



Greater Norwich Development Partnership Joint Core Strategy Public Consultation on Favoured Option

Final Report - June 19th 2009

Contents

	<i>Pages</i>	
1. Introduction, Methodology	1	3
2. Sample	4	6
Overall sample		
3. Overall response	7	8
Overall response by question		
4. Response	9	1153
Q1 Spatial vision and planning objectives	10	88
Q2 Spatial strategy	89	137
Q3 Settlement hierarchy	138	183
Q4 - Q5 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area	184	282
Q6 City Centre	283	320
Q7 - Q8 Remainder of Norwich urban area including the fringe parishes	321	382
Q9 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area	383	486
Q10 – Q13 Technical Consultees only	487	543
Q14 Main towns	544	577
Q15 Key service centres	578	624
Q16 Service villages	625	664
Q17 Other villages	665	703
Q18 Countryside	704	731
Q19 The Broads	732	754
Q20 The hierarchy of town and village centres	755	786
Q21 Reducing environmental impact	787	827
Q22 Housing delivery	828	874
Q23 The economy	875	924
Q24 Strategic access and transportation	925	978
Q25 Environmental assets	979	1009
Q26 Communities and culture	1010	1045
Q27 Implementation and monitoring	1046	1079
Q28 Anything else you would like to tell us	1080	1153
5. Appendix		
1 Public Exhibition timetable	1154	1156

1. Introduction, Methodology

Introduction and Methodology

Introduction

Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk are working with Norfolk County Council as the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) to develop a Joint Core Strategy for housing growth and jobs in the area.

Public consultation on “Issues and Options” took place in the early part of 2008 to gain reaction to the proposed plans. Following the public consultation and changes to planning procedures¹, the GNDP undertook a technical consultation with “specific bodies” (statutory agencies, service providers, organisations that deliver infrastructure and other key stakeholders) during August / September 2008.

Technical consultees were asked to consider three options for the distribution of major growth in and around Norwich. Evidence and information was presented to Councillors from the four GNDP councils, who agreed to publish the emerging Joint Core Strategy for full public consultation.

A single favoured option has been put forward by the GNDP which includes large scale housing in and around Norwich and on major sites in Broadland and South Norfolk. The GNDP undertook a public consultation from 2nd March to 24 April 2009 to gauge reaction and comment to this proposed favoured option for growth. Following a review of the response, the consultation period was extended to Friday 12th June 2009.

The public were encouraged to take part in the consultation via an intensive publicity campaign with adverts in the local papers, council magazines and posters in public places. Approximately 36 public exhibitions took place across the whole area and the GNDP wrote to 2000 parish councils, community organisations and local organisations. Over 7000 letters to other people who took part in previous consultations were also distributed.

In addition the “specific bodies” were asked to consider any changes resulting from adopting the favoured option. This group were only asked to respond to a subset of questions (Q10 – Q13) due to their previous involvement in the consultation process with the caveat that they could respond to a full set of questions if they wish.

¹ Regulation 25 of the revised PPS12 guidance

Methodology

The GNDP invited the public to make their comments via their website www.gndp.org.uk using JDI² to capture their responses. Paper question booklets were also available for respondents to complete. Public exhibitions (36) ran from 14th March to 18th April in a variety of locations across the GNDP area including: The Forum, Little Melton Village Hall, Wroxham Church Hall and Hingham Village Hall. (See Appendix 1 for full details).

“Specific bodies” were asked to complete their response via an electronic form as in the previous consultation.

Additional correspondence, email or letters were also received. These were collected by GNDP, who recorded date of receipt and allocated category as required. Scanning of attachments (maps, reports and additional material) was undertaken by GNDP and attributed to the representations. (N.B at draft report stage scanning of documents had not taken place).

The views and opinions collected in paper format were added to the consultation and entered on the JDI system.

² JDI - software package used by a number of Local Authorities to capture feedback on Local Development Framework documents

2. Sample

Respondent Sample

The details below set out the monitoring information relating to respondents who responded to the Public Consultation as 'individuals' (i.e. not through an agent). The latest population estimates across the three districts, for each of the monitoring categories are shown for comparative purposes.

Gender of respondents

	No. of respondents	% respondents	% of Broadland, Norwich & South Norfolk population ³
Male	41	53%	49%
Female	37	47%	51%

Number of respondents with a disability

	No. of respondents
Number of respondents with a disability	11

Age range of respondents

	No. of respondents	% respondents	% of Broadland, Norwich & South Norfolk population ⁴
Under 18	0	-	19.38%
18 – 24	0	-	9.65%
25 – 34	0	-	12.45%
35 – 44	6	7.7%	14.41%
45 – 54	5	6.4%	12.72%
55 – 64	8	10.3%	12.94%
65 – 74	8	10.3%	9.24%
75+	11	14.1%	9.13%
No reply	40	51.3%	-

³ } Norfolk County Council Mid-2006 estimates

⁴ }

Ethnic Origin

Ethnic Origin	No. of respondents	% respondents	% of Broadland, Norwich & South Norfolk population ⁵
White British	61	78.2%	93.52%
White Irish	-	-	0.58%
Any other white background	2	2.6%	2.31%
Mixed, white and black Caribbean	-	-	0.08%
Mixed, white and black African	-	-	0.14%
White and Asian	-	-	0.11%
Any other mixed background	-	-	0.27%
Indian	-	-	0.66%
Pakistani	-	-	0.49%
Bangladeshi	-	-	0.22%
Any other Asian background	-	-	0.16%
Black or black British - Caribbean	-	-	0.36%
Black or black British - African	-	-	0.19%
Black or black British - Other	-	-	0.49%
Chinese	-	-	0.25%
Any other ethnic group	-	-	0.22%
No reply	15	19.2%	

⁵ ONS table EE1 : Estimated resident population by ethnic group and sex, mid -2005 (experimental statistics)

3. Overall response

Overall response

The details below set out the overall response to the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, Public Consultation Regulation 25 as at 19th June 2009. Please note that total no. of respondents refers to total number of submissions for this consultation. Total no. of representations may exceed total no. of respondents as some respondents may have submitted more than one representation per question.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Total	356	799	1481	924	3204
Q1 Spatial vision and planning objectives	183	40	79	70	189
Q2 Spatial strategy	151	28	61	66	155
Q3 Settlement hierarchy	155	24	73	24	159
Q4 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area	151	27	55	73	155
Q5 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area	120	14	58	53	125
Q6 City Centre	117	17	69	32	118
Q7 Remainder of Norwich urban area including the fringe parishes	130	18	75	37	130
Q8 As Q7	93	7	67	19	93
Q9 Locations for major change & development in the Norwich Policy Area	179	54	56	75	185
Q10 Technical Consultees only	37	34	0	3	37
Q11 Technical Consultees only	21	21	0	2	23
Q12 Technical Consultees only	17	17	0	2	19
Q13 Technical Consultees only	23	10	6	7	23
Q14 Main towns	122	29	60	35	124
Q15 Key service centres	120	30	62	34	126
Q16 Service villages	129	32	63	38	133
Q17 Other villages	113	28	59	29	116
Q18 Countryside	105	18	69	19	106
Q19 The Broads	90	10	72	8	90
Q20 The hierarchy of town and village centres	109	25	69	20	114
Q21 Reducing environmental impact	131	25	67	40	132
Q22 Housing delivery	122	31	42	50	123
Q23 The economy	122	35	62	27	124
Q24 Strategic access and transportation	146	30	58	61	149
Q25 Environmental assets	101	20	67	15	102
Q26 Communities and culture	112	24	75	16	115
Q27 Implementation and monitoring	106	28	55	25	108
Q28 Anything else you would like to tell us	129	123	2	6	131

4. Response Q1 – Q28

Response – Q1

Spatial Vision and planning objectives

The vision and objectives for the Joint Core Strategy describes what sort of area the GNDP is aiming for in the future, and the objectives set the principles to do this

Q1 Spatial vision and planning objectives

Spatial vision and planning objectives

The vision and objectives for the Joint Core Strategy describes what sort of area the GNDP is aiming for in the future and, and the objectives set the principles to do this.

Q1 Do you agree with the spatial vision and objectives? YES / NO

If no, please say which part(s) you disagree with and why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q1 Total	183	40	79	70	189

Rep No.	Name of respondent [JDI reference number] Response e.g COMMENT, SUPPORT, OBJECT Method of response e.g. Web / paper, and date of submission
7910	<p>Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - COMMENT Web - 06/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? This document got too long to read properly. Maintain centres, green spaces, feeling of safety, and reduce the need to travel will suffice.</p> <p>C - 7910 - 6885 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
7922	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - COMMENT Web - 08/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? no youve already made up yer minds your going to ruin norfolk with over development</p> <p>C - 7922 - 7812 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
7985	<p>Mr Keith Bigland [7843] - COMMENT Web - 14/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p>

	<p>fully agree</p> <p>C - 7985 - 7843 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8064	<p>Miss Janet Saunders [7875] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>I agree in principle with the need to reduce the use of private vehicles and encouraging companies to provide employment close to peoples homes is a good start. However, until a truly viable alternative is available, and having tried to use public transport when working in Norwich, I know this is a very very long way off, there is still a pressing need improve the road transport network and parking facilities in and around the region.</p> <p>C - 8064 - 7875 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8108	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 29/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>I am not convinced that the current scientific projections on climate change and zero carbon development are valid. they constitute projections on very selective data.</p> <p>The emphasis on affordable housing is leading to a low quality living environment as demonstrated by the current high density estate developments.</p> <p>C - 8108 - 7888 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8321	<p>Mr Geoffrey Loades [6873] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 16/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>FURTHER OBJECTIVE SUCH THAT RURAL COMMUNITIES CAN SHARE IN THE GROWTH TO PREVENT THEM FROM BEING UNSUSTAINABLE.</p> <p>C - 8321 - 6873 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8342	<p>Age Concern Norwich (Phil Wells) [7957] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Nothing to object to, but I cannot see that the vision or objectives properly acknowledge the proportion of the population who</p>

	<p>will be retired. Their need for a functioning community will have to be met, or this will result in huge additional social and health costs. Design of mixed communities around service centres (GP, Post Office, community building, etc. to allow access without transport will be critical and this is a great opportunity to plan for this.</p> <p>C - 8342 - 7957 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8627	<p>University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029] - COMMENT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Paragraph 5.4 - The Spatial Vision - Whilst the paragraph headed Communities, deprivation and regeneration provides for high expectations in educational achievement the paragraph headed living, working and getting around, fails to follow through with mention of investment in the university as the sole higher education provider in the area.</p> <p>C - 8627 - 8029 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8866	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? the emphasis is on increasing housing BEFORE addressing existing employment and transport problems. before expanding it would be better to make existing residents life sustainable</p> <p>C - 8866 - 8071 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9056	<p>Mrs CA Gilson [8102] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Regarding the possibility of thousands of new homes being built in East Anglia, my views are as follows: The land in this country already designated as being green belt land i.e. protected from development and principally arable land to grow our food / green spaces should be left as precisely that. It shouldn't be destroyed in this way and we don't want our beautiful countryside disappearing under masses of housing estates. East Anglia is "bread basket" of the country and it is important that land is retained in this way for this very reason. We must remain self sufficient - who knows what the future will hold? Why are all these new homes needed in the first place? Because of overpopulation of our small islands. Britain is more heavily populated than France and look at the difference in land size! The problem is the result of EU imposed</p>

	<p>immigration laws that allow too many people into Britain. The only way this problem can be dealt with is to withdraw from the EU, so Britain can once again protect herself and make her own laws.</p> <p>C - 9056 - 8102 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9060	<p>Chenery Drive Residents Association (Mr R. Craggs) [3412] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Everyone I have spoken to including the residents whom I represent are opposed to a Greater Norwich that is urban sprawl under another name. Please refer to comments previously submitted by our Chairman Tony Stubbs and myself.</p> <p>C - 9060 - 3412 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9064	<p>Mr Alex Kuhn [8106] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>I am in receipt of your circular dated 02.03.2009 regards large scale growth favoured by the current government in the above area.</p> <p>Large scale growth is NOT and option, especially in the green belt area and also as arterial roads around Norwich are not being improved in conjunction with the above plans for the future!</p> <p>Congestion is already rife as it is and the current infra structure would not be able to cope with yet more housing developments and its resulting traffic.</p> <p>It is sheer Utopia in thinking by simply concreting over green field sites this would create wealth for the local government, but at what price!</p> <p>Ecologically and environmentally and from the wildlife point of view greater density would not be sustainable, as every NEW brick, roof tile, wall or tarmac road adds to global warming by absorbing sunlight and reflecting it!</p> <p>C - 9064 - 8106 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9074	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] – COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Pages 16 / 18 are bland in the regulations 25 book</p> <p>C - 9074 - 8109 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>

9086 Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

VISION

The Broads Authority believes that there is much to be welcomed in parts of the text of the Vision, but that the opportunity to set out what sort of place the Joint Authorities are trying to create (or conserve) appears to have been lost sight of, and that policies and programmes seem to be determining the Vision, not the other way around. Hence much of the Vision is expressed along the lines of "X will have been done", rather than outcome and benefits aimed at.

Par 8.21 of the Strategy document is, by contrast not part of the Vision, but just happens to outline much that is treasured at present in the area. It is interesting to consider this as a substitute "vision" and wonder how much of this might be preserved, enhanced or degraded by the draft policies and programmes in the strategy. Clearly that paragraph is not comprehensive enough to be an adequate vision, but the above thought experiment perhaps illustrates the value that a real vision might have to the shaping and justification of a strategy.

The Authority welcomes the recognition of the Broads in the Rural Area section, but it would appreciate the insertion of the word "adjacent" or some other wording change, to clarify that the Broads is outside the area of this Joint Core Strategy.

The Authority also welcomes the recognition (under the Key Service Centres heading) of the importance of employment and tourism-related links to the Broads for settlements such as Acle, Brundall, Loddon, Chedgrave and Wroxham. It is not clear to the Authority why the vision is that these should be "limited", nor why the vision should be to "form" these (again a policy rather than a vision?) rather than they continue or are strong. Hence it is suggested the words "Form limited but" are deleted, and this part of the vision be simply worded "Strong employment and tourism-related links with the Broads"

OBJECTIVES

The Broads Authority supports all of the Objectives as they are expressed in the headline of each objective. Most of the text that follows each headline objective is, however, not about the objective but policies and programmes instead. These belong (and are covered) elsewhere in the document. A real opportunity has been missed here to articulate what it is the Joint Authorities are seeking to achieve and why. It would be helpful if the relative priority of the objectives was also addressed.

The Broads Authority particularly welcomes Objective 8 in its generality and its mention of improvements. However, phrases such as "the special qualities of the Broads. It is a priority to improve those special qualities .." may create the incorrect impression that the Broads fall within the Joint Core Strategy area and policies and the wording should be adjusted to avoid this. The Authority also strongly supports in particular Objective 12 in emphasising the importance to the well-being of the area of access to the countryside and recreational opportunities.

The Broads Authority would like to see a greater emphasis (here and throughout the document) on the importance of the protection and enhancement of the environment (including that of adjacent areas such as the Broads) as a pre-requisite for the successful long term growth of housing provision and employment.

	C - 9086 - 7986 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
9470	<p>Louisa Young [8135] - COMMENT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Improve Norwich's abysmal public transport and reduce its costs. Better access to health services in North Norwich. Build in shop opportunities so people don't have to use cars to access supermarkets. Insist that provision for Schools, parks and socialising for young people is built in to any development. Housing should be carbon neutral and affordable NOT more executive monsters.</p> <p>C - 9470 - 8135 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9654	<p>Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Page 9 The main common trends of the sustainable community strategy are First for people to play a part in community life and to be involved in decision - the flawed consultation carried out by south Norfolk Council - info re this used in the decision by the GNDP Group? Second to have healthier and safer places and a high quality environment that is respected for everyone's enjoyment - Police cannot look after everything now! Larger development will mean less safety! - to have access to suitable housing, jobs, facilities and services for all whatever their needs, how can these be possible? Explanation needed as to costs to provide for the area and as to where the funding a will come. Page 9 The Spatial Vision - 35750 houses only 33000 jobs! 33000 would not be sufficient jobs allowing for just one third of working people (allowing for only 2 working people in a house) would mean 23826 new jobs needed - are we to have a large number of unemployed in the event of the development being carried out? page 10 Communities - people will enjoy healthy safe .. access to high standard of health and social care. We all know that there is not the social care needed now - with more older members of the community - somebody has to be there for all those needing care - the elderly, the vulnerable ... the young are having to work - who will be available to do the caring work? The area will provide high quality cultural and leisure opportunities that improve people wellbeing - where is the money coming from this? Business investment in the area ... How has this been assessed? Where will the businesses be sited - how can this be guaranteed? Are there to be orders for businesses to do this - if so prices will rise! Are there to be orders for businesses to come in and set up in Long Stratton?</p>

The road works will be monitored and improved to and across the area - there is not the money for dealing with roadwork now - how can this be a certainty?

Page 11 each one ... how can this be achieved in Long Stratton to have a new centre! There is not room for expansion round the centre of the village unless farmland close by is taken in - would this be by compulsory purchase? Are we to deprive farmers of their land and create more jobs?

Page 12 Long Stratton currently functions ... We need to know exactly what is proposed for Long Stratton to be able to make comment!! Pages 12 / 13 objective 1. How is this going to be dealt with to provide as stated?

Objective 2 Safe...

Problem with policing - how can this be stated?

Objective 5 last paragraph Mixed area. To have the need to commute to work 1800 dwellings - taking that one third have 2 parents working parents means 1200 jobs - need another 600 wanting jobs - this leaves another 600 where there are no workers - we all know this is not even possible or likely!

Objective 6 Need to know what would be considered - what services they need Objectives - on what basis - will new be provided? Would need schools all schools, primary, secondary & high!

Dr surgery, health centre, leisure facilities, road improvements from and to all areas, water, electricity, gas etc

Objective 9 - will this mean that wind turbines are a must at the areas - will the opposition to these be disregarded - it needs to be or we shall be in a worse situation retarding energy supplies!

The thinking on this should be make known now!

Page 15 People will need to use cars less - how is this going to work - look what happens now parents come to school with cars who live close by! Need to start now re this matter.

Road network will be maintained - does this mean all roads, rural as well, will definitely be maintained - there are a lot of road mileage needing attention now - yet alone then.

Where is the funding to come from?

Spatial Vision - planning objectives?

The ideas are right but how can they be achieved? Where will the funding come from - need definite answers to this!

C - 9654 - 8165 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

9667

Mr Quinton Biddle [8166] - COMMENT

Web - 11/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

I am concerned that objective 10 will not be met and that traffic on Salhouse Rd will increase considerably once the NDR and new housing is built.

	C - 9667 - 8166 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
9668	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>As a comprehensive vision, yes. However, I have concerns in the wider policy area, especially referencing fringe villages and identified key service areas.</p> <p>C - 9668 - 8047 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9745	<p>Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>I believe it is important that we do not lose our identity in Norfolk and become an amorphous mass of countryside covered by concrete and housing estates. Many Norfolk people believe we are special, we are very proud of "being Norfolk" and different.</p> <p>C - 9745 - 1155 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9814	<p>East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 29/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>EEDA's principal role is to improve the East of England region's economic performance. Our main concern with Core Strategy documents is therefore that they will help deliver and provide the spatial framework for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sustainable economic development and regeneration in the East of England and in particular - the new Regional Economic Strategy (Inventing the Future - Collective Action for a sustainable economy, 2008) <p>Planning Policy Statement 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development', 2005 reminds local authorities that in preparing local development plans, they should seek to provide a positive planning framework for sustainable growth in support of the Regional Economic Strategy (RES). The RES advocates a region that is internationally competitive with a global reputation for innovation and business growth, that harnesses and develops the talents and creativity of all and is at the forefront of a low carbon and resource efficient economy.</p> <p>In addition, Planning Policy Statement 12 'Creating Strong Safe and Prosperous Communities through Local Spatial Planning', 2008 recognises that spatial planning is a critical element in relation to economic growth and regeneration. The RES supports</p>

	<p>and complements the East of England Plan and EEDA supports the implementation of policies within that strategy.</p> <p>Importantly, EEDA has commented previously on the core strategy in September 2008 and those comments remain extant. In commenting on these latest changes EEDA have focussed on Policy 5 regarding locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area.</p> <p>C - 9814 - 1509 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>9848</p>	<p>Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr James Alflatt) [8204]) - COMMENT Paper - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. supports the Spatial Vision as a coherent and cohesive vision for the Greater Norwich area, reinforcing the existing strengths and qualities of the area and seeking to deliver significant new housing growth in the most sustainable manner, with recognition that Hethersett is identified as a sustainable location for growth within the Norwich Policy Area for strategic (major) growth as well as its continued function as a Key Service Centre.</p> <p>C - 9848 - 8203 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>9980</p>	<p>GF Cole and Son [8226] (represented by ASquared Architects (Mrs Jayne Taylor) [7042]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Partial objection: see below</p> <p>The Preferred Option concentrates the majority of new development within the urban area of Norwich and an identified Norwich Policy Area outside of Norwich. The effect of concentrating the vast majority of growth in the combined Norwich Policy Area (32,000 new dwellings out of a proposed 35,750 between 2008 - 2026) is to constrain the level of new development supported in the extensive rural areas, particularly in the southern half of South Norfolk. Some growth is proposed for the main towns of Diss and Harleston, but this is relatively modest in terms of amount, compared with the major expansion of settlements within the Norwich Policy Area.. The growth at Long Stratton has clearly been chosen to deliver a by pass, and to up grade the settlement to a town, rather than a key service centre.</p> <p>Whilst not objecting to the principles of the preferred option in terms of the general distribution of development, we feel that the balance between the growth in the NPA and the rural area under provides for the rural area, and that this should be adjusted accordingly. A total growth over the period 2008-2026 of some 3,750 dwellings is disproportionately low.</p>

The Issues and Options report identified that the rural parts of South Norfolk and Broadland (outside the Norwich Policy Area) provided 1,210 new homes in the period 2001 -2006, compared with 6,236 in the NPA - representing a fifth of the NPA growth. The current proposals would mean that the growth in rural area would be just under one tenth of the growth of the NPA. We do not suggest that the proportions should continue as at present, given the influence of growth status on the overall housing figures, but rather that a modest increase in the growth figures for the rural areas would enable development to contribute more positively to meeting the needs of the rural area.

Whilst we do not object to the principles of expansion at Long Stratton (1,800 dwellings), Diss (300) or Harleston (2-300), the overall lower levels of growth outside the Norwich Policy Area results in a reduced growth in the service and other villages within the rural area. Given the extensive area of South Norfolk outside the main towns, the smaller rural settlements provide an important local social and facility focus for the rural population. Inadequate allowance for growth in such settlements will not assist in overcoming rural isolation and deprivation. Rather that lack of growth will fail to provide support for the limited facilities that already exist in the face of the enhanced facilities in the towns.

No other key service centres are identified that would serve the rural area which extends across the southern half of South Norfolk - which means that any growth will be limited to that considered appropriate for service and other villages. Such growth is limited to 10 -20 dwellings (for service villages), and even smaller amounts for other villages. Over the plan period to 2026 this scale of potential growth is very small, and less likely to be able to assist in meeting local needs for balanced housing provision or to provide support for local facilities.

We would suggest that the spatial vision put forward in the Core Strategy should recognise that in rural areas outside the Norwich Policy Area, the smaller village settlements provide an important focus for the rural population, and that some growth may be appropriate within the villages to address local needs and support local facilities. Rather than limiting growth to a specified 10 -20 dwellings (or in the case of smaller villages to even lower levels, or effectively none at all), it would be more appropriate to identify that growth in the service centres and other villages will be of a scale appropriate to the character of the settlement and at a level to enable local housing needs and demands in a balanced manner, or contribute to an enhancement of the settlement.

In reality the nature of the rural settlements and the more limited need for local housing is such that there would be little support for large scale housing development that would be contrary to the main thrust of the preferred development option. However, the greater flexibility provided by such an approach would enable settlements, and crucially groups of settlements that together provide a range of facilities, to be considered in terms of their housing need and facility provision. A more positive approach could then be taken to the use of development to enhance the structure and layout of the settlement and improve or support local facilities.

	C - 9980 - 8226 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
10065	<p>The Greetham Trustees [7606] (represented by Strutt and Parker (Mr David Williams) [7605]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Objective 4 of the spatial vision states that the Greater Norwich Development Partnership's (GNDP) aim is to allocate enough land for housing and affordable housing, in the most sustainable settlements. While we agree with this objective, there should be an emphasis within the development plan on the need to reinforce the more limited services that are available in smaller rural settlements such as the service villages and the other villages within the GNDP area.</p> <p>This objective also ties in with Objective 6 which aims to make sure that people have ready access to services, encouraging innovative approaches to supporting rural service provision. The objective prioritises the role of market towns and service centres, however service villages and other villages should also be central to this aim. These points will be expanded further in the responses to subsequent questions.</p> C - 10065 - 7606 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
10144	<p>R Smith [8243] (represented by Beacon Planning Ltd (Ms Jenny Page) [7833]) - COMMENT Paper - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The spatial vision is supported in principle but this does not differentiate between those key service centres within the Norwich Policy Area which will be contributing to the proposed new homes on smaller sites and those further afield.</p> C - 10144 - 8243 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
10209	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - COMMENT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I do not believe that area needs as many homes as proposed. 16000 would be more acceptable and Wymondham should have only 1000 new homes otherwise the whole character of the area will be compromised.</p> C - 10209 - 5864 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
10245	<p>Mrs Angela Garner [8258] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I have recently attended one of your exhibitions with the slogan "jobs, homes, prosperity for local people" - what a joke! Without jobs the homes will not be sold and the prosperity will be for landowners and builders only. I came away with a feeling of anger and hopelessness towards local government.</p> <p>C - 10245 - 8258 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10249</p>	<p>Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260] - COMMENT Paper - 09/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Section 4 Spatial Portrait: 4.2 Natural Environment, landscape and diversity A brief outline of the region's rich geodiversity is missing from this spatial portrait. The word geology does occur once, but rather inappropriately. Geodiversity is also missing from the title.</p> <p>Spatial Planning Objectives Objective 8 Geodiversity is again missing from this objective. I suggest that the next to last sentence be amended to "Biodiversity, geodiversity and locally ..."</p> <p>C - 10249 - 8260 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10263</p>	<p>Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Spatial Vision. My Council is pleased to see that all villages will be allowed some development. It feels that had this policy been in place in the Local Plan it would have helped to make small communities more sustainable by adding to the numbers likely to use local shops and businesses instead of which many have now gone out of business. It would also have helped to reduce some of the 'urban sprawl' which many Parishes on the periphery of Norwich like Costessey are now suffering changing the character and identity of the places in which we live. Norfolk is a large rural County and if we are serious about reducing the use of private cars then there should be greater emphasis on making rural communities more sustainable by providing housing to increase the potential viability of village shops, post offices, pubs and other businesses as well as rural bus routes.</p> <p>C - 10263 - 7068 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>

10281 Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrold) [8267] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

- JCS has been developed with an emphasis on accommodating growth and "roads and drains infrastructure" rather than from a place shaping/local identity focus. This will lead to problems in the long term. We should approach it from the point of "what sort of place do we want Norwich to be in the future?"

- JCS lacks "local distinctiveness" needs a greater emphasis on local businesses

C - 10281 - 8267 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

10380 GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT

Paper - 01/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Spatial Portrait:

1. The spatial portrait should provide sufficient information to allow a reader who may be unfamiliar with the area to understand the broad extent of the plan area, its key characteristics, including the area's physical, social and economic geography, and the nature of existing opportunities and constraints. It need not be lengthy, but the aim should be to present a balanced portrait overall. A short factual narrative incorporating data on baseline conditions, would be helpful.

Spatial Vision:

2. The spatial vision is a fundamental element of the DPD, reflecting local ambitions and aspirations, and providing the underpinning for the subsequent objectives and policies. We note the reference to Sustainable Community Strategies as evidence to this, and would encourage you to elaborate the relationship of the Core Strategy to other relevant plans and strategies, such as the Norfolk Local Transport Plan, Norwich Area Transportation (NATS), the Economic Strategy for greater Norwich, and the Broads Plan.

3. We welcome the prominence given to climate change, sustainability and quality of life in your document, for example in linking housing and employment growth locations to the provision of good public transport links. Elsewhere in our representations we identify opportunities to strengthen the link between sustainable transport, carbon reduction, accessibility and health, and the role of 'greater Norwich' as the focus for sustainable growth, and question whether the economic vision could also be strengthened.

4. The north east of Norwich is identified for the largest growth allocation, and you may want to incorporate some elements of the emerging vision for the Rackheath eco-town within your DPD and embed an expectation that this location should serve as an exemplar for sustainable growth.

5. To avoid repetition of subsequent policy, some of the more detailed content, for example relating to the rural area, could be omitted.

Spatial planning objectives:

6. Whilst welcoming the commitment given to community involvement under Objective 1, we question whether this is strictly a spatial objective. More generally, although there is clearly no intention to prioritise objectives by virtue of the order in which they appear, there might be merit in considering an order which best reflects the overarching spatial vision and key social, economic and environmental drivers.

C - 10380 - 7463 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

10405 Easton College [3570] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Colin Campbell) [7597]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Agricultural and rural economy

Agricultural and land-based industries play a significant role in terms of land management, employment and GVA in the Plan area and the Region. Over 75% of the land in the East of England is used for farming and the Region possesses a high number of businesses in food processing and the supply chain. The importance of these industries increases to the north and east of the region. It is important that the JCS recognises these important characteristics, the potential of different sectors of the economy and the potential of food and agricultural industries to contribute to supporting employment in Norfolk's rural area. There also important opportunities to develop synergies with environmental industries and the Further and Higher Education institutions of the area, such as Easton College

Given the importance of agriculture to Norfolk and the significant rural area covered by the JCS, greater policy provision for supporting the rural economy and land-based industries is required. This needs to be addressed prior to Submission.

