8357 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	No change to plan
8069 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875]	
9760 - Damien van Carrapiett	
9290 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	No change to plan

Page 32 of 129

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

Representations***Action***

8448 - Ian Harris [8007]	No change to plan
9565 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	No change to plan
9164 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	No change to plan
9478 - Mr David Gladwell [8126]	No change to plan
7950 - Colin Mould [7809]	No change to plan.
10534 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	No change to plan
9411 - Mr David Gladwell [8126]	No change to plan
9230 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 8057 - Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870] 8113 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	Consider approach to expansion of retailing set out in policy given the fact that the retail assessment was undertaken prior to the 2009 recession .
9484 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139] 9515 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140] 10340 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	
8491 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	No change to plan
10581 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	See q 28
8950 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	Consider amendments to retail and cycling/walking elements of policy and text.
7872 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	No change to plan
8836 - Mr John Nelson [8064] 8775 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	No change to plan
9189 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	Consider rewording in relation to walking and cycling.
8881 - mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	No change to plan
8942 - Miss Marguerite Finn	Consider amendments to retail element of policy.
7928 - mr paul newson [7812]	No change to plan
10363 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] 9916 - Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] 7963 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 9793 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] 8153 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 9910 - Christopher Webb [8019] 8589 - Mr M Read [8024] 10102 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] 9298 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	No change to plan
10558 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	No change to plan
10977 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	No change to plan

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

Representations***Action***

10789 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] 10804 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	No change to plan
10763 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	No change to plan
10847 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	No change to plan
9263 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	No change to plan
9382 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	No change to plan
9825 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	No change to plan
10820 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	No change to plan
9088 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Amend key diagram to show boundary with Broads and consider more specific reference to the river.

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

Representations

10732 - Aylsham Town Council
(Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)
[1776]
9218 - Stratton Strawless Parish
Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
8565 - Bressingham & Fersfield
Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer)
[1976]
9150 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish
Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
9875 - Swardeston Parish Council
(Carole Jowett) [2058]
9032 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E.
J. Keymer) [4187]
8246 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

8178 - Mr Roger F. Weeks
MRICS [4796]
9698 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]
10214 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

8809 - Marlingford & Colton
Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)
[6869]
9959 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel
Brigham) [6903]
10014 - notcutts Limited (Mrs
Erica McDonald) [6911]
9929 - John Heaser [7015]
9104 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
9354 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
10509 - Postwick with Witton
Parish Council (A R Woods)
[7215]
8517 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]
7990 - Mr Keith Bigland [7843]
7999 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]
8088 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]

8268 - Rockland St Mary and
Hellington Parish Council (Mr
Dennis Passingham) [7912]
8294 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
8467 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
8541 - Mrs Patricia Robertson
[8021]
8654 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
8678 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
9673 - Wroxham Parish Council
(Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
8728 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]
8974 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9139 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9343 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
9450 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
9547 - Mr R Harris [8146]
9599 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
[8162]
9724 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson
[8174]
9992 - The Bunwell Partnership
(Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
10026 - The London Planning
Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)
[8230]
10085 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher
[8235]
10177 - Commercial Land [8246]

Action

No change to plan

Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

Representations***Action***

11114 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Clarify housing allocations in Norwich.
10259 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	No change to plan
8899 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change to plan
10883 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	No change to plan
10075 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	No change to plan
8203 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	Consider amendments to retail element of policy.
10612 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	No change to plan
9899 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	Consider amendments to retail element of policy.
8721 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	No change to plan
10663 - Mrs Lyn Robertson	
11045 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	No change to plan
8934 - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081]	Consider amendment to wording to include archaeology
8784 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	No change to plan

Q6 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

Consider rewording in relation to walking and cycling.

Provision is made for improvements to walking and cycling provision which would be in accordance with the provisions of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy, as also covered by the Access and Transportation policy.

Consider amendments to the policy in relation to housing development and greater emphasis on historic and cultural assets.

The policy has been simplified with regard to housing provision which is clarified in the supporting text and the Housing Delivery policy. Historic and cultural assets are covered by the new policies promoting good design.

Consider amendments to retail element of policy.

The supporting text has been amended to reflect uncertainties arising from the current recession.

Clarify housing allocations in Norwich.

The policy has been simplified with regard to housing provision which is clarified in the supporting text and the Housing Delivery policy.

Consider amendments to retail element of policy.

The supporting text has been amended to reflect uncertainties arising from the current recession.

Consider amendment to wording to include archaeology.

This is provided for the policy to protect Environmental Assets.

Consider amendments to retail and cycling/walking elements of policy and text.

The supporting text has been amended to reflect uncertainties arising from the current recession.

Provision is made for improvements to walking and cycling provision which would be in accordance with the provisions of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy, as also covered by the Access and Transportation policy.

Consider approach to expansion of retailing set out in policy given the fact that the retail assessment was undertaken prior to the 2009 recession.

The supporting text has been amended to reflect uncertainties arising from the current recession.

(Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

10644 - David Morris (Mr David Morris) [8335]	No change proposed
---	--------------------

8492 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	No change proposed
11032 - Mr Bernard Godding [8372]	No change proposed
8343 - Age Concern Norwich (Phil Wells) [7957]	Consider scope for a clearer focus on meeting the needs of the elderly at appropriate points in the text/policies.
8426 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	Amend appropriately to refer to Norwich area sports and leisure provision.

Page 36 of 129

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

Representations***Action***

8407 - paul eldridge [7987]	No change proposed.
8204 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	No change proposed.
10274 - Norwich HEART (Mr Michael Loveday) [960]	No change proposed
9077 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	No change proposed.
8449 - Ian Harris [8007]	No change proposed.
10535 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	No change proposed
8629 - University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]	Consider change to the text to add this reference to intra-urban routes.
10383 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Consider adding reference to the growth triangle AAP and specific housing numbers and locations.
9750 - Mr David Holliday [8178]	No change needed
10634 - Ms Jane Chittenden	No change proposed
9089 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	No change proposed
9299 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	No change proposed
8049 - Mr Keith Jones [7536]	No change needed
9845 - Mr Mike Linley [8200]	No change proposed
10559 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	No change proposed
10715 - Ms S Layton [8354]	No change proposed
8331 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	No change proposed
9375 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	No change proposed.
7929 - mr paul newson [7812]	No change
10582 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	No change proposed
9166 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	No change proposed.
10454 - Mr David Smith [8309]	No change proposed.
10482 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	
9414 - Mr David Gladwell [8126]	Consider reference to enhancing facilities for water-based recreation and leisure as part of the riverside walks policy.
9566 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	No change proposed
8455 - Mr Peter Sergeant [7993]	No change proposed.
9190 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	No change proposed.
10884 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Consider more specific reference to local rail enhancements and growth in the knowledge economy locally: no further changes proposed.
7873 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	No change
11087 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

Representations***Action***

8901 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change proposed.
8883 - mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	
8943 - Miss Marguerite Finn	
8810 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	No change proposed
9383 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	No change proposed.
10316 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	No change proposed
10167 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]	No change proposed.
8700 - mrs jane fischl [8031]	No change proposed.
9264 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	No change proposed
10103 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	No change proposed.
10848 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	No change proposed
9507 - South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142]	Consider scope for possible clarification.
9674 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	No change proposed.
8779 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	No change proposed
9960 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	No change proposed
8335 - MR Stephen Graveling [7940]	No change proposed.
8590 - Mr M Read [8024]	No change proposed
8951 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	
8358 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	No change proposed.
8318 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922]	No change proposed
7964 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	No change needed
10015 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]	No change proposed
8070 - Miss Janet Saunders	Consider clarifying this term in supporting text.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

Representations

Action

9219 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
 8566 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]
 10364 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]
 9151 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
 9876 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]
 9033 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]
 9231 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]
 8247 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

No change needed

8179 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]
 9699 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]
 10215 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

8391 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]
 9930 - John Heaser [7015]
 9107 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
 10510 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]
 9794 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]
 8000 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]
 8089 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]

8114 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]

8154 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]
 8269 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]
 8295 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
 8416 - Ed King [7965]
 8384 - M Harrold [7966]
 8468 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
 8542 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]
 8655 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
 8679 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
 8729 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]
 8785 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

8837 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
 8975 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
 9105 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
 9426 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9451 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
 9476 - Louisa Young [8135]
 9485 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]
 9516 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]
 9600 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162]
 9725 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]
 9761 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]
 9993 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

Representations***Action***

Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] 9548 - Mr R Harris [8146]	No change proposed
11046 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	No change proposed
9867 - Hill Residential [8215]	No change proposed.
8722 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	No change proposed.
9355 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	No change proposed.
10086 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10930 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]	No change proposed
10613 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] 10605 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	No change proposed
10871 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	No change proposed
9826 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	No change proposed
7951 - Colin Mould [7809]	No change needed
10341 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	No change proposed
10790 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Claburn) [8360] 10805 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	No change proposed.
9900 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	No change proposed
10733 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] 10754 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048] 10764 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] 10978 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] 10664 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] 10821 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10954 - Mr William E Cooper [8369] 7914 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

Representations

Action

Q7 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

Consider scope for a clearer focus on meeting the needs of the elderly at appropriate points in the text/policies. This action has been revised.
These needs are provided for by the Housing Delivery policy.

Consider more specific reference to local rail enhancements and growth in the knowledge economy locally: no further Changes proposed.
Rail enhancements are provided for by the Access and transportation policy.

Consider scope for possible clarification. This action has been revised.
This refers to clarification re whether the reference to " East Norwich (City centre to Deal ground/Utilities)" includes the sites or just the corridor leading to them. The reference used implies their inclusion as further implied by the new reference in the policy to "opportunities for mixed use development and enhanced green linkages from the city centre to the Broads."

Consider clarifying this term in supporting text.
This refers to the use of the term "social regeneration". Clarification reference to be added to the Glossary..

Consider change to the text to add this reference to intra-urban routes.
Refers to the need to add a reference to the promotion of a bus route linking Norwich city centre with Thickthorn Park and Ride site, the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, Norwich Research Park and the UEA. While the importance of such as route has been acknowledged, a text change has not been made as such detailed proposals could be accommodated through the provisions of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy.

Consider reference to enhancing facilities for water-based recreation and leisure as part of the riverside walks policy.
Considered to be too detailed to warrant inclusion.

Consider adding reference to the growth triangle AAP and specific housing numbers and locations.
This is referred to in detail in the policy covering locations for new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area.

(Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

9549 - Mr R Harris [8146]	No change proposed
10317 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Consider scope for clarifying relationship of strategic growth distribution to 60% brownfield target in RSS - explain that whilst the priority given to brownfield sites remains an important objective, the capacity of the Norwich urban area to accommodate an increased share of development is demonstrably finite.
10716 - Ms S Layton [8354]	No change proposed
9300 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	No change proposed
8862 - Mr Stephen Andrews	No change proposed
9961 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Bringham) [6903]	No change proposed
7982 - mr Daniel Yellop [7836]	No change proposed
10455 - Mr David Smith [8309]	No change proposed
8811 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	No change proposed.
10483 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	No change proposed
10583 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	No change proposed.
8885 - mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	No change proposed
10560 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	No change proposed
8205 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	No change proposed
9726 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	No change proposed
9191 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	No change proposed.

9266 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue
[8115]

No policy change proposed. But consider need for

- (a) More specific definition of areas to which the policy applies;
- (b) more explanation of terms physical and social regeneration in supporting text:
possibly include definitions in Glossary.

8776 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]

No change proposed

Page 41 of 129

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

Representations

10849 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]

9675 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]

9567 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]

8591 - Mr M Read [8024]

7874 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]

8332 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]

10168 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]

9378 - Mr E Newberry [8120]

10077 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]

10614 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]

10104 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]

Action

This may again be a misunderstanding of the "tired suburbs" reference - suggest since the renewal initiatives envisaged might apply to residential areas in the inner Norwich urban area (not in fact "suburban" at all) as much as to housing estates further out, we revisit the term in favour of something that more accurately reflects where the strategy's regeneration priorities actually are.

No change proposed.

No change proposed

No change proposed

No change proposed

Consider whether a reference to carbon reduction in the existing building stock is appropriate and can be effected through Policy 4.

No change proposed

No change proposed.

No change proposed.

Consider potential for clarifying the areas to which this policy applies.

No change proposed

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

Representations***Action***

10734 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	No change proposed
10365 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	
9877 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]	
8180 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	
10216 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	
11047 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	
9931 - John Heaser [7015]	
10511 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]	
9795 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	
10765 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	
10979 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	
9762 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]	
9827 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	
9994 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]	
10028 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]	
10179 - Commercial Land [8246]	
10342 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	
10432 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	
10665 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348]	
10822 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	
10931 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]	
10955 - Mr William E Cooper	
9167 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	No policy change proposed. But consider need for more explanation of terms physical and social regeneration in supporting text: possibly include definitions in
10087 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	No change proposed
10885 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	No change proposed
8071 - Miss Janet Saunders	No change needed
9452 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	No change proposed
8735 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	No change proposed.

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

Representations

Action

9220 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
 8567 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]
 8906 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
 9152 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
 9034 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]
 9232 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]
 8248 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

No change proposed

9700 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]
 7915 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]
 8359 - Alyson Lowe [6992]
 9108 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
 9356 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
 8518 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]
 8001 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]
 8090 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]

8115 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]

8155 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]
 8270 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]
 8469 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
 8493 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
 8543 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]
 8656 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
 8680 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
 8730 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]
 8786 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

8838 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
 8976 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
 9106 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
 9327 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
 9384 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]
 9427 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

Representations

Action

Q8 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

Consider whether a reference to carbon reduction in the existing building stock is appropriate and can be effected through Policy 4.

Considered to be not appropriate as lacking a means of retrospectively collecting funding for earlier developments. Other local authority means are available of encouraging the appropriate measures. Future general sustainable energy generation will benefit existing development.

Action: No policy change proposed. But consider need for

(a) More specific definition of areas to which the policy applies;

(b) more explanation of terms physical and social regeneration in supporting text: possibly include definitions in Glossary.

The revised introduction to the policy clarifies the areas included.

Definitions of physical and social regeneration to be included in the Glossary.

No policy change proposed. But consider need for more explanation of terms physical and social regeneration in supporting text: possibly include definitions in Glossary.

Definitions of physical and social regeneration to be included in the Glossary.

This may again be a misunderstanding of the "tired suburbs" reference - suggest since the renewal initiatives envisaged might apply to residential areas in the inner Norwich urban area (not in fact "suburban" at all) as much as to housing estates further out, we revisit the term in favour of something that more accurately reflects where the strategy's regeneration priorities actually are.

This refers to concerns about pockets of deprivation just outside Norwich city centre which may not be perceived to be "suburbs". While on the one hand, the policy title implies all areas outside the city centre which covers the areas of concern, the supporting text has been amended to clarify the position.

Consider scope for clarifying relationship of strategic growth distribution to 60% brownfield target in RSS - explain that whilst the priority given to brownfield sites remains an important objective, the capacity of the Norwich urban area to accommodate an increased share of development is demonstrably finite.

A general reference to the limited availability of previously developed land is made in the supporting text to Policy 1 providing for the protection of environmental assets.

Consider potential for clarifying the areas to which this policy applies.

The policy has been revised to clarify the area covered.

(Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

10407 - Easton College [3570] 10292 - Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277]	Amend the introduction to policy for to use the phrase "recognised design process" [RB]
8884 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	Note change needed [R B]
9057 - Mr and Mrs G Watson [8103]	No change needed [R B]
9062 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Do not make " Secured by Design" a formal requirement, but consider the use of " Building for Life" as a criterion in an expanded design policy, and ensure that crime prevention continues to be referred to in any redrafting of the policy on communities and culture. [R B]
11073 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] 10063 - RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] 10147 - R Smith [8243]	Indicate that each component of the allocation to be made in the Norwich policy area in strategic locations, and the non location specific component should be regarded as a minimum. Delete the suggestion that the non location specific 2000 dwellings in Broadland could be accommodated within the major identified growth location to the north east of the urban area. [RB]
10284 - RSPB (East of England Regional Office) (Dr Philip Pearson) [8268]	No change needed [RB]
9692 - Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement [8170]	No change needed [R B]
9090 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Add a reference to future population characteristics to spatial portrait and/or vision [R B]
10606 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	No change [RB]

9078 - Ms R Pickering [8109]

Reconsider the scale of retail growth proposed. [R B]

11101 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd
[8300]

No change unless current discussions confirm the proposed development at Long
Stratton, and any available public funds, cannot fund the bypass
[RB]

10334 - Trafford Estate
Rackheath [8291]

Include employment allocation within eco development at Rackheath - precise site
to be determined through area action plan [RB]

Page 45 of 129

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations**Action**

10702 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	No change needed [RB]
9526 - Taylor Wimpey [7257]	No change needed [R B]
8050 - Mr Keith Jones [7536]	No change needed [R B]
8457 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	No change needed [R B]
9267 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	Add more illustrative the material to pre submission publication document [R B]
9036 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change needed [R B]
8072 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875]	Make explicit reference to additional employment allocation in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle, for example by proposing a specific allocation at Rackheath [R B]
11077 - Norfolk & Waveney Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust [1062]	Delete reference to the possibility of the non location specific 2000 dwellings in the Broadland part of the Norwich policy area being added to named growth locations [RB]
10657 - Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271]	
9233 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	No change needed [R B]
9291 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]	
9568 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	
7875 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	
8400 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]	
8402 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]	
8592 - Mr M Read [8024]	
8623 - Kay Eke [8025]	
9385 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	
9550 - Mr R Harris [8146]	
9727 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson	
9058 - Newton Flotman Parish Council (Mrs D Davidson) [2036]	Continue investigation into feasibility of development funded bypass, or potential for contribution from public funds, and consider appropriate scale for employment allocation. Ensure policy is clear that development does not precede the bypass
8181 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	[R B]
9701 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	
8252 - R Barker [6805]	
7941 - mr David Jones [7816]	
8156 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	
8258 - pulham market parish council (mr laurence taylor) [7907]	
8399 - Keeley Wilson [7979]	
9812 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	Reexamine the introduction to policy 5 to see if greater clarity can be offered without losing the intent.
11145 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	
10289 - Tasburgh Parish Council (Mrs Julie King) [7053]	No fundamental change to the proposals, unless current discussions indicate that a bypass cannot be funded by the development and any available public funding. [RB]
10105 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	
10693 - Sunguard Homes [8320]	
11115 - The Leeder Family [8390]	

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Action

7893 - mr andrew gibbins [7788]	The plan already acknowledges the need for improvements at the Thickthorn junction, but ensure these are included in the implementation strategy. [R B]
8580 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]	No changes needed. [R B]
8839 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	
9962 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Bringham) [6903]	Not applicable [RB]
9796 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	
10850 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	
9763 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]	
9950 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd [8222]	
10584 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	
8781 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen the policies dealing with the design of new development, and environmental protection. [R B]
9306 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	
9518 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	
11130 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	Include delivery strategy in the pre submission publication
10049 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	Reexamine vision and objectives to see if these can be refined
11023 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	Include an indication of the scale of employment allocation to be made at different locations, including Wymondham
9862 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	[RB]
10217 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	
10244 - Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708]	
11064 - Wymondham Consortium of Landowners [8218]	
9869 - Wymondham Consortium of Landowners [8218]	
10195 - Hopkins Homes Limited [8247]	
10823 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	
10910 - Allied London Properties	
9446 - Mr Geoffrey Champion [7854]	Refer to "recognized design process" rather than "accredited design process"
9951 - Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223]	[RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Action

10735 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]
 10366 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]
 9878 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]
 10016 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]
 11048 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]
 9932 - John Heaser [7015]
 11028 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]
 10512 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]
 10766 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]
 10980 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
 9772 - Mr Michael Whalley [8189]

Clarify that the scale of development proposed at named locations, and identified through non location of specific allocations in the Norwich policy area will be viewed as a minimum [RB]

10154 - Timewell [8209]
 10256 - WM Morrison Supermarkets plc [8212]
 9868 - Hill Residential [8215]
 9995 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
 10029 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]
 10078 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]
 10161 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]
 10180 - Commercial Land [8246]

10343 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]
 10422 - Ms Barbara Lockwood [8306]
 10433 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]
 10615 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]

9168 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner

Include a reference to the need to maintain access for people with disabilities in the supporting text to the transportation policy. [R B]

8812 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)

No change needed [RB]

8907 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]

No change needed [R B]

9071 - Wymondham Heritage Society (Ms Irene Woodward) [1003]

No change to strategy needed, but ensure the plan is more explicit about how education facilities could be expanded to cope with the development proposed in the A11 corridor including Wymondham. [R B]

7881 - Mr Paul Mallett [7783]

8737 - Ms K Dunn [8045]

8889 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]

8928 - Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079]

7965 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]

No change needed [R B]

9192 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations**Action**

9774 - Cemex [8191]	No change needed	[RB]
8044 - Shane Hull [7857]	No change needed	[RB]
10238 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]		
9849 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]		
11078 - Residents of Gibbs Close, Little Melton [8385]		
8681 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	No change needed	[R B]
8657 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]	No change needed	[R B]
11092 - Tesco Stores Ltd [8388]	No change	[RB]
9815 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509]	Include scale of employment allocations at strategic locations	
10318 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Include an expectation of the share of future development on previously developed land	
8206 - Mr P Anderson [7901]		
11037 - Norwich Design Quality Panel (The Manager) [8375]		
11089 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]		
7904 - mr david harper [7790]	Include expanded implementation strategy itemizing infrastructure requirements.	
7952 - Colin Mould [7809]	[R B]	
7930 - mr paul newson [7812]	No change needed	[RB]
8494 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen policy references to design	[R B]
9112 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]		
9328 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]		
9386 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]		
9953 - Costco Wholesale UK Ltd [6950]	No change needed	[RB]
10421 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change needed to policies for the growth triangle	
10201 - North East Norwich Consortium of Landowners [8249] Broadland.	Delete reference to the possibility of non location specific allocations to accommodate 2000 dwellings on smaller sites in the Broadland part of the Norwich policy area being accommodated as extensions to the named growth location in	
10272 - Mr D Jeans [8265]		
10717 - Ms S Layton [8354]		
10886 - Broadland Land Trust		
9901 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	No change needed	[RB]
10088 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]		
10234 - Ms Jane Pond [8255]		
10302 - mrs LISA ford [8282]		
10456 - Mr David Smith [8309]		
10484 - Mr I T Smith [8310]		
10536 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]		
9641 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	No change needed	[R B]
8863 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037]	No change needed	[R B]
7939 - Mr Peter Boddy [7815]	No change needed	[R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations**Action**

8002 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851] 8058 - Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870] 8470 - Mr C Skeels [8016]	No change needed [R B]
10696 - Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement [8170] 9828 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	no change [RB]
10265 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068] 10872 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes	No change needed [RB]
10206 - Mr Paul Dunthorne [8216] by EDAW 9952 - Barratt Strategic/Manor	Reconsider the timing of the secondary school in the light of the outcome of work Refer to "recognized design process" rather than "accredited design process" [RB]
8296 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	No change needed [R B]
8349 - Spixworth Parish Council (Mrs R Rose) [1826] 9221 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] 8568 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] 9153 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] 8249 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	No fundamental change needed, but consider whether more explicit reference to sports and recreation facilities need to be made, for example in the communities and culture policy. [R B]
7916 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] 8360 - Alyson Lowe [6992] 9109 - Mr John Osborne [7111] 9357 - Mr Peter Rope [7113] 8427 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] 8519 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8091 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	
8116 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	
8271 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] 8544 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] 9676 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] 8731 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] 8754 - Highways Agency (Mr Eric Cooper) [8057] 8787 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	
8977 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092] 9428 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] 9617 - RW Kidner [8163]	No change needed [R B]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations

Action

Q9 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Continue investigation into feasibility of development funded bypass, or potential for contribution from public funds, and consider appropriate scale for employment allocation. Ensure policy is clear that development does not precede the bypass [RB]

The supporting text clarifies that the completion of a bypass is a prerequisite for the scale of growth identified in Long Stratton.

