

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group – Local Development Framework Working Group

Agenda

Date

Wednesday 14 May 2008

**Members of the
Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy
Group
– Local Development Framework Working Group**

Representing Broadland District Council

Cllr Andrew Proctor (Chairman)
Cllr Anthony D Adams
Cllr Stuart Clancy
Cllr Joella C Cottingham
Cllr Kim Davis-Claydon
Cllr Roger R Foulger
Cllr Shelagh Gurney
Cllr Shirley Peters

Representing Norwich City Council

Cllr Jenny Lay
Cllr Tom Llewellyn
Cllr Judith Lubbock
Cllr Steve Morphew
Cllr Brian Morrey
Cllr Adrian Ramsey
Cllr Brian Watkins

Representing South Norfolk Council

Cllr Vivienne Bell
Cllr Derek Blake
Cllr Daniel Cox
Cllr Leslie Dale
Cllr Colin Gould
Cllr Murray Gray
Cllr Keith Weeks
Cllr Martin Wynne

Representing Norfolk County Council

Cllr Evelyn Collishaw
Cllr Adrian Gunson

Officers

Sandra Eastaugh GND Partnership Manager

Time

2.00pm

Place

The Ballroom
Pinebanks
9 Yarmouth Road
Thorpe St Andrew
Norwich

Contact

Martin Thrower tel (01603) 430540

Broadland District Council
Thorpe Lodge
1 Yarmouth Road
Thorpe St Andrew
Norwich NR7 0DU

Fax: (01603) 430411
E-mail: martin.thrower@broadland.gov.uk



**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS - FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE
FLOWCHART OVERLEAF**

MEETING: _____

DATE: _____

ITEM NO: _____ **AND TITLE:** _____

NATURE OF INTEREST: (Please write in this space a description of your interest)

	YES	NO
Is (or should) the Interest be registered in the Register of Members' Interests?		
If not, whose well being or financial position is affected to a greater extent than the majority of other people in the ward?		
Your own		
A family member (state name)		
A close associate (state name)		
Any person or body who has employed or appointed your family member/close associate (state name)		
Any firm in which your family member/close associate is a partner or company of which they are directors (state name)		
Any company in which your family member/close associate has shares with a face value more than £25,000 (state name)		
Any of the following in which you hold a position of general control or management: outside organisations, other public authorities, charities, pressure groups, political parties or trade unions (state name)		
Does the interest (a) affect your financial position or the financial position of a person or body described above? <i>(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)</i> (b) relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or any person or body described above? <i>(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)</i> (c) relate to scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny committee of a decision you were party to? <i>(If Yes the interest is prejudicial)</i> (d) relate to the functions of the council in respect of housing (except your tenancy), statutory sick pay, an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members, any ceremonial honour given to members, or setting the council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992. <i>(If Yes the interest is NOT PREJUDICIAL)</i>		
PREJUDICIAL INTEREST If you answered Yes to (a) or (b) is the interest one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest? If Yes the interest is PREJUDICIAL. If you answered Yes to (c) the interest is PREJUDICIAL		
If prejudicial do you intend to attend the meeting to make representations, answer questions or give evidence?		

Signed: _____

Date: _____

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to my interests?

- A** Does it affect my entries in the Register of Interests?
OR
B Does it affect the well being or financial position of me, my family or close associates; or my family's or close associates'
 • employment, employers or businesses;
 • companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more than £25,000 face value;
 • business partnerships; or
C Does it affect the well being or financial position of the following organisations in which I hold a position of general control or management:
 - other bodies to which I have been appointed or nominated by the council;
 - other public authorities;
 - charitable bodies;
 - bodies whose main purpose is to influence public opinion or policy
- More than the majority of other people in the ward?**
- D** Is Overview and Scrutiny considering a decision I made? If so you have a prejudicial interest.

NO

Disclose the existence & nature of your interest

You have a personal interest in the matter

YES

Is the interest financial or relating to a regulatory issue e.g. planning permission?

NO

The interest is not prejudicial you can participate in the meeting and vote

YES

You may have a prejudicial interest

- This matter relates to
- housing (except your tenancy)
 - statutory sick pay from the council
 - an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members
 - any ceremonial honour given to members
 - setting the council tax or a precept

YES

NO

The interest is prejudicial withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room (after making representations, answering questions or giving evidence). Do not try to improperly influence the decision

YES

Would a member of the public – if he or she knew all the facts – reasonably think that personal interest was so significant that my decision on the matter would be affected by it?

NO

Personal Interest

Prejudicial Interest

A G E N D A

Page No

- | | | |
|----------|---|---------------|
| 1 | To receive declarations of interest under Procedural Rule no 8 | |
| 2 | Apologies for absence | |
| 3 | Minutes of meeting held on 21 April 2008 | 1 - 4 |
| 4 | Matters arising therefrom (if any) | |
| 5 | Review of Preferred Options Proposals following comments received on 21 April 2008 | 5 - 27 |
| 6 | Next Steps | |

Joint Core Strategy – Preferred Options draft
Consideration of issues arising from the
Joint LDF Groups meeting 21 April 2008

Contents

Summary

1. Concerns raised by the LDF Working Group
2. General considerations of 'soundness' for the JCS
3. Background reasoning for the choice of development strategy in the draft Preferred Options document
4. Alternative suggestions for consideration relating to:
 - 4.1 Development in major growth locations
 - 4.2 Flexibility in rural settlements
 - 4.3 Infrastructure dependencies
 - 4.4 Phasing issues
 - 4.5 Scale of development in market towns

Appendices

- A. Housing completions 1990 – 2007 by district and policy areas
- B. Housing completions and % shares (projected) 1981 to 2026
- C. Implications of proposing 2000 houses at Long Stratton

Summary

The LDF Working Group raised a number of concerns at the meeting on 21 April.