The Vision identifies growth at the main towns and Key Service Centres as the means to revitalise the rural economy. However, no mention is made to the importance of agriculture and land-based industries to the economy. Given the importance of the rural economy we recommend a separate bullet be included "The rural economy will have been revitalised through

support for the growth of agriculture and land-based industries and the expansion of the economies of the market towns and Key Service Centres." We also recommend that the a new bullet be added to the section on the rural area "the agriculture and food industry will remain as a world leading, competitive sector and have developed as a model for other rural areas in terms of supporting rural employment, providing access to local healthy produce, reducing food miles, developing a local/regional brand, developing relationships with education/research institutions."

C - 10405 - 3570 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

10412 Honingham Thorpe Farms Limited [8296] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Colin Campbell) [7597]) - **COMMENT**
Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

We are concerned that the draft Joint Core Strategy (JCS) does not address issues of rural employment or the rural economy sufficiently. The approach to the rural economy needs to be reviewed in the light of the report and recommendations of The Taylor Review of Rural Economy and Affordable Housing. The Taylor Review identifies that planning has a crucial role to play in supporting rural economic development, but that it is currently hampering growth. It states that removing planning blockages "can increase the availability of premises, help new firms to start and many others to grow. This in turn will help to raise productivity across all rural communities, benefiting those that live and work in them and improving the overall contribution they make to regional and national economies." As the Taylor Report identifies strong rural economies are essential to the maintenance of attractive and diverse landscapes and natural environments - contributing to the environmental stewardship of the countryside. The production of the JCS provides an opportunity to positively support and deliver economic growth of the rural area.

The Joint Core Strategy

Given the importance of agriculture to Norfolk and the significant rural area covered by the JCS, greater policy provision for supporting the rural economy and land-based industries is required. This needs to be addressed prior to Submission.

The Vision identifies growth at the main towns and Key Service Centres as the means to revitalise the rural economy. However, no mention is made to the importance of agriculture and land-based industries to the rural economy. The spatial vision as currently drafted is too urban focussed. Given the importance of the rural economy we recommend a separate bullet be included "The rural economy will have been revitalised through support for the growth of agriculture and land-based industries and the expansion of the economies of the market towns and Key Service Centres." We also recommend that the a new bullet be added to the section on the rural area "the agriculture and food industry will remain as a world leading, competitive sector and act as a model for other rural areas in terms of supporting rural employment, providing access to local healthy produce, reducing food miles, developing a local/regional brand, developing relationships with education/research

	<p>institutions."</p> <p>C - 10412 - 8296 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10682</p>	<p>Ms Natalie Beal [8349] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 10/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>There is no mention of car sharing in the document. Whilst I am a great supporter of promoting walking and cycling and public transport, I think car sharing is also an important way to address single occupancy car use - especially taking into account the increase in rail fares for example.</p> <p>C - 10682 - 8349 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10700</p>	<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>We generally support the Spatial Vision and in particular, spatial planning objectives 8 and 9. We do however wish to advise as follows:</p> <p>Objective 8:</p> <p>We recommend that the seventh sentence is amended to read "The use of previously developed land, with appropriate remediation where necessary, will be prioritised to minimise the loss of agricultural land and the countryside". This reflects the aims of the Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control, Annex 2 of which refers to the 'Development of Land Affected by Contamination'. In particular the Environment Agency wishes to ensure that there is no risk to controlled waters through the development of land which has been contaminated by its previous uses.</p> <p>We also suggest that greater emphasis could be placed upon protecting, enhancing and importantly preventing deterioration of the aquatic environment, in particular throughout our river and lake network. Deterioration, biological, chemical or hydromorphological arising from development should not be allowed. This is a requirement of the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>Objective 10:</p> <p>This objective relates to the need for infrastructure to meet the needs of existing and future populations.</p> <p>We note that the objective only refers to transport infrastructure. However, other types of infrastructure, for example waste water infrastructure, will also be required or existing facilities improved.</p>

C - 10700 - 8352 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

10712 Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT

Paper - 26/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

In point 5.3 "healthier and safer spaces" is mentioned. "High-density" housing, seems to be defined by building streets without pavements. This "free for all" where pedestrians have to share road space with cars, I think is dangerous, and also leads to stress when walking, this making walking unattractive, frightening. This will lead to a generation who don't know how to exit their home without stepping straight into the car. Cars and pedestrians can never be "equal" on the road as cars will always be bigger and more dangerous than a pedestrian.

It gets dark at 4 in winter - why should a pedestrian have to stop, move aside and wait, to stay safe, each time a car passes?

Page 9 - You mention "regeneration" and minimising use of global resources. I get the impression you are using "regeneration" as a euphemism for mass demolition.

This is not a sustainable use of precious natural resources, and it's a contradiction to try to ally "sustainability" as a concept, with proposals to demolish large numbers of well-planned out, classically laid-out housing estates, built of solid-lasting materials. Replacing these with houses built of flimsy, cheap materials which will probably not last more than 50 years is a waste.

It's not socially-sustainable either, to replace estates where people have space to walk, play, park and privacy, with places overlooking and overhearing each other because too close.

Mass-demolition has caused public outcry in places like Liverpool and Durham area, and condemnation. It disregarded and disrespected the areas' architectural heritage. The same would be true in Norwich. Mass-demolition or "regeneration" as you have put it should be a last resort.

I think this type of approach stems from a classist attitude - it wouldn't be suggested for middle class areas.

Is it also to do with the government's preference for PFI?

On page 10, I find the description so idealistic that it smacks of "spin", rather than sincerity. On pages 11-12"complementing

each town's form and function" is described. I think it's good to try to protect the special character of market towns, but the design of Norwich city's traditional (from 1930s) housing estates have a special character too, which I think has just as much right to appreciation rather than dismissal by middle-class planners. Their form and function should be respected.

Page 12 - "To involve as many people as possible in new planning policy". I didn't find out about this "consultation" till 2 weeks before it ended (from a reader's letter in EDP), and so didn't get a consultation document till 1 week before deadline (at the Forum exhibition). I don't think much effort was made to publicise this.

Objective 3 page 13 - "make healthy travel choices in daily lives". If "high density" housing deliberately excludes pavements, walking will become unpleasant, dangerous, leading to obesity because walkers aren't properly allocated space.

Objective 4 page 13 - "Appropriate densities". See photos - there are a number of photos I took on new housing estates (building over the last 10 years approx. in Norwich) where vast areas of grassland with lots of space have no pavement at the edge despite lots of space. Any argument to defend what appears to be an "abolishing" of pavements almost, on these new estates, I believe would be deeply flawed.

Objective 8 page 14 - "everyone should be proud of where they live". I've lived in a city housing (council) estate in East Norwich for 18 years. It's a fantastic place for kids to grow up. Yes, there is some social deprivation in the area, but all the kids enjoy their childhoods because there is plenty of pavement (and grass verge), space for them to play out and walk to school in all weathers with no danger from cars. There are trees lining the streets to oxygenate the air, and people have gardens, where kids and pets can play, and where you can enjoy the outdoors, the quiet spaces and growing plants and food. It's down to these estates being well-thought out that this positive quality of life is possible. The above would not be possible on a high density housing estate, where all space outside the front door seems to belong to the car, and privacy is often a problem due to being closely overlooked.

C - 10712 - 8354 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

10906 Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

In principle, ALP consider the spatial vision and objectives appropriate and achievable within the plan period. However, deliverability of the major infrastructure and unlocking of ownership constraints required to facilitate the major development proposals is essential to the success of the overall strategy. ALP do not feel it has been demonstrated these matters have been

	<p>resolved sufficiently to consider the strategy is sound and comment further on this matter in the following questions/text.</p> <p>C - 10906 - 8367 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
11019	<p>Norwich Chamber Council (Mr Don Pearson) [8371] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>The strategy is for the benefit of the whole of Norfolk, not just Norwich.</p> <p>We believe firmly this essential for growth in the region, not just about job creation, but putting in the infrastructure which will enable that growth to occur.</p> <p>C - 11019 - 8371 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
11025	<p>Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>The identification of Poringland as Key Service Centre is supported. However the plan does not reflect the potential for Poringland to accommodate growth in the Plan period and beyond.</p> <p>C - 11025 - 7175 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
11036	<p>Norwich Design Quality Panel (The Manager) [8375] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>No clear vision for the kind and type of places we want to have in the future since the JCS is essentially concerned with infrastructure capacities and decision making on an ad hoc basis. Instead generic phrases which are culled from Government policy have been repeated without and specificity for a vision for our sub region.</p> <p>The quality agenda should be made specific to the sub region and the JCT and not generalised.</p> <p>A vision for high quality environment should be central to this strategy and there should be a clear mechanism to ensure that as far as possible it is embedded and implemented in all schemes at the macro and micro level (i.e. from location of sites, masterplanning through to detail design of buildings) at all design stages (from concept through to implementation). Without robust advocacy and requirement for good design we will end up with more misplaced, poorly designed and damaging</p>

schemes.

However quality of design is not an explicit aspiration of the JCS, is subsidiary to other issues as follows ...

- Executive summary/Vision 1.8. Quality is part of healthier and safer places.
- In 5.3 this is further developed as part of a safer environment and then completely lost when expended in Spatial Planning Objectives, Objective 2.
- It is not mentioned anywhere else as an aspiration or vision other than as a bullet point of Policy 13 - Reducing Environmental Impact.
- No mention is made of quality under Policy 14, Housing Delivery.
- It is mentioned under Policy 15, The economy, saying there is "... A general emphasis of the JCT on achieving high quality design ..." however this is not born out by the document.
- Implementation and monitoring is covered by Policy 19. The only 'hook' for design is Design & Access Statements which is clearly insufficient and there needs to be a more robust and comprehensive process dealing with mechanisms that ensure good quality decisions making from choosing locations, through Master plans to detailed design.

C - 11036 - 8375 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

11097 Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - **COMMENT**
Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

In principle, PJH consider the spatial vision and objectives appropriate and achievable within the plan period. However, deliverability of the major infrastructure and unlocking of ownership constraints required to facilitate development proposals is essential to the success of the overall strategy. PJH do not feel it has been demonstrated these matters have been resolved sufficiently to consider the strategy is sound.

C - 11097 - 8300 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

7994 Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - **SUPPORT**
Web - 16/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

I appreciate there is a need for new housing but that has to be linked to improved public services such as transport and infrastructure otherwise it will just overburden what is already there.

S - 7994 - 7851 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

<p>8053</p>	<p>Mrs Charlotte Wootten [7861] - SUPPORT Web - 17/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I agree with the aims of the Spatial vision although I am not sure that those aims are achievable.</p> <p>S - 8053 - 7861 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>8078</p>	<p>Mr S Buller [7879] - SUPPORT Web - 25/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? NEED TO KEEP THE DIVERSIFICATION OF THE AREA</p> <p>S - 8078 - 7879 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>8082</p>	<p>Mr S Buller [7879] - SUPPORT Web - 25/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>S - 8082 - 7879 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>8083</p>	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT Web - 26/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? If we absolutely have to have new development, I agree with the objectives.</p> <p>S - 8083 - 7880 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>8148</p>	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? A Utopian view, delivered and presented in the modern style, that quite frankly, tells me you are trying to please everyone again. This means no real priorities, therefore, spreading effort and resources too thinly will mean nothing will be properly achieved.</p> <p>S - 8148 - 7899 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>

8173	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? But, I am opposed to further development of Hethel engineering centre or Lotus cars. This is an isolated site and does not concur with objective 11. In any case, enough public money has already been spent on this site</p> <p>S - 8173 - 4796 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8222	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 8222 - 4558 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8260	<p>Miss Claire Yaxley [7908] - SUPPORT Web - 07/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I am in full support of the plans to expand Norwich. Norwich is a growing city and in order to compete with other cities and remain a desirable destination for businesses, families, shoppers and tourists for their own purposes, it has to expand. With congestion a big problem today, I fully agree with all plans to reduce the need to travel. To implement all of these plans with climate change and 'green' ideas in mind is the best step forward.</p> <p>S - 8260 - 7908 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8262	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Agree</p> <p>S - 8262 - 7912 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8288	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The Wymondham/A11 corridor needs to be more clearly defined with respect to %4 and Objective 5.</p>

	<p>Which side of the A11 is envisaged for Employment Development?</p> <p>S - 8288 - 7915 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8387	<p>Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>S - 8387 - 7012 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8411	<p>Ed King [7965] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>S - 8411 - 7965 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8512	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8512 - 7817 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8536	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8536 - 8021 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8560	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 8560 - 1976 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
8605	<p>Tacolnaston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Parish council was generally supportive to whole document. Concern for employment prospects and infrastructure provision, particularly schools</p> <p>S - 8605 - 2059 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8615	<p>Thorpe St Andrew Town Council (Mr Steven Ford) [8027] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The majority of the principles are fully supported.</p> <p>S - 8615 - 8027 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8616	<p>Kay Eke [8025] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? In general, I support the principles of the vision.</p> <p>S - 8616 - 8025 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8617	<p>Thorpe St Andrew Town Council (Mr Steven Ford) [8027] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Providing local employment, good public transport and housing are vital.</p> <p>S - 8617 - 8027 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8649	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>S - 8649 - 8036 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>

8673	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? S - 8673 - 8044 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8723	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? We agree with this section S - 8723 - 8053 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8768	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes S - 8768 - 8061 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8803	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? But given the current economic climate we question how relevant and realistic some aspects may be S - 8803 - 6869 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8962	<p>Ms Rosemary Mann [7706] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes S - 8962 - 7706 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8969	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 8969 - 8092 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9024	<p>Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes - Broadly supportive of settlement hierarchy</p> <p>S - 9024 - 7535 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9094	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 9094 - 7111 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9096	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 9096 - 8111 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9140	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I agree in principle but have reservation as in the plan. It is more on the sustainable transport i.e. walking, rail, cycling and buses. But as a disabled person are no use to me or others in my position</p> <p>S - 9140 - 8112 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9144	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 9144 - 2055 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9213	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 9213 - 1828 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9265	<p>Mrs Gray [5927] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Having said yes, objective 1 - you have not given enough time for comment. I was at the Hingham part of the consultation which has only given me a week to respond. Busy people cant digest all this in one week! I have therefore left a lot of these questions blank</p> <p>S - 9265 - 5927 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9461	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>S - 9461 - 8134 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9479	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 9479 - 8139 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9536	<p>Noble Foods Ltd [8149] (represented by Steve Abbott Associates (Mr Richard Percy) [8144]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? On behalf of Noble foods Ltd</p> <p>Yes. The spatial vision and objectives are generally agreed, provided they are adopted in a flexible manner</p> <p>S - 9536 - 8149 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9585	<p>Mr Ashley Catton [8157] - SUPPORT Web - 06/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? support</p> <p>S - 9585 - 8157 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9594	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 9594 - 8162 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9717	<p>Ingleton Wood LLP (Nicole La Ronde) [8172] (represented by Ingleton Wood LLP (Nicole La Ronde) [8172]) - SUPPORT Web - 12/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Support</p> <p>S - 9717 - 8172 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9755	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - SUPPORT Web - 15/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Alternative methods of travel are, in my opinion, vital. In an area which is generally flat, we have precious few dedicated cycle paths.</p> <p>S - 9755 - 8184 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>

<p>9820</p>	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 9820 - 8198 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>9860</p>	<p>Diocese of Norwich [2708] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr William Lusty) [7762]) - SUPPORT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The Diocese of Norwich fully support the spatial vision for the Joint Core Strategy Area. The Diocese of Norwich particularly welcome identification of Wymondham as a Main Town and the identification of Hingham and Poringland / Framingham Earl as Key Service Centres.</p> <p>Wymondham is a sustainable location for further development, owing to the excellent range of services and facilities that are provided in the town. Wymondham is also well located in terms of its accessibility by public transport. To this end, it is entirely appropriate that Wymondham is identified as one of four Main Towns.</p> <p>We also support the identification of Hingham and Poringland / Framingham Earl as Key Service Centres. Both Hingham and Poringland / Framingham Earl benefit from a range of services and facilities appropriate for that of a Key Service Centre. To this end, it is entirely appropriate that Poringland / Framingham Earl and Hingham are identified as Key Service Centres.</p> <p>S - 9860 - 2708 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>9865</p>	<p>Hill Residential [8215] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr William Lusty) [7762]) - SUPPORT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Hill Residential support the Spatial Vision for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. In terms of locations for major new development, the Spatial Vision confirms that these locations include Norwich itself, the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle and also at a number of other sustainable outlying settlements.</p> <p>Norwich is identified as a Key Centre for Development and Change within the East of England Plan. This means that Norwich will be a principal focus for growth arising from the requirements of the East of England Plan. As such, Policy NR1: Norwich Key Centre for Development and Change requires the provision of 33,000 net additional dwellings in the Norwich Policy Area</p>

	<p>in the period 2001 to 2021. PPS3 requires that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. In accordance with this approach, use of sites lying within Norwich itself should be made. However, there will not be sufficient land within the city to accommodate all of the required growth. There will therefore be a need for development of land on the edge of the city and land at other settlements. In distributing this required growth at Norwich, in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 3 and the approach to the location of housing development required, we therefore consider that the Spatial Vision is appropriate.</p> <p>We also support reference within the Spatial Vision to guide development to areas with good services to Norwich, to a range of strategic employment locations and services and where good public transport links exist or can be provided when greenfield development is unavoidable. We consider that this approach generally reflects guidance contained within PPS3 and specifically guidance contained within PPS3 in relation to the location of housing development.</p> <p>S - 9865 - 8215 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9870	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT Paper - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 9870 - 2058 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9923	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 9923 - 7015 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9947	<p>Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd [8222] (represented by DPP LLP (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [8221]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 9947 - 8222 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9987	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 9987 - 8228 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10010	<p>notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 10010 - 6911 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10021	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 10021 - 8230 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10044	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 10044 - 2373 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10060	<p>RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Alan Presslee) [8160]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Supportive of the approach to invest in strategic and other employment locations.</p> <p>Supportive of the approach to provide sustainable new development on smaller sites in the NPA, in combination with major development at strategic growth locations.</p>

	S - 10060 - 8232 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
10070	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>We broadly agree with the spatial vision set out in section 5. We particularly support the identification of the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth 'triangle' as a location for major growth.</p> <p>With regard to climate change and sustainability, although we consider that the aim for zero carbon development to be the standard to be achieved on new development is laudable, this should be considered in the context of the Government's timetable, which seeks private developers to achieve zero carbon development by 2016. In addition, zero carbon development will also have to be considered in the context of development viability and feasibility.</p> <p>We broadly agree with the objectives set out in the draft Joint Core Strategy and we believe that a sustainable urban extension to North East Norwich will be successful in meeting a number of these objectives.</p> <p>S - 10070 - 8234 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10097	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>I agree with the principles of the spatial vision and objectives</p> <p>S - 10097 - 8239 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10122	<p>Mr David Nichols [8242] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 31/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>.</p> <p>S - 10122 - 8242 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10157	<p>Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [7674]) - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>The Spatial Vision is welcomed and the identification of Easton/Costessey as a growth location is supported. The acknowledgement of the role of smaller sites in sustainable locations within the NPA is appreciated and it is in this context that the above site will come forward.</p> <p>S - 10157 - 8244 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10172	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10172 - 8246 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10258	<p>The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>We support the spatial vision and objectives especially regarding Norwich being acknowledged as the cultural capital of East Anglia to provide access to cultural facilities for residents and visitors including theatres, museums, art galleries etc.</p> <p>S - 10258 - 8263 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10358	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>In principle, yes. There is little to disagree with. However, the vision is aspirational thinking towards an ideal concept that has no measure of confidence that it is achievable. Moreover there is no apparent regard to cost which, at a time of long-term economic uncertainty, adds further to the doubt that such ambitious plans are practicable.</p> <p>S - 10358 - 2020 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10393	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 28/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 10393 - 8294 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
10425	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 10425 - 8308 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10476	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 10476 - 8310 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10504	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 10504 - 7215 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10632	<p>Ms Jane Chittenden [8329] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? In the vision for the future, I would like to see more emphasis on alternatives to car travel - eg local rail, trams, exploiting under-used existing infrastructure where possible; controlled and coordinated by a single integrated transport authority</p> <p>S - 10632 - 8329 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10652	<p>Jim Smith (Mr Jim Smith) [8342] - SUPPORT Web - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The following is stated in the spatial vision:</p>

	<p>"Norwich will maintain and promote its rich heritage of historic and contemporary buildings as well as parks, wildlife sites, woodland and heathland."</p> <p>The Forestry Commission would like to tie into this strategy ENV5 of the Regional Spatial Strategy:</p> <p>S - 10652 - 8342 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10658	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10658 - 8348 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10727	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10727 - 1776 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10752	<p>Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048] (represented by J and J Design (Mr J R Shephard) [8358]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>The Trust welcomes the Spatial vision which recognises the spiritual needs of our communities in the JCS area. This will need to be reflected in the detailed policies including Policy 18 in order to deliver community infrastructure including new Places of Worship.</p> <p>The Trust supports the objectives, especially Objectives 2, 6 and 10.</p> <p>S - 10752 - 7048 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10758	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p>

Yes: Spatial vision has clear understanding of the importance of a health promoting environment to encourage healthy lifestyle behaviours. Building a physical environment to allow people to play an active part in community life promotes social cohesion and extends healthy life.

The right infrastructure should allow varied forms of transport with particular focus on being able to walk and cycle safely and have ready access to services.

Use of green space, allotments and community gardens.

S - 10758 - 7666 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

10815 North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - **SUPPORT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

The Landowners promoting these representations broadly agree with the spatial vision and objectives as set out in section 5 and consider that the planning and development of a sustainable urban extensions to north east Norwich and Wymondham in particular will make a significant contribution towards achieving the provision of at least some 33,000 dwellings in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) in the period 2001-2021 and at least a further 9,000 dwellings in the 5year period ending 2026.

Spatial vision

Climate change and sustainability

- The Landowners support the vision of development and growth that will create sustainable places. In promoting their landholdings for an urban extension to Wymondham the Landowners will base their concepts on sustainable urbanism and walkable neighbourhoods. This includes ensuring that new communities have easy and convenient access to employment opportunities, services and facilities, which will act to promote more sustainable modes of transport.
- The aim for zero carbon development to be the standard to be achieved on new development needs to be considered in the context of the Government's timetable, which seeks private developers to achieve zero carbon development by 2016. Zero carbon development will also have to be considered in the context of development viability and feasibility.
- Key to a good form of development is the creation of a network of green links to connect open space and wildlife habitats within urban areas and to the countryside. The area being promoted as a sustainable urban extension by the Landowners is fortunate in having a number of attractive landscape features and good links to areas of landscape and recreational interest. The creation of a high quality landscape as a setting for the new urban extension is paramount, their approach to this will be informed and supported by ecological and landscape assessments, which will identify important assets that warrant protection and enhancement. The creation of a 'green network' will not only meet important ecological and landscape objectives but will

also; promote health and well-being; optimise the value of new development; and act enable a modal shift away from the private car by encouraging more sustainable modes of transport, such as walking and cycling.

Communities, deprivation and regeneration (people, deprivation, skills, health, culture, participation and civic life).

- The Landowners support the objectives set out under this heading and believe the way in which growth is planned should help to build new communities and integrate them with existing ones. The concept of sustainable urbanism includes a mix of uses, services and facilities that are appropriately situated in order to provide people with the opportunity to interact with one another.

Living, working and getting around (transportation, access, housing, jobs)

- Support is given to the objective to encourage business investment into the area to create a sustainable, diverse and thriving economy. The area being promoted by the Landowners for a sustainable urban extension has a locational advantage in that it is in close proximity to existing employment opportunities at Gateway 11 Business Park, Ayton Road Industrial Estate Wymondham and Lotus Cars at Hethel together with other areas being promoted in Wymondham area through the LDF process which, comprise a significant amount of employment floorspace, with the capacity for expansion. In addition, Wymondham Town Centre itself offers additional employment opportunities diversify and improve the range of employment opportunities available in the area.

- The concepts of sustainable urbanism and which are promoted by the Landowners include creating places where services and facilities are easily accessible by sustainable modes of transport and that are robust and adaptable to accommodate changing occupational requirements over time. Growth in Wymondham generally and to its north east promoted by the Landowners will be masterplanned to create walkable neighbourhoods that have access to a range of services and facilities and offer a range of sustainable transport choices.

- Access to high quality open space, sport and recreational facilities and community centres are important in promoting social cohesion as well as creating a sense of place. It is the Landowners intension that the new urban extension to north east Wymondham integrates a variety of functional and useable open spaces to cater for existing and new communities as well as making the most of the landscape assets that exist in and around the area.

Locations for major new development

- The Landowners particularly support the identification of Wymondham and the north east of Norwich as locations for major growth with specific regard to the land being promoted by the Landowners in Wymondham as shown in Appendix 1.

- The Landowners consider that these two locations are the most sustainable, accessible and coherent location for major growth in the NPA and offer the best opportunity:

1. To link growth with existing, planned and potential opportunities for strategic transport improvements, including opportunities to incorporate rail, bus and park and ride services;

2. Link together existing services, facilities and employment areas with existing and new residential communities;
 3. To enhance the natural landscape and integrate this with new development to provide a valuable recreational resource to new and existing communities;
 4. For the organic progression of the urban pattern of Wymondham and Norwich as it has strong links with the City;
 5. To develop a significant number of homes in a sustainable manner;
 6. To accommodate social infrastructure that will have benefits for existing as well as new communities; and
 7. To make the most of the attraction of the area.
- The Landowners support the aim to create distinctive high quality sustainable communities and a network of local centres serving existing and new communities. This promotes the concepts of sustainable urbanism and walkable neighbourhoods.
 - The Landowners have begun to identify the key and detailed issues associated with planning for sustainable growth in north east Wymondham and Wymondham as a whole.

The urban area of Norwich

- The Landowners support the vision for the urban area of Norwich and their proposals for development in Wymondham complements the vision by encouraging current and future residents of Wymondham to contribute to vision in working with in and to the benefit of the City.

Main Towns

Wymondham

The Landowners generally support the vision but believe Wymondham offers greater opportunities with capability of accommodating a level of growth of about 6,500 new dwelling in the period to 2026.

- Wymondham can be a stronger social, economic centre and it is considered that a sustainable urban extension in north east designed around the concept of sustainable urbanism will contribute towards this aspiration.
- Wymondham can provide sustainable transport options, including a network of safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle links and public transport services to provide easy access to Wymondham and Norwich City centre, business parks and further afield, reducing the need for a car.

An urban extension to north east Wymondham is the most sustainable location for growth as it provides good links with the Wymondham and Norwich City existing business/industrial parks, local centres and will provide the capacity and opportunity for economic growth, which will complement rather than compete with them. Growth in this location also offers the best opportunity to link growth with improvements to the strategic and local rail, bus and road network. North east Wymondham also provides the opportunity to improve access to a wider range of recreational opportunities due to its general proximity and access areas of tourism and leisure. The Sustainability Appraisal highlights the potential for growth in Wymondham.

The planning objectives

Objective 1 - To involve as many people as possible in new planning policy

The Landowners will initiate a series of public exhibitions and workshops as part of its process in the creation of a masterplan as the culmination of a collaborative approach with relevant stakeholders and the range of professional disciplines. The first stage of this process will be undertaken once Wymondham has been formally approved as an area suitable for growth on the scale promoted in these representations. Landowners have started to scope the issues associated with planning for growth in this area. The findings of this scoping exercise will supplement these representations. The next stage will, through a series of workshops, not only consult representatives of existing communities and other stakeholders on development proposals but proactively engage them in the creation of the vision for the urban extension as well as planning for the development itself. This ensures that existing communities and other stakeholders can communicate their concerns and specific requirements as well as being able to articulate how they envisage that the new development will deliver key objectives for growth and integrate communities.

Objective 2 - To be a place where people feel safe in their communities

The sustainable urban extension that the Landowners are promoting in north east Wymondham will be based on the principle of walkable neighbourhoods. This will ensure that existing and new communities are linked together by a network of permeable walking and cycling routes to encourage social interaction. These connections will create a sense of place and community, which will act to promote a feeling of safety. Through careful design, buildings within the new urban extension should address the street, establishing opportunities for passive surveillance. In addition the public realm will be designed in a way that encourages people to walk by creating a sense of security.

Objective 3 - To encourage the development of healthy and active lifestyles

It is the intention that the new urban extension integrates a variety of functional and usable open spaces to cater for existing and new communities as well as making the most of the landscape assets that exist in and around the area. These will be defined to meet a range of objectives including contribution to landscape quality, environmental objectives, access to sport and recreation, promoting well-being, social cohesion, and education and creating opportunities for local food and fuel production.

In masterplanning terms it is important that the green 'infrastructure' of the growth area is recognised for its ability to 'add value' as a desirable setting for development and engenders a 'sense of place'. It is critical that proposals for the green infrastructure are fully tested both from a capital and revenue perspective. This is to make sure that a long term management regime can be put in place to ensure the continued maintenance and quality of the green infrastructure provided in the growth

area.

The new urban extension being promoted by the Landowners offers the best opportunity to ensure that growth can encourage modal-shifts away from car based travel. This will be done through incorporating the principle of walkable and cyclable neighbourhood to ensure that new and existing communities are linked together and with appropriate services to cater for their needs, including access to appropriate medical and social facilities. Growth in this location also offers good links to the Town centre, indeed Norwich, strategic employment areas, existing district and local centres offering a range of employment opportunities. This also offers the best opportunity to link growth with transport improvements to the rail, bus and road network.

