

Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, Broadland Part of Norwich Policy Area Examination

Matter 02: The implementation of the submitted JCS proposals

Written Statement on behalf of Landstock Estates Ltd
Landowners Group Ltd and United Business and Leisure Ltd

1. Whether policy 10's proposals and associated text for employment and housing are positively prepared, justified by the evidence, consistent with national policy, and effective?

Q1.2. Given the delay in bringing forward the NEGТ, are the housing delivery figures in the JCS Appendix 6 Housing Trajectory correct? For example, has Rackheath started delivering homes in 2011/12 as stated (is this not a commitment if they are built?) and will the remainder actually start delivery in 2014/15?

1.1 **No.** The figures in Appendix 6 Housing Trajectory are not correct and should be updated to reflect the delay in bringing forward development in Broadland.

1.2 The total requirement for the NPA is 33,000 dwellings to 2026. The Broadland contribution is identified as 11,099 new commitments of which 9,000 are new allocations. The GNDP proposes that at least 7,000 dwellings will be delivered in the NEGТ. We do not consider that the NEGТ will deliver this level of growth.

1.3 Rackheath has not yet started to deliver homes and a planning application for the exemplar scheme of 200 dwellings (due to be delivering dwellings in 2011/12) has not yet been submitted. As a result, it is likely completions will not take place at the Rackheath exemplar site until 2016/17 (some 5 years after the current JCS trajectory proposes). The remainder of Rackheath will follow sometime after this, but the up to date evidence base fails to set out any trajectory to inform this examination.

1.4 The constraints imposed by the need for the NDR and improvements to Postwick Hub place a further constraint on delivery.

1.5 Completions since the beginning of the plan period across the Norwich Policy Area (2008-2012) has seen a delivery rate of only 67.9% of the JCS requirement. This results in a present shortfall in housing delivery of 3,359 dwellings in only 4 years of monitoring [AMR 2011/12 Appendix A Para 8].

1.6 In order to reflect the above delay, we have provided an alternative trajectory to reflect the extent of the variation that we now consider is present in the Broadland part of the NPA (**Appendix 1**). The "BW Trajectory" reflects the Broadland part of page 113 together with completions from commitments within the Broadland part of page 111 of the submitted JCS and also includes supportive background tables to provide clarity on our assumptions. For

completeness, the latest AMR 2012 trajectories have also been reflected on the revised trajectory. It assumes a "best case scenario" and that the NDR is delivered by 2018.

- 1.7 Our **Appendix 1** demonstrates that using a revised base date of April 2012, there is a 2 year 'no completion zone' arising from the proposed allocations up to March 2014. This is on the basis of a 2 year window from now in which new applications need to be submitted and approved before dwellings can be delivered in the form of completions. From April 2015, there is a period of reduced delivery to March 2018 when the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) and/or Postwick hub maybe expected to be delivered.
- 1.8 The BW Trajectory reflects a best case scenario for delivering housing in Broadland NPA. It demonstrates that the housing requirement set out in the JCS (which is a minima) will not be achieved within the remaining years of the plan period (13 years) and at 2026 there is likely to be an under-delivery of approximately 3,700 dwellings in the Broadland Part of the NPA (see **Appendix 1**: difference between Row 1 and Row 3). The NEGТ will not make the level of contribution to the NPA requirement as identified in the JCS.
- 1.9 In addition, consideration must be given as to how the JCS is to address the current shortfall in housing delivery in the NPA of 3,359 dwellings between 2008 – 2012 (an issue we cover at paragraphs 1.6 to 1.9 of our Matter 01 Statement). The current deficit in housing delivery in the NPA is critical, and flexibility is required to be introduced into the JCS to respond to this issue. This cannot be remedied by increasing the rate of delivery and/or capacity at NEGТ.
- 1.10 In addition to the BW Trajectory (which is a best case scenario), the following risks and potential showstoppers are present that could delay the delivery of the housing in Broadland even further and potentially 'flood the market' during the latter years of the plan period:
- The completion of the NDR is delayed beyond 2018;
 - The NDR is not delivered at all;
 - Postwick Hub or an 'alternative' is further delayed;
 - Postwick Hub or alternative is not delivered at all;
 - No 'Plan B' comes forward;
 - Rackheath continues to fail to come forward as per the trajectory;
 - The NEGТ AAP is delayed;
- 1.11 If the NEGТ proposals cannot be achieved in the timescales proposed by the GNDP. The result is that the GNDP fails to have a Joint Core Strategy that provides for the identified minimum housing land requirements and is therefore not considered to be 'up to date'. If this