These were primarily:

- a. Distribution of the large scale housing growth
 - Between districts
 - Choices of particular locations.
- b. Flexibility to allow for development in smaller villages and beyond in the 'countryside'.
- c. Infrastructure delivery and the links to the quantum of development achievable.
- d. Phasing issues.
- e. Level of development proposed in some rural towns

To help address these concerns this document outlines the context for the JCS work and the implications on 'soundness' of different approaches.

In seeking to respond to Members concerns a more detailed explanation of the suggestions in the draft Preferred Options document is given.

The suggested options were chosen because of (in broad terms):

- Prospects of providing adequate infrastructure
- A close relationship between housing and a choice of employment locations giving the opportunity of living near to a workplace
- Prospects of achieving self containment in larger growth locations
- The potential to maximize public transport opportunities / investment in larger areas.
- Opportunities to ensure growth can continue into the longer term to meet commitments 2026+

A settlement hierarchy concentrating on larger towns aids the sustainable pattern of development. In broad terms lower levels of development are appropriate to smaller places (as defined by reference to the range of services and facilities).

Major development is unlikely to be able to take place without significant infrastructure e.g. A47 junction improvements; NDR; NRP etc. This is the case whether we explicitly try to make caveats or not.

Lead-in times and potential development rates will naturally phase development.

Distinctions need to be made between area wide infrastructure needs e.g. NDR and localised improvements which can come with site by site developments.

Dispersal of development to 'many' locations fails to secure critical mass in any one location to give major infrastructure provision e.g. schools, public transport and road improvements.

Major concentration to a 'new town' will not deliver the rate of completions required to meet RSS figures (certainly in the short to medium term) nor will maintain a 5 year housing supply.

Alternative growth location scenarios have been developed and the consequences outlined. These generally perform poorly in sustainability appraisal against the suggested options.

It is likely that a way can be found to provide more flexibility for development in smaller settlements; however we need to avoid inconsistency with the relevant RSS policies.

A robust approach to the provision of infrastructure could be written in more explicitly to the JCS, although this may be of limited value since locations are already noted as having significant dependencies on infrastructure projects. The RSS had such a 'robust' approach struck out by Inspectors at Examination.

1. Concerns raised by the Joint LDF Group

- 1.1 The LDF Working Group raised a number of concerns at the meeting on 21 April. These were primarily:

- a. Distribution of the large scale housing growth
 - Between districts
 - Choices of particular locations.
- b. Flexibility to allow for development in smaller villages and beyond in the 'countryside'.
- c. Infrastructure delivery and the links to the quantum of development achievable.
- d. Phasing issues.
- e. Level of development proposed in some rural towns

1.2 These issues are addressed in the section 4 below. In sections 2 and 3 we give some background to the suggested preferred options in the document considered by the Joint LDF Group. This is intended to show the interrelationships between issues such as infrastructure requirements and development locations. In section 2 we have also given an appreciation of the 'soundness' issues that any plan document will have to consider once it gets to an Examination.

1.3 This note seeks to set out the concerns expressed by Members and provide either additional context for the draft Preferred Options suggestions or provide alternatives for consideration.

The role and content of a core strategy

1.4 Aspects include:

- The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) should be a strategic document providing high level guidance with more detailed policy included in subsidiary planning documents (LDDs) and delivery information in an Implementation plan (this is likely to be the role of the Integrated Development Plan)
- The vision should be aspirational and paint a picture of how a place is intended to be late in the Plan period

JCS and Growth Point

1.5 The relationships include:

- The need for the JCS to deliver the current housing targets pre-dates and is not predicated on Growth Point status.
- Growth Point status results from the housing targets not the other way round
- If we did not have Growth Point status we would still need to deliver the same targets, but without any support.

2. General considerations of 'soundness' for the JCS

2.1 The JCS must be in "general conformity" with the RSS.

- 2.2 It is very unlikely to be sound if it does not deliver on key RSS and Government planning policies and in particular
1. It must show how it will deliver **housing provision** in full for at least 15 years
 2. It must demonstrate how it will deliver a shift to **public transport** (PT) use in the NPA
 3. or it must include very clear and overwhelming evidence why it can not do these things.
- 2.3 An unsound JCS would have severe consequences:
1. as a statutory responsibility there would be a need to commit resources to a resubmission (delay might also require evidence studies to be updated).
 2. it is a significant indicator of Local Authority performance.
 3. it would reduce Planning Delivery Grant.
 4. if the plan is unsound because it fails to deliver housing provision it is likely to be significantly detrimental to attracting Growth Point and related money (for evidence studies as well as infrastructure).
 5. inability to demonstrate medium and long term housing supply is a very significant material consideration for applications – consequently, the growth would still happen but by unplanned application and appeal – it would then be much more difficult to ensure adequate and timely supporting infrastructure.
- 2.4 This has implications for **making housing allocations conditional on strategic infrastructure or jobs.**
- It is intended that the Preferred Options includes clear “dependencies” i.e. those bits of local infrastructure that are required to enable development (e.g. Longwater junction improvement to serve employment and housing growth in the area)
 - Phasing against more strategic infrastructure would only be “sound” if it is backed up by clear evidence that there is no alternative strategy. It is almost inconceivable that a plan that attempted to link growth generally to strategic infrastructure provision would be considered sound. The Panel and Secretary of State rejected such an approach proposed for the RSS.
 - The impact of the NDR on delivery of housing allocations in the northern half of the NPA and on the transport strategy for the area as a whole, and the delivery of significant housing at Long Stratton linked to a bypass are probably the only examples of clear links to strategic infrastructure. (There are other smaller scale dependencies which will be highlighted in the JCS)
 - However there would also need to be clear justification for why alternative growth locations not needing such infrastructure had not been selected.
 - It is proposed that the POs include a clear statement that growth in the NE and at the airport can not take place without an NDR, that there are no suitable and preferable alternative locations, and consequently overall levels of growth would have to be reduced