Include scale of employment allocations at strategic locations

References are made to potential employment provisions and their scale is included in Policy 9 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA).

Include an expectation of the share of future development on previously developed land [RB]

By implication the proposed areas for major growth will be developed predominantly on green field land. However a general reference is made to the limited availability of previously developed land in the supporting text to Policy 1 providing for the protection of environmental assets.

No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen policy references to design [R B]

A detailed policy is included to promote good design.

No change to the overall strategy needed, but strengthen the policies dealing with the design of new development, and environmental protection. [R B]

Detailed policies are included to protect environmental assets and to promote good design.

Delete reference to the possibility of non location specific allocations to accommodate 2000 dwellings on smaller sites in the Broadland part of the Norwich policy area being accommodated as extensions to the named growth location in Broadland. [RB]

Text amended accordingly.

Reconsider the scale of retail growth proposed. [RB]

Retail provisions have been clarified in relation to the proposed growth areas.

Clarify that the scale of development proposed at named locations, and identified through non location of specific allocations in the Norwich policy area will be viewed as a minimum [RB]

Text clarified to show "at least xxxx dwellings" etc.

Reconsider the timing of the secondary school in the light of the outcome of work by EDAW

This refers to Rackheath. Growth area renamed Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle and policy clarified re all school provisions.

Refer to "recognized design process" rather than "accredited design process" [RB]

Policy revised accordingly.

Reexamine the introduction to policy 5 to see if greater clarity can be offered without losing the intent.

Respondents referred to policy introduction implication that Long Stratton growth area automatically required new primary healthcare facilities. Reference removed from this policy and replaced by general reference to new or expanded primary health facilities subject to Health Impact Assessments in new policy "Supporting Communities".

The plan already acknowledges the need for improvements at the Thickthorn junction, but ensure these are included in the implementation strategy. [RB]

Included in the Appendix covering the Implementation Framework.

Add more illustrative the material to pre submission publication document [R B]

The appropriate maps and illustrations are included.

No change to strategy needed, but ensure the plan is more explicit about how education facilities could be expanded to cope with the development proposed in the A11 corridor including Wymondham. [RB]

The policy providing for locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) includes clarified education provisions.

Make explicit reference to additional employment allocation in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle, for example by proposing a specific allocation at Rackheath [R B]

The policy providing for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) includes clarified employment land provisions and specifies expansion of the Rackheath employment area.

Include employment allocation within eco development at Rackheath - precise site to be determined through area action plan

[RB]

The policy includes clarified employment land provisions and specifies expansion of the Rackheath employment area.

Refer to "recognized design process" rather than "accredited design process" [RB]

The policy introduction has been revised to include this.

Indicate that each component of the allocation to be made in the Norwich policy area in strategic locations, and the non location specific component should be regarded as a minimum.

The revised proposed housing provisions state "at least xxx dwellings" to provide for this point.

Delete the suggestion that the non location specific 2000 dwellings in Broadland could be accommodated within the major identified growth location to the north east of the urban area.[RB]

Text amended accordingly.

Include expanded implementation strategy itemizing infrastructure requirements. [RB]

Implementation policy revised and accompanied by new Appendix containing an infrastructure Implementation Framework.

Do not make "Secured by Design" a formal requirement, but consider the use of "Building for Life" as a criterion in an expanded design policy, and ensure that crime prevention continues to be referred to in any redrafting of the policy on communities and culture. [R B]

The supporting text refers to the use of "Building for Life" model of residential design excellence..

Include a reference to the need to maintain access for people with disabilities in the supporting text to the transportation policy. [R B]

The revised supporting text to the Access and Transportation policy provides for all residents to have good access to local jobs, services and facilities which is assumed to cover this point.

Include delivery strategy in the pre submission publication

Original representations relate to growth at Wymondham. The NPA growth areas policy has been expanded to clarify infrastructure requirements, and a revised Policy 20 plus an Implementation Framework clarifies the means of infrastructure delivery. These factors have been referred to in the relevant sections dealing with the individual localities.

Re-examine vision and objectives to see if these can be refined.

The Spatial Vision and the Spatial Planning Objectives have been revised and the latter re-ordered to reflect a revised policy emphasis in the strategy.

Include an indication of the scale of employment allocation to be made at different locations, including Wymondham [RB]

The employment provisions for the strategic employment areas have been quantified in the Strategy for growth in the Norwich policy Area (NPA) and clarified for most smaller places in their respective policies.

No fundamental change needed, but consider whether more explicit reference to sports and recreation facilities need to be made, for example in the communities and culture policy. [RB]

The provisions for sport and recreation are implicit in the provisions for community infrastructure under Policy 7 "Supporting Communities" and Policy 8 "Culture, Leisure and Entertainment".

Add a reference to future population characteristics to spatial portrait and/or vision [R B]

Change not made albeit references are included to current population structure and recent migration in the Spatial Portrait.

Amend the introduction to policy for to use the phrase "recognised design process" [RB]

Policy introduction amended to reflect this.

Delete reference to the possibility of the non location specific 2000 dwellings in the Broadland part of the Norwich policy area

The appropriate reference in the Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) deletes this reference.

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Representations**Action****Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?**

9657 - Ms E Riches [8165]	On completion of the current work being undertaken by EDAW, draft a comprehensive implementation strategy itemizing the infrastructure needed, when it is needed, and responsibility for its provision, including funding sources. [RB]
9093 - National Grid (Mr Les Morris) [8110]	No change needed in response, but ensure the plan includes an implementation strategy setting out the infrastructure needed to accommodate the development proposed [RB]
9091 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Incorporate the findings of the stage 2 Appropriate Assessment into relevant policies [RB]
11116 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Transport elements in delivery plan to be updated to reflect most up to date evidence from work to determine an NATS implementation plan. Incorporate the requirements of Children's Services in the favoured option
10767 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Ensure impact on secondary health care is included in implementation strategy [RB]
9850 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	No change needed [RB]
9063 - Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653]	Ensure the implementation strategy pays due regard to crime prevention requirements [RB]
10911 - Allied London Properties [8367]	No change needed [RB]
9037 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change needed [RB]
9067 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]	No changes needed to the plan, subject to the outcome of the traffic modelling currently underway [RB]
8755 - Highways Agency (Mr Eric	
10293 - Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277]	No change needed, but ensure that the work on electricity supply, water supply and wastewater treatment in the infrastructure study and implementation strategy does take account of the wider picture. [RB]
11049 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	Propose an allocation for 300 dwellings at Aylsham subject to sewage treatment limitations being overcome. [RB]
10148 - R Smith [8243]	No change in policy, but clarify that the dwellings to be provided in unspecified locations will be distributed in line with the spatial hierarchy and other planning considerations. [RB]
8458 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	No change needed [RB]
10703 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Subject to the outcome of the work by EDAW, and the water cycle study, no change needed [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Representations

10276 - Diocese of Norwich
(Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266]

9933 - John Heaser [7015]
8453 - Frederick Watkins (Mr Frederick Watkins) [8013]
10239 - Hethersett Parish Council
(Ian Weetman) [8023]

10887 - Broadland Land Trust
[8366]

9061 - Chenery Drive Residents
Association (Mr R. Craggs) [3412]

10851 - Norwich Green Party (Mr
Stephen Little) [8018]

9059 - Newton Flotman Parish
Council (Mrs D Davidson) [2036]

8886 - ie homes & property ltd

10408 - Easton College [3570]

10824 - North East Wymondham
Landowners [8362]

10079 - Lothbury Property Trust
Company Ltd [8234]

11093 - Tesco Stores Ltd [8388]

10235 - Ms Jane Pond [8255]

10250 - Norfolk Geodiversity
Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone)
[8260]

7931 - mr paul newson [7812]
10457 - Mr David Smith [8309]
10485 - Mr I T Smith [8310]

8640 - The Landscape Partnership
Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge)
[7569]

8882 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037]
10196 - Hopkins Homes Limited

Action

Redraft the communities and culture policy including references to the potential role of faith groups in promoting community cohesion and the need for premises when it can be demonstrated. [RB]

No change needed, subject to the requirements in appendix 0 being translated into policy in the next version of the plan, along with a clarification of the strategy for secondary education in the area. [RB]

No change needed [RB]

No change needed [RB]

Include Implementation strategy in pre submission publication

No change needed [RB]

No change to the policy, but ensure the implementation strategy reflects as accurately as possible the position in the major growth areas. [RB]

No change needed [RB]

No change needed [RB]

No change [RB]

No change needed [RB]

No change needed [RB]

No change needed [RB]

No change needed, but continue a dialogue with team preparing waste LDF [RB]

No change to strategy, but ensure implementation strategy reflects fully the infrastructure needs of the chosen locations. [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Representations

Action

Q10 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

No change needed, subject to the requirements in appendix 0 being translated into policy in the next version of the plan, along with a clarification of the strategy for secondary education in the area. [RB]

Appendix 0 details transferred to new Policy 10 Locations for new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area which includes clarified provisions for secondary education.

Redraft the communities and culture policy including references to the potential role of faith groups in promoting community cohesion and the need for premises when it can be demonstrated. [RB]

The appropriate provisions are included in Policy 7 Supporting Communities.

Include Implementation strategy in pre submission publication

Policy 20 and an Implementation Framework in the Appendix provide for this.

No change to strategy, but ensure implementation strategy reflects fully the infrastructure needs of the chosen locations. [RB]

An Implementation Framework is included in the Appendix. The uncertainties surrounding sewage infrastructure have been added to the text covering the specific localities concerned.

Ensure the implementation strategy pays due regard to crime prevention requirements [RB]

Implementation Framework includes a global indication of the additional police resources, with an indicative number of additional officers required in each district.

Propose an allocation for 300 dwellings at Aylsham subject to sewage treatment limitations being overcome. [RB]

Provision for 300 dwellings at Aylsham is included subject to overcoming sewage disposal constraints.

On completion of the current work being undertaken by EDAW, draft a comprehensive implementation strategy itemizing the infrastructure needed, when it is needed, and responsibility for its provision, including funding sources. [RB]

An Implementation Framework is included in the Appendix which provides for these elements.

Incorporate the findings of the stage 2 Appropriate Assessment into relevant policies [RB]

Enhanced green infrastructure provisions have been incorporated in response to this.

Ensure impact on secondary health care is included in implementation strategy [RB]

Policy 7 "Supporting Communities" provides for secondary health care in the major growth areas as detailed in the Implementation Framework in the Appendices.

No change in policy, but clarify that the dwellings to be provided in unspecified locations will be distributed in line with the spatial hierarchy and other planning considerations. [RB]

The appropriate reference is made in policy 9 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA).

No change needed, but ensure that the work on electricity supply, water supply and wastewater treatment in the infrastructure study and implementation strategy does take account of the wider picture. [RB]

The implementation Framework relates the critical impacts of the required infrastructure on the relevant growth provisions of the JCS.

No change to the policy, but ensure the implementation strategy reflects as accurately as possible the position in the major growth areas. [RB]

The implementation Framework relates the critical impacts of the required infrastructure on the relevant growth provisions of the JCS.

Transport elements in delivery plan to be updated to reflect most up to date evidence from work to determine a NATS implementation plan.

The Implementation Framework incorporates the latest information

Incorporate the requirements of Children's Services in the favoured option [RB]

School provisions have been clarified in policy provisions for "Locations for new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA)".

Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

10458 - Mr David Smith [8309] no change needed [RB]

10486 - Mr I T Smith [8310]

11131 - Persimmon Homes No change [RB]

(Anglia) [2373]

10825 - North East Wymondham
Landowners [8362]
10912 - Allied London Properties
[8367]

11102 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd
[8300]

No change [RB]

8887 - ie homes & property ltd
(mr ed palmieri) [7620]

No change needed [RB]

10694 - Sunguard Homes [8320]
11117 - The Leeder Family [8390]

No change needed [RB]

10384 - GO East (Ms Mary
Marston) [7463]

Include in policy a reference to moving towards eco town standards, or aspiring to them. [RB]

11094 - Tesco Stores Ltd [8388]

see other questions [RB]

Page 54 of 129

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

Representations**Action**

10704 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	no change [RB]
10294 - Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277]	No change needed [RB]
10888 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	No change needed [RB]
10873 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	No change needed [RB]
9851 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	No change needed [RB]
10126 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	no change needed [RB]
9038 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change needed [RB]
8459 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	Ensure green infrastructure is included in implementation strategy [RB]
10050 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	No change needed [RB]
8865 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037]	
8878 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037]	

Q11 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option Include in policy a reference to moving towards eco town standards, or aspiring to them. [RB]

Eco town standards have been reflected in the new policies concerning Design, Energy and the provisions for the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle.

Ensure green infrastructure is included in implementation strategy [RB]

This is included in the Implementation Framework and policy provisions for "Locations for new or expanded communities in the Norwich policy Area (NPA)" and Norwich.

Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

10768 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Ensure health facilities are included in implementation strategy [RB]
8417 - Ed King [7965]	No change needed, but ensure the implementation strategy links the implementation of the employment allocation to the implementation of the northern distributor road
8460 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	no change needed [RB]
10874 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	no change [RB]
10705 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	not applicable [RB]
11095 - Tesco Stores Ltd [8388]	
10295 - Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277]	No change needed [RB]
9039 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change needed [RB]
10127 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	No change needed [RB]
11132 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	no change [RB]
10826 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	

10459 - Mr David Smith [8309]
10487 - Mr I T Smith [8310]

No change needed [RB]

Page 55 of 129

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Representations**Action**

10889 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	no change [RB]
8888 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	No change needed [RB]
10051 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	No change needed [RB]
8867 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037]	Clarify that the 3800 dwellings on unidentified sites in Broadland and South Norfolk will be distributed within the Norwich policy area according to the spatial hierarchy, taking into account service capacities, environmental and other planning
8872 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037]	

Q12 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

No change needed, but ensure the implementation strategy links the implementation of the (Airport) employment allocation to the implementation of the northern distributor road [RB]

The Implementation Framework makes this link in the "Critical to" column.

Ensure health facilities are included in implementation strategy [RB]

Healthcare is provided for in the Implementation Framework and the Policy covering Implementation.

Clarify that the 3800 dwellings on unidentified sites in Broadland and South Norfolk will be distributed within the Norwich policy area according to the spatial hierarchy, taking into account service capacities, environmental and other planning considerations. [RB]

This is clarified in the policy providing for the "Strategy for growth in the Norwich policy Area (NPA)".

Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

10128 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	No change needed [RB]
10890 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	
10913 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Subject to the outcome of continuing discussions with the promoters of development at Long Stratton, no change [RB]
11133 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	no change needed [RB]
10052 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	
10827 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	no change needed [RB]
8461 - Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953]	No change needed [RB]
8756 - Highways Agency (Mr Eric Cooper) [8057]	No change needed [RB]
10296 - Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277]	
11096 - Tesco Stores Ltd [8388]	No change [RB]
8880 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037]	No change needed [RB]
10199 - Hopkins Homes Limited	
10460 - Mr David Smith [8309]	No change needed [RB]
10488 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	
10852 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	As recorded elsewhere
10706 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	
10769 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	Include an implementation strategy in the pre submission version of the plan, including health requirements [RB]
10875 - Taylor Wimpey	no change [RB]

Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

Representations**Action**

8418 - Ed King [7965]	No change needed [RB]
10736 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	No change needed [RB]
9879 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]	
8890 - ie homes & property ltd	
9040 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change [RB]

Q13 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the

Include an implementation strategy in the pre submission version of the plan, including health requirements [RB]

An Implemntation Framework including healthcare requirements is included in the appendices to the JCS

(Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

8593 - Mr M Read [8024]	No change.
9271 - Mrs Gray [5927]	No action required.
10303 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	No change
7917 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	No change.
10806 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	No change.
9779 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	No change.
11079 - Residents of Gibbs Close, Little Melton [8385]	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
8495 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
10089 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	No action required.
8510 - Sunguard Homes [8320]	To be clarified in the supporting text to Policy 6 Main Towns or the relevant policy following the proposed reconsideration for consistency of the designation of Long Stratton. (See also response to 9293).
9816 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509]	No change.
8117 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	No change.
10718 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Ensure a consistent approach to the Spatial Vision provisions for communities under the headings "The Urban Area of Norwich" and "The Rural Area".
9658 - Ms E Riches [8165]	To clarify the link between the provisions of new housing and a bypass at Long Stratton in the sections providing for the locations for major growth in the Norwich Policy Area, the Main Towns, and Access and Transportation
8909 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	(1): Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. Actions (2): Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.
9852 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]	Policy 14 - to add the words "at least" to preface the Policy 14 references to housing provisions in the Norwich Policy Area.
9642 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Add references to the "Executive Summary" to note the emphasise on the provisions for growth required in the Norwich Policy Area, cross refer to the relevant chapters/policies and annotate the summary table of housing provisions to clarify the Norwich Policy Area and Rural Policy Area provisions.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations**Action**

10537 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	No change.
9846 - Spen Hill Developments Limited [8201]	No change.
9392 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	No change.
9963 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	No action required.
10698 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
8710 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	No change
9764 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]	No change.
8051 - Mr Keith Jones [7536]	No change.
10791 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360]	No change.
10915 - Allied London Properties [8367]	No change.
10207 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
9193 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	(1): Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. Actions (2): Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.
9829 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
8624 - Kay Eke [8025]	No change subject to the reconsideration of the growth provisions for Aylsham within the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2, and the status of Long Stratton for consistency.
9293 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Policy 6/para 7.15 - Long Stratton's designation will be reconsidered for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth. (See also response to 8510)
9569 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	No change.
8933 - Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079]	Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of achieving all required provisions.
9329 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	
9387 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	
8739 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	No change.
11118 - The Leeder Family [8390]	Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other settlements also subject to significant growth.
10241 - Mr Duncan Smith [8257]	No change.
11146 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.
10585 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	No change subject to specific reasons covered under Question 28, and the reconsideration of the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
8892 - Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	No change.
8520 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	No change
9025 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535]	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations***Action***

10106 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	No change.
7882 - Mr Paul Mallett [7783]	No change.
10461 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10489 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	No change.
8361 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
9519 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	No change required.
8253 - R Barker [6805] 7942 - mr David Jones [7816] 8658 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] 8682 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	Policy 6/para 7.15- Long Stratton's designation will be reconsidered for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.
9041 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of achieving this.
10319 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	(1): To amend and enhance the policy provisions for the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and the use of locally sourced materials. (2): Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other settlements also subject to significant
7876 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	No change.
10667 - Mrs Lyn Robertson	No change other than to review the housing provisions for Aylsham within the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
7907 - Norfolk Homes Ltd (Mr Terence Harper) [6956]	Policy 6 - To reconsider growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
10562 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	No change.
9702 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	No change.
9358 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	No change.
9560 - Cllr John Francis Pitt-Pladdy [8147]	No change.
8385 - M Harrold [7966]	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
8060 - Cedric Brown [7871]	Policy 6 - To reconsider growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
7966 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	No change
8182 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	No change.
9797 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	No change.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations***Action***

9223 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
 8569 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]
 10367 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]
 9154 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
 9880 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]
 8606 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]
 11134 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]
 10053 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]
 9234 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]
 10218 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

8813 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]
 11050 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]
 9934 - John Heaser [7015]
 9110 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
 10513 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]
 10770 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]
 8964 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]

8272 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]
 8297 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
 8545 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]
 9677 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
 8732 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]
 8840 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
 8978 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
 8995 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093]
 9115 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
 9169 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]
 9429 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9488 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]
 9603 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162]
 9728 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]
 10981 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
 9996 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
 10030 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]
 10129 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]
 10181 - Commercial Land [8246]

None

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations

Action

10398 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294]	
10434 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	
10828 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	
10891 - Broadland Land Trust	
10737 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)	Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
8207 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	No change
10853 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	To clarify the key infrastructure requirements of the major growth areas under Policy 5 "Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area".
9454 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	No change
8003 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving the necessary services.
8232 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	none
8428 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	
10616 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	No change.
8157 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	No change
7884 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	No change
10344 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	No change.
8788 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	No action required.

Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations **Action**
Q14 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

(1): Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.
 Actions (2): Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.

- 1) Aylsham growth provisions revised to include allocation subject to overcoming sewage treatment issues
- 2) Long Stratton has been redesignated as a Key Service Centre allied to provisions for significant housing growth.

Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

- 1) Aylsham growth provisions revised to include allocations subject to overcoming sewage treatment issues

1): To amend and enhance the policy provisions for the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and the use of locally sourced materials.

These points have been addressed in the new policies providing for the protection of environmental assets and the promotion of good design.

(2): Policy 6/para 7.15 - to reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other settlements also subject to significant growth.

- 2) Long Stratton has been redesignated as a Key Service Centre allied to provisions for significant housing growth.

Policy 6 - To reconsider the growth provisions for Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Aylsham growth provisions revised to include allocations subject to overcoming sewage treatment issues

Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of achieving all required provisions.

This refers to a representation concerning the ability of public services and facilities in Wymondham to provide for the proposed levels of housing growth.

No change subject to the reconsideration of the growth provisions for Aylsham within the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2, and the status of Long Stratton for consistency.

- 1) Aylsham growth provisions revised to include allocations subject to overcoming sewage treatment issues
- 2) Long Stratton has been redesignated as a Key Service Centre allied to provisions for significant housing growth.

No change other than to review the housing provisions for Aylsham within the context of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

Aylsham growth provisions revised to include allocations subject to overcoming sewage treatment issues

Policy 6/para 7.15- Long Stratton's designation will be reconsidered for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth.

Long Stratton has been redesignated as a Key Service Centre allied to provisions for significant housing growth.

Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of achieving this.

This refers to a comment that strategic development in satellite towns is unsustainable

Add references to the "Executive Summary" to note the emphasise on the provisions for growth required in the Norwich Policy Area, cross refer to the relevant chapters/policies and annotate the summary table of housing provisions to clarify the Norwich Policy Area and Rural Policy Area provisions.

These changes have been superseded by the revised Housing Delivery policy that defines the housing required in the Norwich Policy Area and defines the area in the Appendix. The table showing housing requirement clarifies the distribution of housing provisions between the Norwich Policy Area and remainder of the strategy area. Supporting text to the policy provisions for Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) clarifies the the East of England Plan's emphasis on growth provisions in the NPA.

To clarify the link between the provisions of new housing and a bypass at Long Stratton in the sections providing for the locations for major growth in the Norwich Policy Area, the Main Towns, and Access and Transportation

The links are clarified in the Access and Transportation policy supporting text, and the Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA).

Discussions are underway with service providers to seek the best means of improving the necessary services.

This relates to concerns regarding the abilities of public services and facilities to provide for the proposed levels of growth at Diss and Harleston.

To be clarified in the supporting text to Policy 6 Main Towns or the relevant policy following the proposed reconsideration for consistency of the designation of Long Stratton. (See also response to 9293).

This refers to concerns that Long Stratton should be defined as including development in the adjacent parish of Tharston. No change made as the Settlement Hierarchy refers to places and not parishes, and future site specific policies development will reflect that.

Policy 6/para 7.15 - Long Stratton's designation will be reconsidered for consistency with the designation of other locations subject to significant growth. (See also response to 8510)

Long Stratton has been redesignated as a Key Service Centre allied to provisions for significant housing growth.

Policy 14 - to add the words "at least" to preface the Policy 14 references to housing provisions in the Norwich Policy Area.

Housing Delivery policy renumbered and clarified to provide for "at least xxx new homes..." as included for consistency in all housing growth area policies.

Ensure a consistent approach to the Spatial Vision provisions for communities under the headings "The Urban Area of Norwich" and "The Rural Area".

This refers to the need to value the qualities of established communities within Norwich as well as those in the market towns. The provisions of the Spatial Vision and (revised) Spatial Objectives reflect the respective scales, forms and functions of Norwich and the remaining settlements.

To clarify the key infrastructure requirements of the major growth areas under Policy 5 "Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area".

This refers to a perceived inconsistent approach to the references to the need for improved water supply and sewerage infrastructure in different growth locations. Such references reflect the needs known at the time for improved infrastructure. The absence of a reference implies no need for an improvement. All such references have been revisited in accordance with the Water Cycle Studies carried out as part of the evidence base.

(Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

8118 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	None
9773 - Mr Michael Whalley [8189]	Action (1): To consider the potential accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Blofield in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. Action (2): To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision. (DSW)
9624 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Action (1): To add supporting text to Policy 7 "Key Service centres" to clarify the functions of the centres within the context of the RSS and where relevant, previous structure and local plan policies. Action (2): To clarify the basis of the settlement hierarchy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper. (DSW)
10792 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] 10807 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	Action: No change. (DSW)
10697 - Mr A Semmence [6362]	Action: To add the appropriate text to clarify that the housing provision figures represent a minimum provision. (DSW)
9817 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509]	Action: No change. (DSW)
7918 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	Action: No change. (DSW)
8645 - Mr Alan Cant [8032]	Action: To maintain the policy references to development density reflecting the characteristics and accessibility of particular areas. (DSW)
9643 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Consider using an * or similar notation to distinguish Norwich Policy Area Key Service Centres in submission document
10149 - R Smith [8243]	Action: To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Blofield and Poringland in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)
11068 - Mr R W Kidner [5016]	To consider the needs for and allocation of employment sites in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)
11103 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	No change. (DSW)
11062 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] 10164 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	Action: To add the appropriate text to clarify that the housing provision figures represent a minimum provision. (DSW)
8910 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Action: To maintain the policy references to respecting local distinctiveness including the varied character of our market towns and villages. (DSW)
9964 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	None

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations**Action**

8594 - Mr M Read [8024]	None
9395 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	None
10320 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Action: To amend and enhance the policy provisions for the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and the use of locally sourced materials. (DSW)
8711 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	Action: No change. (DSW)
9786 - East Carleton Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1997]	Action: No change. (DSW)
8814 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]	None
10090 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	No change. (DSW)
10916 - Allied London Properties [8367]	Action: To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Wymondham in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)
9520 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	Action: To maintain the policy references to respecting local distinctiveness including the varied character of our market towns and villages. (DSW)
9703 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	None
7908 - Norfolk Homes Ltd (Mr Terence Harper) [6956]	Action: Policy 6 - to reconsider Aylsham's growth provisions to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. (DSW)
7943 - mr David Jones [7816]	Action: No change. (DSW)
9798 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Action: To complete the Settlement Hierarchy review and revise the village categories of the Settlement Hierarchy to provide for additional sustainable locations for lower scales of housing, employment and services development.
8496 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	Action: No change. (DSW)
9863 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Action (1): To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures representing a minimum provision. Action (2): To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)
8075 - mr steve kittle [7753]	None
10982 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	Action: To complete the review of the Settlement Hierarchy and revise the designations of the "Service Villages" and "Other Villages" as required. (DSW)
9235 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	No change. (DSW)
8392 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]	Action: No change but to consider the accommodation of additional growth through the provisions of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)
9552 - Mr R Harris [8146] 9551 - Mr R Harris [8146]	Action (1) : Policy 6 - to reconsider growth provisions in Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2. Action (2): To address the protection of important gaps between settlements in the proposed design policy. Action (3): To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)
9979 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535]	Action: No change. (DSW)
9295 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Action: To review the village categories of the proposed Settlement Hierarchy.

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations***Action***

9416 - Mr David Gladwell [8126]	Action: No change (DSW)
9026 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535]	None
8045 - Shane Hull [7857]	
8409 - pete eldridge [7990]	
9194 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	
9503 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]	
9678 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	Action: No change. (DSW)
9570 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	None
7877 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]	
10462 - Mr David Smith [8309]	
10490 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	
10563 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	
10107 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	No change. (DSW)
11029 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	To consider the potential accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Poringland in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)
11147 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	Action (1): No change to growth provisions. (DSW)
8659 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]	Action (2): Policy 6/ para. 7.15 - reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other settlements subjected to significant growth provisions. (DSW)
8683 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	
7906 - Mrs Lucy Perry [7800]	Action: To address the protection of important gaps between settlements in the proposed design policy. (DSW)
8625 - Kay Eke [8025]	
8841 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	
9330 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	
10304 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	
8999 - Mr & Mrs Roger Brown [5038]	Action: No change other than changes arising from the Settlement Hierarchy review. (DSW)
7967 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	None
8004 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	None

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations***Action***

10368 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	None
9881 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]	
10219 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	
9935 - John Heaser [7015]	
10514 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]	
7885 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	
9830 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	
9997 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]	
10031 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]	
10130 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	
10182 - Commercial Land [8246]	
10345 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	
10435 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	
10538 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	
10539 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	
9729 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	Action: No change. (DSW)
8273 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]	Action: No change(DSW)
10399 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294]	Action: No change. (DSW)
9455 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	None
9765 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]	
11005 - Mrs S Plaw [8370]	Action: No change. (DSW)

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations***Action***

9224 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	None
8570 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]	
9155 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]	
8607 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]	
9042 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	
8233 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	
8184 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	
8362 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	
9111 - Mr John Osborne [7111]	
9359 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	
8965 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]	
8429 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	
8521 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	
8158 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	
8472 - Mr C Skeels [8016]	
8546 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]	
8733 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]	
8790 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	
8979 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]	
8996 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093]	
9116 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]	
9170 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]	
9388 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	
9430 - Swannington with Alderford	
11051 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	To consider the potential accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in Blofield in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSV)
10738 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	None
10771 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	
10854 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	
10668 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348]	
10829 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	
10892 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	
10934 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]	
10958 - Mr William E Cooper	
8298 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	None
8436 - J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003]	To be addressed in submission version of JCS settlement heirarchy which will set out levels of growth proposed in key service centres.

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations **Action**
Q15 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

Policy 6/ para. 7.15 - reconsider the designation of Long Stratton for consistency with the designation of other settlements subjected to significant growth provisions. (DSW)

Long Stratton has been redesignated as a Key Service Centre with provisions for significant housing growth.

To maintain the policy references to respecting local distinctiveness including the varied character of our market towns and villages. (DSW)

These elements are provided for by the area-wide policies covering the protection of environmental assets and the promotion of good design.

Policy 6 - to reconsider growth provisions in Aylsham to reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2.

The growth provisions have been revised to provide for 300 dwellings subject to overcoming sewage disposal constraints and the conclusions of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2b.

To address the protection of important gaps between settlements in the proposed design policy.

The promotion of good design policy provides for development proposals to respect "the historic hierarchy of the city, towns and villages maintaining important strategic gaps".

To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW).

This will be the next stage of the preparation of the Local Development Framework which will consider the availability and suitability of potential development sites within the context of the defined Settlement Hierarchy for the accommodation of the housing provisions not yet allocated to particular places.

To review the village categories of the proposed Settlement Hierarchy. (DSW)

The schedules of Service Villages and Other Villages has been revised and includes additional places suitable for limited new development..

Consider using an * or similar notation to distinguish Norwich Policy Area Key Service Centres in submission document

The Norwich Policy Area Key Service centres are annotated in this way in the policy.

To complete the review of the Settlement Hierarchy and revise the designations of the "Service Villages" and "Other Villages" as required. (DSW)

The schedules of Service Villages and Other Villages has been revised and includes additional places suitable for limited new development..

To consider the accommodation of additional growth on small sites within the Norwich Policy Area (in general/ Blofield/ Poringland/ Wymondham) in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

This will be the next stage of the preparation of the Local Development Framework which will consider the availability and suitability of potential development sites within the context of the defined Settlement Hierarchy for the accommodation of the housing provisions not yet allocated to particular places.

No change but to consider the accommodation of additional growth through the provisions of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

This will be the next stage of the preparation of the Local Development Framework which will consider the availability and suitability of potential development sites within the context of the defined Settlement Hierarchy for the accommodation of the housing provisions not yet allocated to particular places.

To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision. (DSW)

The general Housing Delivery policy has been revised to provide for "at least XXX new homes" as reflected by the provisions of ranges of new housing development for the Key Service Centres.

To consider the needs for and allocation of employment sites in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. (DSW)

This will be the next stage of the preparation of the Local Development Framework which will consider the availability and suitability of potential development sites within the context of the defined Settlement Hierarchy for potential employment uses not yet allocated to particular places.

To maintain the policy references to respecting local distinctiveness including the varied character of our market towns and villages. (DSW)

The appropriate references have been included in the new general policy to promote good design.

To add supporting text to Policy 7 "Key Service centres" to clarify the functions of the centres within the context of the RSS and where relevant, previous structure and local plan policies.

No further change made as the supporting text defines the services available which are based on the Regional Spatial Strategy band refers to the defined centres as meeting the needs people living locally and in the surrounding areas. Further detail is included within the Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper.

To clarify the basis of the settlement hierarchy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper. (DSW)

This has been produced.

No change other than changes arising from the Settlement Hierarchy review. (DSW)

The schedules of Service Villages and Other Villages has been revised and includes additional places suitable for limited new development..

To complete the Settlement Hierarchy review and revise the village categories of the Settlement Hierarchy to provide for

additional sustainable locations for lower scales of housing, employment and services development. (DSW)

The schedules of Service Villages and Other Villages has been revised and includes additional places suitable for limited new development..

To be addressed in submission version of JCS settlement hierarchy which will set out levels of growth proposed in key service centres.

Policy provisions for the Key Service Centres include ranges of potential new housing development.

To maintain the policy references to development density reflecting the characteristics and accessibility of particular areas. (DSW)

This is clarified in the area-wide policy to protect environmental assets.

To amend and enhance the policy provisions for the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and the use of locally sourced materials. (DSW)

These elements are provided for in the new area-wide policies to protect environmental assets and to promote good design.

To address the protection of important gaps between settlements in the proposed design policy. (DSW)

The policy to promote good design requires development proposals to respect local distinctiveness including the maintenance of strategic gaps.

To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures representing a minimum provision.

The Housing Delivery policy has been revised to provide for "at least XXX new homes" and the provisions for new homes in the Key Service centres policy presented as ranges.

Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations**Action**

(Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

10266 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson)	No change.
10155 - Timewell [8209]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages. To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.
10150 - R Smith [8243]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
8430 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9644 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Policy 8 - To consider new supporting text to clarify the impact of the favoured option on the potential need for additional housing land allocations within the Norwich Policy Area. To consider the allocation of sites in the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document to accommodate the South Norfolk share of new housing growth on small sites in the Norwich Policy Area.
10600 - Mr G Barnes [8321]	To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.
8895 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	None
9397 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	No change.
10290 - Tasburgh Parish Council (Mrs Julie King) [7053]	No change.
10463 - Mr David Smith [8309]	No change
8712 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	No change.
10619 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	None
8815 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	None
9965 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Bringham) [6903]	None
9780 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	No change.
9475 - Louisa Young [8135]	No change.
10491 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	No change.
10719 - Ms S Layton [8354]	
10321 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	To clarify the supporting text regarding the implications of the need to find additional housing land allocations to accommodate the South Norfolk Norwich Policy Area residue of 1800 dwellings as small sites or additions to named growth locations arising from the chosen growth option.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations

10297 - The Thelveton Estate (Sir Rupert Mann) [8279]
 10793 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360]
 10808 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]
 9744 - Ms Fae Whalley [8177]
 8595 - Mr M Read [8024]
 10202 - Mr Robert Debbage
 9858 - Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd [8210]
 9625 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]
 8660 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
 8684 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
 8052 - Mr Keith Jones [7536]
 8005 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]
 8751 - Ms K Dunn [8045]
 8966 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]
 9571 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]
 10564 - Mr G P Collings [8318]
 10587 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]
 10983 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
 9331 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
 9508 - South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142]
 10540 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]
 10108 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]
 7878 - Mr Stephen Streeter [7782]
 9919 - stephen eastwood [7962]
 8440 - MR Philip Hearsum [8004]
 8643 - Mr Steve Dowall [8033]
 8760 - Ms Sarah Smith [8059]
 8997 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093]
 9002 - Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094]
 9006 - Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095]
 9010 - Mr Philip Smith [8096]
 9013 - Mr KD White [8097]
 9017 - Mr Robert Hall [8098]

Action

Respondent advised to check position of settlements in submission document.
 Suggestions for Site Specific DPD can be sent to Council.
 No change.
 To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.
 None
 Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
 Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
 To amend Policy 8 and its supporting text to clarify the "Service Villages" functions within the context of the RSS, to emphasise form and character considerations and clarify the services basis for the choice of villages.
 To clarify the basis for the Settlement Hierarchy and impact of villages growth on the strategy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper.
 Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
 Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
 No reductions in the levels of housing allocation
 None
 None
 No change.
 No change
 To consider the allocation of sites to accommodate the South Norfolk share of new housing growth on small sites in the Norwich Policy Area as part of the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document.
 Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
 No change.
 None
 Pass site specific representations to Broadland District Council to be considered as part of their site specific DPD consultation.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations***Action***

9195 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] 10436 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9998 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9296 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
8511 - Sunguard Homes [8320]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
8736 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9718 - Ingleton Wood LLP [8171]	No change.
7984 - Mr Robert McKee [7840]	No change.
8497 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	No change.
10333 - Burston & Shimpling Parish Council (Mrs P Anderson) [8290]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
11006 - Mrs S Plaw [8370]	No change.
9799 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
7888 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	None
7887 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	None
7886 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	None
9521 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	No change.
9982 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9553 - Mr R Harris [8146]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
	To clarify the supporting text regarding the impacts of the potential accommodation of a further 3800 dwellings on smaller sites within the NPA.
9236 - Ms T Wheatley [4494] 8159 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899] 8209 - Mr P Anderson [7901] 8791 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations***Action***

8571 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]	None
9156 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]	
8608 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]	
9043 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	
8234 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	
8185 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	
9704 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	
9272 - Mrs Gray [5927]	
8363 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	
9113 - Mr John Osborne [7111]	
9360 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	
8522 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	
8119 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	
8120 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	
8274 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]	
8299 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	
8473 - Mr C Skeels [8016]	
8547 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]	
9680 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	
8842 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	
8980 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]	
9021 - Mr and Mrs Peter Tann [8099]	
9117 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]	
9171 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]	
9389 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	
9431 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	
9456 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	None
9538 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149]	No change.
10855 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	No change.
8348 - Spixworth Parish Council (Mrs R Rose) [1826]	None
9618 - RW Kidner [8163]	To consider the allocation of sites in the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document to accommodate the South Norfolk share of new housing growth on small sites in the Norwich Policy Area.
10032 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]	To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.
10183 - Commercial Land [8246]	
8911 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	None
9225 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations***Action***

10369 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	None
9882 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]	
10220 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	
9936 - John Heaser [7015]	
10515 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]	
8061 - MR MIKE HOWARD [7872]	
9679 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	
9831 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	
10131 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	
10091 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	
10346 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	
9766 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]	No change.
10739 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	None
11052 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	
10772 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	
10669 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348]	
10830 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	
10893 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	
10935 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]	

Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations

Action

Q16 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will

No reductions in the levels of housing allocation

This refers to perceived pressures on services arising from new housing provisions. The Settlement Hierarchy review has ensured the appropriate provisions of services while the policy has been revised to be less prescriptive about new housing provisions.

Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

The schedules of Service Villages has been revised and includes additional places suitable for limited new development

To consider the allocation of sites in the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document to accommodate the South Norfolk share of new housing growth on small sites in the Norwich Policy Area.