is the case, we consider the remedy is either a reserve site policy (refer to Barton Willmore Hearing Statement Matter 01 Q1.3.), or further departure planning applications in the NPA.

Q1.3. Will the NDR be built in time (in part or in whole?) to meet the projected housing delivery dates and numbers in the Trajectory?

1.12 **No.** The delivery of any part of the NDR is by no means certain. The JCS [page 95 para. 7.16 and associated table] states that only 1,400 dwellings (seen as an existing commitment in the Sprowston area plus a further 200 dwellings at the Rackheath exemplar) can take place prior to improvements at Postwick. The table also states that **at least** a further 1,600 dwellings can come forward in the NEGT after improvements to the Postwick Junction and before the NDR. Neither the JCS nor its evidence base sets out what is the maximum capacity of the Postwick Junction from NEGT development before improvements, (which are an essential requirement) nor the stage at which the NDR is required as an essential piece of infrastructure.

1.13 Currently, commitments approved since 2008 demonstrate that this capacity may already have been reached; for para 7.16 of the submitted JCS casts some doubt as a result of wording contained in the table at on page 95 of the JCS. If this is the case, then no further dwellings can come forward without the Postwick Improvement, and, the NDR or an alternative strategy (such as a 'Plan B').

1.14 **Appendix 2** has been prepared by Create Consulting Engineers (Highway Consultants) which details sites that have either come forward since 2008 or are identified areas in North East Norwich to meet the Spatial Strategy. In developing the table, Create Consulting has considered the various items of key highway infrastructure required to release each area of development. Part of this assessment has also utilised the Beyond Green Transport Assessment (extract in **Appendix 3**).

1.15 The committed sites at Sprowston (which make up the 1,400 dwellings referred to in Para 7.16 JCS) are not delivering the projected number of dwellings anticipated; and there are delays in the commencement of the Blue Boar Lane scheme. This is also the same with the proposed development at Rackheath. Create Consulting has therefore looked at alternative sites which could assist in the early delivery of dwellings which are in a similar location within the highway network, yet would not be restricted by the delay in the delivery of a Postwick Improvement.

- 1.16 In addition, Create Consulting has also considered what the maximum number of dwellings which could be released following an improvement at Postwick and the provision of a Plan B link road would be. The table in **Appendix 2** shows each of the sites that have been committed in the NEGТ in advance of the Postwick Improvements.
- 1.17 The Brook Farm scheme (600 dwellings) has been shown as coming forward once the Postwick Junction has been improved. Indeed, while the JCS suggests that at least a further 1,000 dwellings could come forward in the NEGТ, it does not state where these sites should be located in advance of the NDR. The Create columns within the table demonstrate that additional sites could come forward with the introduction of a Plan B link Road, if the NDR was delayed. This could release land between Wroxham Road and Plumstead Road. The table also shows that the land South of Salhouse Road could provide an early release of dwellings as it is separated from the effects of Postwick and will not be dependent on the NDR.
- 1.18 **Appendix 2** identifies:
- NCC’s position is:
 - Without any improvements, 1,600 dwellings can come forward either through committed schemes (Sprowston 1,400 and the Rackheath Exemplar 200) or further schemes within the NEGТ 7,000 Allocation if the committed schemes continue to be delayed;
 - The improvement to Postwick Hub releases potentially only a further 600 committed dwellings and 1,000 unidentified sites (i.e. ‘at least’ 1,600 dwellings);
 - The NDR is necessary to release all the growth in NEGТ.
 - Create Consulting’s position is:
 - Without any improvements, a further 1,250 dwellings can be released on top of the already committed schemes as these are not delivering expected dwellings;
 - The delivery of a Plan B releases approximately a further 3,100 dwellings over the committed schemes (4,768 dwellings minus 1,668 dwellings).
 - The NDR is necessary to release all growth.
- 1.19 It is evident from the table that there is no fall back position for the NEGТ if the NDR is not delivered. Postwick Hub only releases a small amount of additional development and whilst Plan B releases an additional 3,000, it would not in itself provide for the total growth envisaged in the NEGТ (i.e. Rackheath and Beyond Green).

