

- 1 In a letter of May 24th 2013, Inspector Vickery requested that we present a paper on LIPP to the reconvened Public Inquiry. This is our response.
- 2 We understand the purpose of this additional paper is to clarify our view of the situation on the difference in phasing and costing of infrastructure projects that is evident in the various incarnations of the “infrastructure plan”. These include:
 - The Appendices in the original submitted JCS, and the resubmitted JCS
 - The DRAFT “Proposed modification to Appendix 7: Infrastructure Framework” circulated at May’s Hearing by GNDP
 - The “Modification to Appendix 7” change control document circulated at May’s Hearing by GNDP
 - Versions of the LIPP. This work is based on LIPP (Version 4.1, published Feb 2012) and we are not aware of any subsequent version.
 - “New infrastructure funding plans”. We are not aware that any have been published in the public domain yet. However, the Leader of Broadland District Council referred to this in the Eastern Daily Press on May 22nd 2013, and mention was made to its development by GNDP officers at the May Hearings.
- 3 We have received no additional information from GNDP since May’s Hearing to help in this exercise so we have to assume any updates only exist as “in-house” drafts.
- 4 We agreed a number of trivial matters like typos etc in some of the documents with GNDP at the May Hearings. We also appreciate that the “Modification to Appendix 7” moves towards getting consistency between the list of infrastructure in the JCS and in the LIPP.
- 5 After discussion with GNDP Officers, Sandra Easthaugh and Richard Doleman, at the May Hearing, our remaining concerns are:
 - i Infrastructure planning appears to be in a state of flux. New infrastructure funding plans are being developed due to CIL shortfall, but there is no clear information at this stage to guide priorities and inform stakeholders.
 - ii Given such a major change in locally available funding, we believe the on-going process of prioritising infrastructure should involve the public and as many stakeholders as possible. Despite, repeated public calls and requests to GNDP and to the Councils, no moves have been made to consult the public on their priorities or to engage wider in the community. This goes against the spirit of Localism and the Localism Act, and democratic engagement in general.
 - iii Bus Rapid Transport (BRT) projects in the NE Quadrant that are a key part of the NATS proposals for promoting sustainable transport and reducing congestion in Norwich have delays or cost increases, these are:
 - A 5 – 10 year delay on the Airport BRT [T12]
 - A shorter delay on the Salhouse Road BRT [T11]
 - A shorter delay on the Broadland Business Park (BBP) – Salhouse Road development link [T15]

As highlighted in my carbon footprinting submission to the reconvened Hearing, the mode split figure used by the Council in the Postwick area of NEGT is 91% car use. Census figures also indicated that the NE of Norwich has much greater car use than areas in the SW quadrant.

It is essential to increasing the modal share of sustainable transport in NEGT area that measures such as these are prioritised. The existing delays and cost risks to these projects compromise the NATS proposals that are meant to underlie sustainable transport in the JCS. Hence, the deliverability and soundness of sustainable transport objectives of the JCS is entirely compromised.

- iv The DRAFT “Proposed modification to Appendix 7: Infrastructure Framework” indicates greater funds being allocated to the NDR [T1].
- In the resubmitted JCS, Appendix 7, T1 receives £106.2m in Phase 1
 - In the DRAFT modifications, TI receives £107m in Phase 1 and £13m in Phase 2. An increase in total of around £14m.

The cost of this project has continued to increase over the years and we simply do not see how the shortfall, after central government funding, can be found in the current climate of severe financial restraint and drastically reduced CIL revenues without severely compromising other necessary infrastructure.

- 6 We pointed out in our “ADDENDUM to Additional Statement” on LIPP for May’s Hearing that a recent report from SNDC indicated that infrastructure projects may need to be re-prioritised and re-ordered “including those strategic elements that contribute to the whole JCS”.
- 7 Other Councils are also responding to the CIL shortfall issue and a paper goes to Norwich City Council on June 25th. However, any known impacts of the shortfall on City based infrastructure has not been made available to Councillors as a public document. It is not clear if the analysis has been done and known only to a few, or that it just has not been done. This is extremely worrying, and I have tabled this question to the Leader of the Council at the meeting:

A recent South Norfolk Council report on the Community Infrastructure Levy calculated the shortfall to the district as £50 million as a result of the CIL Inspector's recommendation to reduce the levy on new residential development by 35%. I am concerned that the Cabinet agreed on June 12th to adopt the new Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule on 15th July 2013 without any research into what the potential shortfall in Norwich would be. Will the Leader and Cabinet instruct officers to produce a model for the Norwich situation similar to that produced by SNDC to provide an estimate of the CIL shortfall in this authority's area, and will the Cabinet revisit the previous commitment that it gave to the GNDP to contribute £10 million of the City CIL money to a proposed NDR, and will Cabinet instigate a public consultation into the public priorities for how the much smaller CIL income from city development should be spent?

(City and County) Councillor Andrew Boswell, Norwich Green Party, June 21th 2013