- Measuring job growth accurately is actually nearly impossible, and available statistics provide broad indications of growth. However, the evidence we have is that job growth has been very strong since 2001. The ARUP study forecasts that growth is likely to continue over the plan period as a whole. Indeed they expect growth to exceed the RSS target of 35,000 jobs (2001-21).
- Net Job growth has been strongest in Norwich and South Norfolk and this is forecast to continue.
- The study recommends additional growth at the existing strategic employment locations (City Centre, BBP, NIA, NRP and Longwater)

- 2.5 The strategy will have to demonstrate how it helps deliver a **shift towards public transport**. As well as directly affecting transport policies it has a significant implication for both the location and scale of development.
- Evidence and experience demonstrates that concentrated development of several thousand houses, specifically designed around PT use, will best support high quality PT.
 - Dispersing development either in smaller scale developments, or around several points of the compass will be most unlikely to deliver significant improvement in PT use.
 - Locating development on routes which are difficult to improve for public transport are less likely to deliver the required shift and will be more expensive to try to resolve

Delivering Infrastructure

- 2.6 Significant amounts of supporting infrastructure (e.g. schools, transport, green infrastructure etc.) will be reliant on developer contributions. Concentrating development in large growth areas will provide efficiencies of scale and make the provision of sufficient infrastructure much more likely.

3. Background to the choices suggested in the draft Preferred Options document

- 3.1 The following comments outline more detailed justification and dependencies between the elements of the suggested strategy. A version of this section could be added into the Preferred Options document to strengthen the references to infrastructure and the interdependencies between its provision and the large amounts of development required.

Overall 'Spatial Strategy' components

- 3.2 The principles underlying the Spatial Strategy can be summarised as follows:
- Use appropriately located previously developed land where possible in preference to Greenfields.
 - All development should be adequately serviced and have the infrastructure and facilities necessary for users to enjoy a healthy and environmentally sustainable way of life.
 - New residential areas should be located close to employment and services, and a choice of such facilities where possible.
 - Major new development should be a mix of uses and incorporate the new services to meet the day-to-day needs of users and thus provide a degree of self-containment.
 - All residents should have access to higher order facilities not available in their immediate locality.
 - Development to maximise public transport use while minimising unavoidable disruption to other travellers.
 - Major new developments should be inter-linked with enhanced green infrastructure to facilitate multiuse green spaces that can function, for example, as pedestrian/cycle corridors, wildlife corridors, recreational facilities and sustainable drainage facilities etc...
 - Recognise that the plan should provide for the requirements set out in the East of England Plan to 2021, extrapolated to 2026 as required by Government policy, but should also provide for some continuity beyond that date

Sequence of locations in the Norwich Policy Area

- 3.3 In the light of these principles the general strategy is to accommodate development at a scale appropriate to the following hierarchy:
1. Norwich Urban Area followed by urban extensions or other developments close to or accessible to the Norwich Urban Area
 2. Main Towns
 3. Key Service Centres
 4. Service villages
 5. Other villages

Reasoning

- 3.4 Significant aspects include:
- Significant amounts of new development will take place within the Norwich Urban Area, but within the city centre housing capacity is limited by competing uses. The city centre strategy is led by the need to continue to provide some housing but to give primacy to town and city centre uses. In particular there is a need for high quality offices.
 - Elsewhere within the Norwich Urban Area, full use will be made of available sites to the extent that it is consistent with maintaining and improving the environmental character of the locality.

- Major employment growth will principally build on the existing pattern of successful developments as proposed in the East of England Plan. New development will be focused at:
 - City Centre (offices, retail and town centre uses)
 - Longwater (general business)
 - Norwich Research Park to be extended (research/health/science)
 - Wymondham (new general employment allocation)
 - Hethel (expansion of engineering/automotive employment)
 - Broadland Business Park to be extended (business park uses)

- A new employment area focusing on aviation related development will be established near Norwich International Airport to take advantage of opportunities offered by the airport and to provide for a better balance of new employment growth across the Norwich area. This allocation will be subject to the resolution of surface access difficulties through the construction of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road.

- Major new growth locations for mixed use development will be needed to accommodate the housing growth required by the East of England Plan. The scale of these new developments is determined by the need to provide for a reasonable degree of self-containment with the major new developments including:
 - secondary education
 - a district centre or high street
 - primary healthcare
 - sufficient critical mass to enable innovative high quality public transport links
 - some local employment
 - a full range of formal and informal recreation facilities

- The major mixed use developments are located in a north east/south west axis at:
 - Rackheath
 - The north east urban edge
 - Norwich City Centre in association with retail growth and additional high-grade office development
 - Hethersett/Little Melton
 - Wymondham

- They will be linked to each other via the city centre by means of high quality public transport (bus rapid transit offering express limited stop services) and to other nearby employment areas by improved conventional bus services. They will also be linked to the city centre by high quality cycle routes.