This will be the next stage of the preparation of the Local Development Framework which will consider the availability and suitability of potential development sites within the context of the defined Settlement Hierarchy for the accommodation of the housing provisions not yet allocated to particular places.

To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.

The area-wide Housing Delivery policy has been revised to provide for "at least XXXX new homes" while the Service Villages policy has been revised to be less prescriptive about its provisions for small scale housing development.

To consider the allocation of sites to accommodate the South Norfolk share of new housing growth on small sites in the Norwich Policy Area as part of the Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

This will be the next stage of the preparation of the Local Development Framework which will consider the availability and suitability of potential development sites within the context of the defined Settlement Hierarchy for the accommodation of the housing provisions not yet allocated to particular places.

To amend Policy 8 and its supporting text to clarify the "Service Villages" functions within the context of the RSS, to emphasise form and character considerations and clarify the services basis for the choice of villages.

The policy has been revised to provide for form and character considerations and to clarify the services basis for the revised defined settlements which reflect the review of the Settlement Hierarchy. The latter has reinterpreted the provisions of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and is described in the Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper..

To clarify the basis for the Settlement Hierarchy and impact of villages growth on the strategy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper.

This has been produced.

To clarify the supporting text regarding the implications of the need to find additional housing land allocations to accommodate the South Norfolk Norwich Policy Area residue of 1800 dwellings as small sites or additions to named growth locations arising from the chosen growth option.

The supporting text has been clarified regarding potential levels of development but additional housing numbers cannot be attributed to potential places to provide for the unallocated NPA housing provisions in advance of the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

Respondent advised to check position of settlements in submission document.

This refers to support for the provisions for Diss, Dickleburgh, Scole and Burston in the Settlement Hierarchy where the respondent owns potential development land. Some places have revised development provisions arising from the Settlement Hierarchy review.

Suggestions for Site Specific DPD can be sent to Council.

This refers to the same respondent as above regarding potential development land in Diss, Dickleburgh, Scole and Burston.

Policy 8 - To consider new supporting text to clarify the impact of the favoured option on the potential need for additional housing land allocations within the Norwich Policy Area.

The supporting text has been clarified regarding potential levels of development but additional housing numbers cannot be attributed to potential places to provide for the unallocated NPA housing provisions in advance of the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

To clarify the supporting text regarding the impacts of the potential accommodation of a further 3800 dwellings on smaller sites within the NPA.

The supporting text has been clarified regarding potential levels of development but additional housing numbers cannot be attributed to potential places to provide for the unallocated NPA housing provisions in advance of the production of the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document

To add the appropriate text to clarify the meaning of the housing provision figures as a minimum provision.

The Housing Delivery policy has been revised to provide for "at least XXX new homes" while the definitions of small scale development in the Service Villages policy has been made less prescriptive.

Pass site specific representations to Broadland District Council to be considered as part of their site specific DPD consultation.

Potential development sites submitted as part of the JCS consultation will be noted with regard to the potential consultations on the Site Specific Policies development Plan Document.

(Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

7983 - mr Daniel Yellop [7836]	None
10156 - Timewell [8209]	Action (1): Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages. Action (2): To reconsider the reference to Other Villages within the Norwich Policy Area being considered for (implied additional) sustainable development which could contradict the services levels required to support additional growth.
8816 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	None
9966 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	None
9626 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Action (1): To clarify the basis of the settlement hierarchy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper. Action (2): Action: Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of
8323 - Mr Geoffrey Loades	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations**Action**

8713 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	No change.
10322 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Action: To reconsider the reference to Other Villages within the Norwich Policy Area being considered for (implied additional) sustainable development which could contradict the services levels required to support additional growth.
10690 - Messrs P & A Jackson [8351]	Action (1): To produce a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper. Action (2): To amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
10695 - Mr G Mackintosh [8284]	Action (3): To amend the supporting text to clarify that housing provision figures Action (1): To produce a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper. Action (2): To amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages. Action (3): To amend the supporting text to clarify that housing provision figures
9775 - Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8193]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
10794 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360]	No change.
10809 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	
8596 - Mr M Read [8024]	No change
9781 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review
9400 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	None
9666 - Mr Richard Rallison [8167]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9227 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9645 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	No change.
7968 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review.
8393 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]	
10267 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068]	
8410 - M Harrold [7966]	
9196 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris	
9573 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	None
10620 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	
10033 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]	No change.
10184 - Commercial Land [8246]	
9303 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review.
7889 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	
8006 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	No change.
10068 - The Greetham Trustees [7606]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations

Action

8967 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]

Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review.

8661 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]

8685 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]

8738 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]

9999 - The Bunwell Partnership

(Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]

10203 - HJ Spratt & Sons [8250]

10204 - Mr Nicholas

Evans-Lombe [8252]

11075 - Duke of Grafton [8253]

10205 - Duke of Grafton [8253]

10291 - Bunwell Parish Council

(Mr John Pennell) [8276]

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations***Action***

10740 - Aylsham Town Council
(Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)
[1776]
8572 - Bressingham & Fersfield
Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer)
[1976]
10370 - Keswick Parish Council
(Mr P Brooks) [2020]
9157 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish
Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
9883 - Swardeston Parish Council
(Carole Jowett) [2058]
8609 - Tacolneston Parish Council
(Mr P Jeffery) [2059]
9044 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E.
J. Keymer) [4187]
9237 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]
8235 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

9705 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]
10221 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

9273 - Mrs Gray [5927]
11053 - Norfolk Homes Ltd
[6955]
8364 - Alyson Lowe [6992]
9114 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
9361 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
10516 - Postwick with Witton
Parish Council (A R Woods)
[7215]
8897 - ie homes & property ltd
(mr ed palmieri) [7620]
10773 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]
8523 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]
8161 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]
8160 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]
8210 - Mr P Anderson [7901]
8275 - Rockland St Mary and
Hellington Parish Council (Mr
Dennis Passingham) [7912]
8300 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
8474 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
8498 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
8792 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

8843 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
8981 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9118 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9172 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner
[8112]
9344 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
9390 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]
9432 - Swannington with Alderford
& Little Witchingham Parish
Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9457 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
9490 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]
9606 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
[8162]
9731 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson
[8174]
10984 - Howard Birch Associates
(Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
9767 - Damien van Carrapiett
[8184]
9832 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]
10132 - Lothbury Property Trust

No change to plan

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations***Action***

Company Ltd [8234] 10092 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] 10347 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] 10401 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] 10670 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] 10831 - North East Wymondham 10437 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	None
8251 - Mr John Seville [7086]	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review
10109 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] 10464 - Mr David Smith [8309] 10492 - Mr I T Smith [8310] 10565 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	None, although the policy will be amended based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review
9859 - Felthorpe Parish Council (Mr Chris Copsey) [8213]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
9983 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review
8336 - Mr Steve Horrocks [7941]	No change.
9752 - MRS JENNIFER HALL [8180]	No change.
8752 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	None
9800 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Amend policy subject to the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.
10541 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review
10588 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	None
9522 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	No change.
8186 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	None
10856 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	None
8548 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]	None
8913 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	Amend policy based on the outcome of the settlement hierarchy review.
8326 - Mr David Cantrill [7934]	No change.
9937 - John Heaser [7015]	To reconsider the reference to Other Villages within the Norwich Policy Area being considered for (implied additional) sustainable development which could contradict the services levels required to support additional growth.

Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Representations

Action

Q17 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

To clarify the basis of the settlement hierarchy through the production of a Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper.

The topic paper has been produced and is available from the Greater Norwich Development Partnership.

Amend policy subject to/ based on the Settlement Hierarchy review of villages.

The review has been completed and the policy revised in accordance with it. Details are available in the Settlement Hierarchy topic paper.

To reconsider the reference to other Villages within the Norwich Policy Area being considered for (implied additional) sustainable development which could contradict the services levels required to support additional growth.

A reference has been included in the policy to settlements within the Norwich Policy Area that may be considered for small housing allocations and included in the supporting text regarding the exceptional circumstances in which a larger scale of development may be permitted.

To amend the supporting text to clarify that housing provision figures imply a minimum provision.

No change has been made in relation to setting a minimum level of development in the Other Villages as the policy provides for infill or small groups of dwellings subject to form and character which are the overriding considerations. By definition development would not exceed the provisions for new housing requiring land allocations in the higher order places in the Settlement Hierarchy and could be developed as very small developments. No minimum level has been set and new housing in the Other Villages would not contribute towards the housing provisions of the JCS. However such growth would be deducted from the calculations of housing requirement for the next review of the strategy.

(Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

9458 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	None
10720 - Ms S Layton [8354]	No change.
9967 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	None
10323 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	To revise Policy 10 and supporting text to strengthen the need to balance the protection and enhancement of the countryside with the provisions for limited housing, commercial, leisure and tourism related development.
9627 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	
9402 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	None
9659 - Ms E Riches [8165]	None
8431 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	None
10621 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	None
10242 - Mr Duncan Smith [8257]	None
8597 - Mr M Read [8024]	None
10409 - Easton College [3570]	No change.
10414 - Honingham Thorpe Farms Limited [8296]	
8073 - Miss Janet Saunders	None
8915 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	None
8007 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	None
8714 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	No change.
8121 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	None
10034 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]	None
10185 - Commercial Land [8246]	

11157 - Robinson & Hall LLP (Miss Victoria Pearson) [8407]	None
10566 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	None
9241 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	No change.

Page 79 of 129

Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

Representations***Action***

9474 - Louisa Young [8135]	None
9984 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	None
10110 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	None
10348 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	
10465 - Mr David Smith [8309]	
10493 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	
8900 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	None
8758 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	
9574 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	None
9197 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	To revise policy to take account of the results of the Green infrastructure Strategy.
8817 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)	None
10589 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	None
8394 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]	Settlement hierarchy to be reviewed
8421 - M Harrold [7966]	
9801 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	None
8301 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	None
9782 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	None
10371 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	
7969 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	None
11054 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	None
8092 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	None
8793 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	None

Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

Representations***Action***

10741 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	None
9884 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]	
10222 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	
9938 - John Heaser [7015]	
10517 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]	
10774 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	
10857 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	
10985 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	
9768 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]	
9833 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	
10000 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]	
10133 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	
10093 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	
10402 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294]	
10438 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	
10795 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360]	
10810 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	
10832 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	
10895 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	
10937 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]	
10961 - Mr William E Cooper	
8187 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	None

Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

Representations***Action***

8573 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]	None
9158 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]	
9045 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	
9238 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	
8236 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	
9301 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]	
9706 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	
9274 - Mrs Gray [5927]	
8365 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	
9122 - Mr John Osborne [7111]	
9363 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	
8524 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	
8046 - Shane Hull [7857]	
8122 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	
8162 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	
8211 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	
8276 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]	
8475 - Mr C Skeels [8016]	
8499 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	
8549 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]	
8662 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]	
8686 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	
8740 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]	
8845 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	
8982 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]	
9119 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]	
9173 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]	
9345 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	
9391 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	
9433 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	
9491 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]	
9523 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	
7953 - Colin Mould [7809]	To include policy provisions for Broadband access.
10671 - Mrs Lyn Robertson	None
7890 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	None
9681 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	None

Q18 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?

Settlement hierarchy to be reviewed.

The settlement Hierarchy has been reviewed and provisions made for limited new development including provisions in some settlements previously designated by implication as being in "The Countryside".

To include policy provisions for Broadband access.

Information Technology provisions have been made in the area-wide policy providing for Access and transportation.

To revise policy to take account of the results of the Green Infrastructure Strategy.

This is in response to concerns about the lack of clarity regarding countryside access and a green access strategy, sustainable development and provisions for development linked to agriculture and forest activities. Sustainability, green networks and access to the countryside are provided for by the area-wide policies to protect environmental assets, to promote good design, and to provide for The Economy. The outcomes of the Green Infrastructure Strategy are also included within the JCS policies such as the "Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area", "Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area" and "The remainder of the Norwich urban area including the fringe parishes". Agricultural related uses are provided for by the policy provisions for the "Smaller rural communities and the countryside" and the policy titled "The Economy". Forestry related activities are a detail that can be provided for through general provisions in the policies for "The Economy" and the "Smaller rural communities and the countryside" for the promotion of the development of appropriate new and expanded businesses, and "small and medium scale commercial enterprises where a rural location can be justified, including leisure and tourism facilities...".

To revise Policy 10 and supporting text to strengthen the need to balance the protection and enhancement of the countryside with the provisions for limited housing, commercial, leisure and tourism related development.

The supporting text to the policy "Smaller rural communities and the Countryside" refers to the countryside features that need to be protected and enhanced, while the policy provides for limited development that reflects those needs. The area-wide policy to protect environmental assets clarifies the protection of the countryside.

Page 82 of 129

Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?

Representations***Action***

(Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?

8818 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]	No change to plan
9364 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	No change to plan
8334 - Mr Brian Cleland [7938]	No change to plan
7919 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	No change to plan
10324 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	No change to plan
10385 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Consider amending policy to take account of the potential effects and benefits of growth NE of Norwich on the Broads.
9198 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	No change to plan
10543 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	No change to plan
10590 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	No change to plan
8237 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	No change to plan
9575 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	
10094 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235]	
10111 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	
10466 - Mr David Smith [8309]	
10494 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	
10567 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	
7970 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	No change to plan
10439 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	
10672 - Mrs Lyn Robertson	
9419 - Mr David Gladwell [8126]	No change to plan
10622 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	No change to plan

Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?

Representations

Action

10742 - Aylsham Town Council
(Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)
[1776]
9242 - Stratton Strawless Parish
Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
8574 - Bressingham & Fersfield
Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer)
[1976]
8916 - Hempnall Parish Council
(Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
9159 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish
Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
9885 - Swardeston Parish Council
(Carole Jowett) [2058]
9046 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E.
J. Keymer) [4187]
9239 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]
8188 - Mr Roger F. Weeks
MRICS [4796]
9302 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock
[5445]
9707 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]
10223 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

No change to plan

11055 - Norfolk Homes Ltd
[6955]
8366 - Alyson Lowe [6992]
9939 - John Heaser [7015]
9124 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
10518 - Postwick with Witton
Parish Council (A R Woods)
[7215]
9802 - Cringleford Parish Council
(Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]
8903 - ie homes & property ltd
(mr ed palmieri) [7620]
10775 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]
8526 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]
8093 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]

8123 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]

8163 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]
8212 - Mr P Anderson [7901]
8277 - Rockland St Mary and
Hellington Parish Council (Mr
Dennis Passingham) [7912]
8302 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
8476 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
10858 - Norwich Green Party (Mr
Stephen Little) [8018]
8500 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
8550 - Mrs Patricia Robertson
[8021]
8663 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
8687 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
8753 - Ms K Dunn [8045]
9682 - Wroxham Parish Council
(Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
8741 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]
8794 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

8846 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
8983 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9120 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9174 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner
[8112]
9346 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]

Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?

Representations

Action

9393 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]
9434 - Swannington with Alderford
& Little Witchingham Parish
Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9459 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
9492 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]
9555 - Mr R Harris [8146]
9608 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
[8162]
9733 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson
[8174]
10986 - Howard Birch Associates
(Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
9769 - Damien van Carrapiett
[8184]
9834 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]
10001 - The Bunwell Partnership
(Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
10035 - The London Planning
Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)
[8230]
10134 - Lothbury Property Trust
Company Ltd [8234]
10186 - Commercial Land [8246]

10403 - Acle Parish Council (Ms
Pauline James) [8294]
10796 - Liftshare (Ms Ali
Clabburn) [8360]
10811 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]

9628 - Broads Authority (Mr. John
Clements) [7986]

7891 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]

9404 - Mr E Newberry [8120]
9525 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]

Consider use of suggested rewording of policy and text

No change to plan

No change to plan

Q19 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?

Consider amending policy to take account of the potential effects and benefits of growth NE of Norwich on the Broads.

Revisions to the policy "Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich policy Area" provide for enhanced green spaces and woodland including a significant green space to the north of Rackheath to reduce impacts on the Broads Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The supporting text to the revised policy "The Broads" has also been revised to clarify the complementary links and impacts between the Broads and JCS area., and the need to provide for informal visitor attractions in the JCS area that complement the attractions of The Broads to prevent excess visitor pressure.

Consider use of suggested rewording of policy and text

This refers to policy wording suggested by The Broads Authority. The policy has been revised to incorporate the suggested wording while the supporting text has also been revised to

(Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

9660 - Ms E Riches [8165] Action: No change.

9847 - Spen Hill Developments
Limited [8201] None

10305 - mrs LISA ford [8282] Action: No change.

10268 - Costessey Parish
Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) Action: No change.

7971 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett
[6862] None

10325 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James) Action: no change.

Frost) [6826]	
8795 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	Action: No change.
10288 - ASDA Stores Ltd [8274]	Action: No change.
9473 - Louisa Young [8135]	Action: No change.
8009 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	None

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations

9734 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]
 9968 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]
 10286 - Henderson Retail Warehouse Fund [8270]

 8278 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]
 8598 - Mr M Read [8024]
 9746 - Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155]
 9527 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]
 10721 - Ms S Layton [8354]

 8917 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
 11119 - The Leeder Family [8390]

 9304 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock
 10112 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]
 10591 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]
 10135 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]
 10897 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]
 9047 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]
 9576 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]
 9332 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
 8664 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
 9200 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]
 7932 - mr paul newson [7812]

Action

None
 None
 Action (1): Policy 12 - in the context of the Norwich Sub Region Retail and Town Centres Study (October 2007), to confirm whether Norwich city centre should include the Riverside Retail Park and to consider the designation of the latter as a potential district centre.
 Action (2): Policy 12 -in supporting text paragraph 7.38 immediately after the first words "This is supplemented by...", insert the additional words, "...the Riverside Retail Park, "
 Action: No change.
 None
 None
 None
 Action: No change.
 Action: To reconsider the status of Long Stratton as a Key Service Centre in terms of general growth for consistency with the maintaining of the existing status of other centres that coincide with major housing growth locations, and for further consistency, to consider the retention of this centre in Group 3 of the Hierarchy of Centres as the centres in Groups 1 and 2 have an acknowledged and quantified growth potential for significant retail floorspace. However in view of the proposed housing growth and the potential for additional shops and services to meet the needs of that growth within the new housing areas, the status of Long Stratton in terms of both the Settlement Hierarchy and the Hierarchy of Centres will be reviewed in future reviews of the strategy to reflect the impacts of the proposed housing and potential new commercial development when it has occurred.
 None
 Action: No change.
 None
 Action: Policy 12 - For consistency to revise the status of the proposed district centres of Old Catton/ Rackheath/ Thorpe St Andrew, Blue Boar lane, Sprowston and Hall Road, Norwich to Category 3 on the basis of their potential ranges of goods sold and potential sales floor space.
 Action: No change.
 Action: No change.
 Action: No change.
 Action: No change.
 Action: to refer in the Policy 12 supporting text to the complementary roles of the towns and main district centres of Beccles, Bungay and Hoveton as significant shopping and service centres adjacent to and serving the strategy area.
 Action: No change.

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations

8501 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
9405 - Mr E Newberry [8120]
10095 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher
[8235]
10096 - Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher
[8235]
10349 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole
Williams) [8293]
10495 - Mr I T Smith [8310]
10544 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]

10568 - Mr G P Collings [8318]
7940 - Mr Peter Boddy [7815]

Action

Action: No change.

None

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations

10386 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]
 9803 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]
 9629 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]
 9269 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]

Action

Policy 12 - to clarify the supporting text regarding the functions of and basis and reasons for the defined hierarchy of centres as suggested below: Insert three new paragraphs between Paragraphs 7.36 and 7.37 as follows: "The hierarchy of centres reflects the functions of and catchments served by each centre, their availability of shops and services and their potential to accommodate growth as assessed by background evidence studies. Categories 1 and 2 respectively group the largest centres of Norwich and the main towns (plus a large district centre) which serve notable urban and rural catchments and have potentials for additional shopping floor space and leisure uses as identified by the "Norwich Sub Region: Retail and Town Centres Study" (October 2007), and office development potential in Norwich as detailed below. Category 3 shows the smaller district centres within Norwich and the smaller towns and large villages with centres serving more localised catchments and which have a greater emphasis on providing for everyday needs. (This category also includes the largest proposed new district centres). Local smaller scale provisions to serve the remaining proposed new housing growth areas are shown in Category 4. Other local shops and services will also be provided for where local needs arise. Overall the development of potential town centre uses will be provided for on a scale appropriate to the form and functions of, and the potentials for development identified by background evidence studies as detailed below." Add to Paragraph 7.37: " (of which most retail comparison goods), while the centre also provides for most of the strategy area's commercial leisure provisions". (Follow 7.37 with new para.): "Norwich is expected to continue as the area's primary retailing and leisure centre, with expansion potential to 2016 (based on high confidence levels) in the city centre for up to some 4%-12% additional convenience goods floor space (depending on expenditure being taken up by large or small stores respectively), and some 21% additional comparison goods floor space. Norwich city centre will remain the focus for much large scale commercial leisure development to reflect a potential growth in leisure expenditure of 23% by 2016, while Norwich and parts of its fringe are identified as potential locations for significant office growth to 2021. The latter could total some 300,000m2 of which some 33% would be accommodated within the city centre, while 50% could be accommodated in the Norwich Research Park and Broadland Business Park with the remainder to be divided between a variety of potential city centre and other locations." Para, 7.38: Replace first word "This" with, "Norwich city centre". Add to paragraph 7.38 the words, "The district centres would be considered for additional improvements as shopping destinations. On a sequential site selection basis, Anglia Square would provide a potential location for growth identified for Norwich city centre. However no potential has been identified for additional out-of-centre retailing." Insert two new paragraphs after paragraph 7.39 to say: "The market and other main towns will need to maintain their roles and diversify their shops and services. Recent major food store developments have taken up any potential for convenience goods stores in the town centres of Aylsham and Diss, whose respective potentials for further comparison goods floor space to 2016 amount to an additional 35% and 42%. The remaining town centres of Harleston and Wymondham have been identified as having floor space potentials for an additional 22-67% convenience/ 18% comparison goods, and 15-43% convenience/ 19% comparison goods floor space respectively (the convenience goods ranges again reflecting expenditure take up by large or small stores). These towns will also act as foci for leisure development such as cafes, bars, restaurants and other food and drink establishments. These could total broadly some 15% of total town centre floor space and would be provided for to enhance the vitality and viability of such centres as a whole." Insert two new paragraphs after paragraph 7.40 to say: "No specific retail floor space potentials have been identified for this range of smaller centres, albeit evidence shows a notable potential for additional convenience goods floor space growth within the Norwich urban area as a whole. Policies will define all retail and service centres in which provisions may be protected and enhanced." "The proposed large scale housing areas will provide for shops and services to meet local needs where they are not able to benefit from existing centres. The Old Catton/ Rackheath/ Thorpe St Andrew growth area in particular will be sufficiently large to require a district centre to preferably comprise a food store as an anchor and sufficient leisure and ancillary activities to provide for the attraction of a range of trips."

