

## Greater Norwich Development Partnership

### Matter 4 Infrastructure delivery (the JCS generally and policy 20 & Appendices 7 & 8 in particular)

- A Is the JCS effective in what it conveys about the infrastructure necessary for its successful implementation and when and by which agencies it will be delivered? Does the Implementation Framework at Appendix 7 adequately identify the fundamentally essential infrastructure items without which its major component elements (eg the major growth locations) cannot progress? Are all 80 items in Appendix 7 equally 'critical', or would some be more appropriately styled 'desirable' or 'aspirational'? If so, which?

1. These issues are dealt with in EIP84 including the revised Infrastructure Framework (Appendix 7). This provides the level of guidance appropriate to a core strategy.
2. Critical infrastructure has been categorised into three levels of priority and phased over three periods for delivery.
3. The infrastructure requirements specified in the JCS, and prioritised in revised Appendix 7, are derived from the available evidence, updated through ongoing engagement with providers.

- B Do any infrastructure items represent 'showstoppers' which, if not completed by a certain date, would prevent implementation of particular key aspects of the JCS? Does the JCS appropriately identify them, and the consequences of their non-delivery?

1. Insofar as it is possible and at the level of detail appropriate for a core strategy, the JCS, including the revised Appendix 7, correctly identifies "showstoppers" as Priority 1 infrastructure. It provides a critical path and outlines the consequences of non-delivery. More detailed information is included in the LIPP (EIP85). "Showstoppers" that relate to particular locations are discussed under Matter 3.
2. "Showstoppers" that have an impact which makes them fundamental to delivery of the overall strategy are the NDR and Thickthorn junction. Potable water supply is also a "Showstopper", but has not been included in appendix 7 because it can only be funded through

the AMP process and is covered by statutory responsibilities.

3. Without the NDR, growth to the north of Norwich is severely constrained and the required step change in public transport cannot be achieved. The JCS recognises this. Delivery of the NDR is discussed in more detail under Matter 3B.
4. Thickthorn junction affects all the growth locations along the A11 corridor and is discussed under Matter 3C.
5. Notwithstanding the extensive investment in the Water Cycle Study, the Environment Agency's Review of Consents has only recently been completed and has identified the scale and timing of issues around the potential for delay in resolving a sufficient potable water supply. Ongoing engagement with Anglian Water Services, the Environment Agency and Natural England continues to identify the preferred solution. A shared Position Statement will be available at the Examination.
6. Even "showstoppers" may not be absolute constraints and are based on available information at a point in time. For example, absence of sewerage capacity appears to be a showstopper in some locations and the WCS identifies a need for strategic interceptor sewers. However, actual capacity is subject to further modelling and there may be alternative mechanisms to overcome or moderate the constraint particularly in the short to medium term.
7. The key issue is active management. The existence of the GNDP and the adoption of the LIPP process, establishes the mechanism for managing timely provision and overcoming constraints to ensure that they do not become "showstoppers".
8. Funding for infrastructure will come from a range of sources, including mainstream funding. Another key element will be CIL/Tariff and a viability study is underway to understand how this would be implemented. Every possible funding opportunity, such as CIL/Tariff, TIF, opportunities arising from the government's match funding for council tax and other new initiatives will be explored to ensure critical infrastructure required for the JCS is delivered. We recognise the need to make the best use of funding streams to maximise value.

**C** Is there evidence of agreement by providers that there is a reasonable prospect of the required infrastructure being completed by the critical dates?

1. Position Statements from key service providers will be available for the examination.
2. Through the JCS and the LIPP there is a process on ongoing

engagement with all service providers on timely infrastructure delivery and funding.

3. The County Council is a key infrastructure provider. It is a full and active partner in the GNDP and a signatory of the JCS.

*[Understanding of the above matters A-C may be assisted by the Integrated Development Programme being drawn up by GNDP and by the critical path diagrams promised at the Exploratory Meeting to illustrate the degree of fit between the expected delivery times of the housing proposed at the various growth locations at p111 of the JCS and the reasonable prospect of phased completion of the critical infrastructure items, as agreed by providers.]*

- D Is the JCS flexible? Does it indicate any actions that may need to be triggered by contingencies, such as failure to achieve timely provision of necessary infrastructure, or unforeseen circumstances.

1. The JCS is flexible with respect to timing. The housing trajectories indicate that there is a significant existing commitment to provide for short term growth. The trajectories are indicative not prescriptive. There is scope to vary the start dates and growth rates for new growth in the smaller and medium scale proposals with no detriment to overall delivery.
2. The JCS is flexible with respect to provision. Housing targets are set as minima. When site allocations DPDs are produced, reasonable levels of additional growth could be considered in individual locations if it becomes apparent that other locations may be delayed. Additionally, a significant amount of growth is provided for in more dispersed smaller scale sites and many of these (but not all) are likely to be less constrained.
3. Some key employment locations are constrained, particularly by the need for transport investment. However, the strategic employment locations are largely based on existing employment concentrations and, because they are strategically co-located, the majority also share infrastructure constraints with housing growth locations. A degree of flexibility is provided by the over-allocation of employment land (as explained in TP2).
4. It should be recognised that the JCS is delivering significant growth in the Norwich area and infrastructure constraints exist for all realistic options. The ability of a core strategy to deal with these issues through “flexibility” is limited, and the key will be the active engagement of the GNDP as a delivery vehicle. Paragraph 7.11 of the JCS makes it clear that a critical shortfall in infrastructure delivery will trigger a review.

E Are policy 20 and p10 of the JCS clear and effective on the issue of implementation, including the role of GNDP as a delivery agency?

1. Policy 20 (including proposed Minor Change) provides the clarity appropriate for a Core Strategy. The role of the GNDP is specified in paragraph 7.2 of the JCS.
2. The GNDP partners are fully committed to developing and managing an infrastructure delivery programme through the Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP), which is a draft, and will remain a regularly updated working document (EIP 85).
3. The Inspectors might consider whether Policy 20 could be improved by removal of reference to specific examples of Government funding sources as these may change.