3.5 These locations have been chosen because:

- The sustainability appraisal shows these areas perform best individually.

- In respect of the **south west sector (including Hethersett / Little Melton and Wymondham)** the following factors are relevant:
 - Currently the best performing public transport corridor with good scope for further improvement and links directly to priority measures within the city centre.
 - There is a challenge presented by the Thickthorn junction of the A11/A47. (Potential solutions to this include the use of the former A11 to approach Thickthorn, and the use of bus activated priority to speed buses through the junction and access the current priority measures serving the Park and Ride site).
 - The B1108 junction with the A47 is capable of being upgraded and offers an opportunity to provide access to the main road network avoiding Thickthorn.
 - The area is adjacent to the NRP and offers good opportunities for bus and cycle links to it, Wymondham and possibly Longwater.
- **Wymondham** itself is a significant existing market town with well-developed local facilities including education and employment opportunities. It is more self-contained than many other locations.
- The **north east sector (Rackheath and the NE urban edge)** is relatively close to strategic employment at Broadland Business Park, the airport and the city centre with a choice of radial routes for public transport potential. A number of detailed issues need to be considered around precise routings, but the principle is established.
- The necessary heavy investment in public transport priorities will serve the maximum benefit if extensive measures are focused on one corridor serving two growth areas at each end, and in the case of Wymondham and Hethersett will also benefit a significant existing population.
- Focusing on public transport priorities in this way will also minimise the impact on other traffic corridors.
- The locations selected also offer the potential for rail connections to the city centre and each other should a light rail transit system become feasible.
- The major growth locations have been selected for their proximity and access to a choice of the established and proposed employment growth locations.
- The major growth locations offer potential to implement the Green Infrastructure strategy.

Key dependencies

3.6 These include:

- Local infrastructure (dealing with education, health, shopping, community facilities, open space etc) will be provided as part of the development.
- Major strategic infrastructure may be implemented in part through developer contributions but will require the active cooperation of other agencies. This principally concerns utilities and transport i.e. the NDR and NATS.
- The key dependencies for each location are:

Longwater

- Improved interchange with the A47 trunk road
- Improved electricity supply

Wymondham and Hethersett/Little Melton

- Bus priorities to avoid delays at the Thickthorn junction and on the former A47 linking them to it.
- Improved direct links from these areas to the Norwich Research Park for primarily pedestrian/cycle and public transport traffic.
- Improvement to the B1108/A47 junction (to be investigated).
- Any specific utility requirements.

West (smaller level of proposed growth)

- The formation of an acceptable access to the A47 and a crossing serving pedestrians and cyclists linking the new development to Longwater and Costessey.

Broadland Business Park expansion.

- Improvements to the Postwick interchange to the A47, and a link road connecting the business park to Plumstead Road East between Dussindale and Thorpe End.

North-eastern urban extension inside the Northern Distributor Road

- Improvement of the Postwick A47 interchange and construction of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road as far as the A140 (north).
- Public transport priorities through the urban area to link to existing city centre priority measures

Northeast outside Northern Distributor Road [Rackheath].

- A grade separated pedestrian/ cyclelink across the Northern Distributor Road to connect the new development to services available within the Urban extension inside the Northern Distributor Road
- Public transport infrastructure provided as part of the major mixed use development proposed inside the Northern Distributor Road
- Rail halts to serve the mix-use developments and Broadland Business Park

3.7 The above infrastructure, beyond that normally provided as part of the development, will need the active cooperation of the other agencies, principally utility providers through provision in their Asset Management Plans, the Highways Agency and support through the Regional Funding Allocation in the case of trunk roads, and appropriate government funding in the case of the Norwich northern distributor road. Without this support the proposal in question will not be able to proceed, and the plan's ability to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan will be correspondingly reduced.

Spatial Strategy and the remainder of Plan Area

3.8 In the remainder of the plan area, future development is based on a hierarchy of centres that have been defined according to the level and range of existing facilities and the need to provide a reasonable distribution across the plan area in terms of providing for access to the services they offer. The hierarchy of settlements concentrating on the tiers other than Norwich itself, consists of:

- Main Towns
- Key Service Centres
- Service Villages
- Other Villages

3.9 The scale of development in these centres depends on the level in the hierarchy. Outside these 'centres', in the countryside limited development will be permitted where it is in accordance with government policies on countryside development or where a particular proposal would further the objectives of the plan.

Key dependencies in the rural area

3.10 Because of the dispersed nature of the remainder of the plan area, dependencies relate to a particular settlement. Those for the other towns will be added to the document. In the absence of these being resolved, the scale of development proposed in plan for that settlement cannot be delivered.

4. Alternative suggestions to address Member concerns

4.1 Development locations in the Norwich Policy Area

4.1.1 Recognising the points made by Members the table below sets out four potential scenarios, in addition to the original draft suggestion. The component locations can be seen in the table, with a description and potential implications of choosing the scenario given below the table.

Locations	Options					
	(Original)	1	2	3	4	5
City	4000	4000	4000	4000	4000	4000
SNDC Fringe	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000
Broadland Fringe	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000
East					1000	
NE Inside and Out	6000	6000	4000	2000		
North			4000	2000		
Hethersett	6000	4000	4000	2000		
West		2000	2000	1000		
Long Stratton		2000		2000		
Poringland				2000		
North West				2000		
Wymondham	4000	2000	2000	2000		
Stand Alone						5000*
City %	17	17	17	17	17	17
SNDC %	50	50	42	54	8	
Broadland %	33	33	42	29	8	
To 2026	24000	24000	24000	24000	13000	

* Only 5000 in the plan period the remainder (approx 11000) would be beyond 2026.