Objective 4 - To allocate enough land for housing and affordable housing, in the most sustainable settlements

The Landowners consider that the land which they are promoting in north east Wymondham for a sustainable urban extension is the one of most sustainable accessible and coherent location for major growth in the NPA for the reasons set out above. This location offers the best opportunity to accommodate a significant amount of much needed housing growth in a location which offers good access to existing employment, transport, recreation, and services in both the town of Wymondham and city of Norwich. It also offers the opportunity to link housing growth with future infrastructure improvements.

The Landowners consider it is important that to include a mix of tenure types within new development in order to promote sustainable communities and economic growth by providing housing for a variety of income groups. This in turn supports a number of occupational choices required to operate services and facilities needed to sustain communities. In order to create a sustainable urban extension to Wymondham, new growth will include housing that is affordable to meet housing need. The level and type of affordable housing required in the area will be determined by the GNDP's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The urban extension will also contribute towards meeting the Government's objective to improving the affordability of housing available in the Norwich area to different households by increasing housing supply.

Neighbourhoods within the new urban extension should contain an appropriate density to support the viability local services and facilities needed by the local community. In determining densities, it will also be important to understand accessibility to the transport network. The Landowners would encourage all involved in the growth area to consider this approach to ensure that infrastructure and development respond to the particular context of the location and optimises its development opportunity.

Objective 5 - To promote economic growth and diversity and provide a wide range of jobs within Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk

Wymondham and the north east sector of Norwich benefit from the presence of established high quality Business Parks in close proximity to the proposed growth locations. In planning for growth, a key consideration will be to establish sustainable travel patterns between residential areas and business/ industrial parks in addition to the both the town and city centres and beyond. Additional employment opportunities are also available at existing district centres and local centres in the areas.

Each of these established employment areas and district and local centres have the capacity for improvement and expansion. The area proposed for the urban extension in north east Wymondham also has the potential capacity to accommodate at least two additional local/neighbourhood centres, which would complement and improve the range of employment opportunities available. In addition it proposed to develop a further mixed use development in close proximity to the Waitrose/Gateway 11 and Business Park and retail area. This could include space for business start ups which would complement the GNDP's objective of achieving growth in the local and knowledge economy. In addition a new Cinema and Hotel and Conference Centre will be developed in this location.

Improvements to the transport infrastructure, growth in this location is also well placed to benefit from wider employment opportunities in, Norwich and the county hinterland.

Objective 6 - To make sure people have ready access to services

The proposal for an urban extension to north east of Wymondham by the Landowners is based on the concept of 'walkable and cyclable neighbourhoods'. This includes ensuring that community and commercial uses are integrated within the urban structure so that the daily needs of residents, in terms of services and facilities, are easily accessible by foot and other sustainable means of transport. The masterplan will also take into account existing local services within established neighbourhoods on the fringe of Wymondham and consider how the location and composition of proposed neighbourhood centres can provide supplementary and accessible amenities to established communities.

Objective 7 - To allow people to develop to their full potential by providing educational facilities to support the needs of a growing population

The land being promoted for an urban extension by the Landowners has the capacity to accommodate a significant level of growth in a sustainable way. The masterplanning process will ensure that all relevant stakeholders are engaged in the planning and development process to ensure that the new urban extension integrates the necessary services, facilities and infrastructure to support the new communities that the development will accommodate.

In masterplanning of the various elements of the growth area, it will be important that the distribution and potentially, the positive relationship between elements such as employment, education, childcare and transport intersections, are considered

carefully to support viable and sustainable neighbourhood structures.

Objective 8 - To protect, manage and enhance the natural, built and historic environment, including key landscapes, natural resources and areas of natural habitat or nature conservation value.

The Landowners consider that the conservation, management and enhancement of the natural and built environment, which is of intrinsic value to the local area and beyond is an important consideration in planning for growth. Ecological, landscape and heritage assessments will have to be carried out during the masterplanning process to ensure that important features are maintained and, where possible, enhanced. It is the intention that such features are integrated into the new urban extension in order to create a sense of place and a quality environment in which to live, work and visit. This allows new and existing communities to benefit from its amenity value and access it as a recreational resource. This will result in more sustainable growth whereby communities have appreciation and respect for the natural landscape as it contributes towards the creating a sense of place. The natural landscape is also crucial to creating high a quality environment, which in turn attracts people to the area.

A high quality environment is fundamental in creating value for all those that are part of the scheme, including residents, employers, the local authority, service providers and promoters. The concept of sustainable urbanism includes creating communities with a local character and 'sense of place' that people can feel a connection to. The area being promoted as a sustainable urban extension by the Landowners is fortunate in having a number of attractive landscape features and good links to areas of landscape and recreational interest. The Broads and the Coast are within easy striking distance.

In masterplanning a sustainable urban extension to north east Wymondham, the Landowners will prioritise the creation of a high quality landscape as a setting for the development, which will enhance the landscape character of the north east fringe of the town generally. Areas of landscape/ecological interest will be retained and enhanced as part of the development masterplan, while new landscape features may be created.

It will be important in developing a landscape character for the new growth areas to recognise a fundamental shift in the character of the area, from urban fringe towards becoming an integral set of neighbourhoods within the fabric of the town. While the preservation and enhancement of natural features will be important to the establishment of a high quality environment, such features must respond to a changing role in landscape, environmental, recreation and leisure conditions within the geography of the town.

The Landowners recognises the desirability of creating a range of opportunities for households to interact with the landscape, from passive recreation such as enjoying private gardens, communal gardens and public parks through accessible woodland and

farmland to more active recreation such as working on an allotment and sporting pursuits. The Landowners also acknowledges the need to create a viable, long-term management regime for elements of the 'green infrastructure'.

It is recognised that a high quality environment is not just about natural features. It is also the intention that the built environment captures and creates a sense of place and a valuable setting for development. This will be done by ensuring that architecture and infrastructure responds to local context, with buildings that incorporate sustainability measures and streets that are permeable and are at a human scale to create a pleasant walking environment.

Objective 9 - To minimise the contributors to climate change and address its impact.

Promoting a modal shift towards more sustainable transport choices by locating and designing the urban extension to link to and include a range of employment opportunities, services and facilities will make a significant contribution towards reducing CO2 emissions, thus minimising contributors to climate change. In addition, appropriate methods and best practice related to sustainable design and construction will be explored and, where possible, incorporated into the design of the development including measures to reduce water and energy consumption and waste generation. In addition, the opportunity for local food and fuel production will be explored through planning and managing the green infrastructure.

Objective 10 - To enhance infrastructure provision to meet the needs of existing and future populations

The locational advantage of the land being promoted by the Landowners is the numerous opportunities that exist to improve and enhance the transport network.

The Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS) proposes a number of improvements to public transport services, such as bus rapid transport services. The A11 corridor provides the fastest link into Norwich. These services will with expansion of the Town provide quick and convenient links between and the City Centre and the north east of Wymondham. This area also benefits from having convenient access to the existing bus and park and ride services at the Thickthorn junction.

In addition, growth in this location offers the best opportunity to make better use of the existing Wymondham to Norwich and Wymondham to Cambridge rail network together with its linkages to London, Cambridge and beyond, giving people greater access to jobs and thus improving the viability of commercial activity in this location.

Objective 11 - To reduce the need to travel

As highlighted above, the new urban extension to north east Wymondham promoted by the Landowners will encourage the use

of more sustainable modes of transport, prioritising walking, cycling and public transport in that order. This includes providing a choice of permeable routes through the area and co-locating services and facilities appropriately to reduce the number and length of car journeys needed to be undertaken per household. In addition, it is the intention that the urban form of the urban extension is robust and adaptable to changing occupational requirements over time, to accommodate technological advancements and/or movement towards the live/work lifestyle, which can act to reduce the need for people to commute.

Objective 12 - To positively protect and enhance Norwich's individual character and unique cultural infrastructure.

A number of elements contribute to Norwich's individual and unique character, including its cultural heritage and surrounding natural landscape. It is the intention of the Landowners that the urban extension to north east Wymondham will create distinct communities. These will reflect, integrate and complement the heritage and natural landscape of Norwich, which is crucial to creating a quality environment, which in turn attracts people to the area. Norwich will continue provide many attractions for existing and new residents in Wymondham and thus contribute to the continued wellbeing of Norwich.

S - 10815 - 8362 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

10867 Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - **SUPPORT**
Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Taylor Wimpey Developments and Hopkins Homes agree with the comment at paragraph 13.68 of the East of England Plan to the effect that the Norwich area has the potential to develop further as a major focus for long term economic development and growth. In the light of this policy perspective, it is important to ensure that the Joint Core Strategy provides a robust and flexible spatial strategy, capable of realising the potential of the Norwich area in the period to 2021 and beyond. The JCS should secure the base from which the necessary step-change in housing delivery is achieved in the short/medium term whilst identifying a sound spatial policy framework for the longer term.

The GNDP will be aware that our clients control land to the west of the present Lodge Farm development site on the southern side of Dereham Road at Costessey. They can make a meaningful contribution to the delivery of the new housing required in the Norwich area by virtue of Policies H1 and NR1 of the East of England Plan.

S - 10867 - 8363 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

10878 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - **SUPPORT**
Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

The Broadland Land Trust (BLT) broadly agree with the spatial vision and objectives as set out in section 5 and consider that the planning and development of a sustainable urban extension to north east Norwich will make a significant contribution towards achieving them.

The spatial vision

Climate change and sustainability

* The BLT supports the vision of development and growth that will create sustainable places. The BLT are promoting their landholdings for an urban extension to Norwich that will be based on the concepts of sustainable urbanism and walkable neighbourhoods. This includes ensuring that new communities have easy and convenient access to employment opportunities, services and facilities, which will act to promote more sustainable modes of transport. This objective is supported by the presence of the established Broadland Business Park, which hosts a significant number of jobs.

* Although the BLT consider that the aim for zero carbon development to be the standard to be achieved on new development is laudable, this should be considered in the context of the Government's timetable, which seeks private developers to achieve zero carbon development from 2016.

* The BLT support the creation of a network of green links to connect open space and wildlife habitats within urban areas and to the countryside. The area being promoted as a sustainable urban extension by the BLT is fortunate in having a number of attractive landscape features and good links to areas of landscape and recreational interest, such as the coast and broads. The creation of a high quality landscape as a setting for the new urban extension is a priority to the BLT and their approach to this will be informed and supported by ecological and landscape assessments, which will identify important assets that warrant protection and enhancement. The creation of a 'green network' will not only meet important ecological and landscape objectives but will also; promote health and well-being; optimise the value of new development; and act enable a modal shift away from the private car by encouraging more sustainable modes of transport, such as walking and cycling.

Communities, deprivation and regeneration (people, deprivation, skills, health, culture, participation and civic life).

* The BLT support the objectives set out under this heading and believe the way in which growth is planned should help to build new communities and integrate them with existing ones. The concept of sustainable urbanism that the BLT endorse, includes the delivery of a mix of uses, services and facilities that are appropriately situated in order to provide people with the opportunity to interact with one another. Living, working and getting around (transportation, access, housing, jobs)

* The BLT supports the objective of encouraging business investment into the area to create a sustainable, diverse and thriving economy. The area being promoted by the BLT for a sustainable urban extension has a locational advantage in that it is in close proximity to existing employment opportunities at Broadland and St Andrew's Business Parks and Rackheath Industrial Park, which, together comprise a significant amount of employment floorspace, with the capacity for expansion. The proposed urban extension will reinforce the locational offer at the business parks providing potential relocators with a range of high quality housing choices, and a strong lifestyle proposition.

* In addition, north east Norwich also has existing district centres at Blue Boar Lane and Pound Lane, which offer additional employment opportunities but are in need of improvement. Growth in north east Norwich would generate the capacity for an

additional district centre (which may be in the form of a high street), a number of neighbourhood centres and will create opportunities to diversify and improve the range of employment opportunities available in the area. This could include space for business start-ups, which would complement the GNDP's objective of achieving growth in the local and knowledge economy.

* The concepts of sustainable urbanism, which are promoted by the BLT, include creating places where services and facilities are easily accessible by sustainable modes of transport and that are robust and adaptable to accommodate changing occupational requirements over time. Growth in north east Norwich promoted by the BLT will be masterplanned to create walkable neighbourhoods that have access to a range of services and facilities and offer a range of sustainable transport choices.

* Access to high quality open space, sport and recreational facilities and community centres are important in creating a desirable location, promoting social cohesion as well as developing a sense of place. It is the BLT's intention that the new urban extension to north east Norwich integrates a variety of functional and useable open spaces to cater for existing and new communities as well as making the most of the landscape assets that exist in and around the area.

Locations for major new development

* The BLT particularly support the identification of the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth 'triangle' as a location for major growth with specific regard to the land being promoted by the BLT as shown in appendix 1.

* The BLT consider that this is the most sustainable, accessible and coherent location for major growth in the Norwich Policy Area as it offers the best opportunity:

1. To link growth with existing, planned and potential opportunities for strategic transport improvements, including opportunities to incorporate rail, bus and park and ride services, create a link road and connect to the NDR;
2. Link together existing services, facilities and employment areas with existing and new residential communities;
3. To enhance the natural landscape and integrate this with new development to provide a valuable recreational resource to new and existing communities;
4. For the organic progression of the urban pattern of Norwich as it has strong links with the city, rather than creating isolated communities.
5. To develop a significant number of homes in a sustainable manner;
6. To accommodate social infrastructure that will have benefits for existing as well as new communities; and
7. To make the most of the attraction of the Broads and the coast;
8. To put in place a long term strategy for sustainable growth.

* The BLT support the aim to create distinctive high quality sustainable communities and a network of local centres serving existing and new communities. This promotes the concepts of sustainable urbanism and walkable neighbourhoods.

* The BLT has initiated an Enquiry by Design (EbD) process, championed by the

Princes Foundation for the Built Environment (PFBE), which has begun to identify the key and detailed issues associated with planning for sustainable growth in north east Norwich. The outcome of the full EbD process will be a masterplan for the urban extension.

The urban area of Norwich

* The BLT support the aspiration for Norwich to be a stronger social, economic and cultural centre and consider that a sustainable urban extension in north east Norwich designed around the concept of sustainable urbanism will contribute towards this aspiration.

* The BLT support the aspiration to provide sustainable transport options, including a network of safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle links and public transport services to provide easy access to the city centre, business parks and further a field, reducing the need for a car.

* An urban extension to north east Norwich is the most sustainable location for growth as it provides good links with the city, existing business/industrial parks, district centres and will provide the capacity and opportunity for economic growth, which will complement rather than compete with the City. Growth in this location also offers the best opportunity to link growth with improvements to the strategic and local rail, bus and road network. North east Norwich also provides the opportunity to improve access to a wider range of recreational opportunities due to its proximity to the coast and the Broads.

The planning objectives

Objective 1 - To involve as many people as possible in new planning policy

The BLT has initiated an EbD process, championed by the PFBE. The purpose of the EbD process is the creation of a masterplan as the culmination of a collaborative approach with relevant stakeholders and the range of professional disciplines. The first stage of this process has been undertaken whereby members of the GNDP and its constituent local authorities together with other stakeholders have started to scope the issues associated with planning for growth in this area. The findings of this scoping exercise will supplement these representations. The next stage will, through a series of workshops, not only consult representatives of existing communities and other stakeholders on development proposals but also proactively engage them in the creation of the vision for the urban extension as well as planning for the development itself. This ensures that existing communities and other stakeholders can communicate their concerns and specific requirements as well as being able to articulate how they envisage that the new development will deliver key objectives for growth and integrate communities.

Objective 2 - To be a place where people feel safe in their communities

The sustainable urban extension that the BLT is promoting in north east Norwich will be based on the principle of walkable neighbourhoods. This will ensure that existing and new communities are linked together by a network of permeable walking and cycling routes to encourage social interaction. These connections will create a sense of place and community, which will act to promote a feeling of safety. Through careful design, buildings within the new urban extension should address the street, establishing opportunities for passive surveillance. In addition the public realm will be designed in a way that encourages people to walk by creating a sense of security.

Objective 3 - To encourage the development of healthy and active lifestyles

It is the intention that the new urban extension integrates a variety of functional and usable open spaces to cater for existing and new communities as well as making the most of the landscape assets that exist in and around the area. These will be defined to meet a range of objectives including contributing to landscape quality, environmental objectives, access to sport and recreation, promoting well-being, social cohesion, and education and creating opportunities for local food and fuel production. In masterplanning terms, it is important that the green 'infrastructure' of the growth area is recognised for its ability to 'add value' as a desirable setting for development and engenders a 'sense of place'. It is critical that proposals for the green infrastructure are fully tested both from a capital and revenue perspective. This is to make sure that a long-term management regime can be put in place to ensure the continued maintenance and quality of the green infrastructure provided in the growth area. The new urban extension being promoted by the BLT offers the best opportunity to ensure that growth can encourage modal-shifts away from car-based travel. This will be done through incorporating the principle of walkable neighbourhoods to ensure that new and existing communities are linked together and with appropriate services to cater for their needs, including access to appropriate medical and social facilities. Growth in this location also offers good links to the city, strategic employment areas and existing district centres which offer a range of employment opportunities. This also offers the best opportunity to link growth with transport improvements to the rail, bus and road network.

Objective 4 - To allocate enough land for housing and affordable housing, in the most sustainable settlements

The BLT consider that the land which they are promoting for a sustainable urban extension is the most sustainable accessible and coherent location for major growth in the Norwich Policy Area for the reasons set out above. This location offers the best opportunity to accommodate a significant amount of much needed housing growth in a location which offers good access to existing employment, transport, recreation, services and to the city of Norwich. It offers the opportunity to link housing growth with future infrastructure improvements. The urban extension will also contribute towards meeting the Government's objective to improving the affordability of housing available in the Norwich area to different households by increasing housing supply. The BLT consider that it is important to include a mix of tenure types within new development in order to promote sustainable communities and economic growth by providing housing for a variety of income groups. This in turn supports a number of occupational choices required to operate services and facilities needed to sustain communities. In order to create a sustainable urban extension to Norwich, new growth will include housing that is affordable to meet housing need. The level and type of affordable housing required in the area will be determined by the GNDP's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Neighbourhoods within the new urban extension should contain an appropriate density to support the viability of local services and facilities needed by the local community. In determining densities, it will also be important to understand accessibility to the transport network. The PFBE uses the 'urban transect' as an urban design tool to help to take a view on the appropriate characteristics and level of density of sites (refer to appendix 2). The BLT would encourage all of the partners involved in the growth area to consider this approach to ensure that infrastructure and development respond to the particular context of the location and optimises its development opportunity.

Objective 5 - To promote economic growth and diversity and provide a wide range of jobs within Broadland, Norwich and

South Norfolk

The north east sector of Norwich benefits from the presence of the established Broadland Business Park and St Andrew's Business Park. These represent a significant concentration of employment within this part of Norwich, jointly comprising circa 88,000 sq.m of employment floorspace. This is in addition to the Rackheath Industrial Estate, which comprises 66,000 sq.m of employment floorspace and other employment areas located on Salhouse Road and Roundtree Way. In planning for growth, a key consideration will be to establish sustainable travel patterns between residential areas and business/ industrial parks in addition to the City Centre and beyond. Additional employment opportunities are also available at existing district centres in the area, including Blue Boar Lane and Pound Lane.

Each of these established employment areas and district centres have the capacity for improvement and expansion. The area proposed for the urban extension also has the potential capacity to accommodate at least one additional district centre (as well as a number of neighbourhood centres), which would complement and improve the range of employment opportunities available. This could include space for business start-ups, which would accord with the GNNDP's objective of achieving growth in the local and knowledge economy.

With planned and possible improvements to the transport infrastructure, growth in this location is also well placed to benefit from wider employment opportunities in Rackheath, Norwich and the county hinterland. There is a further opportunity for a major mixed-use centre in relation to the Broadland Business Park and the proposed rail halt. Currently, there is a working population of circa 4,000 present on the business park who could become the catchment for a substantial mixed use development

Objective 6 - To make sure people have ready access to services

The proposal for an urban extension to North East Norwich by the BLT is based on the concept of 'walkable neighbourhoods'. This includes ensuring that community and commercial uses are integrated within the urban structure so that the daily needs of residents, in terms of services and facilities are easily accessible by foot and other sustainable means of transport. The masterplan will also take into account existing local services within established neighbourhoods on the fringe of Norwich and consider how the location and composition of proposed neighbourhood centres can provide supplementary and accessible amenities to established communities.

Objective 7 - To allow people to develop to their full potential by providing educational facilities to support the needs of a growing population

The land being promoted for an urban extension by the BLT has the capacity to accommodate a significant level of growth in a sustainable way. The masterplanning process will ensure that all relevant stakeholders are engaged in the planning and development process to ensure that the new urban extension integrates the necessary services, facilities and infrastructure to support the new communities that the development will accommodate.

In masterplanning the various elements of the growth area, it will be important that the distribution and potentially, the potential nexus between elements such as employment, education, childcare and transport intersections, are considered carefully to support viable and sustainable neighbourhood structures.

Objective 8 - To protect, manage and enhance the natural, built and historic environment, including key landscapes, natural resources and areas of natural habitat or nature conservation value.

The BLT consider that the conservation, management and enhancement of the natural and built environment, which is of intrinsic value to the local area and beyond is an important consideration in planning for growth. Ecological, landscape and heritage assessments will have to be carried out during the masterplanning process to ensure that important features are maintained and, where possible, enhanced. It is the intention that such features are integrated into the new urban extension in order to create a sense of place and a quality environment in which to live, work and visit. This allows new and existing communities to benefit from its amenity value and access it as a recreational resource. This will result in more sustainable growth whereby communities have appreciation and respect for the natural landscape. The natural landscape is also crucial to creating high a quality environment, which in turn attracts people and builds value in the area.

A high quality environment is fundamental in creating value for all those that are part of the scheme, including residents, employers, the local authority, service providers and promoters. The concept of sustainable urbanism includes creating communities with a local character and 'sense of place' that people can feel a connection to. The area being promoted as a sustainable urban extension by the BLT is fortunate in having a number of attractive landscape features and good links to areas of landscape and recreational interest, such as the coast and the Broads.

In masterplanning a sustainable urban extension to North East Norwich, the BLT will prioritise the creation of a high quality landscape as a setting for the development, which will enhance the landscape character of the north east fringe of the city generally. Areas of landscape/ecological interest will be retained and enhanced as part of the development, while new landscape features may be created.

It will be important in developing a landscape character for the new growth areas to recognise a fundamental shift in the character of the area, from urban fringe towards becoming an integral set of neighbourhoods within the fabric of the city. While the preservation and enhancement of natural features will be key to establishing a high quality environment, such features must respond to a changing role in landscape, environmental, recreation and leisure conditions within the geography of the city.

The BLT recognises the desirability of creating a range of opportunities for households to interact with the landscape, from passive recreation such as enjoying private gardens, communal gardens and public parks through accessible woodland and farmland to more active recreation such as working on an allotment and sporting pursuits. The BLT also acknowledges the need to create a viable, longterm management regime for elements of the 'green infrastructure'.

It is recognised that a high quality environment is not just about natural features. It is also the intention that the built environment captures and creates a sense of place and a valuable setting for development. This will be done by ensuring that architecture and infrastructure responds to local context, with buildings that incorporate sustainability measures and streets that are permeable and are at a human scale to create a pleasant walking environment.

Objective 9 - To minimise the contributors to climate change and address its impact.

Promoting a modal shift towards more sustainable transport choices by locating and designing the urban extension to link to and include a range of employment opportunities, services and facilities will make a significant contribution towards

reducing CO2 emissions, thus minimising contributors to climate change. In addition, appropriate methods and best practice related to sustainable design and construction will be explored and, where possible, incorporated into the design of the development including measures to reduce water and energy consumption and waste generation. In addition, the opportunity for local food and fuel production will be explored through planning and managing the green infrastructure.

Objective 10 - To enhance infrastructure provision to meet the needs of existing and future populations

The locational advantage of the land being promoted by the BLT is reinforced by the numerous opportunities that exist to improve and enhance the transport network.

The Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS) proposes a number of improvements to public transport services, such as bus rapid transport services, one of which is intended to serve this area. These services will provide quick and convenient links between Norwich City Centre and the north east sector. This area also benefits from having convenient access to the existing bus and park and ride services that are located at Wroxham Road.

In addition, growth in this location offers the best opportunity to make better use of the existing but underused Bittern Railway Line. Land is currently set aside for a rail halt within Broadland Business Park. The relocation of this, or the creation of an additional rail halt will link residential areas with employment, giving people greater access to jobs and thus improving the viability of commercial activity in this location.

The BLT propose that the potential for tram/train transit opportunities are fully explored.

Within the proposed sustainable urban extension, a route for an inner link road has been safeguarded in part within Broadland District Council's existing Local Plan.

The provision of the link road in its entirety (as shown on the plan in appendix 1) in this location presents a significant opportunity to unlock the potential for a substantial amount of growth in advance of the Northern Distributor Road. It will act to encourage orbital movements between the Broadland Business Park to the south, Wroxham Road to the north and around the city fringe, thus relieving pressure on existing arterial routes. It would also create easier access to the park and ride facility on the Wroxham Road, potentially encouraging more people to use this facility and in turn, reducing commuter traffic into the city.

The proposed Northern Distributor Road (NDR) would also be accessible from the proposed urban extension. The development of this road would act to relieve pressure on arterial routes into and across the City as well as relieving the pressure on quieter roads, thus providing the opportunity to improve the environment on these roads. In addition, the NDR would create better access to the airport and would provide more direct links to the regional and national road network.

Objective 11 - To reduce the need to travel

As highlighted above, the new urban extension to north east Norwich promoted by the BLT will encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport, prioritising walking, cycling and public transport in that order. This includes providing a choice of permeable routes through the area and co-locating services and facilities appropriately to reduce the number and length of car journeys needed to be undertaken per household. In addition, it is the intention that the urban form of the urban extension is robust and adaptable to changing occupational requirements over time, to accommodate technological

	<p>advancements and/or movement towards the live/work lifestyle, which can act to reduce the need for people to commute. Objective 12 - To positively protect and enhance Norwich's individual character and unique cultural infrastructure. A number of elements contribute to Norwich's individual and unique character, including its cultural heritage and surrounding natural landscape. It is the intention of the BLT that the urban extension to north east Norwich will create distinct communities. However, these will reflect, integrate and complement the heritage and natural landscape of Norwich, which is crucial to creating a quality environment, which in turn attracts people to the area.</p> <p>S - 10878 - 8366 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10924	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 10924 - 8368 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10948	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 10948 - 8369 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10972	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>S - 10972 - 8176 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10995	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes. Some concern at choice of Service Villages and their level of growth.</p> <p>S - 10995 - 8370 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>

11070	<p>Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p> <p>Supportive of the approach to invest in strategic and other employment locations and to provide sustainable new development on smaller sites in the Norwich Policy Area</p> <p>S - 11070 - 7535 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
11109	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Partly yes.</p> <p>We support Objective 9 which states that "zero carbon developments will be investigated", and look forward to the opportunity to comment on those investigations, but the second bullet point of the spatial vision prejudices their outcome.</p> <p>The Government announced in Building a Greener Future: Policy Statement (July 2007) that new homes will be zero carbon from 2016. However it recently asked for opinions on what "zero carbon" actually means and identified a 2012 review of that policy at paragraph 9.1 of Definition of Zero Carbon Homes and Non-Domestic Buildings: Consultation (December 2008).</p> <p>Reducing carbon emissions requires the development, refinement and mainstreaming of technologies that are currently at a relatively early stage of development or have yet to be invented. If standards are adopted by GNDP in advance of widescale adoption they could be prohibitively expensive or even technically impossible to achieve.</p> <p>We recommend that in the second bullet point of the spatial vision after "zero carbon development will be the standard" the words "to be achieved" should be replaced by "if this can be achieved in a cost efficient manner".</p> <p>S - 11109 - 8390 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
11125	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Yes</p>

	S - 11125 - 2373 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
7944	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 10/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>My objection concerns the low priority given to the infrastructure. The infrastructure (roads,bypasses,rail, public transport, bus lanes et al) should be in place first then development. In this country the infrastructure comes much later and is done on the cheap if at all. We can look at the fiasco of the Norwich Northern bypass and the traffic jams into Norwich for one example. Others being the Hospital and the overloaded Watton Road, the pitiful single lanes on the A11. What infrastructure is in place for these? It is cheaper to do it right first time rather than remedial work later.</p> <p>O - 7944 - 7809 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
7957	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 12/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Growth should be mainly near to Norwich and in the existing towns to build what is in essence a new town at Long Stratton will encourage even more car commuting into Norwich</p> <p>O - 7957 - 6862 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
7991	<p>Michael Gotts [7844] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 14/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>The whole concept is based on the wrong assumptions. There is not the need nor the wish for development on this scale in Norfolk. It is unnecessary and will ruin the County. Where will the people come from and what will they do?</p> <p>O - 7991 - 7844 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8043	<p>Shane Hull [7857] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 17/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Hethersett is an attractive village which already suffers from over housing. The local amenities, roads etc already cannot cope with the local population!</p>

	<p>The local schools are full, it takes several days to gain an appointment at the doctors surgery and there are limited shops to support a proposed town.</p> <p>O - 8043 - 7857 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8062	<p>Mr Terence George Stanford [7873] - OBJECT Web - 23/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Is this all rather too ambitious, are we all going to live like Sardines in a can, if development was to REPLACE old structures then that's ok, EVERYTHING is just too much to take in.</p> <p>O - 8062 - 7873 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8136	<p>Mr Alan Fairweather [7889] - OBJECT Web - 31/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I have no serious objection in general to the proposed objectives within the "wish list" but that would appear to be all it is. If the objectives are deemed to be desirable it should be infrastructure led and focused. Managing the infrastructure development as the project develops is not a practical option as it is already not fit for purpose. Planned and visionary infrastructure development to both improve the current situation, and to allow expansion on fit for purpose basis should at this stage be the primary focus.</p> <p>O - 8136 - 7889 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8198	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - OBJECT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? No, You are trying to be all things to all people. We have had lots of growth and it is by definition unsustainable. We now need a steady state economy. What is tranquil about the Broads in the summer? How do you promote sustainable access to the countryside? They are not compatible. Its all words, words, with little real meaning. Clap trap.</p> <p>O - 8198 - 7901 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8256	<p>R Barker [6805] - OBJECT Web - 05/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p>