1.20 This issue is a potential 'showstopper' and only emphasises the need for flexibility to be written into the part JCS subject to this examination.

Q1.5. Does the above indicate more than a "slight variance" in the Housing Trajectory? Is it of sufficient significance to warrant amending the Trajectory to reflect reality to date?

1.21 **Yes.** Appendix 1 and the risks identified in paragraph 1.3 above, result in a more than a slight variance in the housing trajectory. The effect is significant. The trajectory should be amended to reflect the up-to-date position. The consequences of maintaining the current housing trajectory will not provide for an accurate ability to monitor and manage the housing delivery. It is recognised that an up-to-date housing trajectory is necessary to make a plan sound. By way of example, the Inspector, in the Ashford (Kent) Borough Council's Site Allocations DPD report [para 78 onwards] concluded with regards to the need for a trajectory '*They are necessary for consistency with the NPPF and for soundness reasons.*' It is therefore considered that any subsequent DPD/AAP is required to have an up-to-date housing trajectory. This in turn, must be based on an up-to-date housing trajectory in the JCS otherwise how can the strategy and selected sites be delivered, and importantly, monitored against? A copy of this report can be provided to the Inspector if necessary.

1.22 In addition, the current annual housing requirement in the NPA is now 2,075dpa (based on the total requirement over the plan period minus completions to March 2012). This is significantly more than the 1,650dpa identified at the start of the plan period [JCS P111] and takes no account of the effect of the application of a 'buffer' as per para 47 of the NPPF upon annual rates in the next 5 years. The failure of housing delivery in the NPA has most recently [March 2013] been recognised in an allowed Appeal at 'Land on the north side of Yarmouth Road, Blofield, Norwich' [APP. Ref. 2177219] where the lack of a 5-year housing land supply position was deemed to warrant an additional 20% buffer. A copy of this decision can also be made available to the Inspector if necessary.

1.23 If the objective of the GNDP is to properly plan for the identified needs of the area, then the JCS needs to make proper provision for the allocation of land to meet those needs. At present, it is failing to do so.

Q1.6. Given the above, and the allowance for smaller sites in the JCS, is the submitted JCS flexible enough to deal with any changing circumstances (JCS para 7.17 and table), even though funding for part of the NDR is now more certain?