(**NB** All options include 4000 in the City and assume 4000 in the urban fringe of Norwich (2000 Broadland 2000 South Norfolk) on a range of sites)

Option 1 – Original as suggested in the draft Preferred Options document

4.1.2 Explanation of the reasoning behind the suggested choices given in section 3. Consistent with the Issues and Options consultation supported by the sustainability appraisal.

Option 2 - As JCS draft PO except reduced growth at Wymondham now moved to Long Stratton

Consequences

Broadly consistent with the Issues and Options consultation, but not supported by the sustainability appraisal.

2000 at Wymondham

- Cannot support an new secondary school (existing school over capacity)
- Smaller market for public transport
- Can use smaller sites
- Does not make best use of existing facilities and economies of scale.

2000 at Long Stratton

- Bypass would be a prerequisite needing up front funding
- Bypass cannot be afforded by this level of growth, would draw funds from other infrastructure provision even based on c£20m single c/way scheme
- Significant trade-off between funding for a bypass and other infrastructure e.g. affordable housing.
- Poor prospects for high quality public transport and no possibility to link to rail network
- Would need improvements to A47/A140 junction
- High school capacity available up to 2000
- Poorly located for strategic employment sites although some local provision
- There is a need to ensure that landowners are willing to actually deliver this option. Discussions are ongoing with landowners who approached us as part of the Issues and Options consultation exercise.

Option 3 - 50/50 split between Districts

Not consistent with outcomes of the Issues and Options consultation and not supported by the sustainability appraisal.

4000 in the North
4000 inside NDR NE
4000 at Hethersett
2000 at Wymondham
2000 in the West

Consequences

4000 in the North

- More dependant on NDR, and would require a redesign of the NDR.
- No significant local Secondary School capacity. Would need to grow to 8000 to support a new school
- Only close to one strategic employment location
- Would need significant public transport corridor enhancement through a 'constrained' part of the network with little existing public transport priority.
- No existing facilities and would exist as a stand alone settlement. Insufficient scale to support significant retail elements.
- Significant mineral constraint to serve the NE sector.
- Dilutes the potential to focus infrastructure

2000 at Wymondham

- Cannot support a new secondary school (existing school over capacity)
- Smaller market for public transport
- Can use smaller sites
- Doesn't make best use of existing and potential facilities and economies of scale

Option 4 - significant dispersal

Not consistent with outcomes of the Issues and Options consultation and not supported by the sustainability appraisal.

Consequences

None of a sufficient scale to:

- support sec school, except where local capacity (eg Long Stratton)
- be capable of supporting *enhanced* public transport services but some improvement of existing may be possible
- significantly improve primary healthcare
- deliver a new district centre

These locations are likely to:

- generate more car trips as public transport will be less effective and therefore require extra investment in the transport network capacity
- assist in improving some local provision.
- spread the risk of non delivery
- result in increased 'suburbanisation'
- divert funding to many more schemes losing economies of scale

Option 5 - New Settlement (16000) – similar in size to Kings Lynn

Consequences

- Deliverability - likely only to deliver 5000 in plan period. This is a fundamental constraint that would make it 'unsound'.
- If it is to maximise sustainability needs to be distant from Norwich. Within NPA would be too close, outside would be out of conformity with RSS.
- Very High Risk
- The volume of movements needing to be catered for would mean local connections to existing networks could require very significant infrastructure to mitigate impacts.

Location choice limited by:

- Would need rail access
- Need to avoid the sensitive environment near to the Broads
- Need an area avoiding constraints that would damage the integrity of the new settlement – far enough away for constraining factors.

If Members wish to pursue a major new town option for late in the plan period and extending into the future it may be best to consider this through the forthcoming review of the RSS.

4.2 Flexibility in rural settlements

4.2.1 The request from Members was to design an approach where development can be facilitated in smaller rural settlements and into the 'countryside'. Members wished to be able to react positively to proposals in these areas.

4.2.2 Potential alternative approaches to enable this could be:

- 1. Adjust the threshold of the number of facilities to include more villages in the 'other' village category.**

Consequences

- The current threshold for 'Other Villages' (ie. The level below a 'Service Village') is set very low as a village hall and primary school. Other locations could be drawn in if they have some other defined 'basic essentials' other than the school etc.
- Potential increases in traveling to get to basic everyday facilities, most likely by private car and an increase in rural isolation.
- Would be contrary to public consultation responses.

2. Adapt the policy wording for the ‘countryside’ to encapsulate a more open approach to infill development.

Consequences

- Approach could be contrary to national policy and runs the risk of being ‘unsound’.
- There could be little protection to stop a flood of applications under such an approach.

3. An approach where potential development that can demonstrate it is furthering the objectives of the Plan can be agreed.

Consequences

- Direct link to JCS policy objectives provides potential to justify proposals.
- Would need clear guidance eg. through SPD to explain references in broad such a broad JCS policy.

4.3 Infrastructure issues

4.3.1 Members requested an approach to ensure clear linkages between new development proposals and the Government / Regional funding of major infrastructure projects. A robust approach was requested linking progress on new (primarily) housing developments to the degree of Government investment.

4.3.2 The EiP Panel examining the RSS and the Government Office rejected such an obvious policy approach. In effect ‘blockages’ will arise anyway if certain projects do not proceed e.g. NDR is needed to give capacity on radial routes for enhanced public transport for growth locations in the NE. Without it development cannot proceed – there is no capacity to have an appropriate public transport serviced development or capacity for extra private car traffic of the scale envisaged. A self-limiting / phasing approach will be evident. This is not merely an NDR related issue, works would be needed on the A11 and A47 corridors for both public and private transport needs. Hence the focus of the Growth Point bids. There are significant technical blockages if the proper infrastructure cannot be provided.