	<p>You include Long Stratton as a centre for major development changing it from a village into a TOWN yet your original Joint Core Strategy stated....</p> <p>'Long Stratton provides a range of local services and some local job opportunities. It is poorly related to strategic employment sites. Even with a bypass, road access and public transport accessibility to Norwich or to the south is poor. This might constrain employment growth in the village. It does not appear to be a suitable location for further investigation for strategic growth at this time'.</p> <p>Nothing has changed - so it must still be unsuitable!!</p> <p>O - 8256 - 6805 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>8312</p>	<p>Marion Amos [7919] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 14/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Your objectives, while sounding fine on a first reading, are completely contradicted by your desire to build the Northern Distributor road and to expand Norwich to a huge degree. There will not be the resources available to achieve the road and put in a decent public transport system, something that has affected this city to its detriment for far too long.</p> <p>O - 8312 - 7919 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>8327</p>	<p>Mr Brian Cleland [7938] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 16/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Re Para 5.4, second point under 'Climate Change and Sustainability'. I believe that this should read'Zero carbon development will be the minimum standard.....'</p> <p>Objective 11('To reduce the need to travel'): there is not enough emphasis on ITC in this objective. Distributed business functionality and homeworking won't function well without a first class ITC infrastructure.</p> <p>O - 8327 - 7938 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>8337</p>	<p>Mr Geoffrey Loades [6873] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 17/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>The strategy does not take sufficient account of the need to have a thriving rural communities and economies.The growth</p>

	<p>challenges are an ideal opportunity to develop all of our villages and market towns, Too much emphasis is placed upon "sustainability" and new towns. By ignoring the many villages which are "unsustainable" because of lack of a facility(ies) will lead to the continuing decline of many. The objective lacks imagination</p> <p>O - 8337 - 6873 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8338	<p>e buitenhuis [7951] - OBJECT Web - 19/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I don't agree with a Norwich Northern Distributor Road. Investment in public transport should be funded by public funds, while road building should be funded by private companies that would profit from the road. The spatial vision should be redesigned to stimulate combine work and living within walking and cycling distance of each other.</p> <p>O - 8338 - 7951 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8350	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - OBJECT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The whole strategy appears to be too much 'pie in the sky'. Certainly it does not all appear achievable in the given timescale. It will be even harder to achieve given the current economic situation. The struggle is going to be to maintain the existing services at a sufficiently high level. The development of new services whilst desirable does not currently appear practical in money terms.</p> <p>O - 8350 - 6992 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8377	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I object to the proposal within the spatial vision to limit housing growth in Aylsham, which appears to be based solely on a perception that there is an insuperable sewerage problem at the Aylsham sewage treatment works.</p> <p>O - 8377 - 7966 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>

<p>8397</p>	<p>COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978] - OBJECT Web - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Consultation</p> <p>The JCS was discussed at the Committee Meeting for Colney Parish on 27th August 2008. There are many good ideas in the document especially those relating to the environment and village communities. However, concerns were expressed that the massive scale development envisaged was based on a Regional Spatial Strategy that was out of date and unsustainable. We therefore cannot support any of the large scale developments proposed and believe that building on this scale would have an adverse impact upon quality of life in the County.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Hazel Martin Clerk 4 Church Farm Colney NR4 7TX Tel:457189</p> <p>O - 8397 - 7978 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>8441</p>	<p>Dr Tim Rayner [8006] - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Too much of the vision seems designed around the construction of the northern distributor road (NDR), which will conflict with important objectives relating to e.g. reducing need to travel, greenhouse gas reduction.</p> <p>O - 8441 - 8006 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>8444</p>	<p>Ian Harris [8007] - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The Spatial Vision pays lip service to the compulsory goals of climate change and sustainability. But what's being proposed tramples all over those critical objectives. A massive newbuild programme, and a new road network, will not support these</p>

	<p>goals. If you build big roads, guess what will happen? Go on. If you truly dream (as I do) of local, sustainable communities, then please go back to the drawing board.</p> <p>O - 8444 - 8007 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8462	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Agree generally but the development in Wymondham appears to be too much in view of recent development in both housing and commercial business sites.</p> <p>O - 8462 - 8016 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8486	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The usual council / LA speak sounds wonderful. There are lots of "wills" in the spatial vision - I very much doubt they will change into has or is. Eaton / Cringleford / Costessey are already at saturation point. The objectives are very sound, but NO 11 is "pie in the sky". It is impossible today to build such a development and reduce travel</p> <p>O - 8486 - 8020 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8584	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? This is an excuse to build high density housing with insufficient parking facilities, which will result in producing the slums of the future. Only brownfield sites should be used to align with existing infrastructure</p> <p>O - 8584 - 8024 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8630	<p>Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I believe the scale of growth is disproportionate to the existing size of the city, with insufficient emphasis on afford, sustainable housing, supported by strong public transport links, an emphasis on cycling and walking built into the plan, and jobs being provided near people's homes. In particular the proposed Northern distributor road seems contrary to these aims.</p>

	O - 8630 - 8030 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
8638	<p>The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? On behalf of Norfolk Environmental Waste Services: The 'vision' omits reference to resource/waste management while covering similar/related issues under the heading of climate change and sustainability. This is clearly mainly an issue for the Waste LDF but is considered conspicuous by its absence in the joint core strategy? We also support the provision in Objective 9 that "domestic and commercial waste will be minimised by encouraging waste reduction, reuse, recycling, composting and safe energy recovery".</p> <p>O - 8638 - 7569 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8694	<p>mrs jane fischl [8031] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? No I disagree there is far too much growth. Too many houses for people without jobs and too many expensive houses for likely economic growth in the area. Available money should be spent on public transport, cycle lanes and sustainable city centre development rather than on schemes aimed at car based living.</p> <p>O - 8694 - 8031 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8704	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Too much development proposed on prime agricultural land - the more food we import the higher the CO2 we use. There are 850,000 empty houses throughout the UK, what proportion does the Greater Norwich area have? On a local level, ie Spooner Row, putting a permanent gypsy site close to a small community will not reduce the fear of crime. It will not enhance the character of the village. It will not improve the community's access to the countryside nor help the biodiversity on an area with a Natural England's Conservation Walk and Stewardship Scheme with historic ruin.</p> <p>O - 8704 - 8045 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>

8707	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Consultation poor by SNDC with key local interests on a major new town proposal Small villages inadequately considered in terms of possible modest development More needed on green links.</p> <p>O - 8707 - 8049 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8734	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Service villages should not be allocated for 10 to 20 new dwellings unless these can be accommodated within defined development boundaries and without detriment to the character of the village</p> <p>O - 8734 - 8053 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8831	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Should be greater development of the urban area of Norwich and possibly towns such as Wymondham not villages like Hethersett</p> <p>O - 8831 - 8064 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8869	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Disagree with the spatial vision only in that to say that service villages should only have 10-20 houses is missing the opportunity to site houses in places like Tasburgh which is on the A140 (an important growth corridor) and close to Long Stratton (a growth point), and for this and other reasons is a sustainable location which should take up to 200 new homes.</p> <p>O - 8869 - 7620 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8891	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The spatial vision is unrealistic. The huge level of development projected is not compatible with reducing CO2 emissions, how will it allow the protection of tranquillity and rurality even though these are stated aspirations. However, it is dressed up this is urbanisation on a grand scale</p> <p>O - 8891 - 2014 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8929	<p>Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Wymondham cannot support any extra new homes</p> <p>O - 8929 - 8079 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8938	<p>Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? This level of growth is unrealistic and unsustainable - especially now, given the economic crisis. The future lies in improving local and national public transport. We can not keep on going for "growth" - and new business developments. We need to concentrate on and maintain what we have got. There are jobs to be found in doing that too. We do not need an NDR. It will just increase the number and speed of cars and the pollution that goes with them.</p> <p>O - 8938 - 8087 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8945	<p>Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Growth too great. Demand for houses has fallen. Only affordable housing now needed. I do not want NDR for Norwich, I want improvements to public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>O - 8945 - 8088 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
8957	<p>MR Richard Edwards [7925] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? 1. I don't agree with Northern Distributor road</p>

	<p>2. Scale of growth is too high. It will mean to many executive houses</p> <p>3. Large scale growth and road building will not reduce climate change</p> <p>O - 8957 - 7925 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9027	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Regarding climate change, development should move towards being carbon neutral but build standards must not become so grand as to render new development uneconomic. Transportation: with the advent of electric and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles, the use of the private car must not be planned out of new development</p> <p>O - 9027 - 4187 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9184	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>The last bullet on travel is very old-fashioned. The priority has to be non-car forms of transport, supported by development to facilitate non-car access.</p> <p>O - 9184 - 8114 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9222	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Too much growth, need for affordable housing for local people who need it now, not enough emphasis on local facilities and investment in public transport</p> <p>O - 9222 - 4494 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9259	<p>Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>Admirable sentiments but not very practical. The transport problem will not be solved by the proposed NDR and people will continue to come into Norwich to work, nose to tail as is the case today.</p>

	O - 9259 - 8115 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
9282	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Norfolk should remain broadly as it is with NO huge growth in housing. Where are these new residents coming from?</p> <p>O - 9282 - 5445 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9284	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? No to increased development on existing greenfield sites which are very important wildlife habitats surrounding Catton & Sprowston bluebell woods (ancient) next to Beeston St. Andrews, skylarks etc. Disappointed no cultural expansion proposed, what about a decent concert hall to attract top quality artistes? More funding needed in education higher / teacher pupil ratio. More funding for care services and public transport please. Agree with objective 2 (p13) more funding for police and 12 (p45) - so concert hall please?</p> <p>O - 9284 - 8117 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9321	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Too many houses for the area. Not enough employment opportunities, will not be sustainable.</p> <p>O - 9321 - 8123 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9339	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Unfortunately this has been forced upon the region by people who do not understand the area. The number of jobs and need of housing are hypothetical especially in the heat of what is happening now and for some time to come</p> <p>O - 9339 - 8120 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>

9347	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The over development of the area to east of city in the Postwick and various business parks that have emerged in recent years by 2026 will need a structural makeover.</p> <p>O - 9347 - 7113 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9376	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Too many houses in growth triangle. The amount of new housing will change and spoil Norwich as well as those areas. Rackheath will more than double in size. I was also told there is no longer a requirement to keep green belt land. When Dussindale was built we were told there would be green belt dividing it from Thorpe End</p> <p>O - 9376 - 8124 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9420	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? See Comments at Q28</p> <p>O - 9420 - 8127 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9509	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? There wont be enough investment to create or attract 35,000 jobs to the area. Financial services/ public sector contracting owing to economy/mergers etc. Still haven't dualled A11, A47 or improved rail links</p> <p>O - 9509 - 8140 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9542	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The area selected is too large and lacks allowance for open space. This area is a lung of fresh air to Norwich.</p>

	<p>I object to the NDR route. This has only been planned to increase the housing developments, no indications have been given for access to the present road system.</p> <p>Every year around 21 square miles of countryside - an area the size of Southampton - are being destroyed to make way for development. This will mean in 17 years, 357 square miles of greenfield site will be lost to development. This rate of loss is not sustainable.</p> <p>Each country in England, Wales & Scotland has to consider the best ways in which it can contribute to the preservation of the countryside & wellbeing of the whole of the UK. The answer is in part political which cannot be dealt with in this consultation and has much to do with immigration, which must be strictly limited.</p> <p>The Consultation is in connection with the GNDP only and a suggestion in some quarters that 100,000 people and in excess of this figure in 17 years, is completely unacceptable for Norwich and in fact for Norfolk as a county.</p> <p>Norfolk's part to play in the wellbeing of the UK is as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is the major food supplier for the nation and this must be protected by the retention of high quality agricultural land of which there is a considerable amount in the area under Question 1. 2. Norfolk is a tourist area and the quality of the countryside is historic sites must be maintained. 3. It is expected within the next 50 years that climate change due to higher sea levels will reduce the areas of land in the county. 4. Water supply will be restricted and therefore a limit on the population increase will have to be imposed. <p>O - 9542 - 8146 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>9559</p>	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>It is considered an over development of the area. Please refer to previous correspondence from Drayton Parish Council</p> <p>O - 9559 - 6690 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>9693</p>	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>As a resident of Long Stratton, I do not consider sufficient thought and planning has gone into allocation of housing there. The only thought is it will provide a bypass. There are no new planned employment areas, so new residents will mainly have to commute to Norwich which goes against policy of reducing car journeys. There is no demographic study. Many of planned houses may be taken up by elderly retiring to Norfolk which puts pressure on health and social services.</p>

	O - 9693 - 5446 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -
9719	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? You describe utopia. Why should all this new development achieve that?</p> <p>O - 9719 - 8174 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
9788	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? No, Cringleford Parish Council does not agree with the Spatial Vision and Planning Objectives.</p> <p>It is always interesting to read contemporary Local Authority documents like the Spatial Vision and Planning Objectives element of the Joint Core Strategy. In summary it says we'll build new homes where it is most convenient to do so and try to do it well, or at least not make the same mistakes as in the past. As expected, it is long on rhetoric while ticking off boxes. We fundamentally disagree with the allocation of a further 1200 homes to the village of Cringleford. we do so for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cringleford has already grown to twice its size under the last LDF and the village character is under threat from this change. We are struggling to ensure that the existing development is properly integrated into the village. 2. South Norfolk has effectively allowed a city centre development to be attached to the side of a village. This will clearly create new circumstances and as a village we need to adapt to these changes. The Local Authority has given minimal consideration of the physical environment and social demographic changes that will impact on Cringleford. We do not consider that South Norfolk or the GNDP is in any better position to judge these impacts than has previously been the case. 3. The current development has grown from an original 450 homes to 750 homes and the Developer is looking to extend this to 1065 homes. We do not trust that the new development will be limited to 1200 dwellings, either by the South Norfolk or the GNDP or any future developer. Expedience and profit will undoubtedly change this number in the future. 4. The current 106 Agreement for our existing does not provide sufficient resources for the development of village facilities. We do not trust South Norfolk or whatever Authority may come into existence, to develop and negotiate a reasonable and fair

	<p>Agreement for any new development.</p> <p>5. The likely site for the new development is close to the Yare River Valley while potentially impeding on the restricted zones along the A47 and spatial limits between Hethersett and Cringleford. We anticipate that there will be significant environmental impacts and restrictions in the area suggested for development. We would not consider any new development without a full environmental appraisal by an independent environmental consultant. We would expect to be involved in the tendering process and selection of the consultant.</p> <p>6. The Spatial Vision fails to provide enough housing through small scale developments in rural areas. Rural parishes are demanding more homes delivered in a structured way with local facilities and more local employment. The proposed number of new homes at smaller sites is inadequate to meet this need.</p> <p>O - 9788 - 7513 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>9894</p>	<p>Mr Peter Sutton [8219] - OBJECT Web - 27/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The proposed development in the Old Catton/Sprowston/Thorpe are is far too big. It is nothing more than the same old strategy - build a bye pass, then fill in behind it to the previously built up areas. The transport links to Norwich, such as Salhouse Road, Plumstead Road, Wroxham Road and Blue Boar Lane only just about cope with current traffic levels and will not cope with any increase. Improvement in these roads will result in further destruction of green areas. The quality of life of those living in this area will be adversely affected to a huge degree.</p> <p>O - 9894 - 8219 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>9907</p>	<p>Christopher Webb [8019] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I strongly oppose construction of the proposed Norwich Northern Distributor Road, because it would increase carbon emissions at a time when it is imperative that carbon emissions are drastically reduced.</p> <p>O - 9907 - 8019 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>9911</p>	<p>Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?
Norwich will become too big, causing too many problems with unemployment and too much pressure on essential services.

O - 9911 - 6780 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

9954 **Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - OBJECT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

Agree with the vast majority, but do not understand why there is reference to " the road network will be maintained and improved across the area" and believe that there is not enough recognition throughout of the need to encourage and give advantage to the more sustainable modes of travel if there is to be modal shift. The vision is generally about improving quality of life and sustainability, which has to involve a reduction in distance travelled and modal shift. This is inevitable if regional and national targets on greenhouse gas emissions reductions are to be met and the transport sector is to make an "appropriate contribution to reducing greenhouse gas emissions" (Regional Plan). The VIBAT study (Hickman and Banister) showed that transport can make significant contributions to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions if distance travelled is reduced and people travel more efficiently (modal shift to more sustainable modes, increased vehicle occupancy and improved fuel efficiency). Likewise the impact of peak oil is expected to be very significant over the period of the plan with burning oil for transportation likely to become a luxury that few can afford. This will lead to increasing social deprivation unless there is a major modal shift to more sustainable modes. Improving the road network if that means increasing road capacity will undoubtedly undermine this if the impacts of peak oil have not already reduced motorised traffic substantially. The reference would better be " the transport network will be maintained and improved across the area to deliver more sustainable and healthier travel." Similarly the reference in the same paragraph to people needing to use their cars less is different to the desired aim of people using their cars less. There are plenty of examples of locations that have good access by foot, cycle, public transport and car, where car usage is high, but the aim must be to reduce unnecessary car usage by making the other modes more attractive. This has long been understood on the continent and is clearly the case in Cambridge City Centre for instance, which has thrived, whilst car travel has been made more difficult and walking, cycling and public transport have been given advantages. The reference would be better: ".people will use their cars less as jobs, shops, schools and recreational facilities will be in areas most easily accessed by public transport, cycle and foot."

These points are repeated within Objective 10, which refers to... "The road network will be maintained and access within Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, and to and from Norwich will be improved." Indeed this whole objective appears to be confused since whilst expressing the desire for greater use of sustainable modes it appears to suggest that this can be achieved by simply providing better public transport, footways and cycleways, whereas modal shift will only be achieved by shifting the balance between the modes and by increasing awareness of the preferred modes. Improving road access to and from Norwich is

	<p>likely to be incompatible with much of this, since one of the most important ways to increase modal share of cycling and bus use will be by reallocating road space from the private car to bus and cycle lanes. We suggest: "Greater use of sustainable modes of transport will be encouraged by giving public transport, walking and cycling clear and well understood advantages over the private car. People will also need to use cars less by making services, jobs, shops, schools and recreational facilities closer and easier to reach by walking, cycling and by public transport. The strategic road network is also essential, especially for the health of the economy and will be maintained. More than 90% of the area is rural and rural isolation can be reduced by encouraging newer communication and information technologies."</p> <p>Objective 11 is a repeat of parts of objective 10 but again does not fully recognise the need to increase the walkability and cyclability of neighbourhoods by making these the obvious modes. There is a strong health need to increase walking and cycling (see NICE Guidance and Obesity Strategies). We suggest "Preference will be given to locations where services, employment, shops, schools and recreation are more easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport than by private car to reduce the need to travel especially by private car and to encourage more active lifestyles".</p> <p>O - 9954 - 6903 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10080</p>	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - OBJECT Web - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I have lived in Norfolk for much of my life (as well as in the home counties which I think are now congested and unpleasant). I object very strongly indeed to any large scale "development" in the county. It will increase traffic which is already appallingly heavy and destroy what was a tranquil rural environment which is much appreciated by most who live here. It's no good dressing it up as "growth". It is destruction on a big scale.</p> <p>O - 10080 - 8235 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10165</p>	<p>Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245] (represented by David L Walker Limited (Head office) [8182]) - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? 1.1 An initial point relates to the lack of detail in Chapter 4 of the document in relation to the economic characteristics of the plan area, and in particular the distribution and areas of concentration of business and industrial land uses, some of which may be strategic in nature.</p> <p>1.2 Such points are reflected in the spatial vision in Chapter 5 of the document. In particular, the strategic sites noted in the County's emerging MWDF Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPDs do not appear to have been replicated into any of the</p>

	<p>major development types detailed in the spatial vision.</p> <p>1.3 In respect of Question 1, therefore, we do not agree with the spatial vision as it does not take full account of other local and strategic policy and guidance. Accordingly it is considered that the proposals are not justifiable under the provisions of PPS 12.</p> <p>1.4 Similarly, the spatial objectives, particularly Objective 5, do not seek to protect sites of strategic significance in an industrial context (especially railheads/wharves and ports), whereas in reality the operation of such intermodal facilities are a fundamental part of achieving the development objectives of the emerging core strategy.</p> <p>1.5 A further point is that no account has been made for the continued and/or increased use of the rail network for transporting goods, thus reducing pressure on the strategic road network.</p> <p>O - 10165 - 8245 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10298</p>	<p>mrs LISA ford [8282] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 07/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? Keep Hethersett as a village with it's natural green spaces and its sufficient current amenities. We can not keep 'adding' to existing villages without spoiling them - this is not fair on current residents.</p> <p>O - 10298 - 8282 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10310</p>	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The aspirations of the spatial vision sound laudable but are unachievable. Many of the objectives work in direct opposition to each other and cannot be realised in tandem. For example, the infrastructure requirements involve large amount of new road building - this does not fit with carbon reduction targets (Objective 9) and the aspiration to reduce the need to travel by car (Objective 11). And a high level of greenfield development is required to meet the spatial strategy's approach to housing allocation - this will make it impossible to retain a tranquil and distinctive Norfolk character, as stated in the spatial vision for rural areas (5.4, page 11).</p> <p>Specific comments on the elements of the spatial vision and objectives follow in the subsequent questions. In summary, CPRE Norfolk cannot support the proposals because of the considerable and irretrievable loss of countryside that will result. Rather, there is a need to extend the timescales for target numbers of housing and level of economic growth; improve the prospects for</p>

	<p>affordable housing and the effective use of land; re-cast the spatial strategy to make better links between housing and employment; and to develop a transport strategy that reduces the use of the car, and with it congestion and carbon dioxide emissions.</p> <p>O - 10310 - 6826 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10335	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>I do not see the evidence for the need for such a large number of new houses. Brownfield sites should be used.</p> <p>O - 10335 - 8293 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10448	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>No to all of it - this will change Norfolk for ever.</p> <p>O - 10448 - 8309 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10529	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>There are many fine words in this section but in practice local roads/infrastructure will not cope.Norwich will be swamped with vehicles and have insufficient car parking thereby spoiling the city.Health care which is already lacking will be further stretched.</p> <p>O - 10529 - 8312 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
10553	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?</p> <p>No to any further building of roads and houses.</p> <p>O - 10553 - 8318 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>

<p>10576</p>	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10576 - 8319 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10647</p>	<p>Ms Lucy Hall [8295] - OBJECT Web - 11/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I object to Objective 10 and Objective 11. All carrot and no stick is not going to get people out of their cars, especially if they live ten miles out of Norwich. Unless we have a long term vision for a post-car city we will not begin to meet Objective 9: to minimise the contributors to climate change.</p> <p>O - 10647 - 8295 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10784</p>	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I am aware that the objectives are not ranked, but it is vital that they are considered in the correct order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) In every new growth area an appropriate number of jobs must also be created within walking/cycling distance of the new houses as well as all of the necessary services to ensure that it is not necessary to travel unsustainably b) All new growth areas must have high speed broadband installed as standard to enable homeworking and e-activities/services rather than travel c) New growth areas must have convenient and affordable public transport (bus and rail) and cycling and walking facilities incorporated into them so sustainable travel is possible and encouraged when habits are being formed d) Car-sharing needs to be properly promoted in each area to ensure that any car journeys that are made have a high occupancy (this needs to be monitored) e) It is important that car use is not made too convenient otherwise it will be chosen and then congestion will become an issue. <p>O - 10784 - 8360 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10800</p>	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? I am aware that the objectives are not ranked, but it is vital that they are considered in the correct order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) In every new growth area an appropriate number of jobs must also be created within walking/cycling distance of the new houses as well as all of the necessary services to ensure that it is not necessary to travel unsustainably b) All new growth areas must have high speed broadband installed as standard to enable homeworking and e-activities/services rather than travel c) New growth areas must have convenient and affordable public transport (bus and rail) and cycling and walking facilities incorporated into them so sustainable travel is possible and encouraged when habits are being formed d) Car-sharing needs to be properly promoted in each area to ensure that any car journeys that are made have a high occupancy (this needs to be monitored) e) It is important that car use is not made too convenient otherwise it will be chosen and then congestion will become an issue. <p>O - 10800 - 8361 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>10842</p>	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? The Spatial Vision often states a series of ideals with which no one could possibly disagree. Descriptions such as 'safe, healthy, prosperous, sustainable and inclusive' are fairly hard to argue with. We would rather it talked of finding a balance between a quality and protected environment on the one hand and economic objectives of providing housing and jobs on the other. We note that the Spatial Vision has been expanded from its draft version (from 'issues and options') to, for instance, talk more specifically about different locations and settlement types. We applaud the prominence given to 'Climate change and sustainability' but, as detailed in our full response to 'issues and options', question how the strategy lives up to these aspirations. We welcome the reduction from 40,000 new homes in the Technical Consultation of August 2008 to 35,750 now (in the Norwich Policy Area from 33,000 to 32,000) but would urge that further reductions are made (see Question 4 below). In terms of reducing deprivation, greater equality has a huge role to play yet, as is characteristic with such 'visions' in a post-collective age, this unquestionably desirable social objective does not merit a mention. Although some maintenance and improvement of the road network is obviously necessary, we would rather the vision made a definite commitment to prioritise public transport over road-building.</p> <p>O - 10842 - 8018 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -</p>
<p>11040</p>	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - OBJECT Paper - 09/06/09</p>

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?
With regard to climate change/sustainability/provision of facilities etc. the general aim is supported but to achieve developments they have to be viable and a balanced approach is required here to avoid stifling development.

O - 11040 - 6955 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

11081 Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

No.

Whilst the spatial planning vision contains several laudable aspirations and positive elements such as revitalising areas of deprivation, zero carbon development and a network of green links, we have concerns about the overall vision:

- Greenhouse gas emissions from transport are not addressed. Norfolk County Council is currently failing to deliver its carbon dioxide emissions reduction target for transport. Proposed major road building projects would further increase emissions.
- The high level of growth, most of which will be built on countryside. The spatial strategy would reinforce the pattern of decentralisation of activities to the Norwich fringe, supported by an outer orbital northern road which would open up land for car-based development. The effect will be to increase reliance on car use and worsen transport-related social deprivation.
- The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) is transport-infrastructure-led. In particular, it is clear that a growth triangle in north-east Norwich has been designated to enhance the case and funding for a NDR. Major housing growth has been allocated to Long Stratton, a village with poor public transport links to Norwich, purely in order to help fund a bypass. Rather than take an integrated approach to land use and transport planning and test different options with the aim of reducing transport carbon emissions, the JCS treats the NDR as a fixed element and locates growth around it. A BRT system with cross city links would provide a much better fit with the spatial pattern that concentrates growth on a SW - City Centre - NE axis than an outer orbital route.
- The high level of growth and provision of enhanced road infrastructure conflicts with several Spatial Planning Objectives viz. healthy and active lifestyles (Obj 3), protection of the natural, built and historic environment (Obj 8), minimisation of climate change (Obj 9) , reduce the need to travel (Obj 11). The conflicts are reflected in the JCS proposals for greenfield development and road building.

• Growth planned for Norwich offers an opportunity to implement a major modal shift to public transport, walking and cycling in line with RSS Policy Norwich NR1 and yet the Spatial Vision does not give adequate recognition of the need to encourage modal shift. Provision of better public transport, footways and cycle paths alone will not encourage modal shift. A strategy is required that actively encourages a modal shift from car to sustainable transport and manages demand for travel.

Recommended Changes

Bullet point 3 of the Spatial Vision - Living, working and getting round to read:

The transport network will be maintained and improved across the area to deliver more sustainable and healthier travel and to support a reduction in transport carbon emissions. Rural isolation will be reduced by improving sustainable transport networks and encouraging new communication and information technologies. People will use their cars less as jobs, shops, schools and recreational facilities will be in areas accessible by public transport, cycle and foot.

Objective 10 to read:

Greater use of sustainable modes of transport will be promoted through the provision of high quality public transport, local rail, walking and cycling networks and by managing the demand for travel. People will use cars less by making services, jobs, shops, schools and recreational facilities closer and easier to reach by walking, cycling and by public transport. The strategic road network will be maintained to support sustainable access . More than 90% of the area is rural and rural isolation can be reduced by encouraging newer communication and information technologies

O - 11081 - 8387 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

11140 JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives?

OBJECT

Overall, The Fairfield Partnership endorse the Core Strategy's spatial vision and objectives.

Wymondham

We endorse the identification of Wymondham as a location for major development.

Wymondham is already one of the most sustainable locations for new growth, being well provided with local facilities and good public transport links. There is scope to improve Wymondham's sustainability credentials through improved public transport, local facilities and local employment, and we endorse the Core Strategy's

recognition of this opportunity.

There is also a degree of synergy between the proposals for development Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford, which have the potential to jointly fund improvements to public transport along the A11 corridor, and reduce reliance on the private car.

However, we believe that Wymondham is a far more sustainable location for development than Long Stratton, a village which is proposed to receive a very high level of new development. We believe it may be appropriate to relocate some of the proposed growth for Long Stratton to Wymondham.

Long Stratton

We are concerned that the proposed level of growth at Long Stratton has been conceived with the single aim of funding a bypass for the town. We believe that the proposed enabling residential development will be contrary to several of the Core Strategy's objectives. Objective 4 aims to locate development in the most sustainable settlements. The Vision states that Long Stratton will be upgraded from a Key Service Centre to the status of a main town. This will involve the construction of 1,800 new dwellings.