- 1.24 **No.** This issue is our principal concern. There is at present no flexibility built into the JCS that will allow for alternative locations to deliver dwellings in the event the strategy in Broadland fails to deliver appropriate levels of housing in the plan period. This issue was highlighted by Barton Willmore at the original JCS hearing sessions (see Matter 01 Hearing Statement Q1.3) and within the submitted representations to the Pre-Submission JCS consultation [paras 2.23-2.29]. This current examination only emphasises the need to provide for flexibility within the plan in the event of continued failure. Notwithstanding the NDR funding is considered by the GNPD to be more certain, the actual delivery of the NDR is not, bearing in mind planning permission/Compulsory Purchase Orders and Traffic Orders are still required to be obtained (as well as full funding). At present, the GNPD is reporting a £53 million funding shortfall without any clear plan on how this will be met.
- 1.25 Any contribution of small sites is not of a scale to address the significant risks to and shortfall in the delivery at the NEG. There is no 'Plan B'.
- Q1.7. Exactly what limited capacity in numbers is there for the delivery of homes ahead of the NDR? Is it as the 7.17 table or as the North Sprowston planning application or other?*
- 1.26 See response to Q1.3 above. We consider additional capacity can be achieved by a 'Plan B' of up to 3,100 dwellings. However, a 'Plan B' has not been tested as part of the SA and therefore a review of the SA will be necessary (the 'Cogent Land' route) for this to be able to take effect. There is no evidence base present that sets out the maximum capacity of housing ahead of the NDR.
- Q1.8. NPPF para 48 allows for windfall sites to be included in the housing supply figures provided there is compelling evidence they will continue to come forward. Are the councils' now arguing in SDJCS 14 that windfalls should be included in the submitted and adopted JCS, thus taking the housing numbers up to 42,000, which would be at the higher end of the range as set out in its Table 1.*
- 1.27 SDJCS 14 was released in December 2012 after the close of the consultation relating to the proposed submission Part JCS in November 2012. It should be noted, though, that SDJCS 14 amended (particularly in its approach to windfall development) its forerunner, namely, Topic Paper 10 (August 2010) also referred to in documents as EiP 70, prepared for the original JCS Examination. However, SDJCS 14 has not been subject to any formal consultation or process whereby comment could be made about its approach to windfall development. We request the opportunity to expand on this issue verbally at the examination as appropriate.

Q1.11. Given the above SDJCS 14 points, does the housing forecast in SDJCS 14 provide a robust and justified evidential basis for the scale of the proposed development in policy 10?

1.28 **No.** The overall JCS figure for growth in the NPA is appropriate. It is based on a robust evidence base and meets the objectively assessed needs as set out in the NPPF. However, the distribution of the housing within Policy 10 (and Policy 9) cannot be delivered within the plan period due to the failure of the timely delivery of the NEGТ (i.e. it is not effective). The Barton Willmore housing trajectory in **Appendix 1** demonstrates this.

Q1.14. Does the submitted JCS provide sufficient strategic guidance for achieving a single co-ordinated approach to the future planning of this large area with its multiple ownership and complex infrastructure issues?

1.29 **No.** Whilst the detail of the policy provides for sufficient guidance in bringing forward the NEGТ within subsequent DPDs/AAPs, it does not set out the 'what if' scenario. This further emphasises the need for a reserve site policy as set out in our Hearing Statement relating to Matter 01.

Q1.17. Is the information contained in the latest version of the Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP), particularly that in Table 11.1, reflected in the Infrastructure Framework in Appendix 7 of the JCS for the policy 10 proposals? If not, should it?

1.30 **No.** There are a number of discrepancies between the two documents, in particular the estimated costs of key elements of infrastructure vary greatly between the LIPP and Appendix 7 of the JCS. For example, item SP3 [Waste Water Table 11.1 page 66 of the LIPP] shows a cost of £61.6m but only £42.9m on Appendix 7 of the JCS. This key item of infrastructure is required to be delivered by 2016. However, it would have to be committed in AMP5 (AWS investment period for 2010 to 2015) for the work to be completed by 2016. If funding has not been secured then this will significantly impact on the overall growth triangle. AWS will not invest unless a scheme has received planning consent.

1.31 Other key items of infrastructure identified as priority 1 have start and delivery dates between 2011 and 2016. A number of these items do not have secured funding and there is a real risk of delay to a number of these delivery dates. For example, the NDR is shown to be completed by 2016 in Appendix 7 of the JCS. This is optimistic when planning permission has not been secured and the final route alignment is still being investigated.

- 1.32 The LIPP should be an overall programme with critical paths identified against each element, this should be linked to a finance plan identifying how each of the elements are to be financed. For example item T15 [Table 11.1 Page 66 of the LIPP] has been shown as a Priority 1 scheme which is shown to be completed between 2011 to 2016. Unfortunately this would need an improvement at Postwick [item T2A of Table 11.1 pg 66 of the LIPP] before it could be completed. If Postwick improvement is delayed, it will have an impact on the delivery of T15, both requiring developer funding. This interdependency between varying elements of infrastructure is not recognised in either the LIPP or Appendix 7 of the JCS. It needs to be recognised through appropriate text and cross-referencing

