

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: representation on jcs
Date: 21 October 2013 16:07:35

Dear GNDP,

I'd like to thank you for your work in planning for the future of Greater Norwich. City Council call center advised me to email my points to you at this address.

I would like to comment on the JCS and their modifications. I was not aware of the existence of GNDP while JCS was being developed. I only became aware because of a direct threat to my way of life here in Trowse.

Having seen housing allocations close to Norwich. Cringleford, Costessey, Wymondham, Poringland, and especially Trowse it looks like the strategy has amounted to filling in the green bits with houses.

It seems the method has been 'who has a field they want to sell?' and then in line with this temporary governments policy to 'assume in favour of the applicant for planning'.

This is unacceptable.

When assessing where housing should go. Would it not be better to firstly look at what areas need rehabilitation? Where existing houses are standing empty because of lack of amenity? For example this was done to good effect with the abandoned warehouses on the riverside (though not the new builds), but not with some of the villages around Norfolk where the pub, shop/post office, and school have closed (like Swainsthorpe). Secondly ask where an increase of housing would benefit a community, and how.

This is brought to beautiful light in the situation of Trowse:

A small village, built as a model by the Colman family and this is partly why it is currently a conservation area. With an independent village shop, an outstanding village school, two popular pubs, a start up successful restaurant, and a cohesive community of about 300 houses that in the words of the local Councillor represent a 'minor miracle'. Trowse is only just outside Norwich, and it partly due to this that it is desirable as a place to live, but also as a place that is visited and enjoyed by the people of Norwich. Now, between Norwich and Trowse the Deal Ground has been approved for 670 houses. In addition SNDC have in their new proposed Local Plan 160 additional houses, and to provide for the children from these housing developments, a new school of up to 4 times the size the current outstanding one.

So now strategic planning suggests a community that works, a model village, instead of being used as a model is having unwanted excess pushed upon it?

More houses, blurring the village boundary directly against the conservation area report from last year.

A larger school, despite that the successful 'oustanding' primary schools in Norfolk are in the clear majority small schools.

A statement by Norwich City Council planning officers to create greater cohesion between the communities (committee report of the deal ground application), when it is precisely Trowse's distance from Norwich that makes it beloved by resident, visitor and tourist alike.

How is this good strategic planning?

I am sorry to bring this up at the 11th hour when already so much work has been done, however the effects on Trowse have only just been brought light in the last month or so, and I only just heard of GNDP as part of that and was unaware of any right to submit therefore.

It is my request that your Joint Core Strategy specifically commits to protecting Trowse as it is a asset to Norwich for recreation, tourism, and heritage.

It is my request that your strategy discourage the use of greenfield sites for housing development as more people don't just mean more houses, they mean more mouths, so destroying the land on which it grows is bad long term planning and poor economic strategy.

It is my request that when considering the placement for additional housing, first priority is given to 'where will benefit the community'

Many Thanks

Joss Guin

Trowse Resident, Parent, Small Business Person, Allotment Holder.