Long Stratton does not have the local facilities or public transport connections to sustain such a high level of growth. As a settlement, it compares unfavourably with Wymondham, which has been allocated only a slightly higher level of growth, at 2,200 new dwellings. Further to this, the Regional Plan identifies Wymondham as a location for high-tech employment development and rail-related uses, whilst Long Stratton, as an isolated village, is not mentioned. It should be noted that the August 2008 Reg 25 Core Strategy noted that only 20-50 new homes could be accommodated in Long Stratton if the bypass were not to be delivered. The comparative levels of development therefore seem to be in conflict with the Regional Plan; if this is the case, the Core Strategy could be found unsound at examination.

We are also concerned that there is also less scope for this development to improve facilities in Long Stratton, as there will be little money available after the cost of the bypass and other essential infrastructure have been accounted for. We are concerned that the combination of an increase in the housing stock and a reduction in congestion on the local roads will simply lead to unsustainable commuting patterns to Norwich and an overall increase in vehicle traffic.

Objective 5 also notes the parts of the Norwich Policy Area which will be locations

for major employment development. These do not include Long Stratton, a fact which only increases the possibility of out-commuting adding to unsustainable development.

With the above points in mind, the proposed level of development at Long Stratton will be inconsistent with Objectives 9, 10 and 11. This would be an unsustainable form of development, which would result in a significant increase in traffic, and carbon emissions.

O - 11140 - 6979 - (Q1) Do you agree with the spatial vision & objectives? -

Response – Q2

Spatial Strategy

The Joint Core Strategy depends on important infrastructure being delivered. Please refer to page 17

Q2 Spatial strategy

The Joint Core Strategy depends on important infrastructure being delivered. Please refer to page 17

Q2 Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q2 Total	151	28	61	66	155

Rep No.	Name of respondent [JDI reference number] Response e.g COMMENT, SUPPORT, OBJECT Method of response e.g. Web / paper, and date of submission
7923	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - COMMENT Web - 08/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? the northern distributor is just about opening building land up so developers can make easy money ,note the southern bypass hasn't solve any issues it was supposed to</p> <p>C - 7923 - 7812 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8054	<p>Mrs Charlotte Wootten [7861] - COMMENT Web - 17/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? I believe that the Northern Distributor road will not join up with the Southern Bypass meaning that business and individuals wishing to link to the A11 or Southern Norwich will still be at a very significant disadvantage.</p> <p>C - 8054 - 7861 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8109	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - COMMENT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Housing development needs to address current problems such as a lack of outside living space.adequately sized car garages and a minimum of two off road parking spaces for every household. Existing estate roads are cluttered with on road car parking</p>

	<p>both on the road and partially on the footways.</p> <p>C - 8109 - 7888 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8263	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Also include dualling of A47 & A11. Improved Norwich to London and Norwich to Midlands rail links. Rapid Bus Lanes into Norwich.</p> <p>C - 8263 - 7912 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8628	<p>University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Throughout the text in relation to travel, there are references to public transport and reduced dependency on the private car and yet in the key dependencies, section 6, there is no mention of the Colney Lane Bus Link.</p> <p>C - 8628 - 8029 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8650	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Basically agree but more emphasis should be placed upon rural cycling facilities.</p> <p>C - 8650 - 8036 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8674	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Support place more emphasis on rural cycleways</p> <p>C - 8674 - 8044 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8708	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The expected funding gap between infrastructure requirements and funds needs addressing - will RSS targets be scaled back when this transpires?</p> <p>Need to address timing of infrastructure delivery - often held over awaiting critical mass of new residents, who move in and make alternative arrangements so no new facilities are delivered!</p> <p>C - 8708 - 8049 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8870	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? minimum new development should be allowed until the infrastructure is ready to fit. the effects of the Harts Farm and Whispering Oaks developments have swamped Wymondham</p> <p>C - 8870 - 8071 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8871	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? agree but with the proviso that there should also be junction improvements on the A140 eg where it meets the A47 as the A140 is an important corridor for growth as there as sustainable service villages along it like Tasburgh and of course major growth at Long Stratton.</p> <p>C - 8871 - 7620 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8902	<p>Old Catton Parish Council (Mrs S Barber) [1816] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Old Catton Parish Council is concerned that the proposed NDR will be of limited value to the Village as it will not be accessed locally. It is feared that the link from the NDR to the Airport industrial estate will not be attractive to people employed there who will continue to use routes through Old Catton to get to work. There would be an objection to increased traffic passing though the Village from the proposed new homes to the north of Norwich.</p> <p>C - 8902 - 1816 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>

<p>9075</p>	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? At present in Norwich neither are satisfactory, i.e. storm drains no longer cleared regularly. Bus station must be ready to take an increased number of county buses (space difficult now!) C - 9075 - 8109 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>9087</p>	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The Broads Authority welcomes the recognition of the dependency of the growth agenda on infrastructure above and beyond the "hard" infrastructure of roads and utilities, and the explicit mention of green infrastructure. The Authority trusts that green infrastructure provision is to be considered on a strategic scale and not just in terms of individual developments, and that the wording will be strengthened to cover this. The Authority would wish to see the list strengthened by reference to recreational infrastructure. C - 9087 - 7986 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>9342</p>	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The problem will be getting it in place in the right order to create little or no inconvenience. I doubt the right amount of public transport or small convenience shops (not Tescos or the like) or medical coverage will be available or schools C - 9342 - 8120 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>9462</p>	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - COMMENT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The northern bypass will certainly relieve the traffic congestion on the Norwich northern ring road but the A47 from Great Yarmouth to Kings Lynn and beyond needs to be upgraded to the same status, as dual carriageway or motorway to make it all work. Is it worth doing a small bit in the middle without the remainder. C - 9462 - 8134 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>

<p>9471</p>	<p>Louisa Young [8135] - COMMENT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? There needs to be stronger insistence on green infrastructure, schools, emergency services, healthcare and affordable housing. In its present state, the wording implies they are after thoughts.</p> <p>C - 9471 - 8135 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>9586</p>	<p>Mr Ashley Catton [8157] - COMMENT Web - 06/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? improved public transport (train and bus) are needed</p> <p>C - 9586 - 8157 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>9637</p>	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Our concerns regarding infrastructure provision appear borne out by the statement appearing at paragraph 6.1 of the consultation document. This indicates that the strategy is dependent on significant investment in supporting infrastructure provided by various utilities and that without this the plan's ability to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan will be reduced. This suggests that the GNDP are unable to put forward any realistic delivery vehicle in support of its favoured growth options at this time. Indeed the Note appearing in the introduction to the Consultation states that it does not yet reflect any comments made by technical consultees and as a result no changes have been made to the proposed settlement hierarchy to meet the challenges of the new favoured option shown in Policy 5. This proves that the GNDP cannot provide the necessary evidence base on which to justify its favoured growth option and renders this consultation worthless. There is no justification whatsoever for an allocation of 1,800 dwellings at Long Stratton simply to justify a new bypass. This is an acknowledged existing problem and there is no evidence put forward to show that the number of proposed dwellings will in fact meet the costs of providing this road. In any event it represents a car based access strategy which will only serve to increase traffic volumes and attendant congestion on the A140 on its approach to Norwich City Centre.</p> <p>C - 9637 - 7503 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>9655</p>	<p>Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Spatial strategy - 6.1 last paragraph How can it be ensured that the support necessary will be in place? Bypass provision for Long Stratton must surely be a must from Highways Agency before any increase necessary discussion can be even thought about for Long Stratton - a bypass should be provided by Govt funding anyway - not through depriving of services that could be provided but will be restricted (if indeed there is any funding available for such anyway) after funding for infrastructure has been allowed for!</p> <p>C - 9655 - 8165 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9669	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Obviously in depth assessment has been addressed, but in my view the very small amount of 'B' road upgrading in some areas, and lack of attention to traffic flow analysis, may contribute to future problems.</p> <p>C - 9669 - 8047 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9743	<p>Great Yarmouth Borough Council (Mr David Glason) [6974] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The Council generally welcomes the proposals and in particular the ambitions regarding housing, transport and economic growth, as there are potential benefits regionally and for the County of Norfolk. However, the Council has concerns that these plans may generate an adverse impact in the Great Yarmouth area as they could be seen to be in competition with the Borough's own aspirations for social and economic regeneration. In particular, investors may well be more attracted to the Greater Norwich area as development could be regarded as less challenging and infrastructure better developed. In turn, this may undermine the extensive efforts made by the Council and 1st East Regeneration Company in recent years to regenerate brownfield riverside sites in the heart of the town and to improve infrastructure and connectivity within Great Yarmouth and to the east of Norwich. On balance, whilst giving its general support, the Council needs to be re-assured that the specific challenges facing Great Yarmouth will continue to be recognised and responded to through appropriate and timely interventions and assistance designed to support and facilitate its own development and regeneration.</p> <p>C - 9743 - 6974 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10246	<p>Mrs Angela Garner [8258] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? There appears to be no sensible communication or discussion between planning, health, education, transport and roads. Our hospital is already full to capacity and beds are blocked because excellent community hospitals have been closed and residential beds reduced. Care in the community for mental health and the elderly is a complete disaster. The really efficient walk-in centre with excellent parking on the city outskirts is due for relocation to the MALL - I cannot believe it! I thought the transport strategy was to keep cars out of the city centre? (How much taxpayer's money is this move costing?) Added to this, how many villages, like Cringleford, have no public transport in the evening or on Sundays.</p> <p>C - 10246 - 8258 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10264</p>	<p>Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Spatial Strategy. My Council supports the statement in 6.2 but point one should be amended to read the COMPLETE Northern Norwich Distributor Road. Support should not be given to anything other than the complete NDR. Anything less will not best serve the aims and objectives of this document nor the communities such as Costessey caught in the land between the southern bypass and the end of the Northern Distributor. Improved public transport is to be welcomed but consideration needs to be given to how people get from their homes to this 'rapid transport network'. The whole service needs to be 'joined up' to make it attractive to the general public.</p> <p>C - 10264 - 7068 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10381</p>	<p>GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 01/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Key dependencies:</p> <p>7. Para 6.2 identifies transport infrastructure as critical to the delivery of growth, principally by reference to NATS. We comment further on the relationship between NATS and the Core Strategy under draft Policy 16; however, in addition to road based schemes which the Partnership considers will be required to enable certain locations to come forward for development, early recognition of the role of sustainable transport in delivering growth would be helpful. References to Bus Rapid Transport (BRT) at Policies 2, 3 and 4, suggest that this might also be regarded as either critical or essential infrastructure.</p> <p>C - 10381 - 7463 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>

<p>10601</p>	<p>Mr/Mrs Smith [8322] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Not only is it critical to identify infrastructure required, but it is also critical to take account of the likely timing of provision of such infrastructure. A number of employment developments, such as at the airport, are reliant on the provision of major infrastructure and consequently are unlikely to be able to be available in the short to medium term.</p> <p>C - 10601 - 8322 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10701</p>	<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] - COMMENT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? It is acknowledged that improvements to water supply and sewage disposal is acknowledged as critical infrastructure requirements. The water companies are best to advise where and the phasing of these improvements. This information should be studied through your WCS.</p> <p>C - 10701 - 8352 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10907</p>	<p>Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The proposed critical infrastructure requirements for growth are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern Norwich Distributor Route (NNDR) and the implementation of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy. (Note: This critical infrastructure requirement requires large amounts of public and private funding which in the current economic climate is unlikely to come forward) • Investment in junction improvements on the A47 (Note: There is concern that the A47 Southern Bypass has yet to be assessed in terms of capacity) • Long Stratton Bypass (Note: This critical infrastructure requirement requires large amounts of public and private funding which in the current economic climate is unlikely to come forward)

- Improvements to water supply and sewage disposal
(Note: This critical infrastructure requirement requires Anglian Water upgrades)
- Flood Defence

24 Essential supporting infrastructure such as, green infrastructure, schools, emergency services and health care will also be required.

25 There is a general acceptance that the NNDR will be developed in line with proposed growth over the next 20 years. However, ALP raise concern about how the NNDR will be funded, as it is unlikely that contributions from development in the Sprowston and Rackheath area alone will be sufficient to finance the deficiency in current funding. The JCS cannot rely on potential development areas in other parts of the GNDP to fund the NNDR when they clearly will not have the same effect on capacity as development in the North East Norwich area.

26 Improvements to water supply and sewage disposal are essential when planning development of this scale. There is, however, a requirement that Anglian Water (Water Industry Act 1991) make provision for new residential and employment development. Whilst it is acknowledged that development on this scale will involve large scale updates and in some cases new sewage treatment facilities, further details are needed on how much this will cost and the distribution of potential contributions from the various growth options / locations.

27 There is concern that the A47 Southern Bypass has yet to be assessed in terms of capacity against the anticipated growth and that there may be a need to complete this assessment prior to allocations being determined to understand the impact this may have on the proposed growth options.

C - 10907 - 8367 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -

11098 **Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300]** (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

The proposed critical infrastructure requirements for growth are as follows:

- Northern Norwich Distributor Route (NNDR) and the implementation of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy.

(Note: This critical infrastructure requirement requires large amounts of

public and private funding which in the current economic climate is unlikely to come forward)

- Investment in junction improvements on the A47

(Note: There is concern that the A47 Southern Bypass has yet to be assessed in terms of capacity)

- Long Stratton Bypass

(Note: This critical infrastructure requirement requires large amounts of public and private funding which in the current economic climate is unlikely to come forward)

- Improvements to water supply and sewage disposal

(Note: This critical infrastructure requirement requires Anglian Water upgrades)

- Flood Defence

Essential supporting infrastructure such as, green infrastructure, schools, emergency services and health care will also be required.

19 There is a general acceptance that the NNDR will be developed in line with proposed growth over the next 20 years. However, PJH raise concern about how the NNDR will be funded, as it is unlikely that contributions from development in the Sprowston and Rackheath area alone will be sufficient to finance the deficiency in current funding. The JCS cannot rely on potential development areas in other parts of the GNDP to fund the NNDR when they clearly will not have the same effect on capacity as development in the North East Norwich area.

20 Improvements to water supply and sewage disposal are essential when planning development of this scale. There is, however, a requirement that Anglian Water (Water Industry Act 1991) make provision for new residential and employment development. Whilst it is acknowledged that development on this scale will involve large scale updates and in some cases new sewage treatment facilities, further details are needed on how much this will cost and the distribution of potential contributions from the various growth options / locations.

21 There is concern that the A47 Southern Bypass has yet to be assessed in terms of capacity against the anticipated growth and that there may be a need to complete this assessment prior to allocations being determined to understand the impact this may have on the proposed growth options.

	C - 11098 - 8300 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -
7946	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - SUPPORT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Need to add the A11 single lane dualling traffic/people/business has to have easy access to the major road links for the region to prosper. Also the railway link to London and Europe (via Straford International) must be included in the infrastructure plan.</p> <p>S - 7946 - 7809 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
7986	<p>Mr Keith Bigland [7843] - SUPPORT Web - 14/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? sufficient road infrastructure is essential</p> <p>S - 7986 - 7843 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
7992	<p>Michael Gotts [7844] - SUPPORT Web - 14/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? If the development is to take place the infrastructure improvements must be completed BEFORE new building takes place. The existing infrastructure is already inadequate and links to other parts of the country must be improved.</p> <p>S - 7992 - 7844 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
7995	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? As long as infrastructure is improved then further development should be possible.</p> <p>S - 7995 - 7851 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8065	<p>Miss Janet Saunders [7875] - SUPPORT Web - 23/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p>

	<p>It is essential that the supporting infrastructure be in place as the new developments go ahead or we will simply be exacerbating the problems that already exist.</p> <p>S - 8065 - 7875 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8079	<p>Mr S Buller [7879] - SUPPORT Web - 25/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? BETTER LINKS ARE NEEDED TO MAINTAIN BUSINESSES AND ATTRACT NEW TO THE AREA</p> <p>S - 8079 - 7879 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8084	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT Web - 26/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Adequate drainage systems to account for very heavy rainfall events. Flooding will be a real risk in the future.</p> <p>S - 8084 - 7880 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8149	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? But I have been paying taxes to you people for the last 35 years with all these same priorities identified and have seen little or no progress to this end. Why not?</p> <p>S - 8149 - 7899 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8174	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? But these need to be in place before development is approved and not provided years later</p> <p>S - 8174 - 4796 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8223	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? yes</p> <p>S - 8223 - 4558 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8261	<p>Miss Claire Yaxley [7908] - SUPPORT Web - 07/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? - NDR is long overdue - NDR will take traffic off of smaller roads and make country lanes that people use to avoid traffic safer - Cycling and improved bus routes are an unrealistic alternative</p> <p>S - 8261 - 7908 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8264	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Agree</p> <p>S - 8264 - 7912 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8289	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? A11 dualling still needs priority</p> <p>S - 8289 - 7915 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8379	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 8379 - 7966 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8388	<p>Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 8388 - 7012 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8412	<p>Ed King [7965] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 8412 - 7965 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8422	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Support</p> <p>S - 8422 - 7966 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8463	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 8463 - 8016 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8537	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 8537 - 8021 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8561	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 8561 - 1976 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8619	<p>Kay Eke [8025] - SUPPORT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? I agree that any development must be undertaken with full supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>S - 8619 - 8025 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8724	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? We agree with this section</p> <p>S - 8724 - 8053 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8769	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? If the NNDR is to be build what is the planned course of its route?</p> <p>S - 8769 - 8061 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8804	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 8804 - 6869 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8868	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p>

	<p>these are requirements for the EXISTING population. the infrastructure is over loaded with the current levels of occupation</p> <p>S - 8868 - 8071 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8970	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8970 - 8092 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9095	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9095 - 7111 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9097	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>yes</p> <p>S - 9097 - 8111 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9141	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9141 - 8112 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9145	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 9145 - 2055 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -
9214	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? But make sure all existing suburbs have sewage rather than develop new systems at their expense</p> <p>S - 9214 - 1828 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9421	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 9421 - 8127 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9595	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 9595 - 8162 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9756	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 15/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Fully supported.</p> <p>S - 9756 - 8184 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9789	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes, the correct infrastructure requirements have been identified. Further to this list, local employers must be involved with infrastructure development, both as employers and service providers to town and rural communities.</p>

	S - 9789 - 7513 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -
9821	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9821 - 8198 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9871	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9871 - 2058 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9988	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9988 - 8228 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10011	<p>notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10011 - 6911 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10022	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10022 - 8230 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>

<p>10045</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes S - 10045 - 2373 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10098</p>	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - SUPPORT Web - 30/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Appropriate infrastructure has been identified S - 10098 - 8239 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10123</p>	<p>Mr David Nichols [8242] - SUPPORT Web - 31/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? I support the proposal but do believe that dualling the remaining A11 road link into Norwich is critical. S - 10123 - 8242 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10173</p>	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes S - 10173 - 8246 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10210</p>	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes S - 10210 - 5864 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10336</p>	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? However unless the NDR is built as a DUAL carriageway AND linked up to the existing bypass, it will be a "white elephant".</p> <p>S - 10336 - 8293 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10359	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? In principle, yes. The first sentence is key in that the strategy is dependent on significant investment in supporting infrastructure and the government track record is questionable in this regard. This element contributes further to doubt in the viability of the strategy. It is akin to a house of cards where failure of this single element could result in the collapse of the whole.</p> <p>S - 10359 - 2020 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10394	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 28/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 10394 - 8294 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10426	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 10426 - 8308 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10505	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 10505 - 7215 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>

10633	<p>Ms Jane Chittenden [8329] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Are these the right objectives? Broadly speaking, yes. On objective 10 (infrastructure) I would like to see specific mention of investment in local rail services linking the market towns to Norwich; less dependence on road travel to work or for shopping/leisure.</p> <p>S - 10633 - 8329 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10659	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes, assuming that the transportation network is improved to prevent the roads being more crowded with commuters. Also, the provision of the additional services required to support the growth must be implemented simultaneously to prevent additional pressure on existing services.</p> <p>S - 10659 - 8348 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10728	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 10728 - 1776 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10759	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes: Planning for primary and secondary healthcare will be required to meet the needs of the new population moving into Norfolk. The EDAAW study has produced helpful estimates of projected demography to allow some early thinking as to how best to respond and meet healthcare needs (including dentistry).</p> <p>S - 10759 - 7666 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10925	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 10925 - 8368 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10949	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 10949 - 8369 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10973	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 10973 - 8176 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10996	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Yes</p> <p>S - 10996 - 8370 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
11041	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT Paper - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Subject to ensuring contributions from new developments does not have a material impact on viability and hence deliverability.</p> <p>S - 11041 - 6955 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
11110	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p>

	<p>We endorse the observation that "the Joint Core Strategy depends on important infrastructure being delivered as explained in 6.2". Where infrastructure is described as "critical" we believe therefore that a policy requirement is essential to ensure that related development is not permitted to exceed the level which triggers the requirement if that infrastructure has not already been implemented (or at least already has planning permission, guaranteed funding and certainty of timely implementation)</p> <p>A Long Stratton bypass is described appropriately as essential supporting infrastructure. Norfolk County Council has already demonstrated the need for this and growth in and around Norwich is likely to increase traffic on the important A140 link not only to the Main Towns of Diss and Harleston but also to Ipswich, the Haven Gateway ports and beyond. (See also our response to Question 24).</p> <p>S - 11110 - 8390 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
11126	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 11126 - 2373 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
7958	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 12/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>The NDR is not needed and is only being built to provide yet more land for housing</p> <p>O - 7958 - 6862 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8056	<p>Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 19/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Too much emphasis has been placed on the road network. The rail network needs to be improved as well with more trains and more stations/halts.</p> <p>O - 8056 - 7870 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8063	<p>Mr Terence George Stanford [7873] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/03/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? first thing I pick up is more road building which is ridiculous and all the other improvements is to come from our pockets, NO THANKS</p> <p>O - 8063 - 7873 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8137	<p>Mr Alan Fairweather [7889] - OBJECT Web - 31/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? This approach lacks vision and a lack of understanding of the current situation. The NDR is a pointless project unless it is a fully dualled northern bypass that links directly at both ends to the A47. Fiddling with the utilities and traffic infrastructure as the proposals are agreed and developed will create future negative issues instead of the intended improvement/development</p> <p>O - 8137 - 7889 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8199	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - OBJECT Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? No, all through the spatial vision and objectives you emphasise that the use of cars has to reduce. Yet you insist on the damaging, polluting, unsustainable Northern distributor road. See objective 11. What is meant by the term infrastructure? Road building?</p> <p>O - 8199 - 7901 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8257	<p>R Barker [6805] - OBJECT Web - 05/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? NO YOU HAVE NOT</p> <p>Your original Joint Core Strategy included the statement</p> <p>'Long Stratton provides a range of local services and some local job opportunities. It is poorly related to strategic employment sites. Even with a bypass, road access and public transport accessibility to Norwich or to the south is poor. This might constrain employment growth in the village. It does not appear to be a suitable location for further investigation for strategic growth at this time'.</p>

	<p>You clearly stated THEN that even WITH a BY Pass transport accessibility is poor - Your policy for growth is therefore flawed</p> <p>O - 8257 - 6805 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8313	<p>Marion Amos [7919] - OBJECT Web - 14/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The Distributor Road will ruin this city. It will set its development, and the TYPE of development in stone, and an opportunity will be missed. We have the chance to do something different in Norwich and live up to our county motto, but instead you are offering more of the same. On a vast scale.</p> <p>O - 8313 - 7919 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8328	<p>Mr Brian Cleland [7938] - OBJECT Web - 16/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? No initiatives shown here to reduce water usage and sewage generation.</p> <p>If the NNDR falls, the whole spatial strategy has nowhere to go.</p> <p>Is the proposed change to the pattern of local authorities not a key dependency?</p> <p>O - 8328 - 7938 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8339	<p>e buitenhuis [7951] - OBJECT Web - 19/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? I don't agree with a Norwich Northern Distributor Road. Priority must be given to providing a first class public transport system for Norwich, better rail services and safe walking and cycling networks.</p> <p>O - 8339 - 7951 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8351	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Whilst the development of Transport networks is important maintaining and improving existing services such as sewage/water and healthcare are more immediately important to people and investing in these areas is more likely to be achievable in the current economic climate.</p> <p>O - 8351 - 6992 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>8398</p>	<p>COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Consultation</p> <p>The JCS was discussed at the Committee Meeting for Colney Parish on 27th August 2008. There are many good ideas in the document especially those relating to the environment and village communities. However, concerns were expressed that the massive scale development envisaged was based on a Regional Spatial Strategy that was out of date and unsustainable. We therefore cannot support any of the large scale developments proposed and believe that building on this scale would have an adverse impact upon quality of life in the County.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Hazel Martin Clerk 4 Church Farm Colney NR4 7TX Tel:457189</p> <p>O - 8398 - 7978 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>8442</p>	<p>Dr Tim Rayner [8006] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>I don't support a Norwich Northern Distributor Road, think that alternatives should be prioritised.</p>

	O - 8442 - 8006 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -
8445	<p>Ian Harris [8007] - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Still the same, outmoded, backward-looking assumptions. If people are to live, work and play within walking and cycling distance, why are two out of the three requirements road-related? You're just pushing through your favourite mantra - more roads, more prosperity. Goodbye planet.</p> <p>O - 8445 - 8007 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8454	<p>Mr Peter Sergeant [7993] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The NDR plans do not include a link from the A1067 to the A47 to the West of Norwich. This may result in an increase in traffic on existing roads and creation of new flows as people seek to negotiate the route</p> <p>O - 8454 - 7993 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8487	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Not enough - the A47 needs duelling not piecemeal improvement. If we are to have all this development the main road to the north must be suitable for the 21st century</p> <p>O - 8487 - 8020 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8513	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Although you have identified the need for better public transport, the document does not go into the detail about how to support services with the necessary revenue</p> <p>O - 8513 - 7817 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>

<p>8585</p>	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Use brownfield sites only</p> <p>O - 8585 - 8024 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>8631</p>	<p>Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? No - I believe there is insufficient emphasis on public transport and safe walking/cycling routes - these should be a top priority, both in terms of genuine sustainability and social cohesion</p> <p>O - 8631 - 8030 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>8639</p>	<p>The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569] (represented by The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]) - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? On behalf of Norfolk Environmental Waste Services: We wish to point out the absence of 'waste management' as a critical infrastructure requirement - especially as water supply and sewage disposal are included. This needs to be recognised and amended to include waste management.</p> <p>O - 8639 - 7569 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>8697</p>	<p>mrs jane fischl [8031] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? No I do not support a Northern distributor route - a road to nowhere. The priority should be public transport, rail services and cycle routes. Focus on putting services within the communities which need them rather than car based isolated communities and business facilities with no sensible public transport links.</p> <p>O - 8697 - 8031 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>8705</p>	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? needs more emphasis on hospital facilities. The beds at the N&N hospital are under pressure now before the new developments and increase in population. It is also naive to think that people will use their cars less (Objective 2).</p> <p>O - 8705 - 8045 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8832	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Planned Northern distributor road not complete. No link to A47. Growth should be planned adjacent to existing rail links</p> <p>O - 8832 - 8064 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8893	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The huge infrastructure requirements needed to accommodate the planned high level of growth are themselves incompatible with the aspiration to preserve the rural nature of the countryside surrounding Norwich. Large new road developments e.g. NNDR and Long Stratton by-pass are particularly unwelcome</p> <p>O - 8893 - 2014 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8939	<p>Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? I do not support a Northern Distributor Road. It is not necessary and we can not afford it. Priority must be given to better public transport. Invest in new forms of transport eg light rail. Get ideas from other countries that are much further advanced in decent public transport than we are. The age of the car is over - accept it. Give us decent bus and rail services and cycle lanes - that's where the future lies.</p> <p>O - 8939 - 8087 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8947	<p>Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p>

	<p>I do not want the NDR, I want improvements to public transport and facilities for walking and cycling instead. NDR will cause greater pollution and increase climate change. We should be trying to reverse these trends.</p> <p>I support the proposal to improve water supply and sewage disposal infrastructure.</p> <p>O - 8947 - 8088 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8958	<p>MR Richard Edwards [7925] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>No. I don't support a Northern Distributor road. Priority must be given to providing a first class public transport system for Norwich. Better rail services and safe walking and cycling networks plus bring back trams system</p> <p>O - 8958 - 7925 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
8963	<p>Ms Rosemary Mann [7706] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>O - 8963 - 7706 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9028	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Wider use of the rail network should be encouraged with more stations and possible light rolling-stock for short commuter journeys to / from Norwich.</p> <p>O - 9028 - 4187 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9185	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>The NDR and A47 junction improvements will make the situation worse. What is needed is a proper sustainable transport package way beyond the vague suggestion in "Transport in the Norwich area" the so-called "bus rapid transit" project.</p>

	O - 9185 - 8114 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -
9226	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Need for better public transport links not NDR which only encourages car use and pollution</p> <p>O - 9226 - 4494 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9260	<p>Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? As above, the proposal to have rapid bus transit routes as on Newmarket Rd is not feasible unless the narrow roads are widened. This would be very costly and unpopular with residents whose property would be affected. A NDR would serve a very small community and would encourage further building along its route</p> <p>O - 9260 - 8115 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9283	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Not identified in the correct order. If, these houses are to be built, (hopefully not) the MAIN objective will need to be the building of a new hospital, as the NNUH is already very often on black alert</p> <p>O - 9283 - 5445 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9286	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? No to NDR. No to increased development in areas as above. North of Norwich is much ancient woodland and park land e.g Beeston estate, Hainford woods, wildlife on edge of farmland.</p> <p>O - 9286 - 8117 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9322	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Distributor road will create more traffic. Need more trains & better bus links.</p> <p>O - 9322 - 8123 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9349	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? You need to address the traffic problems: for the Thorpe / Postwick business areas</p> <p>O - 9349 - 7113 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9377	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? As we should be reducing the number of vehicles on the roads it doesn't seem sensible to build the NNDR. When roads like that are built it just encourages more cars, lorries etc onto the roads. Surely it is more sensible to have more cycle paths (not share pedestrian / cycle paths or little narrow cycle paths at the sides of roads with cars parked over them) - perhaps little roads with their own traffic lights. In addition, bus fares are too high - higher than many cities.</p> <p>O - 9377 - 8124 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9480	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? When the Dussindale area was developed the school was a long time coming, have you thought enough about schools?</p> <p>O - 9480 - 8139 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9504	<p>South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? No. There are major infrastructure implications for any development of the Deal Ground and Utilities (DG&U) sites. This is particularly the case because it is unlikely that the infrastructure required for the DG & U sites can be funded by a developer alone.</p>