APPENDIX 1
BARTON WILLMORE REVISED HOUSING TRAJECTORY

| Row Number ref. | Broadland Growth Locations as page 113 of JCS | Total Number of Units per year | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total Units | Average annual build rate | Notes | Row Number ref. |
|-----------------|--|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | | Source | 2008/09 | 2009/10 | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | | | | |
| 1 | Total from Growth Locations | JCS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 230 | 230 | 580 | 680 | 804 | 804 | 804 | 804 | 804 | 804 | 804 | 804 | 804 | 764 | 9900 | 550 | Row 4+7+10+13 | 1 |
| 2 | | AMR 2011/12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 96 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 28 | 800 | 44 | Row 5+8+11+14 | 2 |
| 3 | | BW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 100 | 400 | 500 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 650 | 700 | 700 | 700 | 6200 | 344 | Row 6+9+12+15 | 3 |
| 4 | Rackheath | JCS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 230 | 3400 | 189 | | 4 |
| 5 | | AMR 2011/12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200 | 11 | | 5 |
| 6 | | BW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 100 | 150 | 150 | 650 | 36 | | 6 |
| 7 | Remainder of Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle (inside NDR) | JCS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 225 | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 | 3850 | 214 | | 7 | |
| 8 | | AMR 2011/12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 28 | 600 | 33 | | 8 |
| 9 | | BW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 200 | 300 | 350 | 350 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 350 | 350 | 3550 | 197 | | 9 |
| 10 | Additional smaller sites around Broadland NPA (2,000) | JCS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 130 | 2000 | 111 | | 10 | |
| 11 | | AMR 2011/12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 11 |
| 12 | | BW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 150 | 150 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 2000 | 111 | | 12 |
| 13 | Additional sites around rural Broadland | JCS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 55 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 650 | 36 | | 13 | |
| 14 | | AMR 2011/12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 14 |
| 15 | | BW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 15 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|-------------|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|------------------------------|----|
| 16 | Commitments page 111 Broadland Part only | JCS | 100 | 89 | 54 | 266 | 290 | 213 | 167 | 270 | 247 | 174 | 172 | 57 | | | | | | | 2099 | 117 | | 16 |
| 17 | | AMR 2011/12 | 104 | 84 | 81 | 157 | 198 | 117 | 296 | 170 | 203 | 186 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 70 | 43 | 0 | 2309 | 128 | Actual completions 2008/2012 | 17 |
| 18 | | BW | 104 | 84 | 81 | 157 | 198 | 77 | 176 | 50 | 123 | 186 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 2196 | 122 | Actual completions 2008/2012 | 18 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------|-------------|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|----------|----|
| 19 | Total Broadland NPA | JCS | 100 | 89 | 54 | 446 | 520 | 443 | 747 | 950 | 1051 | 978 | 976 | 861 | 804 | 804 | 804 | 804 | 804 | 764 | 11999 | 667 | Row 1+16 | 19 |
| 20 | | AMR 2011/12 | 104 | 84 | 81 | 157 | 198 | 117 | 400 | 274 | 307 | 282 | 172 | 172 | 172 | 172 | 172 | 122 | 95 | 28 | 3109 | 173 | Row 2+17 | 20 |
| 21 | | BW | 104 | 84 | 81 | 157 | 198 | 77 | 226 | 150 | 523 | 686 | 720 | 720 | 720 | 720 | 770 | 820 | 820 | 820 | 8396 | 466 | Row 3+18 | 21 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-------------|----|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|-----------|----|
| 22 | Total Broadland NPA Shortfall Against BW Trajectory | JCS | -4 | 5 | -27 | 289 | 322 | 366 | 521 | 800 | 528 | 292 | 256 | 141 | 84 | 84 | 34 | -16 | -16 | -56 | 3603 | 200 | Row 19-21 | 22 |
| 23 | | AMR 2011/12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 174 | 124 | -216 | -404 | -548 | -548 | -548 | -548 | -598 | -698 | -725 | -792 | -5287 | -294 | Row 20-21 | 23 |