Action: No change.

10467 - Mr David Smith [8309]

Action: No change.

9770 - Damien van Carrapiett [8184]

None

8944 - Miss Marguerite Finn

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations***Action***

7892 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	None
9244 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	None
8575 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]	
9160 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]	
8610 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]	
9240 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	
8238 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	
8189 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	
9708 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	
8819 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]	
8367 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	
9125 - Mr John Osborne [7111]	
9365 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	
8527 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	
8124 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	
8126 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	
8127 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	
8164 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	
8477 - Mr C Skeels [8016]	
8551 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]	
8688 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	
9683 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	
8742 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]	
8847 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	
8984 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]	
9121 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]	
9394 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	
9435 - Swannington with Alderford	
9175 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	None
11135 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	None
11056 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	
11148 - JB Planning Associates	

Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Representations**Action**

10743 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	None
10372 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	
9886 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]	
10054 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	
10224 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	
9940 - John Heaser [7015]	
10755 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048]	
10519 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]	
10776 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	
9460 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	
10987 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	
10002 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]	
10036 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]	
10187 - Commercial Land [8246]	
10404 - Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294]	
10440 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	
10623 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	
10673 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348]	
10834 - North East Wymondham	
8438 - J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003]	None
10859 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Action: No change.
8303 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	None
9556 - Mr R Harris [8146]	Action: No change.
10017 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]	Action: No change.
8125 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	None
7954 - Colin Mould [7809]	Action: No change
8213 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	
9835 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	Action: No change.
10797 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360]	Action: No change.
10812 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	

Q20 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Action (1): Policy 12 – in the context of the Norwich Sub Region Retail and Town Centres Study (October 2007), to confirm whether Norwich city centre should include the Riverside Retail Park and to consider the designation of the latter as a potential district centre.

The Riverside centre is considered to fall within the overall Norwich city centre but has been included within The Hierarchy of Centres policy, Category 2 “Town and large district centres” consistent with the classification of Anglia Square..

Action (2): Policy 12 –in supporting text paragraph 7.38 immediately after the first words “This is supplemented by...”, insert the additional words, “...the

Riverside Retail Park,

The supporting text has been more extensively revised, but includes an appropriate reference to Riverside.

Action: Policy 12 – For consistency to revise the status of the proposed district centres of Old Catton, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew, Blue Boar Lane, Sprowston and Hall Road, Norwich, to category 3 on the basis of their potential ranges of goods sold and potential sales floor space.

These centres have been revised to be included in Category 3.

Action: Policy 12 – to clarify the supporting text regarding the functions of and basis and reasons for the defined hierarchy of centres as suggested below:

Insert three new paragraphs between Paragraphs 7.36 and 7.37 as follows:

“The hierarchy of centres reflects the functions of and catchments served by each centre, their availability of shops and services and their potential to accommodate growth as assessed by background evidence studies. Categories 1 and 2 respectively group the largest centres of Norwich and the main towns (plus a large district centre) which serve notable urban and rural catchments and have potentials for additional shopping floor space and leisure uses as identified by the “Norwich Sub Region: Retail and Town Centres Study” (October 2007), and office development potential in Norwich as detailed below.

Category 3 shows the smaller district centres within Norwich and the smaller towns and large villages with centres serving more localised catchments and which have a greater emphasis on providing for everyday needs. (This category also includes the largest proposed new district centres). Local smaller scale provisions to serve the remaining proposed new housing growth areas are shown in Category 4. Other local shops and services will also be provided for where local needs arise.

Overall the development of potential town centre uses will be provided for on a scale appropriate to the form and functions of, and the potentials for development identified by background evidence studies as detailed below.”

The supporting text has been revised to reflect the above wording.

Add to Paragraph 7.37:

“ (of which most retail comparison goods), while the centre also provides for most of the strategy area’s commercial leisure provisions”.

The supporting text has been revised to reflect the above wording.

Follow 7.37 with new para.): “Norwich is expected to continue as the area’s primary retailing and leisure centre, with expansion potential to 2016 (based on high confidence levels) in the city centre for up to some 4%-12% additional convenience goods floor space (depending on expenditure being taken up by large or small stores respectively), and some 21% additional comparison goods floor space. Norwich city centre will remain the focus for much large scale commercial leisure development to reflect a potential growth in leisure expenditure of 23% by 2016, while Norwich and parts of its fringe are identified as potential locations for significant office growth to 2021. The latter could total some 300,000m² of which some 33% would be accommodated within the city centre, while 50% could be accommodated in the Norwich Research Park and Broadland Business Park with the remainder to be divided between a variety of potential city centre and other locations.”

The above change has not been made for being too detailed and for being partially covered elsewhere in the JCS.

Para, 7.38: Replace first word “This” with, “Norwich city centre”.

The supporting text has been revised to reflect the above wording.

Add to paragraph 7.38 the words, “The district centres would be considered for additional improvements as shopping destinations. On a sequential site selection basis, Anglia Square would provide a potential location for growth identified for Norwich city centre. However no potential has been identified for additional out-of-centre retailing.”

The supporting text has been revised to reflect some of the above wording.

Insert two new paragraphs after paragraph 7.39 to say:

“The market and other main towns will need to maintain their roles and diversify their shops and services. Recent major food store developments have taken up any potential for convenience goods stores in the town centres of Aylsham and Diss, whose respective potentials for further comparison goods floor space to 2016 amount to an additional 35% and 42%. The remaining town centres of Harleston and Wymondham have been identified as having floor space potentials for an additional 22-67% convenience/ 18% comparison goods, and 15-43% convenience/ 19% comparison goods floor space respectively (the convenience goods ranges again reflecting expenditure take up by large or small stores).

These towns will also act as foci for leisure development such as cafes, bars, restaurants and other food and drink establishments. These could total broadly some 15% of total town centre floor space and would be provided for to enhance the vitality and viability of such centres as a whole.”

The above changes have not been made.

Insert two new paragraphs after paragraph 7.40 to say:

“No specific retail floor space potentials have been identified for this range of smaller centres, albeit evidence shows a notable potential for additional convenience goods floor space growth within the Norwich urban area as a whole. Policies will define all retail and service centres in which provisions may be protected and enhanced.”

The supporting text has been revised to reflect some of the above wording.

“The proposed large scale housing areas will provide for shops and services to meet local needs where they are not able to benefit from existing centres. The Old Catton/ Rackheath/ Thorpe St Andrew growth area in particular will be sufficiently large to require a district centre to preferably comprise a food store as an anchor and sufficient leisure and ancillary activities to provide for the attraction of a range of trips.”

The supporting text has been revised to reflect the above wording.

Action: to refer in the Policy 12 supporting text to the complementary roles of the towns and main district centres of Beccles, Bungay and Hoveton as significant shopping and service centres adjacent to and serving the strategy area.

The supporting text has been revised to reflect the above wording.

Action: To reconsider the status of Long Stratton as a Key Service Centre in terms of general growth for consistency with the maintaining of the existing status of other centres that coincide with major housing growth locations, and for further consistency, to consider the retention of this centre in Group 3 of the Hierarchy of Centres, as the centres in Groups 1 and 2 have an acknowledged and quantified growth and the potential for significant retail floor space.

However in view of the proposed housing growth and the potential for additional shops and services to meet the needs of that growth within the new housing areas, the status of Long Stratton in terms of both the Settlement Hierarchy and the Hierarchy of Centres will be reviewed in future reviews of the strategy to reflect the impacts of the proposed housing and potential new commercial development.

The status of Long Stratton has been revised to that of a Key Service Centre in the Settlement Hierarchy while retaining its position in Group 3 of the Hierarchy of Centres.'

Page 90 of 129

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

Representations***Action******8. Area-wide policies (policies about topics) (Q21 -Q26)******(Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)***

11155 - British Wind Energy Association (Ms Gemma Grimes) [8401]	Ensure policies for renewable energy and energy efficiency are proactive and can be implemented through the use of recognised standards rather than generic
7972 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Consider need for more detailed design policy.
9630 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Consider placing environmental policies as the first policies in the strategy.
8128 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	No change to plan
9783 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	No change to plan
10649 - Ms Lucy Hall [8295]	No change to plan
10683 - Ms Natalie Beal [8349]	Consider amendments to policy in the light of the findings of the Energy Study and more detailed wording amendments as suggested.
10387 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Ensure submission policy is locally distinctive and takes account of the findings of the Energy Study.
10641 - Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333]	No change to plan
9646 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Ensure environmental policies are locally distinctive
10251 - Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260]	Consider reference to geodiversity in policy.
8048 - Mr Keith Jones [7536]	No change to plan
10707 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Consider amendments to policy to cover water bodies, pollution and contamination.
9969 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	No change to plan
8214 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	No change to plan
8094 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] findings of the energy study	Consider amendments to environmental design standards, taking account of the
8773 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	
9333 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	
10326 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	Take account of the findings of the Energy Study, particularly in relation to the sustainability performance of existing buildings.
7933 - mr paul newson [7812]	Consider energy policies in relation to findings of the energy study.
10113 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	No change to plan
8998 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093]	No change to plan
10860 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	Consider Code for Sustainable Homes requirements in the light of the completed findings of the evidence base.

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

Representations***Action***

9243 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	No change to plan
9079 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	
9201 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	
9396 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	
11057 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	No change to plan
9920 - stephen eastwood [7962]	
8644 - Mr Steve Dowall [8033]	
8762 - Ms Sarah Smith [8059]	
9003 - Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094]	
9007 - Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095]	
9011 - Mr Philip Smith [8096]	
9014 - Mr KD White [8097]	
9018 - Mr Robert Hall [8098]	
10169 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]	Consider amendments to policy to protect minerals sources and railheads.
9048 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change to plan
10592 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	No change to plan
9619 - RW Kidner [8163]	Consider use of national sustainability standards in policy, taking account of findings of energy study.
9528 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	No change to plan
8920 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change to plan
9577 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	
10468 - Mr David Smith [8309]	
10496 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	
10569 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	
8599 - Mr M Read [8024]	No change to plan
8715 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	
8952 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	
10350 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole)	
9406 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	No change to plan
9494 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]	No change to plan
11136 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	Consider Code for Sustainable Homes requirements in the light of further evidence base findings.
10055 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	
10756 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048]	
10136 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	
11104 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	
10646 - David Morris (Mr David Morris) [8335]	
10835 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	
10898 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	
10917 - Allied London Properties [8367]	
11120 - The Leeder Family [8390]	

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

Representations

Action

11149 - JB Planning Associates
(Mr John Boyd) [6979]

No change to plan

8319 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922]

No change to plan

8450 - Ian Harris [8007]
8789 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]

10655 - Mrs Helene Rinaldo

Consider how the notion of human footprinting and food security might be incorporated in policies.

9804 - Cringleford Parish Council
(Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]

No change to plan

9557 - Mr R Harris [8146]

No change to plan

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

Representations

Action

10744 - Aylsham Town Council
(Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)
[1776]
9245 - Stratton Strawless Parish
Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
8576 - Bressingham & Fersfield
Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer)
[1976]
10373 - Keswick Parish Council
(Mr P Brooks) [2020]
9161 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish
Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
9887 - Swardeston Parish Council
(Carole Jowett) [2058]
8611 - Tacolneston Parish Council
(Mr P Jeffery) [2059]
8239 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

9709 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]
10225 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

No change to plan

9276 - Mrs Gray [5927]
8820 - Marlingford & Colton
Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)
[6869]
8368 - Alyson Lowe [6992]
9941 - John Heaser [7015]
9126 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
9366 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
10520 - Postwick with Witton
Parish Council (A R Woods)
[7215]
8905 - ie homes & property ltd
(mr ed palmieri) [7620]
10777 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]
8528 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]
8010 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]
8165 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]
8279 - Rockland St Mary and
Hellington Parish Council (Mr
Dennis Passingham) [7912]
8304 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
8478 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
8502 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
8552 - Mrs Patricia Robertson
[8021]
8665 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
8689 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
8743 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]
8796 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

8848 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
8985 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9022 - Mr and Mrs Peter Tann
[8099]
9123 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9436 - Swannington with Alderford
& Little Witchingham Parish
Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9463 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
9610 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
[8162]
9735 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson
[8174]
10988 - Howard Birch Associates
(Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
9836 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

Representations

Action

9902 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]
 10003 - The Bunwell Partnership
 (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
 10037 - The London Planning
 Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)
 [8230]
 10188 - Commercial Land [8246]

10441 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]
 10545 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]

10624 - Central Norwich Citizens
 Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]

8344 - Age Concern Norwich (Phil
 Wells) [7957]

8190 - Mr Roger F. Weeks
 MRICS [4796]

9176 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner

7955 - Colin Mould [7809]

9305 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock

9854 - Mr Paul Johnson [8207]

9684 - Wroxham Parish Council
 (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]

9308 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]

7894 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]

Ensure strategy promotes housing which provides flexibility and meets the needs of all, including the elderly.

No change to plan

Consider potential to improve the energy efficiency of existing social housing

No change to plan

Consider need for flexibility on densities in design policies

No change to plan

No change to plan

No change to plan

(Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

Representations

Action

Q21 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)(policy on reducing environmental impact)

Consider amendments to environmental design standards, taking account of the findings of the energy study

The energy study has informed considerably expanded policy content including a policy directly concerned with climate change, and a policy relating to the energy efficiency of new buildings

Consider need for more detailed design policy.

There is a completely new policy on design in the pre-submission version

Consider need for flexibility on densities in design policies

There are specific references to density in the policy on climate change and environmental assets, and its supporting text, focused on making the best use of land, but acknowledging that density will need to take account of the characteristics of an area, access to public transport routes etc

Consider reference to geodiversity in policy.

Geodiversity is recognized as an environmental asset. Although this is not specifically mentioned in policy, the supporting text has been amended to explain this

Consider Code for Sustainable Homes requirements in the light of the completed findings of the evidence base.

Policy on sustainable building design refers specifically to the code for sustainable homes

Ensure strategy promotes housing which provides flexibility and meets the needs of all, including the elderly.

The policy on housing delivery specifically seeks the mix of house types to meet the needs of the whole community as determined by the most recent research. Supporting text includes an illustration of the proportions of house sizes derived from the 2006 study, which has also guided the tenure of mix being sought. The policy on housing now explicitly refers to the need for housing with care in view of the significance of an aging population in the future

Consider placing environmental policies as the first policies in the strategy.

The strategy has now been restructured in this way

Consider amendments to policy to protect minerals sources and railheads.

There is support in the transport policy/supporting text for the promotion of rail freight facilities, though this stops short of blanket protection. The policy on environmental assets specifically refers to the need to protect minerals, which also referred to in an objective. The supporting text of the policy on major locations for growth in the Norwich policy area explains that the need to avoid significant mineral deposits was one of the factors in their selection

Consider use of national sustainability standards in policy, taking account of findings of energy study.

Policy on sustainable building design refers specifically to the code for sustainable homes. Are references made to the BREEAM standards for non-residential buildings

Take account of the findings of the Energy Study, particularly in relation to the sustainability performance of existing buildings.

Policy on sustainable building design refers specifically to the code for sustainable homes. Are references made to the BREEAM standards for non-residential buildings

Consider potential to improve the energy efficiency of existing social housing stock.

Policy on sustainable building design refers specifically to the code for sustainable homes. Are references made to the BREEAM standards for non-residential buildings.while this relates to new buildings, the policy also allows for the creation of a carbon offsetting fund which could be used to improve the energy efficiency of the existing building stock

Consider energy policies in relation to findings of the energy study.

Strengthened policy content has been guided by the outcome of the energy study

Ensure submission policy is locally distinctive and takes account of the findings of the Energy Study.

Strengthened policy content has been guided by the outcome of the energy study

Ensure environmental policies are locally distinctive.

The environmental assets policies have been redrafted and more local flavour introduced. Some of the illustrative of material is derived from the green infrastructure strategy

Consider Code for Sustainable Homes requirements in the light of further evidence base findings.

Policy on sustainable building design refers specifically to the code for sustainable homes

Consider how the notion of human footprinting and food security might be incorporated in policies.

The policies on local energy generation and the environmental efficiency of buildings support the purpose of this representation, although it is not expressed as human footprinting. One of the monitoring measures proposed is CO2 emissions per capita. It is hard to see how food security can be incorporated into policies, other than through the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and the use of the densities to minimize green field development.

The plan does seek to make the best use of land, and the locations are selected for growth have had regard to the quality of agricultural land, though it must be acknowledged that considerable Greenfield development is inevitable. Part of the major growth triangle to the north east of Norwich is likely to be developed under the Government's eco – towns banner.

Consider amendments to policy in the light of the findings of the Energy Study and more detailed wording amendments as suggested.

The energy policy in the pre-submission version has been guided by the outcome of the energy study conducted under PPS 1 guidance

Consider amendments to policy to cover water bodies, pollution and contamination.