	O - 9504 - 8142 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -
9511	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? As above, you may identify them but I've lived here 20 years now and in that time all failed to deliver, Long Stratton bypass failed to deliver, A47 scrapped, rail failed to deliver</p> <p>O - 9511 - 8140 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9537	<p>Noble Foods Ltd [8149] (represented by Steve Abbott Associates (Mr Richard Percy) [8144]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? On behalf of Noble foods Ltd</p> <p>No. Not all infrastructure will be relevant to smaller scale developments.</p> <p>O - 9537 - 8149 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9543	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Expansion from an incoming population, as suggested, does not answer the deprivation of Norwich or rural areas; this has to be dealt with via increased investment by public utilities and local government with Government grants, future increased production and education advancement, which means increased taxation; increasing population from outside Norfolk will make things worse.</p> <p>Education must come as a first priority to correct low standards so that the high technical industry which exists around the Science Park at Colney and the UEA can be expanded and provide employment for the young people and others in these areas of deprived population. As for rural deprivation, a higher wage structure is required in agriculture and more housing for the local populace and a restriction on second homes. In certain circumstances second homes are an advantage to the villages but the balance must not cause upset to the local population.</p> <p>Local small industries should be encouraged to support the local village and the young village residents.</p> <p>The gypsy and traveller population will require sites and proper amenities, which will not generally be acceptable and government grants will be required for this, the costs should not fall upon the local authorities.</p>

	<p>Restriction of legal and illegal immigration into the countryside should be applied and local wages should increase to sufficient levels to encourage local people to work on the land, as was the case in the past.</p> <p>With reference to 4.2 Natural Environment Landscape and Biodiversity, I agree with this but the statement seems to be in contradiction with the development plan which seems to destroy these ideals in part.</p> <p>O - 9543 - 8146 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9561	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>In our opinion the NDR will create Highway problems, in particular to the Northwest of Norwich ie Drayton, Costessey and Taverham. At a meeting with Norfolk County Council it was ascertained traffic would increase by 5%. A strain on local resources like water etc</p> <p>O - 9561 - 6690 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9694	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>Insufficient detail of infrastructure required for 1800 houses at Long Stratton. Present sewerage system is antiquated and inadequate. Water pressure in area is often low now. Need to ensure these are addressed before development takes place. Who is going to pay for these if developer has already to pay for bypass and affordable housing and education contribution etc.</p> <p>O - 9694 - 5446 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9720	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>What is the definition of "right"? And "right" for whom? Incomers? Present incumbents?</p> <p>O - 9720 - 8174 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9895	<p>Mr Peter Sutton [8219] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 27/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>The proposed Northern Bye Pass is in the wrong place. It seems to me that it was put there only with the intention of then</p>

	<p>filling in behind it until the development meets up with Norwich City boundary, thus creating one huge 'New' city. Such a development can only be to the detriment of those currently living in the Old Catton/Sprowston/Thorpe area.</p> <p>O - 9895 - 8219 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9908	<p>Christopher Webb [8019] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Unfortunately I do not have the Joint Core Strategy document, so I cannot look at page 17, but I am aware that part of the proposed infrastructure is the Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NNDR), construction of which I strongly oppose. Some of my reasons for opposing the NNDR are: It would attract more traffic, increasing traffic mileage and therefore increasing carbon emissions, when in the context of global warming it is imperative that carbon emissions are drastically reduced, and that this drastic reduction starts now. NNDR construction would put scarce resources into an environmentally polluting structure, when at much less cost, investment could be put into environmentally friendly projects such as footpaths and cycle tracks, and designing localities where residential, work, shopping and civic/leisure facilities were mostly within walking or cycling distance of each other, or at most a short bus ride away. NNDR would encourage transport of goods and freight by highly polluting road transport rather than much less polluting rail. Siting NNDR close to Norwich Airport would encourage use of air transport, which is among the most highly polluting means of transport, and should therefore be reduced rather than increased.</p> <p>O - 9908 - 8019 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9912	<p>Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? There is already too much pressure on the University Hospital. There will need to be another identical one on the North East of Norwich if this goes ahead.</p> <p>I also disagree with a Northern Distributor Road as it will cause massive traffic problems in the city centre and encourage more building around it.</p> <p>O - 9912 - 6780 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
9924	<p>John Heaser [7015] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>NO - In order to maximise the number of people cycling and walking to places of work and education a much improved provision of OFF ROAD, SAFE cycle paths is needed - like they have in Holland - not just a few feet of road separated by a white line!</p> <p>O - 9924 - 7015 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>9955</p>	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>This list of major road schemes ignores the vast majority of the vision and is incompatible with sustainable development. We do not believe that the infrastructure plans are based on correct analysis of the best way to deliver the vision and they should be deleted. Whilst having no expertise on water supply and sewage we would assume that demand management and increased efficiency of existing systems must play an important role in these and to an extent this could be covered by "improvements to water supply and waste disposal", whereas there is no explanation or logic for the need for the road schemes listed especially since there is a clear need to manage travel behaviour and the demand for transport and make efficient use of existing infrastructure. Schemes to increase road capacity are at odds with this, so the Northern Norwich Distributor Road, A47 junction improvements and Long Stratton bypass should not be mentioned. They are specific outputs, which are unlikely to deliver the desired outcomes. We suggest that the critical infrastructure requirements should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficient and adequate water supply and sewage disposal • Efficient and adequate transport networks • Green Infrastructure • Schools • Health facilities • Provision for emergency services • Adequate affordable housing <p>O - 9955 - 6903 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10071</p>	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?</p>

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd acknowledges the need for new transport infrastructure to support the growth of the city, including that identified by the GNDR. It is recognised that the Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NNDR) has been identified as a significant part of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy and that this scheme is being strongly pursued by the East of England Regional Assembly (EEAR) and the constituent Councils of the GNDR as an overall regional strategy to improve transport in the Norwich area. We also understand that the NNDR has a recommended allocation of £79.7 million of funding from the Regional Funding Allocation (RFA), which gives a greater degree of certainty over its delivery. However, even in the absence of the NNDR, we still consider that North East Norwich is the most sustainable location for growth in the area and offers a unique opportunity to facilitate significant improvements to the transport network in Norwich.

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd anticipates the creation of an inner road which will carry orbital movement from Broadland Business Park in the south through to Wroxham Road. The provision of this route will enable the delivery of the urban extension and will also support north/south traffic, cycle and pedestrian movements around the periphery of Norwich and within the fabric of the new extension. The North East sector of Norwich also offers the best opportunity to utilise the existing capacity on the underused Bittern Line (the Norwich-Sheringham railway line). The insertion of a rail halt within a new urban extension in North East Norwich, linking with the proposed Eco settlement at Rackheath, would create a new rail transit and public transport interchange, linked to the centre of Norwich and the wider national rail network. This would act to increase transport choice and promote more sustainable modes of transport. It would also increase connectivity to and from existing communities as well as supporting future communities. These measures together with initiatives to improve pedestrian and cycling routes will significantly improve transport and travel in the Norwich area and enable the North East sector of Norwich to accommodate a significant amount of growth, anticipated to be over the 7,000 dwellings as identified in the Core Strategy.

It is suggested that paragraph 6.2 of the draft Joint Core Strategy is amended to include bullet points that refer to new rail halts that utilise the existing capacity of the Bittern Line and to the inner link road.

O - 10071 - 8234 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -

10081 Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - OBJECT

Web - 28/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?
The Northern Distributor Road is a violation of a tranquil rural area. It will increase traffic and encourage the building of housing estates and industrial buildings. It is yet another example of "growth" which boils down to profit made on house building etc. I cannot see any justification for it. I violently object to its inclusion in this section.

O - 10081 - 8235 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -

<p>10166</p>	<p>Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245] (represented by David L Walker Limited (Head office) [8182]) - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The Spatial Strategy defined in Chapter 6 of the document sets out the key dependencies upon which the objectives of the spatial objectives will be met. It is considered that the critical infrastructure requirements identified do not take account of existing assets within the plan area. With regards to Question 2, it is considered that the long term protection and enhancement of the area's intermodal materials handling facilities will aid in the achievement of the development objectives.</p> <p>O - 10166 - 8245 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10311</p>	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - OBJECT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The infrastructure proposed is dictating the spatial strategy and the location of the development rather than serving it. This imbalance is reflected in the position of Q2 in the sequence of questions and is a key weakness.</p> <p>The Northern Distributor Route (NDR) appears as a fixed element of the Strategy and a core driver for growth in the North East of the area. Similarly, a bypass at Long Stratton appears to be the driving factor for major new development in the town. Allowing road schemes to dictate housing delivery is not the correct strategic approach for the area, but rather a case of 'cart' before the 'horse'.</p> <p>In our view, the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy requires urgent review to refocus priorities on a high grade, efficient public transport system which would link settlements with the city centre and major employment locations. The fixation with the NDR completely discredits the supposed carbon-cutting credentials of the Strategy and embeds high levels of car dependency in the area's future. In the same way, costly improvements to junctions on the A47 southern bypass would not be required with the adoption and financing of an effective public transport system.</p> <p>The level of growth proposed also places further pressure on water resource and treatment in the county - a key issue which is barely touched upon in the proposed planning policies. Such high rates of housing and road expansion will also increase demand for minerals extraction and waste handling, both of which can impact severely on rural communities or sensitive areas of landscape. Improvements to water supply and sewage disposal have to be done without jeopardising further erosion on the natural environment.</p> <p>O - 10311 - 6826 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>

<p>10449</p>	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? There's more crime if you build more houses.</p> <p>O - 10449 - 8309 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10477</p>	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? We feel safe living in a rural community an have a sense of belonging to our small community. However any further development, especially on the lines you are planning, will destroy all of this. No development.</p> <p>O - 10477 - 8310 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10530</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? This critical infrastructure just feeds large numbers of vehicles on to already crowded roads.</p> <p>O - 10530 - 8312 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10554</p>	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? Maintain and improve what already exists.</p> <p>O - 10554 - 8318 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
<p>10577</p>	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10577 - 8319 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>

10648	<p>Ms Lucy Hall [8295] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 11/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? The Norwich Area Transportation Strategy is not a strategy, it is a series of small incremental changes with no vision for the future. It is already out of date. It was produced before this large scale house building was proposed.</p> <p>The critical infrastructure that is needed, alongside water and sewage improvements, is rail and light rail, with good interchange facilities between bike, car, rail and bus.</p> <p>O - 10648 - 8295 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10785	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? All of the critical infrastructure that you have identified is orientated towards making car travel easier. I accept that it is important to reduce congestion on the routes around Norwich. However, this is best achieved by making the priority to provide infrastructure to reduce the need to travel and to travel more sustainably and then addressing the bottlenecks that remain after that. This should be consistent with the hierarchy of priorities that I mentioned above. The critical infrastructure requirements should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensuring all settlements have high speed broadband access - implementing a county wide network of pleasant, convenient, direct and well maintained cycle paths - properly promoting and using a countywide car-sharing scheme to ensure that car journeys are high occupancy - putting in High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) and bus lanes on main routes wherever feasible - ensuring the availability of car clubs where the settlement size is big enough <p>O - 10785 - 8360 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -</p>
10801	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? All of the critical infrastructure that you have identified is orientated towards making car travel easier. I accept that it is important to reduce congestion on the routes around Norwich. However, this is best achieved by making the priority to provide infrastructure to reduce the need to travel and to travel more sustainably and then addressing the bottlenecks that remain after that. This should be consistent with the hierarchy of priorities that I mentioned above. The critical infrastructure requirements</p>

should include:

- ensuring all settlements have high speed broadband access
- implementing a county wide network of pleasant, convenient, direct and well maintained cycle paths
- properly promoting and using a countywide car-sharing scheme to ensure that car journeys are high occupancy
- putting in High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) and bus lanes on main routes wherever feasible
- ensuring the availability of car clubs where the settlement size is big enough
- properly assessing the potential to reopen railway lines to offer massive extra capacity for sustainable travel - especially lines that are already used for heritage trips - all Norfolk market towns used to be linked by rail.

O - 10801 - 8361 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -

10816 North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

The Landowners acknowledge the need for new transport infrastructure to support the growth of the city. It is recognised that the Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NDR) has been identified as a significant part of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS) and that this scheme is being strongly pursued by the East of England Regional Assembly (EEAR) and the constituent Councils of the GNDP as an overall regional strategy to improve transport in the Norwich area. However, there is some doubt as to the certainty of delivery of the NDR and that could frustrate delivery of the projected planned requirement in the north east Norwich location.

The Landowners consider that Wymondham is the next most sustainable location for growth in the Norwich Policy Area and offers a unique opportunity to unlock a significant amount of growth at a relatively early stage of implementation of the Joint Core Strategy. Greater use should be made of the rail link Wymondham has with Norwich, Cambridge and beyond.

O - 10816 - 8362 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -

10843 Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

We are glad at the inclusion in the Spatial Strategy of the assertion that the level of growth depends on sufficient infrastructure funding from 'other agencies' which includes central government. It is surprising, given the stated need for a modal shift away from car use, that 2 out of the 3 'Critical infrastructure requirements' are to do with upgrading the road network. The other - 'Improvements to Water Supply....' - touches on an issue which, if an environmentally responsible path was pursued, could well

act as a brake on development.
See also Questions 10 & 24

O - 10843 - 8018 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -

10879 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - **OBJECT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

The BLT acknowledges the need for new transport infrastructure to support the growth of the city. It is recognised that the Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NDR) has been identified as a significant part of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS) and that this scheme is being strongly pursued by the East of England Regional Assembly (EEAR) and the constituent Councils of the GNDP as an overall regional strategy to improve transport in the Norwich area. We also understand that the NDR has a recommended allocation of £79.7 million of funding from the Regional Funding Allocation (RFA), which gives a greater degree of certainty over its delivery. In addition to the RFA funding, Norwich County Council have submitted a bid to the Government's Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF) for £20 million of funding for improvements to the Postwick Junction. However, even in advance of the NDR, the BLT consider that north east Norwich is the most sustainable location for growth in the area and offers a unique opportunity to unlock a significant amount of growth at a relatively early stage of implementation of the Joint Core Strategy. Growth in this location could also act to facilitate substantial improvements to the transport network in Norwich.

Within the area proposed for sustainable urban extension by the BLT, a route for an inner link road has been safeguarded within Broadland District Council's existing Local Plan. This link road is safeguarded in two parts, one of which has an extant planning permission. However, it should be noted that the road as currently safeguarded, does not link. The 'missing section' is located centrally within the area of land being promoted by the BLT. The provision of the link road in this location will enable the delivery of the urban extension in advance of the Northern Distributor Road. It will act to support north/south traffic, cycle and pedestrian movements around the periphery of Norwich and within the fabric of the new extension and encourage orbital movements between the Broadland Business Park to the south

and Wroxham Road to the north, thus relieving pressure on existing arterial routes. It would also create easier access to the park and ride facility on the Wroxham Road, potentially encouraging more people to use this facility and in turn, reducing commuter traffic into the city (refer to link road alignment in appendix 1).

The north east sector of Norwich also offers the best opportunity to utilise the existing capacity on the underused Bittern Line (the Norwich-Sheringham railway line). Land is currently set aside for a rail halt within Broadland Business Park. The relocation of this or the creation of an additional rail halt within a new urban extension in north east Norwich, linking with the proposed Eco settlement at Rackheath, would create a new rail transit and public transport interchange, linked to the centre of Norwich and the wider national rail network. This would act to increase transport choice and promote more sustainable modes of transport. It would also increase connectivity to and from existing communities and support future communities, giving people better access to jobs and improving the viability of commercial activity in this location. These measures together with initiatives to improve pedestrian and cycling routes will significantly improve transport and travel in the Norwich area and enable the north east sector of Norwich to accommodate a significant amount of growth. It is anticipated that this will be over the 7,000 dwellings as identified in the Core Strategy and it is considered that the Core Strategy should state that this area has the capacity to accommodate at least 10,000 dwellings. The BLT propose that the potential for tram/train transit opportunities are fully explored.

It is suggested that paragraph 6.2 of the draft Joint Core Strategy is amended to include bullet points that refer to new rail halts that utilise the existing capacity of the Bittern Line and to the inner link road.

O - 10879 - 8366 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -

11082 Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

No.

NNTAG is concerned that the JCS has been driven by GNDP's ambitions for road infrastructure projects and funding for these.

In particular, the growth triangle in north-east Norwich has been clearly designed to bolster the case for a NDR.

We object to the emphasis on building major new road infrastructure because:

- it is incompatible with sustainable development and the need to manage travel demand.
- it skews the JCS in a direction which would increase car dependency and CO2.
- it would lead to further decentralisation of activities as has occurred around the A47 Southern Bypass.
- it would take away funding for sustainable transport and community infrastructure.

We object to a NDR as a key component of NATS because:

- it does not provide a good fit with emerging spatial patterns. The axis of growth runs SW of city - city centre ((strategic employment sites) - NE Norwich (strategic housing). Building a NDR to link up with the A47 Southern Bypass would encourage orbital journeys by car between NE/SW Norwich and further decentralisation of activities.
- it would encourage car travel in general. The NDR Business Case Forecasting Report shows over 90% of commuting by car in associated new developments.
- it would increase CO2 emissions relative to the Do-Minimum scenario, by 6% in 2012 and 8% in 2027 (please refer to NNTAG/CPRE Norfolk's critique of the NDR MSBC).

For more detail, please see the accompanying documents:

- Norwich Policy Area - Future Growth and Transport, powerpoint presentation by NNTAG/CPRE Norfolk/Keith Buchan: to Norfolk County Council/DfT on 19 Feb 2009.

- NDR: Preliminary data requests and subsequent analysis by MTRU

- Norwich Northern Distributor Road: Critique of the Major Scheme Business Case for Programme Entry, by NNTAG/CPRE Norfolk (Feb 2009)

Interim note from MTRU, Northern Distributor Road, Assessment of the Major Scheme Business Case: Initial questions and County response (Feb 2009)

We object to the Postwick Hub, the first stage of a NDR because:

- the complex gyratory with long skew bridge over A47 is much larger than required for addressing tailbacks onto A47 and for unlocking land for employment and housing;
- the Hub design would force drivers to travel a circuitous route through a series of links and roundabouts, to create carbon and time disbenefits.

We object to major improvements to A47 Junctions because:

- the extra road capacity would generate further new local journeys by car. Modelling of Harford and Thickthorn junctions shows significant traffic increases.
- the JCS treats the A47 Southern Bypass as a local distributor road rather than protecting it as a strategic route for carrying long-distance traffic.
- Local orbital car trips generated by the A47 Southern Bypass have created patterns of movement and consequential land use planning which are difficult to serve by car.

We object to Long Stratton Bypass because

- a bypass built to dual carriageway standard is not justified;

means of funding a bypass is being sought through major development, for which Long Stratton is unsuitable as travel to/from village is largely reliant on car use.

Suggested Alternatives

We believe that NATS must be reviewed in line with RSS to provide a high quality public transport system with cross-city links to connect the different parts of the NPA, including housing to strategic employment, local rail improvements, comprehensive walking and cycling links, measures for managing travel and modifying behaviour.

New local access roads should be provided on a scale commensurate with servicing new development and supporting green travel modes. For example, implementation of highways works identified in Policy TSA3 of Broadland Local Plan 2006 (improvements to Postwick junction, completion of Broadland Business Park Link Road) would unlock land for housing and employment in the vicinity.

Planning permission for Long Stratton Bypass should be allowed to expire, lower cost options should be examined and proposals for major housing growth abandoned.

Soundness

We consider that road infrastructure identified is unsound for the following reasons:

(i) Inconsistency with national policies

- PPS1 which requires development to be pursued in an integrated way in line with principles for sustainable development;
- PPS1 on Planning and Climate Change, requiring delivery of urban growth patterns which overall reduce the need to travel,

especially by car and to provide for homes, jobs, services and infrastructure that reduce carbon dioxide emissions.
- PPS1 and PPG13 require development which reduce the need to travel and make fullest use of public transport.

ii) Not in general conformity with the RSS

- the road infrastructure proposals are incompatible with RSS which encourages use of existing transport infrastructure, more movement by sustainable modes, management of travel behaviour and demand for transport to reduce CO2 emissions.

- the schemes do not accord with Norwich Policy NR1 which seeks "to achieve a major shift in emphasis across the NPA towards travel by public transport, cycling & walking".

iii) Lack of justification for road schemes

- no supporting evidence has been put forward to justify the road schemes in the context of an overall transport and land use planning strategy.

- the NDR has not been tested through the development plan process.

- NATS, approved in 2006 and pre-dating the RSS adopted in 2008, has been overtaken by a higher RSS housing and employment figures for NPA and by NR1 transport policy.

- there is no regional policy basis for a NDR. The RSS simply refers to 'having regard to NATS' and although a NDR is identified in a RSS appendix on the Regional Funding Allocation, this does not constitute a regional policy.

iv) Failure to test alternative transport options

- No alternative transport options have been tested alongside different growth location options (and the latter are simply variations on one option). The NDR is treated as a fixed transport element in the JCS.

- The NDR Business Case made a poor assessment of a Public Transport Option, where the scheme attracts only one extra passenger compared to Do-Minimum.

v) No Guarantee that Major Road Infrastructure Projects are Deliverable

- The cost of the proposed road schemes is very high, with no guarantee of funding especially if a NDR does not gain Programme Entry. The DfT has raised doubts over value for money of a Postwick Hub (letter to Norfolk CC dated 27 March 2009).

- No sources of funding are identified for A47 major junction improvements. The Highways Agency is unlikely to fund local improvements.

- There is no funding a Long Stratton Bypass. The JCS allocation of 1,800 houses at Long Stratton is insufficient to pay for a

dual carriageway bypass.

- No indication is given of how a BRT system will be funded, in addition to a NDR.
The JCS evidence base does not address public transport funding.

We recommend:

- deletion of the named transport infrastructure projects (NDR, A47 junction improvements, Long Stratton bypass) and
- their replacement by the following requirements:
 - a public transport system to include BRT, with cross-city links for connecting the different parts of the NPA and enhancements to the local rail network".

O - 11082 - 8387 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -

11141 JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements?

OBJECT

We are concerned that developer contributions in Long Stratton will primarily be required to fund the bypass, and that insufficient funds will be available to provide the local facilities which this new development will require. We are also concerned that the Core Strategy is based on an insufficient evidence base with regard to the proposed allocation at Long Stratton, and that the single issue of the bypass must be kept in perspective with regards to the Core Strategy's overall aims and objectives.

The Core Strategy notes that the proposed level of development will upgrade Long Stratton from a Key Service Centre to the status of a main town. This village is an unsustainable settlement, with poor public transport connections and limited facilities. It is therefore unsuitable to accommodate the proposed level of development.

Paragraph 7.15 notes that 'the final number of new homes built in Long Stratton is intended to fund a bypass.' Appendix '0' notes that the number of new homes required to fund the bypass is not yet known. The implication is that the level of growth in Long Stratton could yet increase, depending on the cost of the bypass. At present, the Core Strategy notes that Long Stratton is unable to accommodate more than around 50 new dwellings. A bypass would be required in order to deliver

a greater quantum of development. However, as we have noted in our response to Question 1, we do not believe that Long Stratton is a sustainable location for development. Because of the lack of current facilities in the village, the development will generate a need for an expansion of the existing secondary school and other new facilities. We are concerned, therefore, that the scale of this financial commitment will mean that it may not be possible, for instance, to provide the level of affordable housing in Long Stratton which the Spatial Strategy implies is necessary.

We understand that funding has not so far been allocated to the Long Stratton bypass at a Regional level, and that there is significant competition for what funding does exist. We have also noted that the bypass is considered a 'prerequisite for the scale of growth identified in Long Stratton', implying that funding must be in place prior to the collection of financial contributions from developers.

There appears to be a significant degree of uncertainty around the level of growth required to fund a bypass, the availability of funding to pay for it up front, and the effect that the cost of the bypass will have on the availability of developer contributions to fund local facilities such as affordable housing. We believe that if the Core Strategy were to continue to progress on this basis, it would not be based on a credible or robust evidence base, and would be found unsound.

Settlement hierarchy

Policy 1 (page 19) proposes the places where growth will be focussed, in order of preference.

O - 11141 - 6979 - (Q2) Have we identified the right critical infrastructure requirements? -

Response – Q3

Settlement hierarchy

Policy 1 (page 19) proposes the places where growth will be focussed, in order of preference

Q3 Settlement hierarchy

Policy 1 (page 19) proposes the places where growth will be focussed, in order of preference.

Q3 Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q3 Total	155	24	73	62	159

Rep No.	Name of respondent [JDI reference number] Response e.g COMMENT, SUPPORT, OBJECT Method of response e.g. Web / paper, and date of submission
---------	--

7959	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - COMMENT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? To enlarge existing towns and long Stratton actually ignores the needs of the rural areas which are losing infrastructure PO's pubs shops etc at an alarming rate it would be better to build smaller nos of houses to renew the vitality of the villages (10 -50) per village but of course this would not be popular with developers who build large estates of bland housing which will become slums in the future</p> <p>C - 7959 - 6862 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
7980	<p>mr Daniel Yellop [7836] - COMMENT Web - 13/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Although I agree with the order. I hope there is not a big gap between the amount of development from the Norwich area to the main towns and service centres, as I believe it is important to try and de centralise some services, and offer alternatives in towns of significant size, such as Dereham / Fakenham / Wymondham / Attleborough.</p> <p>C - 7980 - 7836 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8138	<p>Mr Alan Fairweather [7889] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Web - 31/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>The sequence of development is dependent on the infrastructure capacity. Without a visionary approach to development its a question of luck as to this proposal being practical or not.</p> <p>C - 8138 - 7889 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8759	<p>Ms Sarah Smith [8059] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Lingwood should remain as a Service Village within the existing hierarchy and proposed land site specific developments must be in accordance with the sustainable community strategy</p> <p>C - 8759 - 8059 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8873	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>the current settlement hierarchy is too prescriptive as there as some really sustainable service village locations like Tasburgh on the A140 and close to Long Stratton which can and therefore should take more than the 10-20 and up to 200 houses.</p> <p>C - 8873 - 7620 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8874	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>minimum new development only should be allowed until the infrastructure is ready. the Harts Farm and Whispering Oaks development have swamped Wymondham</p> <p>C - 8874 - 8071 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8918	<p>Old Catton Parish Council (Mrs S Barber) [1816] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>The land BDC0051, part of which is already a recreation ground, should all be designated for recreational use.</p> <p>C - 8918 - 1816 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9638	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>The proposed settlement hierarchy should reflect the ability to accommodate development in terms of whether spare infrastructure capacity exists and whether economic advantage can be taken of the spare capacity in order to deliver necessary growth. This could result in some settlements being promoted or relegated in the hierarchy and the strategy should be flexible enough to accommodate this.</p> <p>C - 9638 - 7503 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9670	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Holistically yes, but there are exceptions re. fringe area development.</p> <p>C - 9670 - 8047 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9909	<p>Christopher Webb [8019] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>For this and all following questions (except question 6) I cannot give a response because I unfortunately do not have access to a copy of the Joint Core Strategy Consultation booklet.</p> <p>However I hope that the views I've expressed in Questions 1, 2 and 6 will included in the collation of responses.</p> <p>C - 9909 - 8019 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>

<p>9981</p>	<p>GF Cole and Son [8226] (represented by ASquared Architects (Mrs Jayne Taylor) [7042]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Partial objection: see below</p> <p>We recognise that the hierarchy chosen reflects the preferred option for growth, and that there is a need to identify those settlements which can provide for a higher level of facilities and thus sustain higher levels of growth. However, we are concerned that the lower strata of the hierarchy may not provide an appropriate means of directing growth in the more extensive rural areas. The distinction between service and other villages will be dependent on the criteria used for selection and may overlook the relationship between smaller rural settlements that individually provide limited facilities but taken together make a shared contribution to meeting the needs of the local population.</p> <p>For example, whilst the distribution of facilities between smaller settlements may involve some travel by car, the distance involved is relatively small, and excluding settlements from further growth because of lack of access between such facilities by public transport would be an unreasonable criterion to apply. The consequence would be a lack of support for existing facilities in the individual settlements, their potential decline and loss, resulting in a need for greater travel by car to access facilities further afield</p> <p>C - 9981 - 8226 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10066</p>	<p>The Greetham Trustees [7606] (represented by Strutt and Parker (Mr David Williams) [7605]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? We broadly agree with the settlement hierarchy, however there are some concerns about the spatial distribution of development within the hierarchy which are dealt with under question 9 and also the settlements categorised at various levels of the hierarchy, dealt with under question 17.</p> <p>C - 10066 - 7606 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10145</p>	<p>R Smith [8243] (represented by Beacon Planning Ltd (Ms Jenny Page) [7833]) - COMMENT Paper - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p>

	<p>The settlement hierarchy does not recognise the key service centres within the Norwich Policy Area. Given the favoured option to deliver further new homes on smaller sites then it would clearer if these were identified separately from the other key service centres.</p> <p>C - 10145 - 8243 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10255	<p>WM Morrison Supermarkets plc [8212] (represented by Peacock & Smith (The Manager) [8261]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Our clients support the overarching policies of the emerging Core Strategy. In particular they support the broad aims set out in the settlement hierarchy; this gives a clear steer as the level of services appropriate in different categories of settlement, and also seeks to direct growth towards the most sustainable of settlements.</p> <p>C - 10255 - 8212 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10299	<p>mrs LISA ford [8282] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 07/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Urban fringe area developments result in areas such as Bowthorpe spreading out to Colney and the eventual loss of Colney as a separate village. many roads in to Norwich - such as Watton Road/Earlham Road are not designed to cope with the volume of traffic going into Norwich and they can not be widened.</p> <p>C - 10299 - 8282 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10312	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>CPRE welcomes policies and practices that favours urban regeneration, use of previously developed land and an approach to development that recognises environmental capacity/constraints of areas.</p> <p>We would support the settlement hierarchy if it did not appear at odds with the favoured option (Appendix 0). It is misleading to say that the urban area of Norwich will take the largest proportion of development when so much housing is being allocated</p>

	<p>on greenfield sites elsewhere.</p> <p>We do welcome the stated commitment to low housing numbers in rural villages, although we remain concerned about impacts on villages that 'will be considered for further development because of the favoured option.'</p> <p>C - 10312 - 6826 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10337	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>I do not see the evidence for new houses. New jobs, industries, yes, but sited in existing areas e.g. Broadland Business Park etc.</p> <p>C - 10337 - 8293 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10609	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 10/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Support in general but major reservations about parts of the route of the northern distributor road</p> <p>C - 10609 - 8325 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10689	<p>M Elliott [5264] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 01/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>The Barn Conversion residents are very concerned about a possible development on the field opposite their dwellings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our properties are extremely dark inside and any reduction of light to our properties would be a massive problem - possible lights on all day. 2. The land slopes down towards our properties and water and drainage coming down from the site would also create a big problem for us. I have had my drive flooded in the past, and I have a pipe which passes through the garden and down into the stream, taking surplus water which could not possibly cope with any more water, and as it has not been serviced for about 15 years, I am very concerned.