| Row Number ref. | Broadland Norwich Policy Area Trajectory Comparisons 2011/12 AMR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Notes | Row Number ref. | |
|-----------------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---|-----------------|----|
| | Type | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total to 2012/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | Total 2012/26 | | | |
| 1 | Rackheath: ECO-Community Exemplar Project | A | 0 | 0 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 44 | 200 | | | | | | | | 200 | 1 | | |
| 2 | | A | | | | | 50 | 50 | 100 | 50 | 50 | | | | | | 200 | 2 | | |
| 3 | Thorpe St Andrew, Brook Farm | A | 0 | 0 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 208 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 28 | 600 | 3 | | |
| 4 | | A | | | | | 50 | 50 | 100 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 500 | 4 | | |
| 5 | NEGT in 7,000-10,000 Policy Provision | A | 0 | 0 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 96 | 408 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 28 | 800 | Row 1+3 | 5 | |
| 6 | | A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 200 | 100 | 100 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 700 | Row 2+4 | 6 | |
| 7 | Old Catton: Spixworth Road (CAT 2) | B | 0 | 0 | 43 | | | | 43 | | | | | | | | 43 | 7 | | |
| 8 | | B | | | 43 | | | | 43 | | | | | | | | 43 | 8 | | |
| 9 | Sprowston: Home Farm Phase 4 | B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 29 | 81 | | | | | | | | 81 | 9 | | |
| 10 | | B | | | | | 52 | 29 | 81 | | | | | | | | 81 | 10 | | |
| 11 | Sprowston: Home Farm Phase 5 | B | 0 | 0 | 58 | 22 | | | 80 | | | | | | | | 80 | 11 | | |
| 12 | | B | | | 58 | 22 | | | 80 | | | | | | | | 80 | 12 | | |
| 13 | Sprowston: Home Farm Phases 2 & 3 | B | 28 | 11 | | | | | 39 | | | | | | | | 39 | 13 | | |
| 14 | | B | 28 | 11 | | | | | 39 | | | | | | | | 39 | 14 | | |
| 15 | Sprowston: White House Farm (SPR 6) | B | 0 | 40 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 520 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 70 | 43 | | 1233 | 15 | | |
| 16 | | B | | | | | 40 | 120 | 160 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 1120 | 16 | | |
| 17 | NEGT not in 7,000-10,000 Policy Provision | B | 28 | 51 | 221 | 142 | 172 | 149 | 763 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 70 | 43 | 0 | 1476 | Row 7+9+11+13 | 17 | |
| 18 | | B | 28 | 11 | 101 | 22 | 92 | 149 | 403 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 1363 | Row 8+10+12+14 | 18 | |
| 19 | Blofield: rear of Manor House, North Street | C | 3 | 4 | | | | | 7 | | | | | | | | 7 | 19 | | |
| 20 | | C | 3 | 4 | | | | | 7 | | | | | | | | 7 | 20 | | |
| 21 | Brundall: Vauxhall Mallards Cricket Club | C | | | | | 30 | | 30 | | | | | | | | 30 | 21 | | |
| 22 | | C | | | | | 30 | | 30 | | | | | | | | 30 | 22 | | |
| 23 | Drayton: Firbanks, School Road | C | | | 12 | | | | 12 | | | | | | | | 12 | 23 | | |
| 24 | | C | | | 12 | | | | 12 | | | | | | | | 12 | 24 | | |