4.3.3 The Implementation chapter Preferred Option policy already makes (in line 1) explicit reference to the provision of:

‘...appropriate infrastructure provided in a timely way...’

The policy goes on to specifically list Government funding as a key element.

4.3.4 It would be reasonable to make a more ‘upfront’ statement about infrastructure provision in the Vision section which is at the beginning of the document. A statement such as the following **could** be incorporated:

‘ In creating a well-planned and functioning Joint Core Strategy area we are reliant on significant new infrastructure provision. Any delay in the timely provision of major elements will jeopardise the achievement of the aspirations in relation to housing and employment growth, together with many social and environmental objectives.

4.4 Phasing

4.4.1 Members also raised issues around potential phasing of new development.

4.4.2 The proposed Preferred Option reflects public consultation responses and provides for a mix of smaller (total 8,000 dwellings), medium (total 2,000 dwellings) and large scale development (total 14,000 dwellings). This will automatically provide phasing through market mechanisms:

- Medium and large scale developments take over 6 years on average from plan to first dwellings. So they are very unlikely to begin delivering before 2016
- They are very unlikely to deliver more than 250-500 dwellings per year (reflecting, in part, total scale – the larger the development the higher the potential rates) While these rates are at the very top end of possible delivery rates it is important to aim for high rates to ensure timely delivery of infrastructure
- On 3 large sites and one medium site the absolute maximum delivery rate would be unlikely to reach 1800 per annum (while this is the annual average RSS requirement failure to meet it in the early plan period means we have to plan to exceed it in the remaining years)
- Consequently a significant proportion of the smaller scale developments, which include the urban brownfield sites, will be likely to come forward prior to 2016 to meet market demand. Even when larger sites are in full swing there will continue to be a need for the remaining smaller scale sites to deliver.
- In this context any kind of planned phasing will not demonstrate sufficient delivery rates and would consequently be “unsound”.
- This also demonstrates why a single very large new town could not deliver sufficient housing in the plan period with a maximum delivery of 5,000 dwellings (actually likely to be less as it is likely to take even longer to get started).

4.5 Scale of development in market towns

4.5.1 Some Members expressed concern that the potential scale of growth indicated in the Spatial Hierarchy policy for certain market towns outside the Norwich Policy Area could be considered excessive bearing in mind either current facilities or the infrastructure constraints present. For example in Aylsham, concern was expressed about the capacity of the sewage treatment works and the potential cost of upgrading it for even modest amounts of growth. In Loddon the suggested scale of development seemed very large in comparison to the current population.

4.5.2 Since the 21 April further work has been done to update the housing provision table and a revised figure of 2260 houses for the rural area has been calculated replacing the original figure of 3325. If this is carried through to the broad distribution of numbers to places in the draft Preferred Options document we will clearly not be looking for such large allocations in particularly the larger settlements. This is not the same as potentially avoiding certain locations altogether, but it means there is scope for redistribution.

4.5.3 An alternative distribution based on the revised figures **could** be:

Main towns / Key Service Centres (larger)

Aylsham	
Diss	Approx 350 each = 1050
Harleston	

Key Service Centres (smaller)

Acle	
Hingham	Approx 150 each = 900
Loddon	
Reepham	
Coltishall	
Wroxham	

Service Centre Villages (18)

18 @ 15 – 25 dwellings each	= 270 – 450
-----------------------------	-------------

Total	Approx	2220 -2400
-------	--------	------------

Appendix 1

Housing completions 1981 – 2008

Development in the 1990s up to 2001 (9 years)

	Total	Annual Av	Percentage
NPA			
Broadland	5548	616	56%
Norwich	2497	277	25%
South Norfolk	1922	214	19%
Total NPA	9967	1107	
Check	9967		

	Total	Annual Av	Percentage
Full Districts			
Broadland	6919	769	53%
Norwich	2497	277	19%
South Norfolk	3675	408	28%
Total NPA	13091	1455	
Check	13091		

Development in the 1980s (11 years)

NPA

Broadland		4809	437
Norwich	No data		
South Norfolk		3259	296
Total NPA			

Check

Total 20 yr dev

Broadland	10357
South Norfolk	5181

Full Districts

Broadland		6813
Norwich	No data	
South Norfolk		6106
Total NPA		

Check

Total 20 yr dev

Broadland	13732
South Norfolk	9781

Appendix 2

Percentage shares including current commitments / previous completions and JCS assumption based on Option 1
(Approximately a 45 year period – 1981 to 2026)

NPA area	Current commitment at 2007	Option 1(JCS suggestion)	Total to 2026	% shares	Previous 20 yr completions	Total over 45 year period (1981 – 2026)
Norwich	10460	4000	14500	33	N/a	N/a
South Norfolk	6465	12000	18500	42	5250	23750
Broadland	3222	8000	11250	25	10500	21750
Total			44250			

Appendix 3 - Further Information, Long Stratton

Introduction

Long Stratton appears in the issues and options consultation as a potential Location for major growth and within the transportation section looking at strategic improvements to the A140. This paper examines the implications of proposing 2000 houses in Long Stratton

Context

Local consultation revealed that;

- **The local population were split almost 50/50 on promotion of major growth to support a bypass. (i.e. half of the people who responded did not want major growth to fund a bypass)**
- **Of those that expressed a view on the ranges of growth given, the majority of the responses were in the range 0-1,500**

Long Stratton does not come out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) as a preferred location for large scale growth not scoring as well as the growth locations selected in the current preferred option even when the environmental improvements to the town and the opportunity to encourage local investment and economic growth are factored in.