	<p>Perhaps you would kindly get the appropriate department to come and inspect this pipe as I am an excellent Council Tax payer and would appreciate a necessary service. Thank you.</p> <p>C - 10689 - 5264 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10713	<p>Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT Paper - 26/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? I think high levels of forced radical development imposed from outside (by government) is likely to create more problems of social disruptiveness in the long term than with gradual population change and growth.</p> <p>I'm not sure I trust the basis on which the government calculated its figures for future housing needs, as they are based around their policies (which include encouraging mass immigration for example, and discouraging British agriculture and food production).</p> <p>C - 10713 - 8354 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10868	<p>Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Given the content of Policy NR1 of the East of England Plan, we agree with Policy 1 and the prominence afforded to Norwich and the urban fringe parishes, particularly Costessey.</p> <p>C - 10868 - 8363 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10926	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>C - 10926 - 8368 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>

<p>11026</p>	<p>Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] - COMMENT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? The settlement hierarchy is supported with the identification of the role of Poringland as Key Service Centre. Poringland has a level of population and facilities equivalent to some of the market towns (Loddon and Harleston) - it has, inter alia, a police station, library, community centre, supermarket, veterinary practice, pharmacist and two post offices as well as other facilities that would be expected in a market town.</p> <p>Its proximity to Norwich and excellent access to the A47 means that Poringland may be capable of accepting a higher level of growth than some other market towns, particularly if there is also a reasonable allocation of employment land and the chance to improve public transport provision even further.</p> <p>Public transport connections to Norwich are excellent, with five peak-time bus services per hour. Although there are limited local strategic employment sites, Poringland is fairly well located (via the A47) to the Longwater Business Park and Meridien/Broadland Business Park at Thorpe St Andrew.</p> <p>C - 11026 - 7175 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>11061</p>	<p>Norfolk Association of Architects (Mr Michael Innes) [8378] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Fundamental opposition to spatial strategy derived from a top-down approach. More visionary approach needed - promotes major new town at Acle (illustrative material included).</p> <p>C - 11061 - 8378 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>7987</p>	<p>Mr Keith Bigland [7843] - SUPPORT Web - 14/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? agree</p> <p>S - 7987 - 7843 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>

7996	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? I support this in principle but I think development in villages has to be kept in check otherwise small villages with no services, shops etc can quickly be over burdened. The full picture has to be considered and no just if a farmer has a field he wants to develop outside the boundaries of development which is in his interests but no one else's.</p> <p>S - 7996 - 7851 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8066	<p>Miss Janet Saunders [7875] - SUPPORT Web - 23/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? As most of the employment opportunities in the region are centred in Norwich it makes sense that most of the development should take place there.</p> <p>S - 8066 - 7875 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8080	<p>Mr S Buller [7879] - SUPPORT Web - 25/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? SERVICES IN THESE AREAS CAN EITHER EASILY BE MAINTAINED OR EXPANDED FOR MINIMAL COST</p> <p>S - 8080 - 7879 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8085	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT Web - 26/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? If we have to have development this would seem the most sensible option to link in with current infrastructure</p> <p>S - 8085 - 7880 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8105	<p>Mr S Buller [7879] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Web - 28/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>.</p> <p>S - 8105 - 7879 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8110	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 29/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8110 - 7888 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8175	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8175 - 4796 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8224	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8224 - 4558 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8265	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 8265 - 7912 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -
8290	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Fully</p> <p>S - 8290 - 7915 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8352	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? I support this</p> <p>S - 8352 - 6992 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8380	<p>Mr M Buckingham [7968] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8380 - 7968 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8389	<p>Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8389 - 7012 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8413	<p>Ed King [7965] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8413 - 7965 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8423	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8423 - 7966 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8437	<p>J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003] (represented by Robert Doughty Consultancy Limited (Mr Robert Doughty) [8002]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>This appears to be a logical approach to settlements.</p> <p>S - 8437 - 8003 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8464	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8464 - 8016 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8514	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8514 - 7817 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8538	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8538 - 8021 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8562	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8562 - 1976 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8725	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>We agree with these proposals</p> <p>S - 8725 - 8053 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8805	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8805 - 6869 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>

8833	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8833 - 8064 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8971	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8971 - 8092 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9001	<p>Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Lingwood should remain a service village. Areas indicated for proposed development S39 - 02a and S39 - 02 are outside the sustainable community strategy.</p> <p>S - 9001 - 8094 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9005	<p>Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? However, the area proposed for Lingwood is larger than would be compatible for a service village [S39 - 02 & 02a]</p> <p>S - 9005 - 8095 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9009	<p>Mr Philip Smith [8096] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed</p>

	<p>settlement hierarchy? Lingwood must remain within the existing hierarchy as a service village and the proposed land site (S39 - 02a) and S39-02 is not in accordance with the sustainable community strategy. Agricultural land is necessary to feed a growing population.</p> <p>S - 9009 - 8096 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9016	<p>Mr Robert Hall [8098] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Lingwood should remain a service village. S39 - 02a and S39-02 are in areas of prime agricultural land and we need land to feed a growing population</p> <p>S - 9016 - 8098 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9020	<p>Mr and Mrs Peter Tann [8099] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9020 - 8099 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9098	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9098 - 7111 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9099	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p>

	<p>yes</p> <p>S - 9099 - 8111 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9142	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9142 - 8112 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9147	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9147 - 2055 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9215	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9215 - 1828 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9422	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Our yes is qualified if there has to be this scale of development then the hierarchy proposed is reasonable</p> <p>S - 9422 - 8127 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>

<p>9447</p>	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Without building a Norfolk 'Milton Keynes' this is the only way.</p> <p>S - 9447 - 8134 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9481</p>	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9481 - 8139 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9596</p>	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9596 - 8162 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9721</p>	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9721 - 8174 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9822</p>	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p>

	<p>We would support the proposed hierarchy where new development of an appropriate scale will be focussed on the urban areas of Norwich.</p> <p>S - 9822 - 8198 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9861</p>	<p>Diocese of Norwich [2708] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr William Lusty) [7762]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Policy 1 'Settlement Hierarchy', seeks to direct growth firstly to Norwich and the fringes of Norwich, then to 'Major mixed-use developments in specified locations', followed by growth at Main Towns, then Key Service Centres, then Service Villages and finally Other Villages.</p> <p>The Diocese of Norwich consider this approach to be consistent with Government Guidance contained within Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3) and the Adopted East of England Plan.</p> <p>S - 9861 - 2708 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9866</p>	<p>Hill Residential [8215] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr William Lusty) [7762]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Hill Residential support the proposed settlement hierarchy contained within Policy 1. This is considered to accord with the East of England Plan which designates Norwich as a Key Centre for Development and Change. It is therefore considered appropriate that Norwich itself is at the top of the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Owing to the scale of development that is proposed in the Norwich Policy Area, greenfield development will be necessary in addition to any development that can be achieved within the urban area of Norwich itself. We therefore consider it appropriate for the Partnership to confirm within Policy 1 that new development at Norwich will also be focused on the urban fringe, specifically in the parishes of Colney, Costessey, Cringleford, Trowse, Thorpe St Andrew, Sprowston, Old Catton, Hellesdon, Drayton and Taverham. This area of search for greenfield sites extends from the airport to the northwest of the city, round to the area to the northeast of the City. We consider that the remainder of the urban edge is constrained to a greater extent than the area of search that the Partnership has identified. Indeed, at Appendix 0 it is remarked that the South Norfolk urban edge is defined by the Yare Valley which makes a large scale urban extension inappropriate. Furthermore, Appendix 0 recognises the advantages of locating development within the proposed growth triangle, being the support that can be provided to local</p>

	<p>services and infrastructure and high quality public transport links with potential to contribute significant green infrastructure.</p> <p>We therefore consider that the Partnership has correctly proposed the settlement hierarchy, particularly in terms of the identified growth triangle in accommodating greenfield development. Similarly to our comments in respect of the Spatial Vision, we consider that the Settlement Hierarchy accords with PPS3 and specifically the approach to the location of development required by PPS3.</p> <p>S - 9866 - 8215 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9872	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>We know you are aware of the report by Matthew Taylor MP of the results of the review carried out at the Prime Minister's request, into the provision of housing in the rural countryside.</p> <p>We hope that when the Government and planning community have had the opportunity to digest the findings of the report, schemes will be devised to put its proposals into practice by implementing the philosophy of developing the countryside proportionately within its existing structures.</p> <p>S - 9872 - 2058 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9918	<p>stephen eastwood [7962] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Lingwood must remain within the existing hierarchy as a Service Village and the proposed land site specific developments (S39-02 & Ss39-02) is not in accordance with the sustainable community strategy. See Q 16</p> <p>S - 9918 - 7962 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9925	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9925 - 7015 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9948	<p>Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd [8222] (represented by DPP LLP (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [8221]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9948 - 8222 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9956	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9956 - 6903 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10012	<p>notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10012 - 6911 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10023	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10023 - 8230 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>

<p>10046</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10046 - 2373 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10061</p>	<p>RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Alan Presslee) [8160]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Broadly supportive of the approach to settlement hierarchy, growth locations and housing numbers.</p> <p>S - 10061 - 8232 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10072</p>	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? We support the identification of the parishes of Old Catton, Sprowston and Thorpe St Andrew (the growth 'triangle') at the highest level of the settlement hierarchy, which in turn recognises the capacity of this area to accommodate a significant proportion of major growth required for Norwich.</p> <p>S - 10072 - 8234 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10124</p>	<p>Mr David Nichols [8242] - SUPPORT Web - 31/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? I broadly support this strategy but am very cautious about the ability to develop these surroundings whilst not disturbing critical areas of green belt such as the Whitlingham Country Park.</p> <p>S - 10124 - 8242 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>

<p>10158</p>	<p>Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [7674]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Similarly the settlement hierarchy is supported with the identification of the urban area and fringe parishes such as Costessey as a focus for new development.</p> <p>S - 10158 - 8244 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10174</p>	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10174 - 8246 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10211</p>	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10211 - 5864 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10360</p>	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? In principle, yes. Hand-in-hand with the hierarchy goes consideration of the repercussions on adjoining communities. Inevitably there will be impacts for them. Typically, large scale development at Cringleford will have reverberations on Keswick and Intwood. Already there have been significant increases in traffic along Low Road (which provides convenient access to the Tesco store at Harford Bridge) and this will inevitably increase creating safety considerations along what is already an unsafe road for pedestrians.</p>

	S - 10360 - 2020 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -
10395	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 28/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10395 - 8294 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10506	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10506 - 7215 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10660	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10660 - 8348 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10729	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10729 - 1776 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10753	<p>Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048] (represented by J and J Design (Mr J R Shephard) [8358]) - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10753 - 7048 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10760	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes: NHS Norfolk understands the need for the increased housing to meet the growth requirements. 5 year strategic plans have been produced to manage and promote good health until 2014. Plans to meet health needs will be made as populations increase.</p> <p>S - 10760 - 7666 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10786	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10786 - 8360 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10880	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>We support the identification of the parishes Old Catton, Sprowston, and Thorpe St Andrew (the growth 'triangle') at the highest level of the settlement hierarchy, which in turn recognises the capacity of this area to accommodate a significant proportion of major growth required for Norwich.</p> <p>S - 10880 - 8366 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10950	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10950 - 8369 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10974	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>The Key Service Centres are given too much emphasis over the Service Villages.</p> <p>S - 10974 - 8176 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
11042	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 11042 - 6955 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
11071	<p>Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Broadly Supportive of settlement hierarchy and housing numbers</p> <p>S - 11071 - 7535 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
11111	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p>

	<p>Given the definition of the "locations for major new development" to be found in the spatial vision, and Long Stratton's inclusion within that list, we support Policy 1 as Long Stratton is one of the "specified locations within the Norwich Policy Area."</p> <p>S - 11111 - 8390 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
11127	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 11127 - 2373 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
11142	<p>JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>We agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>S - 11142 - 6979 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
7869	<p>Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>improve if necessary existing sites etc, but for once listen to the majority view, and no more demolitions, or destructions of buildings and land. leave something of my Norwich recognisable</p> <p>O - 7869 - 7782 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
7870	<p>Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p>

	<p>please listen to the majority view of local people, we are the ones that count NOT councillors or ministers. NO, NO, NO to any expansion of the suburbs, the total destruction of fields, woodland, and wildlife. no more housing or roads especially in thorpe/sproston. the majority have had enough</p> <p>O - 7870 - 7782 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
7924	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT Web - 08/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? the new homes are not wanted and will only fuel immigration some one has to say enough is enough</p> <p>O - 7924 - 7812 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
7947	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - OBJECT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Again I object on the grounds of the lack of infrastructure as a prerequisite/precondition. For example the Lodge Lane development in Costessey did not include improvements to the A1047, provision of bus lanes or initiating the construction of the northern Norwich bypass and so the removal of considerable traffic from Costessey. 1000's of homes generates traffic which must be catered for first not afterwards.</p> <p>O - 7947 - 7809 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
7993	<p>Michael Gotts [7844] - OBJECT Web - 14/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? The placing of major development to the north east of Norwich is not desirable. This area is already over developed</p> <p>O - 7993 - 7844 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8150	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - OBJECT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed</p>

	<p>settlement hierarchy? Based on the medieval layout of the city the ability of anyone to travel from one side to the other in anything less than 45 minutes is impossible. Adding to it will only make it worse without radical transport systems.</p> <p>O - 8150 - 7899 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8200	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - OBJECT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? No, Have these proposals taken into account recent new figures for sea level rise by 2100? They are much higher than predicted and much of Norfolk will be under water?</p> <p>O - 8200 - 7901 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8315	<p>Mr Anthony Knights [7922] - OBJECT Web - 15/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? The concept of continually increasing the urban fringe is outmoded and expensive. The strategy should concentrate on brownfield sites within the existing urban area. I do not believe that this has been done, there is no evidence of this.</p> <p>O - 8315 - 7922 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8329	<p>Mr Brian Cleland [7938] - OBJECT Web - 16/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Policy 1 does not seem to agree with 'Locations for Major New Development' shown on page 10 of the consultation document.</p> <p>O - 8329 - 7938 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8434	<p>Helen Baczkowska [8000] - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p>

	<p>Some smaller settles would actually benefit from limited development, whilst some existing large ones seem to have reached capacity.</p> <p>O - 8434 - 8000 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8446	<p>Ian Harris [8007] - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? The 'Norwich Policy Area' is too broad; it includes areas too far from the City itself. Unless public transport and cycle routes are prioritised highest at every stage, this will simply result in more car journeys, more emissions, and your carbon-neutral strategy is in tatters.</p> <p>O - 8446 - 8007 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8488	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Norwich and "fringe" urban parishes are already too over developed and over crowded. They are relatively bland and lack a central focus. A mish mash of housing and little planning for businesses. After 6.30 at night public transport is virtually non-existent or at best infrequent to these areas</p> <p>O - 8488 - 8020 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8586	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? The use of brownfield sites would leave more space for agriculture and self sufficiency, cutting down on transport / imports. Therefore reducing the carbon footprint and global warming</p> <p>O - 8586 - 8024 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8620	<p>Kay Eke [8025] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>As it stands, the settlement hierarchy promotes urban sprawl in and around Norwich, with the consequent loss of village/town characteristics of those parishes situate along the All and A47 corridors. I believe planning should be focussed on brownfield sites and small areas of in-fill, followed by those areas where specific need is indicated. Should this require significant development in the future, could this not be located in an allocated area so that a strategic centre is created within the Joint Core Strategy area for those for whom Norwich is some distance away?</p> <p>O - 8620 - 8025 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8651	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Focus on continued urban development, not expansion of rural villages.</p> <p>O - 8651 - 8036 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8675	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Disagree with village classifications. Tasburgh should be an 'other village' and larger settlements such as Hempnall should be a service village.</p> <p>O - 8675 - 8044 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
8698	<p>mrs jane fischl [8031] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>You should focus on the city centre. Plenty of brown field sites available. Why create communities with no access to a vibrant city centre for people and businesses?</p> <p>O - 8698 - 8031 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>

<p>8706</p>	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? 1,800 houses for small villages is too much.</p> <p>O - 8706 - 8045 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>8763</p>	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? You have not provided good enough reasons for such development, nor for going along with questionable government edicts on growth, that might overcome your duty to a) minimise climate change by major changes of direction both culturally and materially, and b)help Norfolk citizens to make suitable changes in these awesome directions</p> <p>O - 8763 - 8060 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>8770</p>	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Because without information of the scale of proposed contribution to settlement hierarchy from Breckland, southwest and North Norfolk it is hard to decide whether 32,000 dwellings in NPA between 2008 - 20260 is fair proportion</p> <p>O - 8770 - 8061 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>8894</p>	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? The hierarchy per se is a realistic description of the area's settlement pattern. However, the level of housing growth projected for each of the categories and overall is far too high and would lead to a suburban feel becoming the predominant landscape feature</p> <p>O - 8894 - 2014 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>

<p>8930</p>	<p>Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Wymondham should not be expected to receive any further houses</p> <p>O - 8930 - 8079 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>8940</p>	<p>Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Norwich and Norfolk can not sustain this sort of enforced growth. We are in a Recession which may take us 10 years to get out of - we have no industry to speak of - even agriculture uses very little manpower now. When you got all these bright ideas things were not so dire, economically. It would be foolhardy and irresponsible to proceed with this massive and unwanted development in these uncertain times. Sustain and maintain what we have got - eg schools, surgeries, hospitals, existing shops and businesses.</p> <p>O - 8940 - 8087 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>8993</p>	<p>Mrs J Leggett [5263] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? RE Building in white horse lane before by pass and between the bungalow known as half acre & bridge. I am writing to object strongly to any further development in our lovely village at Trowse. The land in question has always been preserved territory and where I live, which is directly opposite, we are not allowed to add anything to our own homes. Yet there is a possibility of affordable housing. I can do my sums: Affordable housing + 10years = SLUMS The village does not need this threat anymore than my family or I do. The paddock is a private road and the back of our homes are below road level. Only the bedrooms are visible as you drive along white horse lane and if you did not know there were houses there you not notice them. I fear for flooding and the incredible damage any construction work could cause. I also fear a very personal level for my own and my family's health. My husband has M S and my daughter is at home disabled.</p>

	<p>I have to be here to look after them. None of us can escape whilst the noisy work is done and moving house with two invalids is most certainly not on the cards.</p> <p>We have lived here for 27 years and in that time we have fought the bypass (which is at the end of my garden) and the park and ride.</p> <p>I know from bitter experience the mental stress of having construction work on one's doorstep. Not to mention the filth to clean away everyday and the cost of replacement curtains, carpets and even furniture.</p> <p>Please, please listen to my plea. Leave Trowse alone and let us live out the rest of our lives in the peace which was here when we chose to live in the village.</p> <p>O - 8993 - 5263 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>8994</p>	<p>Mr CM Sparrow [8093] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Lingwood must remain as a service village. Larger developments are not sustainable.</p> <p>O - 8994 - 8093 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9012</p>	<p>Mr KD White [8097] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>I was assured that the new proposed plot, was class A1 agricultural land. That the local services i.e. roads, sewage etc was up to its maximum capacity with the existing housing</p> <p>O - 9012 - 8097 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9029</p>	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Major development of distant satellite towns such as Long Stratton and Wymondham should be discouraged as they lack an appropriate employment base.</p> <p>O - 9029 - 4187 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>

9186	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>It should be based on non-car travel opportunities.</p> <p>O - 9186 - 8114 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9228	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Settlements should naturally expand accordingly to local demand not through edicts from above</p> <p>O - 9228 - 4494 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9285	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>RURAL should mean RURAL. if all these developments take place each of the expanding areas will not have their own identity. 'Escape to the country' will soon be no more</p> <p>O - 9285 - 5445 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9289	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>No major development in north Norwich fringe area. It will urbanise what is essentially a rural community, destroying valuable natural habitats, choking the small market towns with pollution and traffic spoiling character with new build around small market towns for instance Old Catton, Drayton and Trowse are still villages.</p> <p>O - 9289 - 8117 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9323	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>The Thorpe area triangle will be too large and cause traffic and pollution - unsustainable.</p> <p>O - 9323 - 8123 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9348	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Too much in Eastern Triangle. What we really need is employment units in smaller towns and villages thus enabling people to sustain local areas and thus less need for travel</p> <p>O - 9348 - 8120 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9350	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Only if there is sufficient affordable housing</p> <p>O - 9350 - 7113 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9379	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>The amount of new housing east of Norwich is far too much.</p> <p>O - 9379 - 8124 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9505	<p>South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p>

	<p>The following responses revolve around a lack of clarity of the parish of Trowse and adjoining areas in the Joint Core Strategy consultation document. (Note also that a small portion of the Deal Ground lies within Trowse, as does the currently most favoured access to it).</p> <p>No. It is noted that, in Policy 1, Trowse is identified as one of the 'urban fringe parishes' in which 'new development in the area will be focused.' As will be seen below, the implications of this are unclear. In addition:</p> <p>(a) the term 'urban fringe parish' is imprecise. Does it mean 'a parish on the urban fringe' - which Trowse is? Or a parish that is part of an urban fringe - which Trowse is arguably not, being separated from the City by rail and river, and being primarily rural over most of its area.</p> <p>(b) To the extent that Trowse is an 'urban fringe parish', it is noted that other parishes on Norwich's urban fringe, such as Bixley and Caistor, are not so designated, leading to the implication that Trowse will receive development where those others will not.</p> <p>O - 9505 - 8142 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9512</p>	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Urban area already lots of new housing has been built, it will spoil the green areas that remain, there will be a strain on local services eg schools it took years before a school was built in Dussindale</p> <p>O - 9512 - 8140 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9544</p>	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>It is not easy to follow the questions as the points raised seem to be repeated in other questions. In principle I do not agree that the amount of housing planned is required as the aim of the study is to encourage an incoming population into Norfolk. I agree we need a slow increase in housing to satisfy natural growth within the area.</p> <p>At the present time there is a current commitment of 11,851 houses. This in my view is sufficient to 2026, no more are required.</p> <p>We have a hospital which cannot cope with the present population and was built with insufficient beds. Extensions are required now and certainly to accommodate the proposed extra 11,851.</p>

	O - 9544 - 8146 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -
9562	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>As Drayton Parish Council has already stated there should be no further development NW of Norwich, there are already traffic problems. Why build adjacent to Airport, when there are alternatives. We consider development in our area should refer to Drayton local plan.</p> <p>O - 9562 - 6690 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9695	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Why not have more development in Diss and Harleston where there are more employment opportunities?</p> <p>O - 9695 - 5446 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9753	<p>MRS JENNIFER HALL [8180] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 14/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>These areas are already large enough. To add more housing will destroy any community which manages to exist and put too much strain on services such as Doctors/Dentists. Development should take place in larger villages with the structure available to support same or the creation of a new "village" with appropriate facilities should be considered.</p> <p>O - 9753 - 8180 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9757	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 15/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Developing the fringe parishes must be balanced with appropriate infrastructure development. For example, Thorpe St Andrew</p>

	<p>has undergone a great deal of development in recent years (ie Dussindale) without a comparative increase in services or investment in existing services. In the case of Thorpe St Andrew, some services are in fact being withdrawn (Walk-in Health Centre).</p> <p>O - 9757 - 8184 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9790	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>No, we do not agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy. This does the obvious and fails to focus on the needs of rural communities. The strategy should be one of dispersement not of principally enlarging existing population centres. The fundamental focus must be on what we can deliver to rural communities and thereafter take the easy options in Norwich and the main towns.</p> <p>O - 9790 - 7513 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9853	<p>Mr Paul Johnson [8207] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 25/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>I personally would prefer East Anglia, and particularly Norfolk, to remain as rural and undeveloped as possible. I would prefer Norfolk's population to remain low.</p> <p>Failing this it is of vital importance that facilities and services are put in, from the start, to adequately support the/ any growth in population.</p> <p>O - 9853 - 8207 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9896	<p>Mr Peter Sutton [8219] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 27/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>I object to the proposal that the surrounding parishes of Old Catton/Sprowston/Thorpe are to be sucked into the City of Norwich in this way. It is clear to me that the intention is to eventually do away with these parishes all together and subsume them into the city of Norwich. This plan can only spoil the quality of life of those already living in the surrounding parishes.</p>

	O - 9896 - 8219 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -
9913	<p>Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>It would put too much pressure on the outskirts of Norwich - too much traffic will come into the city - regardless of any planned new roads being built.</p> <p>O - 9913 - 6780 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
9989	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>Bunwell is currently shown in Policy 9 "Other Villages" although it has been long recognised as a Sustainable Community. It has more essential support services than those listed as a Policy 8 "Services Villages" requirement, therefore that is what it should be recognised as.</p> <p>O - 9989 - 8228 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10082	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>There are sites inside and around the City where building could take place. I object very strongly to the plans for building large developments in the small towns like Hingham, Wymondham etc. I think this section places too much emphasis on these small towns.</p> <p>O - 10082 - 8235 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10099	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p>

	<p>All development should be focused within the outer ring road of Norwich where the infrastructure already exist.</p> <p>O - 10099 - 8239 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10236	<p>Mrs M/M Craven/Whattam [8256] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large developments of small, historic market towns and larger villages would irrevocably damage their heritage, status and identity. - The scale of the proposed developments would threaten the natural environment, putting at risk significant populations of protected species and their fragile habitats, contrary to the local plan. - The sheer size of the developments would overwhelm local infrastructures (schools, medical services, roads etc.) and constrained town centres would be unable to support an increase in housing of the proposed scale. - Rather than being an integral part of the existing towns/villages, the new developments would create separate communities. - Many people prefer to live in quieter communities. Not everyone wants to live on a large estate. - By not allowing development in smaller settlements, there is little possibility of village communities thriving and surviving. - Employment opportunities exist throughout Norfolk, not just in a few key areas. <p>O - 10236 - 8256 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10427	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>When houses are built, it is also essential that schools, doctors and other amenities are put in place.</p> <p>O - 10427 - 8308 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10450	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>It sounds a good idea, but you cannot make more than you have already got.</p> <p>O - 10450 - 8309 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>

<p>10478</p>	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Building more roads for people to drive along instead of walking or cycle riding is not encouraging healthy living or active lifestyles. No development.</p> <p>O - 10478 - 8310 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10531</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? I object to service villages. These villages have remained small because roads and other infrastructure are unsuitable for further development. They are on minor roads with few pavements, village halls are small, shops are going bust/losing the post office ,pubs are shut or are restaurants meaning more car journeys to facilities. Local bus routes are often more expensive than using the car and more vehicles make cycling dangerous. Slower speed limits are not enforced and parking at schools would become more chaotic. Crossing the road becomes more dangerous. Wildlife would suffer. The landscape character will suffer meaning people seeking healthy pursuits will travel further.</p> <p>O - 10531 - 8312 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10555</p>	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? Leave things as they are.</p> <p>O - 10555 - 8318 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10578</p>	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p>

	O - 10578 - 8319 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -
10635	<p>Mr Alfred Townly [7878] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 10/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>This concept will create conurbation.</p> <p>It is obsessed with Norwich rather than looking at sustainable employment and investment in rural Norfolk.</p> <p>The Garden Village of Thorpe End is already blighted by traffic,noise and carcinogenic pollution.</p> <p>No Traffic projections have been given,in spite of people requesting these.</p> <p>The Link road from plumstead road C874 to the postwick roundabout has not been implemented in spite of being an integral part of the business park planning application.</p> <p>O - 10635 - 7878 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10637	<p>Mr Alfred Townly [7878] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 10/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>This concept of a greater Norwich means transport into Norwich.</p> <p>Traffic movements are what we do not need.An example for this is the proposed additional park and ride on the southern by pass at Postwick.70% of that traffic currently comes from The coast,whilst at the coast Business parks are empty.We need investments in Towns such as Acle etc with sustainable employment & housing .</p> <p>O - 10637 - 7878 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
10817	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?</p> <p>The hierarchy does not fall four square with the provision of development set out elsewhere in the JCS nor is it possible to apply "The scale of development will decrease at each level of the hierarchy" As an example the wording suggest that development in Trowse will be greater than in the Main Towns clearly this is not the case.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that the wording "The scale of development will decrease at each level of the hierarchy" is deleted</p>

	<p>from the policy in order to avoid unnecessary confusion. The East of England Plan ranks Wymondham higher than any NPA location outside the City of Norwich, this should be reflected throughout the statements of policy. Therefore policy 1 should be amended to read:</p> <p>Policy 1 Settlement hierarchy New development in the area will be focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The urban area of Norwich, and Wymondham. The urban fringe parishes of Colney, Costessey, Cringleford, Trowse, Thorpe St. Andre, Sprowston, Old Catton, Hellesdon, Drayton and Taverham • Major mixed-use developments in specified locations within the Norwich Policy Area • Main towns • Key service centres • Service villages • Other villages <p>O - 10817 - 8362 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10844</p>	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? We are generally happy with the hierarchy, although we feel the first category of 'the urban area of Norwich' is far too broad a definition and does not provide any room for distinction between radically different forms of development. We would suggest this should be divided into two categories and prioritised accordingly: A: the existing urban area B: the 'urban fringe', both in Norwich and adjacent parishes There is, for instance, a large contrast in impact and sustainability between inner urban developments and those in semi-rural locations such as Cringleford.</p> <p>O - 10844 - 8018 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10997</p>	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? No - Service Villages. You can't just land another 15-20 houses on a rural village and expect it not to have a huge impact on</p>

existing residents. Raises question of more young people, lack of access to Norwich and nightlife. No bus services in evening.