| 25 | Drayton: Manor Farm | C | | | | | 36 | | 36 | | | | | | | | 36 | 25 | | |
| 26 | | C | | | | | 36 | | 36 | | | | | | | | 36 | 26 | | |
| 27 | Great and Little Plumstead: 21 Plumstead Road, Thorpe En | C | 2 | 3 | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | 5 | 27 | | |
| 28 | | C | 2 | 3 | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | 5 | 28 | | |
| 29 | Great and Little Plumstead: Little Plumstead Hospital, Hosp | C | 36 | 17 | 17 | | | | 70 | | | | | | | | 70 | 29 | | |
| 30 | | C | 36 | 17 | 17 | | | | 70 | | | | | | | | 70 | 30 | | |
| 31 | Hellesdon: NCS Depot 389 Drayton High Road | C | | 14 | | | | | 14 | | | | | | | | 14 | 31 | | |
| 32 | | C | | 14 | | | | | 14 | | | | | | | | 14 | 32 | | |
| 33 | Horsford: Pinelands Industrial Estate, Holt Road | C | 45 | 17 | | | | | 62 | | | | | | | | 62 | 33 | | |
| 34 | | C | 45 | 17 | | | | | 62 | | | | | | | | 62 | 34 | | |
| 35 | Old Catton: St Christopher's School | C | 2 | 1 | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | 3 | 35 | | |
| 36 | | C | 2 | 1 | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | 3 | 36 | | |
| 37 | Spixworth: 10 Sydney Road | C | 3 | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | 3 | 37 | | |
| 38 | | C | 3 | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | 3 | 38 | | |
| 39 | Sprowston: 12 North Walsham Road | C | 7 | | | | | | 7 | | | | | | | | 7 | 39 | | |
| 40 | | C | 7 | | | | | | 7 | | | | | | | | 7 | 40 | | |
| 41 | Sprowston: Adj Royal Oak PH | C | 8 | | | | | | 8 | | | | | | | | 8 | 41 | | |
| 42 | | C | 8 | | | | | | 8 | | | | | | | | 8 | 42 | | |
| 43 | Taverham: 147/149 Fakenham Road | C | | 3 | 1 | | | | 4 | | | | | | | | 4 | 43 | | |
| 44 | | C | | 3 | 1 | | | | 4 | | | | | | | | 4 | 44 | | |
| 45 | Thorpe St Andrew: 149 Yarmouth Road | C | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 45 | | |
| 46 | | C | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 46 | | |
| 47 | Thorpe St Andrew: 5 Yarmouth Road | C | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 47 | | |
| 48 | | C | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 48 | | |
| 49 | Total Smaller Sites | C | 108 | 59 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 36 | 263 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 | Row 19 +21 plus all odd rows up to and including 47 | 49 | |
| 50 | | C | 108 | 59 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 36 | 263 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 | Row 20+22 plus all even rows up to and including 48 | 50 | |
| 51 | Site below 5 units with permissions at 01/04/12 | D | 62 | 7 | 45 | 28 | 1 | 1 | 144 | | | | | | | | 144 | 51 | | |
| 52 | | D | 62 | 7 | 45 | 28 | 1 | 1 | 144 | | | | | | | | 144 | 52 | | |
| 53 | BROADLAND NORWICH POLICY AREA TOTAL | | 198 | 117 | 400 | 274 | 307 | 282 | 1578 | 172 | 172 | 172 | 172 | 172 | 122 | 95 | 28 | 2683 | Row 2+17+49+51 | 53 |
| 54 | | | 198 | 77 | 176 | 50 | 223 | 286 | 1010 | 220 | 220 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 170 | 2470 | Row 3+18+50+52 | 54 |