Interested parties have produced very outline proposals for growth, but nothing of detail has been received. The key elements of the proposal as we understand it are;

- 3000 houses
- Local employment sites
- Single carriageway bypass
- 25% affordable housing

Requirements of development

Education

The secondary school has the ability to expand to accommodate the demands arising from 2000 extra dwellings. To expand the secondary school will require relocation of the adjacent primary school. In addition there will need to be a new 420 place primary school to serve the new housing. The total [cost of providing the education infrastructure is about £18m.

Transport

The bypass is a prerequisite for growth in Long Stratton. Without a bypass the existing traffic conditions in the village will worsen with increased congestion and delay which impacts on the function of the A140 a strategic route. The bypass would need to be provided at the start of development. The Scheme promoted in the Local Transport Plan is dual carriageway and is costed at £26m (2005 Prices).

A single carriageway option is estimated to cost £20m (2008 prices). In addition growth would require. Improvements would be required to the A140/A47 junction.

The location provides a challenge to meet the RSS requirement of a shift towards public transport. With no deliverable local rail connection available provision of a quality bus service is crucial. Because of its distance from Norwich, journey times will be longer even if priority measures are put in place. To facilitate the best possible bus service, priority measures would be needed on the approach to A140/A47 junction costing about £2m. The bus priority could only extend back to the rail bridge unless the rail bridge were to be widened and this would add at least a further £10m to costs. Other bus priority measures would need to be provided in to the city from the A140/A47 junction.

Viability

Solutions have been identified to overcome the key education and transport constraints of growth. Our initial estimates cost the necessary infrastructure at around £40m. This equates to £20,000 per house assuming all dwellings contributed. This makes no allowance for provision of affordable housing or consideration as to the contribution that could be secured from affordable units. To meet the objectives of the Core Strategy, other requirements of development such as local transport improvements, walking and cycling improvements, contributions to open space, green infrastructure, health facilities would need to be funded.

The Growth Infrastructure Study indicates that assuming 40% developer funded affordable housing the remaining developer contribution for other infrastructure would be about £10,000 to £15,000 per market dwelling. Therefore 2,000 dwellings might only yield £12m contribution. (Insufficient to cover the education need alone)

Summary

- The SA of growth locations does not show Long Stratton to be one of the best performers.
- Education capacity can be provided but is costly with relocation.
- The distance to Norwich compromises quality public transport.
- Improvements needed to the A140/A47 junction.
- The costs of development will necessitate cutting back on social infrastructure and affordable housing, or housing in Long Stratton will need to be cross subsidised through an area wide tariff.
- If this option is to be pursued further work will be needed to investigate viability and the impact on funding infrastructure elsewhere.

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group - Local Development Framework Working Group

Minutes of a meeting of the **Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group – Local Development Framework Working Group**, held at Pinebanks, 9 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **Wednesday 14 May 2008** at 2.00pm when there were present:

	Cllr Andrew Proctor - Chairman
	Representing
Cllr Anthony Adams	Broadland District Council
Cllr Stuart Clancy	Broadland District Council
Cllr Joella Cottingham	Broadland District Council
Cllr Kim Davis-Claydon	Broadland District Council
Cllr Roger Foulger	Broadland District Council
Cllr Shelagh Gurney	Broadland District Council
Cllr Shirley Peters	Broadland District Council
Cllr Brian Morrey	Norwich City Council
Cllr Adrian Ramsey	Norwich City Council
Cllr Vivienne Bell	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Derek Blake	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Leslie Dale	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Colin Gould	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Murray Gray	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Keith Weeks	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Martin Wynne	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Evelyn Collishaw	Norfolk County Council
Cllr Adrian Gunson	Norfolk County Council
Sandra Eastaugh	GND Partnership Manager
Roger Burroughs	Broadland District Council
Phil Morriss	Norfolk County Council
Richard Doleman	Norfolk County Council
Ken Barnes	South Norfolk Council
Alan Gomm	South Norfolk Council
Paul Rao	Norwich City Council

14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Norwich - Cllr Lay, Cllr Llewellyn, Cllr Lubbock, Cllr Morphew and South Norfolk – Cllr Cox.

15 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 April 2008 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

16 REVIEW OF PREFERRED OPTIONS PROPOSALS

Further to the discussions at the last meeting, a further report was presented covering the following issues:

- (1) Concerns raised by the LDF Working Group
- (2) General considerations of 'soundness' for the JCS
- (3) Background reasoning for the choice of development strategy in the draft Preferred Options document
- (4) Alternative suggestions for consideration relating to:
 - o Development in major growth locations
 - o Flexibility in rural settlements
 - o Infrastructure dependencies
 - o Phasing issues
 - o Scale of development in market towns

The following further papers were tabled:

- o Option 6 proposed following a South Norfolk Member briefing session for the distribution of housing growth in the Norwich Policy Area
- o A paper detailing the sustainability appraisal scoring for the respective growth locations (option 6 not scored)
- o A paper correcting page 7 of the report correcting the allocations at Hethersett and West in Option 1.

