

8783/IC1

Inspector Roy Foster
c/o The Programme Officer
lstjohnhowe@hotmail.co.uk

Prince Rupert Way
Norwich
NR70TS

3 February 2011

Dear Inspector,

Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk – Inspector’s Possible Changes – issued 5 January 2011

1. Green Infrastructure Diagrams (documents RF25a and RF25b)

I wish to object to these proposed changes because RF25b fails to make any real improvement to the original as it clearly states that the Green Infrastructure opportunities are indicative and do not “...indicate a constraint on development.”

This removes the existing protection from valuable environmental assets indicated on RF25b, such as the 200 acres of mature woodland in Thorpe St Andrew, and leaves them vulnerable to development. This is particularly important in the case that the NNDR does not achieve funding, as sites closer to Norwich are likely to become targets for development in an eventual Plan B.

I urge the Inspector to insist on better protection from development for those areas indicated on the diagram as “Existing Green Infrastructure Sites”

2. Flexibility/ Resilience of the JCS in relation to the Norwich Northern Distributor Road (document RF117)

I wish to object to the proposed changes to the Joint Core Strategy **Policy 10 and Policy 20** because the transport strategy they outline for north-east Norwich and the adjacent area of Broadland District is not the most appropriate when considered against the reasonable alternatives. They also leave the Joint Core Strategy open to review in just five years time and create uncertainty for local people.

You requested these changes as a ‘partial alternative Plan B’. However, the changes amount only to a scheduling of housing developments to deliver the original Plan A and a re-timing of the NNDR to 2016/17. As such they do not form a ‘Plan B’ which you invited the Greater Norwich Development Partnership to consider due to the uncertainty over NNDR funding at the time of the strategy’s adoption in March.

Community and environmental groups oppose the Postwick Hub and the Norwich Northern distributor Road (NNDR) within the Joint Core Strategy as they have not been properly tested against alternative transport policy options and it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that they will reduce congestion and deliver a sustainable

transport system. They would require substantial public money (c.£130m) at a time of spending restraint. Continuing with these schemes places undue reliance on them as 'critical infrastructure' when funding is unknown.

The uncertainty surrounding the NNDR/Postwick Hub will continue to create uncertainty for the local communities affected by a proposed NDR.

Further, keeping alive the possibility of a NNDR/Postwick Hub through the Joint Core Strategy has encouraged Norfolk County Council to spend more public money on them. In January 2011, the County Council agreed to spend up to £1.5 million over the next two years on further NNDR work. These funds have been taken from budgets originally intended for safety and community transport schemes planned across Norfolk.

The GNDP propose a review in 2016 if the NNDR has not been built. I urge you to consider the alternative of creating, at this stage, a real Plan B that has no dependency on an NNDR and Postwick Hub. Whilst this may take time, there are enough existing permissions for housing development not to be delayed during this period. A plan B is a more realistic proposal in the current economic situation, it would relieve community uncertainty, and it would not leave the JCS open to a likely review in just five years time.

Please will you hold a further day's public hearing to consider such an alternative Plan B as this important matter was not discussed at the hearing on 9 December.

Yours faithfully

Linda Townes