The need to protect the aquatic or water environment is referred to in a number of places including the spatial vision and the policy to protect the environmental assets

(Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

7973 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	No change needed [RB]
10684 - Ms Natalie Beal [8349]	Include 40% target in policy, but with a suitable caveats concerning the need for updated housing market assessments, and the need for flexibility in the light of viability assessments on particular sites.
10388 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Include housing trajectory and implementation strategy in pre-submission draft Calculate requirement for Gypsies and travellers for long stay and transit pitches, and for Travelling Showpeople and include in pre-submission draft. [RB]
9647 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Include an implementation strategy indicating the infrastructure needs, cost and funding sources related to strategic developments, and a global figure to cover the estimated infrastructure cost for smaller scale development in the pre-submission publication version of the joint core strategy [RB]
10374 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations**Action**

10918 - Allied London Properties [8367]	No change needed in a direct response, but include in housing policy or supporting text some more detail on the source of information on the housing mix required. Ensure the housing policy and implementation strategy take account of market conditions and recognize that market conditions of pertaining at any given time may require viability assessment In the light of evidence drawn from the renewable energy study, new policies on climate change/sustainable design should be included In response to other representations it has been suggested elsewhere that the communities and culture policy could be significantly strengthened
8612 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]	No Change needed [RB]
9080 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	No change needed [RB]
8395 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]	No changes needed [RB]
9092 - Anonymous respondent [6929]	No change needed [RB]
8369 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	No change needed [RB]
9661 - Ms E Riches [8165]	No change needed [RB]
10640 - Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333]	No change needed [RB]
8908 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	No change needed [RB]
8864 - Mr Stephen Andrews	No change needed [RB]
11153 - Friends Family and Travellers (Planning) (Mr S J Staines) [7224] 10675 - Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] 10965 - Mr William E Cooper	Amended the policy/supporting text to include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ Residential pitch targets extrapolated to 2026, but with a reference to possible modification in the light of future Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments â€¢ Locational guidance for these to refer to the demonstrable needs of Gypsies and Travellers, Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessments, and access to a range of facilities. In the longer run, some sites should be provided in association with the major strategic housing developments. â€¢ An appropriate share of the Norfolk total for transit sites as recommended by the Secretary of State, linked to the main corridors of movement â€¢ Suggestion that sites will generally accommodate about ten to twelve pitches, but with variations to suit the circumstances of particular sites â€¢ Reference to the diversity of Gypsy and Traveller groups as explanation for the strategy of a number of smaller sites rather than a large concentration â€¢ Although not mentioned by FFT, the Secretary of State's proposed modifications also include a requirement for additional plots for Travelling Showpeople, again with an extrapolation formula. This too should be added to the
11058 - Norfolk Homes Ltd	No change
8529 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8166 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	Strengthen the design policy, but retain a commitment to masterplanning of large developments [RB]
8254 - R Barker [6805]	No changes needed, unless other evidence demonstrates that a bypass cannot be delivered through developer funding, augmented where feasible by available public funds. [RB]
10327 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	No change needed [RB]
9202 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	No change [RB]
8191 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] 8129 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	Strengthen the design policy, but retain a commitment to masterplanning of large developments [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Action

9311 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	No change needed [RB]
8716 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	correct the error in policy 2 [RB]
10306 - mrs LISA ford [8282]	No change needed to the joint core strategy, but recognise that new settlements may become part of any strategy looking further ahead into the future. [RB]
9133 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]	no change needed [RB]
10546 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	No change needed [RB]
10638 - Mr Alan Ives [8299]	Strengthen policy on quality of development [RB]
9805 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	No change needed [RB]
8503 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	
8626 - Kay Eke [8025]	No change needed [RB]
8777 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	
7895 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	No change needed [RB]
9903 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	
9970 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Not applicable [RB]
8074 - Miss Janet Saunders [7875]	
9864 - Diocese of Norwich [2708]	Ensure the final policy recognises that viability may be an issue which will need to be judged according to the circumstances of a particular site, and refer to the 40% target in policy, subject to caveats about viability and about the need for adjustment in the light of future housing market assessments [RB]
8011 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	
	No change needed [RB]
10442 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	No change needed [RB]
10069 - The Greetham Trustees [7606]	
9985 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	ensure the final policy recognizes the need for any particular site viability evidence to be taken into account in the operation of the policy, and reconsider the policies for service villages and other villages to avoid undue rigidity. [RB]
10038 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]	
10137 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	
10151 - R Smith [8243]	
10189 - Commercial Land [8246]	
9253 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	Strengthen policies on energy efficiency [RB]
9049 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change needed [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Action

8921 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change needed [RB]
9307 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]	
9710 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	
9277 - Mrs Gray [5927]	
9578 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	
7934 - mr paul newson [7812]	
8215 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	
8479 - Mr C Skeels [8016]	
8600 - Mr M Read [8024]	
8666 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]	
8690 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	
8852 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	
9068 - Ms Penny Tilley [8108]	
9407 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	
9334 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	
9529 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	
9558 - Mr R Harris [8146]	
9855 - Mr Paul Johnson [8207]	
10247 - Mrs Angela Garner [8258]	
10351 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	
10469 - Mr David Smith [8309]	
10497 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	
11150 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	Add further information to the policy or supporting text concerning the type of housing required to meet needs in the area, stating that it is derived from the ORS study, but acknowledging the possibility of outdated future studies.
10861 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	
10836 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	
10899 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	
9888 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]	Reconsider the policies relating to "service villages" and "other villages" to avoid undue rigidity [RB]
9495 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]	No change needed [RB]
9747 - Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155]	Add a "hook" to the policy to ensure that the housing mix specifically takes account of the needs of an ageing population, who many of whom will have limiting long-term disabilities [RB]
9163 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]	
10876 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	No change
11121 - The Leeder Family [8390]	
9620 - RW Kidner [8163]	Reconsider the policies for service villages and other villagers compared with those included in the technical consultation and public consultation documents, to avoid excessive rigidity. [RB]
8305 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	No change needed [RB]
9398 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Action

10745 - Aylsham Town Council
(Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)
[1776]
9246 - Stratton Strawless Parish
Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
8577 - Bressingham & Fersfield
Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer)
[1976]
11137 - Persimmon Homes
(Anglia) [2373]
10056 - Persimmon Homes
(Anglia) [2373]
8240 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

10226 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

8822 - Marlingford & Colton
Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)
[6869]
9942 - John Heaser [7015]
9127 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
9368 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
10521 - Postwick with Witton
Parish Council (A R Woods)
[7215]
10778 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]
8280 - Rockland St Mary and
Hellington Parish Council (Mr
Dennis Passingham) [7912]
8553 - Mrs Patricia Robertson
[8021]
9685 - Wroxham Parish Council
(Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
8744 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]
8797 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

8849 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
8986 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9177 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner
[8112]
9437 - Swannington with Alderford
& Little Witchingham Parish
Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9464 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
9539 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149]
9611 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
[8162]
9736 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson
[8174]
10989 - Howard Birch Associates
(Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
9837 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]
10004 - The Bunwell Partnership
(Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
10114 - Kimberley and Carleton
Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane
Fraser) [8239]

No change needed [RB]

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Action

Q22 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Strengthen the design policy, but retain a commitment to masterplanning of large developments [RB]

At new design policy has been added, but retains commitment to masterplanning of large developments, as does the policy concerning the major growth locations in other Norwich policy area

Ensure the final policy recognises that viability may be an issue which will need to be judged according to the circumstances of a particular site, and refer to the 40% target in policy, subject to caveats about viability and about the need for adjustment in the light of future housing market assessments [RB]

Policy and redrafted in this way

No changes needed, unless other evidence demonstrates that a bypass cannot be delivered through developer funding, augmented where feasible by available public funds. [RB]

The pre-submission version continues to propose development at Long Stratton which will fund a bypass, in the belief that there will be local benefits (the representation pointed out that Long Stratton was not highlighted as a suitable location for growth in the issues and options stage)

Reconsider the policies relating to "service villages" and "other villages" to avoid undue rigidity [RB]

Following a review of the settlement hierarchy, based on updated information on the ledge facilities, the form and character and roles, the policies for service villages and other villages have been redrafted, with more flexibility to permit local circumstances to be taken into account

Amended the policy/supporting text to include – the Gypsy and traveller policy has been redrafted

â€¢ Residential pitch targets extrapolated to 2026, but with a reference to possible modification in the light of future Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments

The pitch targets have been extrapolated in accordance with the East of England plan

â€¢ Locational guidance for these to refer to the demonstrable needs of Gypsies and Travellers, Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessments, and access to a range of facilities. In the longer run, some sites should be provided in association with the major strategic housing developments.

Locational gardens refer to access to services and facilities, and the needs of the travelling community. The policy on a major growth locations suggests that in the longer run some site should be provided in association with these

â€¢ An appropriate share of the Norfolk total for transit sites as recommended by the Secretary of State, linked to the main corridors of movement

The pre submission of version includes this

â€¢ Suggestion that sites will generally accommodate about ten to twelve pitches, but with variations to suit the circumstances of particular sites

Amended as suggested

â€¢ Reference to the diversity of Gypsy and Traveller groups as explanation for the strategy of a number of smaller sites rather than a large concentration

Amended as suggested

â€¢ Although not mentioned by FFT, the Secretary of State's proposed modifications also include a requirement for additional plots for Travelling Showpeople, again with an extrapolation formula. This too should be added to the policy.

Amended as suggested

No change needed in a direct response, but include in housing policy or supporting text some more detail on the source of information on the housing mix required.

The format of the pre-submission version includes references to evidence base documents alongside the text

Ensure the housing policy and implementation strategy take account of market conditions and recognize that market conditions of pertaining at any given time may require viability assessment.

There are references in the housing policy, particularly in relation to the need to secure affordable housing on mixed tenure developments, and also in the implementation policy, recognizing that CIL must be set at a level which does not threaten viability. The infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW has examined potential developer funding on the basis of a number of different viability scenarios

In the light of evidence drawn from the renewable energy study, new policies on climate change/sustainable design should be Included

Newport's is introduced based on the relevant studies

In response to other representations it has been suggested elsewhere that the communities and culture policy could be significantly strengthened

The community's policy has been considerably strengthened. A separate culture policy is included

Include an implementation strategy indicating the infrastructure needs, cost and funding sources related to strategic developments, and a global figure to cover the estimated infrastructure cost for smaller scale development in the pre-submission publication version of the joint core strategy [RB]

An implementation framework is included. The work for this examined major growth locations alongside global development forecasts so that smaller

developments would be taken into account. The Government's consultation on CIL, and draft regulations, published in July, 2009, imply that, if the CIL route is to be followed, it will be necessary to prepare and consult on a charging schedule separately before submitting it for formal examination.

Ensure the final policy recognizes the need for any particular site viability evidence to be taken into account in the operation of the policy, and reconsider the policies for service villages and other villages to avoid undue rigidity. [RB]

There are references in the housing policy, particularly in relation to the need to secure affordable housing on mixed tenure developments, and also in the implementation policy, recognizing that CIL must be set at a level which does not threaten viability. The infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW has examined potential developer funding on the basis of a number of different viability scenarios

No change needed to the joint core strategy, but recognise that new settlements may become part of any strategy looking further ahead into the future. [RB]

The GNDP has commissioned work to consider the potential of a new country town to contribute to meeting any development requirements in excess of the current East of England plan targets.

correct the error in policy 2 [RB]

The relevant policy (strategy for growth in the Norwich policy area) included a double count of housing requirement in relation to South Norfolk. The corresponding policy is now differently expressed and avoids this error.

Strengthen policies on energy efficiency [RB]

New policies on local energy generation and the energy efficiency of new buildings have been prepared, guided by the energy study

Include 40% target in policy, but with a suitable caveats concerning the need for updated housing market assessments, and the need for flexibility in the light of viability assessments on particular sites.

Included

Add further information to the policy or supporting text concerning the type of housing required to meet needs in the area, stating that it is derived from the ORS study, but acknowledging the possibility of outdated future studies.

Appropriate text added to supporting text for the housing policy

Reconsider the policies for service villages and other villagers compared with those included in the technical consultation and public consultation documents, to avoid excessive rigidity. [RB]

Following a review of the settlement hierarchy, based on updated information on the ledge facilities, the form and character and roles, the policies for service villages and other villages have been redrafted, with more flexibility to permit local circumstances to be taken into account

Include housing trajectory and implementation strategy in pre-submission draft

Housing and strategies for the plan area, and the Norwich policy area will be included. The pre-submission version also includes an implementation strategy based on the infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The Government's consultation on CIL, and draft regulations, published in July, 2009, imply that, if the CIL route is to be followed, it will be necessary to prepare and consult on a charging schedule separately before submitting it for formal examination.

Calculate requirement for Gypsies and travellers for long stay and transit pitches, and for Travelling Showpeople and include in pre-submission draft. [RB]

The policy content to relating to Gypsies and Travellers, and Traveling Showpeople, has been updated in the light of the completion of the single issue review of the East of England plan

Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Representations

Action

Add a "hook" to the policy to ensure that the housing mix specifically takes account of the needs of an ageing population, who many of whom will have limiting long-term disabilities [RB]

The policy includes an acknowledgement that the plan should meet the needs of the area's population, and in view of the particular issue of an aging population, a section has been added to the policy relating to housing with care based on the research of Norfolk adult social services

Strengthen policy on quality of development [RB]

New policy on the quality of development added

(Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

9631 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]

Consider giving greater acknowledgement in the policy to the important of the Broads in respect of local tourism and potential opportunities generated.

Also consider giving greater acknowledgement to the importance of protecting historic and locally distinctive settlements to the tourism economy of the Greater

10278 - Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266]

Consider whether further references to incorporation of churches and faith groups could usefully be incorporated into policy 15 or elsewhere in the JCS.

8324 - Mr Geoffrey Loades

No Change[RB]

10375 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]

Consider providing specific recognition of agricultural industries across the GNDP area, the potential for a "food hub" or "food industry cluster" and links between this industry and existing industry and key educational institutions.

10411 - Easton College [3570]

9313 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]

10415 - Honingham Thorpe Farms Limited [8296]

11063 - The Norfolk Food Hub (Mr Ian Alston) [8380]

10287 - Henderson Retail Warehouse Fund [8270]

No action necessary.

10328 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]

No changes necessary.

10282 - Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrold)

Consider provide more detail on the role of the knowledge economy and cultural industries. Consider including references to the Economic Strategy. Consider strengthening the wording of the Tourism policies.

10018 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]

Consider providing specific support for existing business within Policy 15.

8439 - J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003]

10059 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Alan Presslee) [8160]

Consider whether additional policy restrictions need to be put in place to avoid conflicts between existing intrusive industry and further more "sensitive land uses".

10170 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]

Consider whether sufficient regard has been given to the County Minerals and

9408 - Mr E Newberry [8120]

10352 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]

No change necessary.

7879 - Mr Paul Mallett [7783]

No changes necessary

7896 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]

7900 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]

8095 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]

8937 - Mrs Margaret Elbro [8084]

11105 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]

10548 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]

Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

Representations**Action**

9309 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]	No changes necessary.
9711 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	
8370 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	
7935 - mr paul newson [7812]	
8012 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	
8216 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	
8778 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	
9335 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	
8922 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No changes necessary.
9588 - Mr R Harris [8146]	
9662 - Ms E Riches [8165]	
10470 - Mr David Smith [8309]	
10571 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	
8530 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	No change necessary
10594 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	
8130 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888] location.	Consider whether Harford Bridges should be recognised as a strategic employment location.
10862 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	
8601 - Mr M Read [8024]	
10418 - Mr Alan Ives [8299]	
10607 - Mr/Mrs Smith [8322]	
10645 - David Morris (Mr David	
7974 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	Consider making stronger references in the policy to the link between the UEA and the development of the high knowledge economy.
8504 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	
8632 - University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]	
9081 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	
8192 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	Continue to support Hethel, but for particular sectors[RB]
9254 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	
8857 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	No changes necessary.
9203 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	
10723 - Ms S Layton [8354]	
9579 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	No action necessary
9971 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	
9438 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	
10498 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	No Change [RB]
10416 - Honeyview Investments Limited [8298]	Consider whether more specificity could usefully be incorporated in to the policy.
10275 - Norwich HEART (Mr Michael Loveday) [960]	Consider whether the explanation of connectivity could usefully be expanded to include cultural and commercial linkages.
10260 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	
9806 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	No Change [RB]
9889 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]	No change necessary.
8717 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]	
10900 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	No changes necessary.

Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

Representations

10138 - Lothbury Property Trust
Company Ltd [8234]

10837 - North East Wymondham
Landowners [8362]

11074 - Chaplin Farrant (Julie
Carpenter) [7535]

Action

No change necessary.

No changes necessary.

No action necessary.

Representations

10746 - Aylsham Town Council
(Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)
[1776]
8578 - Bressingham & Fersfield
Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer)
[1976]
9199 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish
Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
9050 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E.
J. Keymer) [4187]
8241 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

10227 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

8823 - Marlingford & Colton
Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)
[6869]
9943 - John Heaser [7015]
9128 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
9369 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
10522 - Postwick with Witton
Parish Council (A R Woods)
[7215]
10779 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]
8167 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]
8281 - Rockland St Mary and
Hellington Parish Council (Mr
Dennis Passingham) [7912]
8306 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
8419 - Ed King [7965]
8480 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
8554 - Mrs Patricia Robertson
[8021]
8667 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
8691 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
9686 - Wroxham Parish Council
(Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
8745 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]
8798 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

8850 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
8987 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9134 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9178 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner
[8112]
9399 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]
9465 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
9496 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]
9612 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
[8162]
9737 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson
[8174]
10990 - Howard Birch Associates
(Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
9838 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]
10005 - The Bunwell Partnership
(Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
10039 - The London Planning
Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)
[8230]
10064 - RG Carter Farms and
Drayton Farms Ltd [8232]
10115 - Kimberley and Carleton
Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane
Fraser) [8239]
10152 - R Smith [8243]
10190 - Commercial Land [8246]

Action

No change necessary.

Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

Representations

Action

10443 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]
10547 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]

10626 - Central Norwich Citizens
Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]

9247 - Stratton Strawless Parish
Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
9787 - East Carleton Parish
Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1997]
9278 - Mrs Gray [5927]
10389 - GO East (Ms Mary
Marston) [7463]
9648 - Gable Developments (Mr
Chris Leeming) [7503]
8956 - City College Norwich (Mrs
Corrienne Peasgood) [8090]

Consider whether the policy could usefully be given more specificity in terms of the distribution and scale of employment land across Greater Norwich.

Consider providing guidance within the supporting text about what sustainable might mean for employers in sectoral terms.

Q23 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

Consider whether more specificity could usefully be incorporated in to the policy.

The policy has been expanded, but more to deal with the cultural and creative industries rather than leisure industries which were the principal concerns of the representation, though there is additional text suggesting that employment land no longer required for its current purpose will only be considered for other uses where complementary to an employment role.

Consider whether the explanation of connectivity could usefully be expanded to include cultural and commercial linkages.

The representation (from HEART) focuses on connectivity, not in a physical way, for example transport infrastructure, but in terms of its cultural connectivity, arguing that the area's strongest selling points are its knowledge based economy and cultural/creative base. There has been considerably more work done on cultural potential, for example the conference hall and concert venue study. This has fed into strengthened cultural content, along with aspects of the culture policy for example the need for performance space. There is also significant emphasis on knowledge based industries as critical to the economic future of the area. The supporting text to the policy on design recognizes that a high quality environment is a key to of the success of certain economic sectors

Consider providing specific recognition of agricultural industries across the GNDP area, the potential for a "food hub" or "food industry cluster" and links between this industry and existing industry and key educational institutions.

Added to the economy policy

Consider whether the policy could usefully be given more specificity in terms of the distribution and scale of employment land across Greater Norwich.

The policy covering the strategy for major growth in the Norwich policy area has had further detail added concerning the scale and nature of development expected at strategic employment allocations

Consider providing guidance within the supporting text about what sustainable might mean for employers in sectoral terms.

The representation seeks to avoid excessive dominance of large companies (Tesco is quoted as an example) The word "sustainable" appears many times in the document, but it does not seek to describe which sectors of the economy are to be promoted for sustainability reasons. For the most part, the employment policy is guided by the Economy and Sites and Premises study. Nevertheless, a number of specific hubs are promoted to encourage the co-location of companies engaged in similar fields, for example at Norwich Research Park, EPIC, and Hethel, and a Norfolk Food Hub. There is also an emphasis on promoting improved I. T. connections in the access and transportation policy

Continue to support Hethel, but for particular sectors[RB]

Noted – this is promoted as an advanced engineering hub

Consider whether Harford Bridges should be recognised as a strategic employment location.

A site at Harford Bridges was promoted by some representations, but the Economy and Sites and Premises study suggested that the existing sites already identified of the right ones on which to focus. A new allocation is not therefore proposed.

Consider providing specific support for existing business within Policy 15.

The policies do not seek to curtail competition. However the availability of sites is important, and the policy takes a generally protective stance towards land identified for currently used for employment, but it also expressly recognizes the needs of start up, small and medium businesses to be able to access sites in a range of locations, and including smaller sites (though this was in the consultation version)

Consider whether additional policy restrictions need to be put in place to avoid conflicts between existing intrusive industry and further more "sensitive land uses".

No explicit policy guidance has been added, though the presence of known intrusive activities has been taken into account in the selection of locations for major development.

Consider whether sufficient regard has been given to the County Minerals and Waste Strategy. There has been subsequent dialogue with members of the team preparing the county minerals and waste development plan a document, who have not identified any conflicts. References to the needed to protect mineral resources have been added, in the environmental assets policy..

Consider whether further references to incorporation of churches and faith groups could usefully be incorporated into policy 15 or elsewhere in the JCS.

Further reference has been added in the communities policy under the community infrastructure and cohesion heading

Consider making stronger references in the policy to the link between the UEA and the development of the high knowledge economy.

Reference has been added in the communities policy under the Education bullet. In the policy setting up a strategy for the Norwich policy area, there remains a reference linking UEA to the science park. There remains continued emphasis on promoting the knowledge economy.

Consider giving greater acknowledgement in the policy to the important of the Broads in respect of local tourism and potential opportunities generated.

There is a separate policy for the Broads. This seeks to balance the fragile nature of the environment with the need to make the most of the opportunities presented.

Also consider giving greater acknowledgement to the importance of protecting historic and locally distinctive settlements to the tourism economy of the Greater Norwich Area.

The historic and locally distinctive settlements are not specifically connected to the promotion of tourism, but are specifically referred to in the policy on design, which seeks to promote good design for its own sake, but also having regard to the fact that the high quality environment is one of the area's selling points in terms of attracting employment.

Consider provide more detail on the role of the knowledge economy and cultural industries. Consider including references to the Economic Strategy. Consider strengthening the wording of the Tourism policies.