At the Chairman's request, Phil Kirby reminded the meeting of its role to prepare a plan for the next 20 years to guide and manage development in the Broadland, South Norfolk and Norwich areas up to 2026. Development included not just jobs and houses but also covered infrastructure roads, schools etc. A number of studies had been commissioned and public consultations carried out, following which a number of options had been suggested to resolve issues identified. A position had now been reached

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group - Local Development Framework Working Group

where proposals needed to be firmed up for further examination. The proposed timetable was as follows:

Autumn 2008 – publish preferred options

Spring 2009 – submission of proposals to the Inspector

Autumn 2009 – Examination by Inspector

March 2010 – adoption by respective councils

Members were also advised of the recent announcement of the East of England Plan which had confirmed the minimum level of new development for which sites needed to be found as 24,000 units in the Norwich Policy Area and 2-2,500 in the remainder of the GNDP area. The key dependencies were major road schemes including the construction of the NDR and junction improvements with the A47. To meet the homes requirements, a multiple allocation of sites was required. It was also necessary to ensure that any strategy was sustainable and to demonstrate that it was and that the Plan was deliverable. In view of the required level of provision it was felt that option 5 as tabled could be dispensed with at this stage. However a new option, option 6, had now been proposed by South Norfolk Members which had yet to be evaluated.

It was stressed that the Inspector would test the soundness of the Plan using 9 separate tests, which would include a sustainability test. If a less sustainable option was selected as the preferred option then the Strategy could be challenged as being unsound. Members were updated on the timetable for reviewing the RSS, which implied adoption in 2010, covering the period through to 2031. If least sustainable options were selected now, as part of the current Joint Core Strategy process, it was likely that they would come forward again as part of the RSS review. Alternatively, if it could be demonstrated that sustainable options were already identified for development through the Joint Core Strategy process, it would be possible to defend a case against further significant growth as part of the RSS review.

The current timetable was tight which reflected Members' aspirations. If Option 6 was to be considered, a proper assessment would need to be carried out. The initial response was that the reduction in the number of units planned for Wymondham and Long Stratton would impact on schools' provision. In the latter case the reduction in units could also reduce the ability of the developer to contribute towards the cost of a new bypass. A reduced development would only require a single carriageway which would need a new business case and require a fresh planning consent. The proposal to

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group - Local Development Framework Working Group

provide a new development served by the A140 (the Mangreen option) was hampered by limited facilities and the need to carry out improvements to the junction with the A140 which could divert funds away from funding for improvements to the primary route, the A11.

An extra 2000 homes had been allocated for Broadland which could be provided in one major development or a number of smaller developments. These requirements could impact on the progress of the NDR which would have implications for the timely determination of the planning application, the need to review the implications for the design of the Postwick junction and could detrimentally affect the current bid for funding to the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Proper consideration of Option 6 would result in the Plan being put back by approximately 6 months which would mean that formal adoption could not take place prior to the implementation of any new local government structures in Norfolk. In the interim period it was stressed that there was a strong likelihood that any applications received and which went to appeal, would be likely to be allowed.

The Working Group was asked to look at the options presented and determine which should be progressed by recommendation to the GNDP meeting on 24 June 2008.

The Chairman thanked Phil Kirby for his introduction which had clarified the issues before the Group. Taking into account the advice given it was suggested that options 3, 4 and 5 be deleted as they did not perform well against the sustainability test and in the case of option 5, did not deliver enough new homes within the plan period to meet the target.

Clarification was requested over the sustainability appraisal scoring matrix and brief details were given on the 21 factors used that determined the score. Alan Gomm agreed to make a more comprehensive summary available to Members on request. Concern was expressed over the lack of information on which Members were expected to make key decisions.

Dr Gray supported the deletion of option 4 and advised the Group that as the promoter of option 6, on reflection it might be ill advised to include Long Stratton and there could be some merit in fine tuning the option.

Mr Dale commented that development at Kettringham would require a new rail halt and roundabout at the junction with the B1108. Mangreen would be receptive to a new rail halt. Attention was also drawn to the Inspector's previous comment that the only way that Long Stratton would secure a

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group - Local Development Framework Working Group

bypass would be by allowing more development.

Mr Clancy recommended that the timetable be put back until such time as assurances were given that the necessary infrastructure would be put in place to support the housing and job growth.

The Group was recommended to take a holistic approach to deciding where development should take place rather than adopting a site specific approach. However, in response, a Member indicated that in the case of development at Wymondham, it was necessary to adopt a site specific stance, as a developer was already promoting one particular site, through the submission of a planning application.

Mr Ramsey expressed the view that whilst Officers had applied the correct criteria, a case could be made to find sites for 24,000 homes, which might not totally meet with the Government's fixed criteria, which could be phased linked to the necessary infrastructure being provided. Mr Gunson supported the need for dialogue with Government on this principle.

The Group then discussed the various options tabled during which the following comments were made:

- Guarantees needed to be received on the provision of infrastructure to support housing and job growth
- Clarification was provided that 4,000 new homes at Wymondham would trigger a new High School (not a sixth form centre), if a smaller number of homes were provided the Council would need to acquire land for a new school.
- The impact on delaying the programme was stressed, including the implications for the progression of the NDR scheme.

ACTION

to

- (1) agree that options 1, 2 and 6 be subject to detailed appraisal for further consideration by the Policy Group on 24 June 2008 and Officers be requested to provide all relevant documentation, evidence base and commentary on the issues involved to enable the GNDR to make an

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group - Local Development Framework Working Group

informed decision on its preferred options.

- (2) approve the principle of growth in rural villages.
- (3) note that the JCS would not be expected to include individual development management policies which would feature in subsequent development management policies development plan document as set out in the respective local development schemes.

The meeting closed at 3.24pm