APPENDIX 2
COMMITTED SITES IN NORTH EAST NORWICH AND LIKELY
DELIVERY AHEAD OF THE POSTWICK JUNCTION
IMPROVEMENTS/NORTHERN DISTRIBUTOR ROAD

| DEVELOPMENT | DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL | NCC VIEW | | | CREATE VIEW | | | COMMENTS |
|--|--------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| | | WITH NO IMPROVEMENT | NCC IMPROVED POSTWICK HUB | NCC POSTWICK HUB PLUS NDR | WITH NO IMPROVEMENTS | CREATE POSTWICK PLAN B IMPROVEMENT | NCC POSTWICK HUB PLUS NDR | |
| Blue Boar Lane | 1233 dwellings | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Planning approval received, development can proceed in advance of Postwick/NDR part of JCS Committed 1400 dwellings see Para 7.16 JCS |
| Sprowston (Home Farm) | 235 dwellings | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Planning Approval Received Development can proceed in advance of Postwick/NDR part of JCS Committed 1400 dwellings see Para 7.16 JCS |
| Rackheath Exemplar Project | 200 dwellings | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Government policy however no application as yet submitted. Can proceed in advance of Postwick/NDR. Identified on table referenced in Para 7.16 page 95 JCS |
| Rackheath Eco Town | 3400 dwellings Plus employment | Red | Red | Green | Red | Red | Green | Government policy but no application as yet. Requires NDR/Postwick before development commences. |
| Brook Farm | 600 dwellings | Red | Green | Green | Red | Green | Green | Committee Resolution to Grant, no permission issued. Cannot proceed until Postwick Hub /Improvement constructed. Could be part of 1600 dwellings identified in table on pg 95 JCS |
| Land between Salhouse and Wroxham Road | 1250 dwellings | Red | Red | Green | Red | Green | Green | No application submitted. Will need NDR and Postwick before development commences Could be released with Plan B Link Road. |
| Land S of Salhouse Road | 1250 dwellings | Red | Red | Green | Green | Green | Green | No application submitted, majority of traffic will use Salhouse Road arterial route into City Centre. Development could be released in advance of Postwick to assist early housing delivery. |
| Beyond Green | 3500 dwellings | Red | Red | Green | Red | Red | Green | TA submitted with application says that max of 584 dwellings can come forward before NDR and 6750m2 of employment. No permission granted, or confirmation that TA acceptable. |
| TOTAL | | 1668 Dwellings Relates to 1400 para 7.16JCS and 200 Rackheath | 2268 plus at least an additional 1000 not identified. | 11668 dwellings | 1668 | 4768 dwellings | 11668 dwellings | |

KEY: **Red** indicates the development cannot be constructed. **Green** indicates the development can be constructed.

APPENDIX 3
EXTRACT FROM BEYOND GREEN TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT



7. Traffic Growth, Trip Generation and Distribution

7.1 Committed Development & Background Growth

7.1.1 It was agreed with NCC on 30th May 2012 that the most realistic background growth for the assessment of the network would be to include all committed and Joint Core Strategy (JCS) growth site traffic within the Broadland area. The future growth years agreed to assess are 2017, 2022 and 2032.

7.1.2 All committed developments and JCS growth location sites have been confirmed by NCC and the trips generated by these developments are included within the highway network flows and assessment of this TA.

7.1.3 The committed and JCS growth sites included within the future growth years can be seen in Table 10. This table excludes the proposed NS&OC development.

Table 10: Committed & JCS Growth Sites

| Residential Growth Site | No. Of Dwellings to be Built | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012-2017 | 2017-2021 | 2021-2032 | |
| Hellesdon, Golf Course | 0 | 200 | 400 | 600 |
| Hellesdon, Hospital | 0 | 66 | 134 | 200 |
| Hellesdon, A140 Corridor | 0 | 66 | 134 | 200 |
| Drayton | 0 | 37 | 75 | 112 |
| Spixworth | 0 | 7 | 12 | 19 |
| Rackheath Eco-Community | 178 | 1300 | 2500 | 3978 |
| Blofield | 0 | 15 | 29 | 44 |
| Thorpe St Andrew | 0 | 74 | 148 | 222 |
| Sprowston (Home Farm) | 235 | 0 | 0 | 235 |
| Blue Boar Lane | 400 | 278 | 555 | 1233 |
| Taverham | 0 | 31 | 63 | 94 |
| Great and Little Plumstead | 42 | 28 | 55 | 125 |
| Land between Salhouse & Wroxham Rd | 0 | 417 | 833 | 1250 |
| Land between Salhouse & Plumstead Rd | 200 | 350 | 700 | 1250 |
| Brundal | 0 | 13 | 25 | 38 |
| Horsford | 0 | 62 | 0 | 62 |
| Horsham | 0 | 9 | 16 | 25 |
| Brook Farm | 174 | 143 | 283 | 600 |
| Total | 1229 | 3096 | 5962 | 10287 |
| Cumulative Total | 1229 | 4325 | 10287 | |