There has been expanded reference to the promotion of tourism in rural areas in the employment/economy policy. The cultural objective has been strengthened to include a reference to the contribution of smaller rural settlements to cultural life, and the section of the economic policy dealing with cultural activity has been significantly strengthened. There is already significant emphasis on the knowledge economy with the promotion of Norwich Research Park, Hethel engineering centre and activities such as EPIC

(Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

9813 - Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029]	No Change
10708 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	No Change
8780 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	No Change

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Representations***Action***

10153 - R Smith [8243]	No Change
7880 - Mr Paul Mallett [7783]	No change
10269 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068]	No Change
10724 - Ms S Layton [8354]	Review policy for NE to ensure that policy looks to have strong walk and cycle
11080 - Residents of Gibbs Close, Little Melton [8385]	No Change
8912 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	No change
9409 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	No Change
9748 - Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155]	Ensure that policy acknowledges the requirements of disabled groups.
9818 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509]	Revise wording to reflect current status of schemes and clarify the impact on deliverability of the plan.
10642 - Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333]	No Change
10920 - Allied London Properties [8367]	No Change
7920 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885]	No change
11021 - Norwich Chamber Council (Mr Don Pearson) [8371]	No Change
11106 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	No Change
9082 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	No change
8131 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]	No Change
10390 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Include in the plan a section on infrastructure requirements and identify a mechanism for prioritisation and delivery. Be clear in policies for places that the transport infrastructure is an integrated approach to providing for travel demand and is not predict and provide. Transport policy is informed by NATS and other sources. It is for the County Council to update and review that strategy.
8602 - Mr M Read [8024]	No Change
9065 - Mr Alex Kuhn [8106]	No change
11035 - Mr Stan Sabberton [8373]	No change
9663 - Ms E Riches [8165]	No change
8634 - University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]	No Change
9466 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	Be more explicit in the plan about promoting sustainable freight and describing the context for promoting of freight infrastructure.
9069 - Ms Penny Tilley [8108]	No change
8255 - R Barker [6805]	No change

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Representations***Action***

9255 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	No change
9580 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	
8531 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	
8953 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	
9270 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]	
9401 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	
9589 - Mr R Harris [8146]	
10116 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	
10685 - Ms Natalie Beal [8349]	No Change
10329 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	
10863 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	No Change
7975 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	No change
7936 - mr paul newson [7812]	
9531 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	No change
9856 - Mr Paul Johnson [8207]	
8505 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]	No Change
10139 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	Change text supporting favoured option to include clear references to the Broadland Business Park link between Plumstead Road and A47.
10650 - Ms Lucy Hall [8295]	No Change
11090 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]	Adjust policy wording to reflect commitment to BRT as well as other public transport enhancements. Amend wording to ensure travel planning and smarter choices are drawn out as means of minimising car use and managing travel demand Be clear in policies for places that the transport infrastructure is an integrated approach to providing for travel demand and is not predict and provide. Transport policy is informed by NATS and other sources. It is for the County Council to update and review that strategy.
10471 - Mr David Smith [8309]	No Change
9510 - South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142]	No Change
9310 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	No Change
9917 - Miss Lynda Edwards	No Change
9972 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	No Change
9944 - John Heaser [7015]	Strengthen supporting text to clarify commitment to promotion of cycling.
10595 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	Include in the plan a section on infrastructure requirements and identify a mechanism for prioritisation and delivery.
11151 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	No Change
10499 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	No Change
10799 - Liftshare (Ms Ali Claburn) [8360]	Amend wording to ensure travel planning and smarter choices are drawn out as means of minimising car use and managing travel demand.
10814 - Ms Kerry Lane [8361]	
9336 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	No Change

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Representations***Action***

8646 - Mr Pat Gowen [8034]	No Change
9179 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	Ensure that policy acknowledges the requirements of disabled groups
9712 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	No Change
10687 - Mr P Baker [8350]	No Change
9621 - RW Kidner [8163]	Check consistency between rural and transport policies.
10572 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	No Change
10838 - North East Wyomondham Landowners [8362]	No Change
8320 - Mr Anthony Knights [7922]	No change
8923 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change
9209 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]	
9279 - Mrs Gray [5927]	
8371 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	
8096 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	
8217 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	
8960 - MR Richard Edwards [7925]	
8341 - e buitenhuis [7951]	
9632 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	
8408 - paul eldridge [7987]	
8435 - Helen Baczkowska [8000]	
8443 - Dr Tim Rayner [8006]	
8451 - Ian Harris [8007]	
8635 - Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030]	
8702 - mrs jane fischl [8031]	
8858 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	
8946 - Miss Marguerite Finn [8087]	
8955 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	
10901 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	Change text supporting favoured option to include clear references to the Broadland Business Park link between Plumstead Road and A47 and the Link between Wroxham Road and Salhouse Road.
10171 - Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245]	Add section on freight into policy.
7897 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	No comment
8613 - Tacolnестon Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]	No Change
7956 - Colin Mould [7809]	No Change
9839 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	Include in the plan a section on infrastructure requirements and identify a mechanism for prioritisation and delivery.
9904 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219]	No Change
9807 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	Add additional text to explain the challenges in delivering rural public transport.
10353 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	Consider list order.

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Representations

Action

10376 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] 9649 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Delivery framework to be as clear as possible over infrastructure requirements.
10019 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]	No Change
11122 - The Leeder Family [8390]	No Change
7901 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	No Change
9051 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	This policy is not intended to identify in detail what all the improvements and interventions may be. Some interventions have been identified in the section of the plan that looks in more detail at the spatial distribution of growth. The policy defines objectives that more detailed work on specific sites will have to meet.
10627 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	No Change

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Representations

Action

10747 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]	No Change
9248 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	
8579 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]	
9890 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]	
11138 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	
10057 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	
8242 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]	
8193 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	
10228 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	
8824 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]	
9129 - Mr John Osborne [7111]	
9370 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	
10523 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]	
10780 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]	
8432 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	
8013 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	
8168 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	
8282 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]	
8307 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	
8420 - Ed King [7965]	
8481 - Mr C Skeels [8016]	
8555 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]	
8668 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]	
8692 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]	
9687 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	
8746 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]	
8799 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	
8851 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	
8988 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]	
9135 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]	
9439 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	
9498 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]	
9613 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162]	
9738 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	
10991 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	
10006 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]	
10040 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]	

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Representations

Action

10191 - Commercial Land [8246]

10444 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]

10419 - Mr Alan Ives [8299]

Strengthen supporting text to clarify commitment to promotion of cycling.

Q24 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Delivery framework to be as clear as possible over infrastructure requirements

An implementation framework has been included as an appendix in the pre-submission version. This is based on infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW in 2009. It assigns some strategic infrastructure to particular growth locations, where there is a clear dependency but takes account of the totality of development, including an allowance for windfall developments over and above defined allocations..

Change text supporting favoured option to include clear references to the Broadland Business Park link between Plumstead Road and A47.

The Implementation Framework in the appendices provides for "Development link Broadland Business Park to Salhouse Road" which provides for this road.

Add additional text to explain the challenges in delivering rural public transport.

A limited amount of additional text has been added to the supporting text. Reference to improved information technology has been included in the access and transportation policy. This will also assist rural enterprise

Review policy for NE to ensure that policy looks to have strong walk and cycle links.

There are references to the need for strong pedestrian and cycling links in the general preamble to the policy on locations for major growth in the Norwich policy area and the section dealing specifically with the north east growth triangle. In the latter, references to connections to employment areas have been expanded to include the surrounding countryside.

Ensure that policy acknowledges the requirements of disabled groups.

No change made. The supporting text includes the wording, "Ensuring that all residents have good access to local jobs, services and facilities...." which is considered to cover this point.

Revise wording to reflect current status of schemes and clarify the impact on deliverability of the plan.

The specific schemes identified have been checked and, when necessary, delivery dates/status updated. Schemes critical to the implementation of the strategy have been included in the implementation framework which forms an appendix to the pre-submission version. This identifies critical dependencies between items of infrastructure and growth locations where possible, though many items of infrastructure have a broader significance.

Add section on freight into policy.

A reference has been added to the "continued investigation of and support for rail freight opportunities".

Change text supporting favoured option to include clear references to the Broadland Business Park link between Plumstead Road and A47 and the Link between Wroxham Road and Salhouse Road.

The Implementation Framework in the appendices provides for "Development link Broadland Business Park to Salhouse Road" which provides for this road.

Amend wording to ensure travel planning and smarter choices are drawn out as means of minimising car use and managing travel demand.

The words "travel planning" and "smarter choices" do not appear, but the policy and supporting text have been expanded to embrace the kind of measures that these would encompass including promotion of walking, cycling, reducing the need to travel, and promoting healthy travel choices.

Check consistency between rural and transport policies.

The representation is arguing for the strategy to recognize their rural sustainability may require some additional development (along the lines of the Taylor report). Though the access and a transportation policy has not been modified specifically in this way, a review of the settlement hierarchy based on updated village service information, and the concentration of the form character of function of rural settlements has been undertaken and the policies for service villages and other villages reflect this. They have also taken into account public transport access, but allow for a greater degree of flexibility to take account of local circumstances.

Strengthen supporting text to clarify commitment to promotion of cycling.

The policy has been strengthened a highlight the significance of cycling (and walking)

This policy is not intended to identify in detail what all the improvements and interventions may be. Some interventions have been identified in the section of the plan that looks in more detail at the spatial distribution of growth. The policy defines objectives that more detailed work on specific sites will have to meet.

This refers to a comment regarding the need for greater emphasis to be placed on the use of rail. The policy has been revised to further clarify the rail services to be enhanced and to provide for the continued investigation of and support for rail freight opportunities.

Include in the plan a section on infrastructure requirements and identify a mechanism for prioritisation and delivery

The revised strategy provides an Implementation Framework which identifies the strategic projects required to facilitate the JCS, their timing and delivery body.

Be clear in policies for places that the transport infrastructure is an integrated approach to providing for travel demand and is not predict and provide. Transport policy is informed by NATS and other sources. It is for the County Council to update and review that strategy.

There is much more emphasis on NATS as an overarching strategy package. The policy outlining the strategy for accommodating major growth in the Norwich policy area, and its supporting text, have expanded references to NATS.

Be more explicit in the plan about promoting sustainable freight and describing the context for promoting of freight infrastructure.

The access and transportation policy has been revised to provide for the continued investigation of and support for rail freight opportunities. Other freight infrastructure could be provided for through general provisions for The Economy.

Adjust policy wording to reflect commitment to BRT as well as other public transport enhancements.

Policy amended as recommended

(Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

10279 - Diocese of Norwich
(Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266] Consider in relation to community and culture section

8636 - University of East Anglia
(Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029] No change to plan

Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

Representations***Action***

10709 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	Consider amending policy to include water quality.
9650 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	No change to plan
8914 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	No change to plan
8603 - Mr M Read [8024]	No change to plan
11107 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	No change to plan.
10252 - Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260]	No change to plan
10573 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	No change to plan
9073 - Wymondham Heritage Society (Ms Irene Woodward) [1003]	No change to plan
9973 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	No change to plan
10921 - Allied London Properties [8367]	No change to plan
10725 - Ms S Layton [8354]	No change to plan
11022 - Norwich Chamber Council (Mr Don Pearson) [8371]	No change to plan
9688 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	No change to plan
9083 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	No change to plan
8924 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change to plan
10020 - notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911]	No change to plan
8218 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	No change to plan
9581 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	No change to plan
10688 - Mr P Baker [8350]	No change to plan
10330 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	No change to plan
9312 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]	No change to plan
9410 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	
10472 - Mr David Smith [8309]	
7937 - mr paul newson [7812]	No change to plan.
10596 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	See quation 28
10864 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	No change to plan
9590 - Mr R Harris [8146]	No change to plan
10117 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	

Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

Representations

Action

10839 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] 10902 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	No change to plan
9205 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	No change to plan
8532 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] 8859 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	No change to plan
7902 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	No change to plan
9440 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]	No change to plan
10420 - Mr Alan Ives [8299]	No change to plan
7976 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] 8283 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]	No change to plan
9403 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	No change to plan
9633 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	Ensure wording in document clarifies that the Broads lie outside of the Joint Core Strategy area.
8014 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	No change to plan

Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

Representations

Action

10748 - Aylsham Town Council
(Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)
[1776]
9249 - Stratton Strawless Parish
Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
8581 - Bressingham & Fersfield
Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer)
[1976]
10377 - Keswick Parish Council
(Mr P Brooks) [2020]
9210 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish
Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
9891 - Swardeston Parish Council
(Carole Jowett) [2058]
9052 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E.
J. Keymer) [4187]
9256 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]
8243 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

No change to plan

8194 - Mr Roger F. Weeks
MRICS [4796]
9713 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]
10229 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

9280 - Mrs Gray [5927]
8825 - Marlingford & Colton
Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)
[6869]
8372 - Alyson Lowe [6992]
9945 - John Heaser [7015]
9130 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
9371 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
10524 - Postwick with Witton
Parish Council (A R Woods)
[7215]
9808 - Cringleford Parish Council
(Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]
10781 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]
7898 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]
8132 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]

8169 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]
8308 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
8482 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
8506 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
8556 - Mrs Patricia Robertson
[8021]
8669 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
8693 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
8807 - Ms K Dunn [8045]
8747 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]
8800 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

8853 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
8935 - Norfolk Landscape
Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton)
[8081]
8989 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9136 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9180 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner
[8112]
9338 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
9467 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]
9499 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]
9532 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]
9614 - Mrs Sandra Osborne
[8162]
9739 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson

Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

Representations

Action

[8174]
 10992 - Howard Birch Associates
 (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
 9840 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]
 10007 - The Bunwell Partnership
 (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
 10041 - The London Planning
 Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy)
 [8230]
 10140 - Lothbury Property Trust
 Company Ltd [8234]
 10192 - Commercial Land [8246]

 10354 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole
 Williams) [8293]
 10445 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]
 10549 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]

Q25 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

Consider in relation to community and culture section

The representation seeks to highlight the cultural and tourism importance of the built heritage, specifically churches. The policy on environmental assets includes the built heritage, and it is made clear in the supporting text that this is an important asset from the point of view of residents and visitors alike. The communities and cohesion policy acknowledges the role that faith groups can have in community development.

Consider amending policy to include water quality.

A new policy on energy and water specifically addresses the need for water efficiency, but also the need to maintain or enhance the water environment

Ensure wording in document clarifies that the Broads lie outside of the Joint Core Strategy area.

This is made clear in the introduction to the strategy and in the text supporting the Broads policy

(Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

9664 - Ms E Riches [8165]	Ensure issue of facilities at Long Stratton is covered.
8219 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	No change to plan
10307 - Mrs LISA ford [8282]	No change to plan
9412 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	No change to plan
9072 - Wymondham Heritage Society (Ms Irene Woodward) [1003]	No change to plan
11033 - Mr Bernard Godding [8372]	No change to plan
10643 - Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333]	No change to plan
10162 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	No change to plan
9784 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	No change to plan
9281 - Mrs Gray [5927]	No change to plan
8925 - Hempsall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change to plan
11108 - Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]	No change to plan
11030 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	No change to plan
10550 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	Ensure implementation element of plan provides agreed focus for spending by

10391 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	agencies involved. Consider inclusion of more spatially specific proposals
8345 - Age Concern Norwich (Phil Wells) [7957]	No change to plan
10331 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]	No change to plan

Page 116 of 129

Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

Representations***Action***

8433 - Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771]	No change to plan
9974 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	No change to plan
9651 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	Ensure Implementation section of plan is clear.
10922 - Allied London Properties [8367]	No change to plan
10257 - South Norfolk Rural Deans consultation group (The Venerable Archdeacon David Hayden) [2801]	Consider how to cover the church and other faith groups in plan
9714 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]	No change to plan
9582 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	No change to plan
10574 - Mr G P Collings [8318]	No change to plan
10118 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	No change to plan
10417 - Honeyview Investments Limited [8298]	Consider the need for a more detailed framework for leisure and tourism development in the plan. Ensure Barnard Road bowling Alley issue is considered through the Norwich Site Allocation plan.
8954 - Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088]	No change to plan
9415 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	No change to plan
9211 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]	No change to plan
8860 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	No change to plan
8861 - Mr Peter Lanyon [8060]	No change to plan
10473 - Mr David Smith [8309]	No change to plan
9257 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]	No change to plan
10757 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048]	Consider whether facilities for faith groups should be identified and required separately from other community facilities
8936 - Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust (Mr Lewis Dunham) [8083]	
10280 - Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266]	
10501 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	No change to plan
10597 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	See question 28
9206 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	No change to plan
10261 - The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]	No change to plan
7977 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]	No change to plan
9181 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner	No change to plan

Representations

Action

10749 - Aylsham Town Council
(Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar)
[1776]
9250 - Stratton Strawless Parish
Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
8582 - Bressingham & Fersfield
Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer)
[1976]
10378 - Keswick Parish Council
(Mr P Brooks) [2020]
9892 - Swardeston Parish Council
(Carole Jowett) [2058]
10270 - Sport England (East
Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986]

No change to plan

9053 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E.
J. Keymer) [4187]
8244 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

10230 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

8826 - Marlingford & Colton
Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin)
[6869]
8374 - Alyson Lowe [6992]
8373 - Alyson Lowe [6992]
9946 - John Heaser [7015]
9131 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
9372 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
10525 - Postwick with Witton
Parish Council (A R Woods)
[7215]
9809 - Cringleford Parish Council
(Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]
10782 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah
Elliott) [7666]
7899 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]
7938 - mr paul newson [7812]
8533 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]
8097 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]

8134 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888]

8284 - Rockland St Mary and
Hellington Parish Council (Mr
Dennis Passingham) [7912]
9634 - Broads Authority (Mr. John
Clements) [7986]
8483 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
8507 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
8557 - Mrs Patricia Robertson
[8021]
8637 - University of East Anglia
(Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029]
8670 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
8695 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
9689 - Wroxham Parish Council
(Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
8748 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr
Edward Jinks) [8053]
8854 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
8990 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9137 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]
9337 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
9441 - Swannington with Alderford
& Little Witchingham Parish
Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9468 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]

Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

Representations***Action***

9615 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162]	
9740 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	
10993 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]	
10008 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]	
10042 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]	
10193 - Commercial Land [8246]	
10355 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]	
10446 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]	
10639 - Mr Alan Ives [8299]	No change to plan
9857 - Mr Paul Johnson [8207]	No change to plan
8801 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]	No change to plan
9314 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	No change to plan
8309 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]	No change to plan
8821 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	No change to plan.
10903 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	No change to plan
9591 - Mr R Harris [8146]	No change to plan
8170 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	No change to plan
10865 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	No change to plan
9540 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149]	No change to plan
9841 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	No change to plan
8195 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	No change to plan
8015 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]	No change to plan
9533 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	No change to plan
10840 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	No change to plan
9318 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	No change to plan
7903 - Mr. Rod Tuck [7787]	No change to plan
10141 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	Take account of amendment suggested re crime

Representations

Action

Q26 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

Ensure implementation element of plan provides agreed focus for spending by agencies involved.

The implementation framework appended to the pre-submission version includes community and social infrastructure needed to accommodate new development. It cannot take account of all qualitative deficiencies. Following publication of the Government's draft proposals for Community Infrastructure Levy, if the authorities decide to go down the CIL route, it will be necessary to prepare and consult on a draft charging schedule prior to submission for testing at an independent examination. The timing of the regulations and the requirement for separate formal consultation means that this will need to be undertaken separately from the submission of the joint core strategy. The process should give an opportunity for obtaining a commitment from the relevant providers

Ensure issue of facilities at Long Stratton is covered.

The implementation framework appended to the pre-submission version includes community and social infrastructure needed to accommodate new development. It has been prepared on the basis of the infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW and completed in 2009, on the basis of the pattern of development proposed in the favoured option set out in the public consultation draft. It cannot take account of all qualitative deficiencies. Following publication of the Government's draft proposals for Community Infrastructure Levy, if the authorities decide to go down the CIL route, it will be necessary to prepare and consult on a draft charging schedule prior to submission for testing at an independent examination. The timing of the regulations and the requirement for separate formal consultation means that this will need to be undertaken separately from the submission of the joint core strategy. The process should give an opportunity for obtaining a commitment from the relevant providers. One consequence of CIL will be to break the link between infrastructure to be provided and a specific development, such that contributions from development throughout an area (or part of an area of different charging zones are introduced) can be pooled and spending prioritized according to need.

Ensure Implementation section of plan is clear.

The implementation framework appended to the pre-submission version includes community and social infrastructure needed to accommodate new development. It has been prepared on the basis of the infrastructure needs and funding work undertaken by EDAW and completed in 2009, on the basis of the pattern of development proposed in the favoured option set out in the public consultation draft

Consider inclusion of more spatially specific proposals

Addressed in a number of ways. The communities policy is generally not location specific, though the areas where housing with care will be most needed are highlighted. Some detail has been added to policies for places, and the implementation framework highlights community infrastructure and, as far as possible, the areas where it will be needed

Consider whether facilities for faith groups should be identified and required separately from other community facilities.

A reference to the role of faith groups has been added to the communities policy, in the communities and cohesion section. While purpose built facilities are not precluded, we have insufficient evidence to treat them as a requirement of the development proposed, and therefore the policy proposes facilities which might be used by faith groups among others

Consider the need for a more detailed framework for leisure and tourism development in the plan. Ensure Barnard Road bowling Alley issue is considered through the Norwich Site Allocation plan.

The strategy is considered to cover adequately leisure and tourism, though the only site specific references concern conference/ concert facilities in the city centre and a proposed country park at Bawburgh. There are a number of references to the significance of the leisure and tourism for the area, and a number of general, supportive, references in policies such as the economy, and culture leisure and entertainment. Barnard Road bowling alley issue is not applicable to the joint core strategy

Consider how to cover the church and other faith groups in plan.

The representation seeks to highlight the cultural and tourism importance of the built heritage, specifically churches. The policy on environmental assets includes the built heritage, and it is made clear in the supporting text that this is an important asset from the point of view of residents and visitors alike. The communities and cohesion policy acknowledges the role that faith groups can have in community development.

Take account of amendment suggested re crime.

The crime section of the communities policy has been redrafted, avoiding the phrase criticized in the representation

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Action

9. Implementation and monitoring (Q27)

(Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

9469 - Mr Barry Dowe [8134]	No change needed [RB]
9413 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]
9319 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]	No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]
11123 - The Leeder Family [8390]	No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor.
10283 - Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrold)	Redraft the policy and supporting text to cover current means of securing developer contributions and the intention to actively consider CIL once introduced by the Government. The plan also needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need. [RB]
10551 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]	No change needed, but ensure that the final implementation strategy does address the question of future maintenance of infrastructure [RB]
9986 - GF Cole and Son [8226]	Redraft the policy and supporting text to cover current means of securing developer contributions and the intention to actively consider CIL once introduced by the Government. The plan also needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need. [RB]
9975 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]	Not applicable [RB]
9316 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock	No change needed [RB]
9084 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	No change [RB]
11139 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor.
10058 - Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373]	The pre submission plan will also need to include an implementation section including an infrastructure schedule. [RB]
9652 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	
9583 - Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690]	No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor.
8375 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	
9842 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor.
10271 - Sport England (East Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986]	. The plan needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need.
9340 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]	
10262 - The Theatres Trust (Ms	This also needs to address arrangements for future maintenance
	Redraft the communities and culture policy and supporting text including greater emphasis on the need for space suitable for performances, and suitable for the accommodation of faith groups, and a greater clarity about what is included within the definition of Community and Recreation facilities.. [RB]

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Action

8647 - Mr Steve Dowall [8033]	Not applicable [RB]
9054 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. This, however, needs to include a mechanism for assessing any arguments concerning viability to demonstrate in an open and transparent way that any variation in the normal level of contribution is fully justified. This will also need to take account of the issue of green field sites compared with previously-developed land.
11059 - Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955]	
11152 - JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979]	
8396 - Mr Ben Du Brow [7012]	
11031 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]	
8641 - The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]	
8220 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	
10866 - Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018]	
8671 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]	
9417 - Ms Irene Burrows [8124]	
9592 - Mr R Harris [8146]	
10142 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]	
10163 - Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244]	
10653 - Jim Smith (Mr Jim Smith) [8342]	
10654 - Jim Smith (Mr Jim Smith) [8342]	
10710 - Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352]	
10841 - North East Wymondham Landowners [8362]	
10904 - Broadland Land Trust [8366]	
10474 - Mr David Smith [8309]	No change needed [RB]
10502 - Mr I T Smith [8310]	
9251 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]	No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor.
9622 - RW Kidner [8163]	
10923 - Allied London Properties [8367]	
9785 - Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974]	Include an implementation strategy, and clear monitoring targets in the pre submission publication version of the joint core strategy
10392 - GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463]	Clarify that any developer commitment to community development should endure to the compilation and first occupation of the development, but not beyond. [RB]
8534 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]	
9635 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]	
9534 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]	No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]
8926 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]	No change needed [RB]
8171 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]	
9741 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]	
10119 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]	
10598 - Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319]	

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Action

<p>8135 - Mr Charles Thomas [7888] 9138 - Mrs S M Curtis [8111]</p>	<p>Redraft the policy and supporting text to cover current means of securing developer contributions and the intention to actively consider CIL once introduced by the Government. The plan also needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need. [RB]</p>
<p>7883 - Mr Paul Mallett [7783] 8830 - Ms K Dunn [8045]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>
<p>7921 - Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] 9905 - Mr Peter Sutton [8219] 10308 - Mrs LISA ford [8282] 10726 - Ms S Layton [8354] 11038 - Norwich Design Quality Panel (The Manager) [8375]</p>	<p>Add a new policy and supporting text focusing on the environmental quality of new development [RB]</p>
<p>9715 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] 7978 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]</p>	<p>No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]</p>
<p>8718 - Mr Nick Miller [8049]</p>	<p>No change needed [RB]</p>
<p>9182 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner</p>	<p>No change [RB]</p>
<p>8016 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]</p>	<p>No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]</p>
<p>9207 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]</p>	<p>No change needed as a direct consequence of this representation [RB]</p>

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

- 10750 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]
- 8583 - Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976]
- 9212 - Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055]
- 9893 - Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058]
- 9258 - Ms T Wheatley [4494]
- 8245 - Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558]

- 8196 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]
- 10231 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]

- 8827 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]
- 9132 - Mr John Osborne [7111]
- 9373 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]
- 10526 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]
- 9810 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]
- 10783 - NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666]
- 8285 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]
- 8310 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
- 8484 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
- 8508 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
- 8558 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]
- 8696 - Mrs Jo Fincham [8044]
- 9690 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]
- 8749 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]
- 8802 - Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061]

- 8855 - Mr John Nelson [8064]
- 8991 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
- 9442 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

- 9501 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]
- 9616 - Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162]
- 10994 - Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176]
- 10009 - The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228]
- 10043 - The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]
- 10194 - Commercial Land [8246]

- 10356 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]
- 10447 - Mr J E Youngs [8308]

Action

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor.

Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Representations

Action

Q27 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. [RB]

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable.

The pre submission plan will also need to include an implementation section including an infrastructure schedule. [RB]

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable.

Redraft the policy and supporting text to cover current means of securing developer contributions and the intention to actively consider CIL once introduced by the Government. The plan also needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need. [RB]

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable.

No change needed, but ensure that the final implementation strategy does address the question of future maintenance of infrastructure

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable. The proposals for CIL are, at best, ambiguous about securing maintenance through this route, and this will need to be clarified it before a charging schedule can be drawn up, consulted on and submitted

The plan needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need.

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable.

This also needs to address arrangements for future maintenance.

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable. The proposals for CIL are, at best, ambiguous about securing maintenance through this route, and this will need to be clarified it before a charging schedule can be drawn up, consulted on and submitted

Redraft the policy and supporting text to cover current means of securing developer contributions and the intention to actively consider CIL once introduced by the Government. The plan also needs an implementation and infrastructure schedule to indicate key infrastructure, responsibilities, and potential funding sources, as well as the likely timing of the need. [RB]

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the

preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable. The proposals for CIL are, at best, ambiguous about securing maintenance through this route, and this will need to be clarified it before a charging schedule can be drawn up, consulted on and submitted

Add a new policy and supporting text focusing on the environmental quality of new development [RB]

The new policy has been included

Clarify that any developer commitment to community development should endure to the completion and first occupation of the development, but not beyond. [RB]

The policy on major growth locations within the Norwich policy area includes a requirement that the developers of major growth locations ensure there is a commitment to supporting community development until the development is completed

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. The pre submission plan will also need to include an implementation section including an infrastructure schedule. [RB]

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable.

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. This, however, needs to include a mechanism for assessing any arguments concerning viability to demonstrate in an open and transparent way that any variation in the normal level of contribution is fully justified. This will also need to take account of the issue of green field sites compared with previously-developed land.

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable. The proposals for CIL suggest that differential rates may be introduced where it can be shown that market conditions have a material effect on viability, but do not suggest that there should be any discount for previously-developed land per se. This might be clarified by the final guidance

Redraft the communities and culture policy and supporting text including greater emphasis on the need for space suitable for performances, and suitable for the accommodation of faith groups, and a greater clarity about what is included within the definition of Community and Recreation facilities.. [RB]

The policy content covering communities, and leisure/culture has been considerably redrafted including reference for performances space and faith groups. In the process some clarification of Community/leisure/recreation has been added.

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. [RB]

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable. The proposals for CIL are, at best, ambiguous about securing maintenance through this route, and this will need to be clarified it before a charging schedule can be drawn up, consulted on and submitted

No change needed as a direct consequence of these representations, but the current policy will need to be refined since CIL will not now be introduced before submission, and will need to reflect both the current means of securing developer contributions, and the potential to move to a CIL, subject to its introduction by the Government. In either eventuality, viability will need to be recognized as a factor. An implementation strategy will also need to be included. [RB]

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable. The proposals for CIL are, at best, ambiguous about securing maintenance through this route, and this will need to be clarified it before a charging schedule can be drawn up, consulted on and submitted

Include an implementation strategy, and clear monitoring targets in the pre submission publication version of the joint core strategy

Included

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Action

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

8828 - Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869]	Review the settlement hierarchy before pre-submission publication version of the strategy. Retain Trowse as an urban fringe parish. No change to the Norwich policy area boundary [RB]
9844 - Mr John Martin Shaw [7544]	
8829 - Trowse Primary School (Mr James Macdonald) [7608]	
8919 - ie homes & property ltd (mr ed palmieri) [7620]	
8968 - Ms Rosemary Mann [7706]	
8559 - Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021]	
8642 - The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]	1. Subject to the outcome of the infrastructure needs and funding study being undertaken by EDAW, include waste management within the implementation strategy. [RB]
9843 - Ms Karen Drane [8198]	No change [RB]
9653 - Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503]	No change needed [RB]
9691 - Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047]	No change [RB]
10877 - Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363]	No change [RB]
11156 - English Heritage (Eastern Region) (Ms. Katharine Fletcher) [905]	Findings of the historic characterisation study to be taken into account
8856 - Mr John Nelson [8064]	No change [RB]
10711 - Hethersett Consortium [8353]	
9541 - Noble Foods Ltd [8149]	Review the policies relating to the settlement hierarchy, particularly service villages and other villages, and consider the appropriate category for Marsham. [RB]
9055 - Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187]	No change needed [RB]
10379 - Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020]	Develop implementation strategy for inclusion in the pre-submission publication of version of the strategy, and seek the commitment of principal service providers [RB]
8376 - Alyson Lowe [6992]	
9374 - Mr Peter Rope [7113]	
9811 - Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513]	
8059 - Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870]	
8259 - pulham market parish council (mr laurence taylor) [7907]	
8403 - COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]	
9085 - Ms R Pickering [8109]	
9418 - Mr E Newberry [8120]	
10423 - Ms Barbara Lockwood [8306]	
10631 - Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325]	

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

10527 - Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215]
10143 - Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]
10905 - Broadland Land Trust
10699 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]
10208 - Kier Land Ltd [8254]

9749 - Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155]
9819 - East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509]
10332 - CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826]
8311 - Mr Robert Mapes [7915]
9636 - Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986]
10240 - Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023]
8992 - Mr Norman Sewell [8092]
9066 - Mr David Wrigley [8107]
9341 - Ms Celia Viner [8123]
9742 - Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174]
9751 - Mr David Holliday [8178]
10651 - Ms Lucy Hall [8295]
11060 - Mr Mark Champion [8376]

8757 - Mrs Anita Turpin [8058]
10253 - Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260]
11066 - Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8382]

9976 - Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903]
10233 - Mrs T P S Cane [7147]
8535 - Mr Daniel Douglas [7817]
8286 - Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912]
8961 - MR Richard Edwards [7925]
8703 - mrs jane fischl [8031]
9320 - Ms Jill Loan [8117]
9443 - Ms Valerie Chipperfield [8128]
11067 - RSPB (East of England Regional Office) (Dr Philip Pearson) [8268]
10357 - Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293]
10947 - Ms Jean Cooper [8368]
10971 - Mr William E Cooper [8369]
11091 - Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387]
11076 - Redenhall with Harleston Town Council (Ms Margot Harbour) [8383]

Action

No change needed [RB]

Amend the joint core strategy to show an allocation at Aylsham of 300 dwellings to be implemented subject to the capacity limitations of the sewage treatment works being overcome. [RB]

Include monitoring targets in pre submission publication version

Include in introductory section a clear statement of the area to be covered by the plan and that it excludes the Broads. Clarify on key diagrams, including any more detailed insets for the Norwich policy area and city centre that the area shown as the Broads authority area is excluded from the JCS.

Amend paragraph 1.2 to refer not only to housing, but also to employment and supporting infrastructure

Give further consideration to including estimates of the population in total, and infrastructure likely to result from major developments, but with appropriate caution given the difficulties of such forecasts at a local scale. [RB]

No change needed [RB]

Ensure the transport policy or supporting text makes appropriate reference to parking strategy and also to the benefits of travel planning. Ensure any reference to density in new developments seeks to focus high density on locations near centres in order to encourage bus patronage [RB]

No change needed [RB]

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

Action

9070 - Ms Penny Tilley [8108]	No change needed [RB]
8197 - Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796]	Add new policies on design and on energy/climate change issues [RB]
9906 - Mr Anthony Springall [8220]	
10243 - Mr Duncan Smith [8257]	
11018 - Mrs S Plaw [8370]	
11039 - Norwich Design Quality	
11069 - Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrold)	Reexamine the vision to see if more local distinctiveness, and a clearer picture can be presented
	Add an appendix identifying relationships to other strategies, including the Greater Norwich Economic Strategy [RB]
8844 - Ms K Dunn [8045]	No change in direct response, but update the policy reference to Gypsies and travellers to show extrapolated figures, for long stay and transit pitches for Gypsies and travellers, and additional accommodation for travelling show people [RB]
11024 - Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425]	No change, other than the addition of a new design policy as recommended elsewhere [RB]
10232 - Mr D Mawson OBE [5864]	
8904 - mrs Dorothy Allen [8071]	
9584 - South Norfolk Council (Cllr Robert Savage) [8151]	
11065 - Wymondham Consortium of Landowners [8218]	
10200 - Hopkins Homes Limited	
8614 - Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059]	No change needed [RB]
8424 - M Harrold [7966]	No change [RB]
8386 - Mr M Buckingham [7968]	
9921 - stephen eastwood [7962]	No change needed [RB]
8648 - Mr Steve Dowall [8033]	
8761 - Ms Sarah Smith [8059]	
9000 - Mr CM Sparrow [8093]	
9004 - Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094]	
9008 - Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095]	
9015 - Mr KD White [8097]	
9019 - Mr Robert Hall [8098]	
9023 - Mr and Mrs Peter Tann [8099]	
8099 - Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880]	Add new policies relating to local energy generation and addressing climate change, and including the use of BREEAM and Building for Life criteria in policies regarding the performance of buildings. [RB]
8221 - Mr P Anderson [7901]	
8604 - Mr M Read [8024]	
9208 - Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114]	
10686 - Ms Natalie Beal [8349]	
11034 - Mr Bernard Godding	

(Q28) Any further comments about the document or the Sustainability Appraisal ?

Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Representations

9252 - Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828]
8927 - Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014]
8017 - Miss Lynne Morris [7851]
8452 - Ian Harris [8007]
8485 - Mr C Skeels [8016]
8509 - Mrs Helen Hutson [8020]
8948 - Miss Marguerite Finn [8087]
9275 - Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115]
9444 - Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127]

9535 - Ms Cathy Armor [8140]
9593 - Mr R Harris [8146]
10121 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]
10120 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239]
10248 - Mrs Angela Garner [8258]

10424 - Morningthorpe Parish Council (Mr P Rodger) [8307]
10475 - Mr David Smith [8309]
10503 - Mr I T Smith [8310]
10552 - MR Adrian Vernon [8312]

9317 - Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445]
9716 - Mr Paul Ruddock [5446]
7979 - Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862]
10254 - Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Glyn Davies) [7725]

10751 - Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776]
9776 - Blofield Parish Council (Mrs D Wyatt) [1781]
9777 - Salhouse Parish Council (Mrs D Wyatt) [1823]
11154 - Coal Authority (Miss Rachel Bust Planning and Local Authority Liaison) [7444]
8172 - Mr A.J. Pring [7899]
8287 - Diane Flynn [7914]
8672 - Mr Kevin Fincham [8036]
8750 - Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053]
9183 - Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112]
9502 - Mrs C H Bryant [8139]

Action

No change in the respect of the scale of housing or employment growth to be planned for, but adopt a cautious approach to the potential for retail growth

Indicate that long stay traveller sites, and an additional site for travelling show people should be included within strategic growth locations through the master planning process, unless it can be demonstrated that need has already been met, with appropriate proposals for their maintenance. [RB]

No change [RB]

No change needed [RB]

Q28 ACTIONS SUMMARY

Decision on Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Review the settlement hierarchy before pre-submission publication version of the strategy. Retain Trowse as an urban fringe parish. No change to the Norwich policy area boundary [RB]

Settlement hierarchy review undertaken based on updated village service information and form and character of villages, including public transport access. Draft policy in pre-submission version reflects this review. Trowse confirmed as an urban fringe parish in the preamble to the policy outlining the strategy for the Norwich policy area. Only change to current Norwich policy area boundary is the inclusion of Salhouse, since it is likely the eco proposal at Rackheath will extend across the parish border

.Subject to the outcome of the infrastructure needs and funding study being undertaken by EDAW, include waste management within the implementation strategy. [RB]

Included in the implementation framework in an appendix to the pre-submission version

Findings of the historic characterisation study to be taken into account

These have been taken into account, and when necessary the text describing major growth locations in the Norwich policy area has been amended to highlight issues emerging from the study

Review the policies relating to the settlement hierarchy, particularly service villages and other villages, and consider the appropriate category for Marsham. [RB]

Settlement hierarchy review undertaken based on updated village service information and form and character of villages, including public transport access. Draft policy in pre-submission version reflects this review. Marsham now categorized as an "other village" (previously a "service village") following closure of the village shop

Develop implementation strategy for inclusion in the pre-submission publication of version of the strategy, and seek the commitment of principal service providers

The policy has been redrafted since the publication in July of the draft regulations and guidance on the Government's proposed CIL. The policy and implementation schedule in the appendix to the pre-submission version have drawn on work on infrastructure needs and funding undertaken by EDAW in 2009. The CIL proposals have arrived too late to be fully taken into account in terms of viability testing, but the regulations would in any case necessitate the preparation and consultation on a draft charging schedule before it could be submitted for independent examination. These additional requirements mean that in this case it would not be possible for such a schedule to be submitted concurrently with the JCS on its current timetable.

Amend the joint core strategy to show an allocation at Aylsham of 300 dwellings to be implemented subject to the capacity limitations of the sewage treatment works being overcome. [RB]

Allocation proposed at Aylsham subject to resolution of sewage treatment issues

Amend the joint core strategy to show an allocation at Aylsham of 300 dwellings to be implemented subject to the capacity limitations of the sewage treatment works being overcome. [RB]

Allocation proposed at Aylsham subject to resolution of sewage treatment issues

Include monitoring targets in pre submission publication version

Included

Include in introductory section a clear statement of the area to be covered by the plan and that it excludes the Broads. Clarify on key diagrams, including any more detailed insets for the Norwich policy area and city centre that the area shown as the Broads authority area is excluded from the JCS.

Clarification added to introduction, and also to policy on the Broads . Diagrams redrafted into aid clarity

Amend paragraph 1.2 to refer not only to housing, but also to employment and supporting infrastructure

Executive summary completely redrafted

Give further consideration to including estimates of the population in total, and infrastructure likely to result from major developments, but with appropriate caution given the difficulties of such forecasts at a local scale. [RB]

Infrastructure shown in implementation framework in appendix to pre-submission version is related to developments where this is feasible, but there is much infrastructure where the need is derived from a wider area. On reflection it is probably unrealistic to attempt to indicate expected population in any given development, other than by a simple multiplication of forecast house numbers and household size.

Ensure the transport policy or supporting text makes appropriate reference to parking strategy and also to the benefits of travel planning. Ensure any reference to density in new developments seeks to focus high density on locations near centres in order to encourage bus patronage [RB]

Policies on access and transportation, and the strategy for the Norwich policy area have been amended to increase references to the outcomes of travel planning, namely increased walking, cycling, public transport and a reduction in the need to travel, and also to refer to parking restraint in areas of good public transport accessibility. The policy on environment and addressing climate change states that high densities should be associated with the availability of good public transport

Add new policies on design and on energy/climate change issues [RB]

Added

Reexamine the vision to see if more local distinctiveness, and a clearer picture can be presented Add an appendix identifying relationships to other strategies, including the Greater Norwich Economic Strategy [RB]

The vision has been re-examined and redrafted in an attempt to give more local flavour. An appendix indicating other related strategies has been added

No change in direct response, but update the policy reference to Gypsies and travellers to show extrapolated figures, for long stay and transit pitches for Gypsies and travellers, and additional accommodation for travelling show people [RB]

Policy for housing includes expanded section on Gypsies and Travellers as recommended, including reference to travelling showpeople

No change, other than the addition of a new design policy as recommended elsewhere [RB]

New design policy added

Add new policies relating to local energy generation and addressing climate change and including the use of BREEAM and Building for Life criteria in policies regarding the performance of buildings. [RB]

Design policy refers to the use of BREEAM and the building for life criteria

No change in the respect of the scale of housing or employment growth to be planned for, but adopt a cautious approach to the potential for retail growth

Policy for city centre indicates an expectation for 20,000 square metres of a additional comparison goods floorspace to 2016 with an early review. This is a significantly lower figure than in the town centre and retail study conducted by GVA Grimley, and reflects the economic downturn since then, but adopts a shorter horizon.

Indicate that long stay traveller sites, and an additional site for travelling show people should be included within strategic growth locations through the master planning process, unless it can be demonstrated that need has already been met, with appropriate proposals for their maintenance. [RB]

The policy for major growth locations in the Norwich policy area includes a requirement for consideration to be given for the inclusion of sites for Gypsies and Travellers within the major growth locations. The Housing policy refers to meeting the needs of Travelling showpeople close to the Norwich urban area.