O - 10997 - 8370 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -

11083 Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy?

No.

New development should be focused first and foremost on the city centre and the urban area of Norwich as this is where development can be provided most sustainably.

The urban fringe parishes should not be lumped in with the city centre/urban area as development in the former will most likely occur on green field sites. Such locations are often more attractive to developers than brownfield sites in the city centre and hence the hierarchy should give priority to the latter.

The difference between development in the urban fringe parishes and major mixed developments in specified locations within the NPA is unclear, because several of the latter have been proposed for location in the urban fringes.

We recommend a revised hierarchy as follows:

New development in the area will be focused on:

- The urban area of Norwich
- Small and medium sites in sustainable locations in the urban fringe parishes of Costessey, Cringleford, Sprowston, Hellesdon, Drayton and Taverham, Thorpe St Andrew
- delete Colney and Trowse as further development would undermine their character and their setting
- Major mixed developments in specified locations with NPA
- Main towns
- Key service centres
- Service villages
- Other villages

O - 11083 - 8387 - (Q3) Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy , (Q3) Do you agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy? -

Response – Q4 – Q5

Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area

Policy 2 (page 20) proposes the places where large scale growth will be focussed, in the Norwich Policy Area

Q4 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy area

Policy 2 (page 20) proposes the places where large scale growth will be focussed, in the Norwich Policy Area.

Q4 Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q4 Total	151	27	55	73	155

Rep No.	Name of respondent [JDI reference number] Response e.g COMMENT, SUPPORT, OBJECT Method of response e.g. Web / paper, and date of submission
---------	--

7911 Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - **COMMENT**

Web - 06/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Rapid bus transit would be a plus, but bus fares have become exorbitant. Until there is local exertion of pressure to keep fares affordable, traffic will not abate.

The need for these new houses is dependent upon generating employment options. Relocation from London or other expensive areas should be a major benefit to a company, and having affordable, quality housing is requisite. I cannot fathom whether you will attempt or be able to do this successfully.

Providing an attraction (golf course, fantastic park, community centres) will be key to populating the new estates.

C - 7911 - 6885 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

7961 Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - **COMMENT**

Web - 12/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

proposed growth is to large for reasons already stated

	C - 7961 - 6862 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -
7981	<p>mr Daniel Yellop [7836] - COMMENT Web - 13/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? I generally agree however on the point of a new rail station at Rackheath. I assume this will be for the eco town development. I think the this can only be justified if the eco town is a lot bigger than I have heard it will be, the town would need to have a population around 20k or more to warrant the outlay of initial money. Perhaps the eco town development could be tailored to serve the existing station at Salhouse which is not too far away from the proposed development.</p> <p>C - 7981 - 7836 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8081	<p>Mr S Buller [7879] - COMMENT Web - 25/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? SUPPORT IF THERE ARE LIMITS ON THE WAY THE AREA WILL BE CHANGED</p> <p>C - 8081 - 7879 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8111	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - COMMENT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? There is unlikely to be sufficient wealth producing employment available to sustain the proposed level of housing development. An influx of unemployed persons will severely detract the living environment. Norfolk has been known as the bread basket of England. Are you hell bent on destroying this image?</p> <p>C - 8111 - 7888 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8322	<p>Mr Geoffrey Loades [6873] - COMMENT Web - 16/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p>

	<p>major new town developments must be properly costed before widespread release of info. Experience to date suggests that some sites have been suggested without being thought through raising unnecessary concerns and potential effects upon property values.</p> <p>C - 8322 - 6873 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8381	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? We have concerns that there is an over-reliance on large sites that require substantial investment in new infrastructure. Credit is in short supply and this has major implications for deliverability.</p> <p>C - 8381 - 7966 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8390	<p>Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? We have concerns that there is an over-reliance on large sites that require substantial investment in new infrastructure. Credit is in short supply in the recession and this has major implications for deliverability.</p> <p>C - 8390 - 7012 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8782	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? I would like to know in what proportion Breckland, North & North West Norfolk contribute to housing, infrastructure plans in the NPA development plans before I decide</p> <p>C - 8782 - 8061 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8875	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support</p>

	<p>the proposed strategy for growth? too much, too fast. where is the demonstrable shortage of labour for local jobs?</p> <p>C - 8875 - 8071 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8876	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? as 1800 homes are to be found in the NPA there should also be junction improvements along the A140 which is an important corridor for growth.</p> <p>C - 8876 - 7620 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9076	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? We do not yet know the final full effects of the recession. It may well be that Norwich now has too many shops and there may where suitable need to be some shops turned into residential provision instead</p> <p>C - 9076 - 8109 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9353	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Too much, not sustainable, will end up with the possibility of future slums, not enough green spaces (back gardens) giving people a small private space</p> <p>C - 9353 - 8120 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9472	<p>Louisa Young [8135] - COMMENT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p>

	<p>Why on earth more office space in Norwich??? There are plenty of offices that are empty as far as I can see. Any new Office development must be zero carbon and attractive to look at. What about transport alternatives within Norwich like tram services?</p> <p>C - 9472 - 8135 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9639	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? We do not support the proposed growth strategy as it remains unproven when compared with reasonable alternatives. Unless and until this is done there can be no assurance that the chosen option is correct. There is no guarantee that the way in which the proposed growth has been thinly spread in South Norfolk will support the levels of infrastructure provision and/or services that may be required. There is no evidence to suggest that a new rail halt at either Rackheath or Broadland Business Park is feasible or viable. A proposed rail halt at Broadland Business Park was proposed some years ago and has never been implemented. The reasons for this should be investigated and discussed within the Core Strategy and justification advanced as to why it is now considered to be viable when it clearly has not been in the past. If it is deemed to be feasible, its timing and means of delivery should be specified. At the present time, there is no guarantee that the investment needed at Rackheath will be made or that the rail operator sees this as a viable proposition. Without such assurances or evidence on which to base the preferred choice it is difficult to see how the preferred option can be justified. The document needs to define what is meant by "innovative new services" on the Wymondham-Norwich-Wroxham axis.</p> <p>C - 9639 - 7503 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9754	<p>MRS JENNIFER HALL [8180] - COMMENT Web - 14/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? There is no evidence of businesses/manufacturing employers moving to the Norwich area to create a need for the defined housing requirements. Norfolk is viewed as a retirement location.</p> <p>C - 9754 - 8180 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10062	<p>RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Alan Presslee) [8160]) -</p>

COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Broadly supportive of the growth locations and indicative minimal figures.

Policy 2 should reiterate that these represent minimal growth figures for each location.

Seek clarification that small and medium sites are expected to, generally, deliver ahead of strategic sites.

Supportive of the principle of providing a new business park associated with the airport, provided that it is widened to include non-airport related uses and which would benefit from close location to the airport, sustainable transport (including Park & Ride) and connectivity to new/existing residential communities.

C - 10062 - 8232 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

10067 The Greetham Trustees [7606] (represented by Strutt and Parker (Mr David Williams) [7605]) - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

We broadly support the proposed strategy for growth within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA). The NPA, as Policy NR1 of the adopted East of England Plan states is one of the two locations with the highest levels of growth within the region. The policy also states that there should be a major shift in emphasis across the Norwich Policy Area towards travel by public transport, cycling and walking.

The importance of the urban area of Norwich to the GNDP area is not doubted, however the correct balance must be achieved between directing growth towards the larger settlements and also supporting rural settlements.

The note along with Policy 2 states that places in the Norwich Policy Area which also appear in the Hierarchy as either Norwich Fringe parishes, Main Towns, Key Service Centres, Service Villages, Other Villages may also be considered for development within this policy. It is considered that these settlements should be included within the policy, for example there should be a breakdown of the 1,800 new dwellings that will be accommodated in the 9 service villages, 6 other villages, 5 Key Service Centres that are located within the Norwich Policy Area.

	<p>Other villages and service villages within the Norwich Policy Area should benefit from public transport links to Norwich, and there are settlements located within the GNDP, with underused public transport infrastructure, such as Spooner Row to the south east of Wymondham. Development in such a location would adhere to the strategy for accommodating growth in the NPA as set out in Policy 2 of the regulation 25 consultation document. In particular it would yield an opportunity to provide the type of innovative new rail services on the Wymondham to Norwich portion of the line stated within the policy. This would meet the advice given in PPS3 paragraph 38, that the relationships between rural settlements should be considered to ensure that growth is distributed in a way that supports informal social support network and assists people to live near to their place of work.</p> <p>C - 10067 - 7606 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10146</p>	<p>R Smith [8243] (represented by Beacon Planning Ltd (Ms Jenny Page) [7833]) - COMMENT Paper - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? In general, this policy is supported. Although the policy should include that employment development in key service centres and smaller settlements will be an important contribution to employment provision particularly for small businesses.</p> <p>It is noted that point 2 in the section covering housing need identifies at least an additional 2000 houses on small and medium sites within the NPA. The fact that this figure is considered to be a minimum with an aspiration to achieve higher than this is not highlighted elsewhere in the document. Opportunities for delivering housing on sustainable sites could therefore be lost particularly as the smaller sites are likely to be able to be delivered faster than the major growth locations.</p> <p>C - 10146 - 8243 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10300</p>	<p>mrs LISA ford [8282] - COMMENT Web - 07/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Building new developments near to new employment areas does not automatically mean people living in the new developments will work in the new employment areas.</p> <p>C - 10300 - 8282 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10309</p>	<p>Wintersgill LLP (Mr Matthew Wintersgill) [8289] - COMMENT</p>

Paper - 20/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Generally:

The Norfolk Hub is a concept proposal first tabled by Wintersgill LLP and others in the concept design team in 2005 which was explained in greater detail in their Pre-feasibility Proposal Document in 2006.

The latter document has been shown to a small number of officers and members in Norfolk County Council and Broadland District Council.

The concept:

The Norfolk Hub is a concept whose details are yet to be defined.

It is the nature of this type of concept that the content of such a finished development will need to be examined in considerable detail before proposals are finalised.

Many aspects will need to be considered including commercial viability, transport links, planning policies and land availability.

The exact nature of the development should, therefore, be regarded as flexible at this stage.

However, the concept of the Hub is based on the potential synergy between two related but separate commercial "offers".

1. A world class, purpose-built large conference/event centre capable of housing large events with the flexibility to host a number of smaller events, as the market dictates, with related catering, parking and other facilities, set in an out-of-town location for maximum transport convenience.
2. A popular tourist attraction capable of building on the existing tourism business which the region already has, using the attractions of the nearby city and the Broads but providing an offer which the region does not currently have. This offer could include an all-weather enclosure to achieve an all-year attraction and a lake/water resource combined with a quality and scale of tourism facilities not found nearby.

The two offers can provide a synergy through the week and through the year, with the event business filling hotels Monday to Thursday while the tourism business can provide weekend trade, while the conference business pauses in the summer months at

precisely the time when the tourism business is at its peak.

This combination of offers can provide a sound economic basis for a number of other facilities which can be co-located:

- Hotels, of a range of standards and sizes which will suit large events and would provide a scale and top end quality which the area does not currently have, particularly the provision of four and five star hotels.
- Restaurants on site to cater for event attendees and tourists.
- Retail units and coffee shops - not of a scale to compete with or threaten the city centre shopping, but of a scale and nature to cater for some on-site demand.
- Health club/indoor sports centre
- Sports facilities such as a golf course, shooting and other country pursuits.
- Housing - for site staff, other local people or for people wanting a holiday cottage/flat near a tourist attraction.
- Public transport - in the form of new bus links and possibly an Ultra-light Rail link - this is a tram-scale of provision (but with advantages over a tram) which costs about one tenth that of a 'light railway' to build and operate and could provide fast, easy links both to the city centre and the airport.

The Hub will be a significant generator of new employment, both higher and lower skilled jobs, with a significant potential for part time working.

It will also be a golden opportunity to produce a truly green, low-energy, ecologically-friendly development which will set the standards for future Norfolk developments.

The Woodbastwick site:

Part of the need for a proper Pre-feasibility Study is to determine what the mix of facilities required are, based on sound commercial logic.

The mix and scale of uses, together with the initial phasing plan, then determines what size of site is required and an examination of land availability and transport links can then determine which site(s) are viable for the Hub concept.

The site currently under consideration is of 4.21 Sq Km and is delineated on the "Woodbastwick Site Proposal". The land appears at this stage to be of a suitable size and is conveniently located for the site of the new eco-town nearby, Norwich city centre and Norwich airport.

Planning policy:

The Woodbastwick site appears to conform to several of the policies of the Joint Core Strategy, namely:

"Policy 15 The Economy":-

The local economy will be developed in a sustainable way:

To facilitate the job growth potential of the local economy and deliver the RSS target.

Sufficient employment land will be allocated in locations consistent with the Spatial Hierarchy policy to meet identified need and provide for choice. In particular ...

Larger scale needs will be addressed through the allocation of sufficient land to provide a choice and range of sites.

Opportunities for innovation, skills and training will be expanded through ...

Encouraging links between training/education provision and relevant business concentrations including co-location where appropriate.

Tourism, leisure and cultural industries will be promoted. This will be assisted by:

- the general emphasis of the Joint Core Strategy on achieving high quality design and environmental enhancement
- implementation of a Green Infrastructure Strategy
- encouragement for appropriate development including sustainable tourism initiatives

Reasoned Justification:

8.15 Tourism, leisure and cultural industries are recognised as crucial sectors in the local economy that are also fundamental to local quality of life and the attraction and retention of other businesses and staff."

Conclusion:

Whilst still being at a 'concept' stage, this proposal has the potential to be of significant strategic importance in the region.

It could revitalise the region in a way which no other current proposal is likely to do and its potential effect on the region's economy could be far reaching and very beneficial.

For this reason we ask that the Norfolk Hub concept be included in the Joint Core Strategy as a Potential Development Site to ensure that no planning impediment is placed in its way.

C - 10309 - 8289 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

10382 GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT

Paper - 01/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA):

8. We welcome the identification of strategic employment sites but would see merit in quantifying your target for employment growth within the NPA. The inclusion of indicative targets would also be helpful in terms of understanding the roles of the locations listed and related infrastructure requirements/

9. We would encourage you to give further consideration to the relationship between your proposed housing and employment locations. For example, if Rackheath emerges as an eco-town location, there will be an expectation that unsustainable commuter trips will be kept to a minimum, and that some employment will be provided as part of a mixed use development. This may have implications for the scale of growth proposed for Broadland Business Park and Norwich Airport; we comment further on employment related issues elsewhere (Policies 5 and 15).

C - 10382 - 7463 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

10406 Easton College [3570] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Colin Campbell) [7597]) - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Policy 2 fails to recognise the importance and potential of agriculture and land-based industries and the potential synergies with institutions such as Easton College. We recommend the addition of a new bullet "support for the rural economy and to enable the agricultural industry to innovate, remain competitive and exploit synergies with environmental industries." We also recommend that the expansion of Easton College be added to the second bullet.

C - 10406 - 3570 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

10413	<p>Honingham Thorpe Farms Limited [8296] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Colin Campbell) [7597]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? In Policy 2 we recommend the inclusion of a bullet to reflect the importance and potential of agriculture and land-based industries "support for the rural economy and to enable the agricultural industry to innovate, remain competitive and exploit synergies with environmental industries." C - 10413 - 8296 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10608	<p>Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271] (represented by Andrew Martin Associates (Mr Michael Calder) [7689]) - COMMENT Paper - 01/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? With regard to site BDC0076 (Hellesdon Golf Course West), part of this site (11.2ha) falls within the inner and middle consultation zones as identified by the HSE and as such, residential development on this land would not be acceptable in principle, however non-residential uses would. The remainder of this site (16.5ha) falls within the outer consultation zone and therefore residential development on the northern part of the site would be acceptable to the HSE. In light of this information, we proposed a mixed use development on this site, with non-residential uses on the southern part. This approach would lead to between 250 and 400 dwellings on this site. C - 10608 - 8271 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10692	<p>Mrs Jacalyn Collins [7797] - COMMENT Paper - 22/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? "BIG" is far from beautiful as history normally shows. Councils need to serve the 'local' communities concentrating on jobs, schools, houses and the environment. The larger the authority, the poorer the response to local needs. PLEASE LEAVE WELL ALONE! C - 10692 - 7797 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>

11027	<p>Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] - COMMENT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? The strategy for growth, which like the Spatial Vision details the role to be played by smaller sites in sustainable locations, is also supported.</p> <p>C - 11027 - 7175 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
7948	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - SUPPORT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? I support this providing the infrastructure is first.</p> <p>S - 7948 - 7809 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
7988	<p>Mr Keith Bigland [7843] - SUPPORT Web - 14/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? agree</p> <p>S - 7988 - 7843 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8106	<p>Mr S Buller [7879] - SUPPORT Web - 28/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Areas have been started so need to be completed</p> <p>S - 8106 - 7879 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8151	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support</p>

	<p>the proposed strategy for growth? I wish you luck. When you can get a politician or a government to keep their promises you might see part of this.</p> <p>S - 8151 - 7899 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8176	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 8176 - 4796 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8225	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 8225 - 4558 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8266	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 8266 - 7912 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8292	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Full</p> <p>S - 8292 - 7915 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>

<p>8414</p>	<p>Ed King [7965] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes S - 8414 - 7965 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>8425</p>	<p>Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? yes S - 8425 - 7771 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>8465</p>	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes S - 8465 - 8016 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>8515</p>	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes S - 8515 - 7817 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>8539</p>	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8539 - 8021 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8563	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8563 - 1976 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8726	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8726 - 8053 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8834	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8834 - 8064 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8972	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8972 - 8092 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>

<p>9100</p>	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 9100 - 7111 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>9101</p>	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 9101 - 8111 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>9143</p>	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 9143 - 8112 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>9148</p>	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes, but why not also start to establish a comprehensive cycle network?</p> <p>S - 9148 - 2055 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>9216</p>	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9216 - 1828 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9351	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Only if there is an efficient transport system</p> <p>S - 9351 - 7113 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9423	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Again qualified yes as in our response to Q3</p> <p>S - 9423 - 8127 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9448	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Again expansion of existing sites must be pursued and road improvements must be a good thing.</p> <p>S - 9448 - 8134 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9482	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>But I am sorry about greenfield sites</p> <p>S - 9482 - 8139 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>

<p>9597</p>	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 9597 - 8162 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>9671</p>	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 9671 - 8047 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>9771</p>	<p>Mr Michael Whalley [8189] (represented by King Sturge (Mr Mark Connell) [6455]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes. The strategy of focussing growth and development in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) is endorsed. The statement that "at least an additional 2,000 dwellings on small and medium sites in sustainable locations elsewhere in the Broadland NPS" will be provided in the period 2008-2026, creates a policy framework to deliver additional development at Key Service Centres, such as Blofield. Policy 2 is therefore supported.</p> <p>S - 9771 - 8189 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>9823</p>	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 9823 - 8198 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>9873</p>	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>We know you are aware of the report by Matthew Taylor MP of the results of the review carried out at the Prime Minister's request, into the provision of housing in the rural countryside.</p> <p>We hope that when the Government and planning community have had the opportunity to digest the findings of the report, schemes will be devised to put its proposals into practice by implementing the philosophy of developing the countryside proportionately within its existing structures.</p> <p>S - 9873 - 2058 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9926	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>YES - BUT - I don't see why there will be an increase in employment just because space is made available - it will take something more than office space to persuade companies to create jobs in this region.</p> <p>S - 9926 - 7015 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9990	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9990 - 8228 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10024	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10024 - 8230 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>

<p>10047</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 10047 - 2373 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10125</p>	<p>Mr David Nichols [8242] - SUPPORT Web - 31/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? no further comment</p> <p>S - 10125 - 8242 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10159</p>	<p>Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [7674]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? The strategy for growth, which like the Spatial Vision details the role to be played by smaller sites in sustainable locations, is also supported, as are the strategic employment locations at Longwater and Norwich Research Park/UEA.</p> <p>S - 10159 - 8244 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10175</p>	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 10175 - 8246 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10212</p>	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? But the number of homes for Wymondham should be limited to 1000, otherwise the historic character will be lost.</p> <p>S - 10212 - 5864 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10361	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? In principle, yes. The Document makes no reference (especially in regard to the preferred Appendix 0) of the previously mooted development at Mangreen. The Parish Council understands that the development may be considered as a "strategic reserve". The views of the Mangreen Action Group have been submitted separately to the GNDP. These will not be rehearsed again here apart from reiterating the Parish Council's support for the content of the letter dated December 14th 2008 circulated by members of the Action Group to all SNC District Councillors.</p> <p>S - 10361 - 2020 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10396	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 10396 - 8294 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10428	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 10428 - 8308 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10507	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 10507 - 7215 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10610	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? We agree that growth of the economy with housing is much needed as long as the infrastructure, particularly water and sewage management is sufficiently provided.</p> <p>S - 10610 - 8325 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10661	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 10661 - 8348 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10730	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 10730 - 1776 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10869	<p>Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p>

Taylor Wimpey Developments and Hopkins Homes welcome the comment at paragraph 1.10 of the Technical Consultation that "to deliver the planned housing growth large scale development concentrated in particular locations and a mixture of small scale development, dispersed around the area, is proposed." The Public Consultation acknowledges the value of planned urban extensions of a moderate scale, interlinked with an existing neighbourhood of Norwich, to create the economies of scale capable of supporting/providing, in tandem, high quality public transport services, enhanced retail opportunities and improved education provision. Medium scale urban extensions can make a significant and sustainable contribution to the growth agenda and the regeneration of deprived areas of Norwich.

The achievement of the necessary housing delivery rates in the short/medium term will arise if the spatial strategy promotes an approach which incorporates a range of urban extensions, both in terms of scale and distribution. In the early years of the period to be covered by the Joint Core Strategy, the required rate of delivery will be achieved by concentrating new development on sites that presently have the benefit of planning permission and new allocations which can be developed in the short/medium term, augmenting and building upon existing facilities in established neighbourhoods. Not only is it important to ensure that new housing is supported by essential community facilities/infrastructure but it is also equally vital to confirm that the proposed urban extensions are integrated with the existing built-up area of Norwich, not physically/socially divorced from it. The new development areas must exhibit a strong degree of interaction with the existing urban area if the objectives enshrined in Policy NR1 of the East of England Plan are to be fulfilled.

We agree with the observation in Policy 2 of the Consultation that the focus for major growth and development will be the Norwich Policy Area as defined in Appendix 4. Our clients equally support the proposition that further employment development is envisaged at strategic locations, including the consolidation of activity at Longwater. New housing should be accommodated in locations well related to the strategic employment sites.

S - 10869 - 8363 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

10927 Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support

	<p>the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 10927 - 8368 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10951	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 10951 - 8369 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10975	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 10975 - 8176 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10998	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 10998 - 8370 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
11043	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT Paper - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? However brownfield sites are a finite resource and some may not be viable due to site clean up costs etc. Sustainable locations in the NPA such as Trowse should provide appropriate locations for new housing development.</p>

	S - 11043 - 6955 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -
11072	<p>Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>But would wish to clarify that the smaller and medium sites are expected to deliver ahead of strategic sites</p> <p>Strongly supportive of new business park associated with the airport, provided that this is widened to include non-airport related uses which would benefit from close proximity to the airport, sustainable transport and connectivity to new and existing residential communities</p> <p>Put forward the site known as Manor Farm Horsford (see attached plan) as the strategic site for the above stated new business park given its proximity to the airport, major transport links, park and ride and its location within the proposed NDR preventing any further coalescence of settlements.</p> <p>S - 11072 - 7535 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
11112	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>We support the definition of the NPA at Appendix 4. Policy 5 suggests that 7,200 dwellings will be provided in larger developments in specified locations in the South Norfolk component of the NPA. Is that figure correct or is the requirement of 9,000 units set out in Policy 2 right?</p> <p>S - 11112 - 8390 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
11128	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support</p>

	<p>the proposed strategy for growth? Yes</p> <p>S - 11128 - 2373 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
7871	<p>Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] - OBJECT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? we do not need more growth and the destruction that goes with it. it is what the majority wants that counts not politicians</p> <p>O - 7871 - 7782 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
7925	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT Web - 08/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? no we neither want or need this excessive growth</p> <p>O - 7925 - 7812 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
7960	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - OBJECT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? with food security becoming an increasing concern as world population explodes we should not be building on large areas of agricultural land - East Anglia provides 1/3rd of the nations food this is more important than housing</p> <p>O - 7960 - 6862 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
7997	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - OBJECT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? I think the Norwich development is acceptable but the burden on south norfolk is too great - there is a lack of basic public transport and infrastructure in the south norfolk area. I don't know about Broadland as I don't know enough about that area.</p>

	O - 7997 - 7851 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -
8055	<p>timothy watson [7866] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 17/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>The provision for significant expansion of office space in Norwich city is unnecessary.</p> <p>The provision for extra housing in Broadland is excessive</p> <p>O - 8055 - 7866 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8086	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 26/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>I do not support huge growth in and around the Norwich area. I suspect that it will be difficult to deliver the increase in employment opportunities suggested here. Norwich has always been a relatively small city because of its distance from London and other major cities and its relatively poor transport links. This would have to change to encourage more businesses and jobs to the city.</p> <p>O - 8086 - 7880 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8139	<p>Mr Alan Fairweather [7889] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 31/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Impossible to agree or disagree as a view or vision of where we will progress too has not been expressed in an informed judgement to be made.</p> <p>O - 8139 - 7889 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8201	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support</p>

	<p>the proposed strategy for growth? No. Much of this has been overtaken by the current depression and in any cases focussing on airport related use is not sustainable. Flying and car use has to be curtailed. We are in the throes of environmental crisis. You should be emphasising job creation in green technologies and services. Shopping and business will decline during this period.</p> <p>O - 8201 - 7901 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8314	<p>Marion Amos [7919] - OBJECT Web - 14/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? I don't want to live in the city you envisage. Your desire for growth is totally out of step with that of most of the inhabitants. By the time you have built the road to nowhere, you will not have any money left for all the other worthy causes. And I object strongly to the dual strategy of building the road and opening up vast new areas for house building. The road has been sold to many people as a way to reduce congestion, whereas the real major aim is to vastly expand the city.</p> <p>O - 8314 - 7919 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8316	<p>Mr Anthony Knights [7922] - OBJECT Web - 15/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? The NNDR is an outmoded piece of 1970's road planning that will increase global warming and eventually traffic flows. it will also take far too much greenfield and agricultural land.</p> <p>O - 8316 - 7922 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8340	<p>e buitenhuis [7951] - OBJECT Web - 19/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? The spatial vision should be redesigned to stimulate combine work and living within walking and cycling distance of each other</p> <p>O - 8340 - 7951 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8355	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? I support this</p> <p>O - 8355 - 6992 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>8356</p>	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - OBJECT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? I am uncertain as to the full effectiveness of this strategy.</p> <p>O - 8356 - 6992 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>8401</p>	<p>COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978] - OBJECT Web - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Colney Parish Meeting The JCS was discussed at the Committee Meeting for Colney Parish on 14th April 2009. There are many good ideas in the document especially those relating to the environment and village communities. However, concerns were expressed that the massive scale development envisaged was based on a Regional Spatial Strategy that was out of date and unsustainable. We therefore cannot support any of the large scale developments proposed and believe that building on this scale would have an adverse impact upon quality of life in the County.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Hazel Martin Clerk 4 Church Farm Colney NR4 7TX</p> <p>O - 8401 - 7978 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>

<p>8406</p>	<p>paul eldridge [7987] - OBJECT Web - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? basically to say to central government that enough growth thank you, i do not believe that Norwich can remain the city i have grown to love if this growth occurs. If this has to happen i feel that an eco town offers the best solution however not one that encourages car use by being placed within reach of the NDR. The money that has been wasted on the development of this road could have been better used to promote public transport within the city and the surrounds, the NDR will be a white elephant</p> <p>O - 8406 - 7987 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>8447</p>	<p>Ian Harris [8007] - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Cars, cars, cars. Don't you have anything better to offer? No greater vision than 'more of the same'? The weak platitudes about 'rapid bus transit' and the like are almost afterthoughts, rather than the central strategy: 'build more roads'. This is beginning to look like the Greater Norwich Road Development Project.</p> <p>O - 8447 - 8007 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>8489</p>	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? All employment development OK except for expansion of office provision in city centre - too much already - need more small business of all varieties. (Is this just a way of the council making more money on rates?) If we actually do need more housing investigate ways of having higher density with thoughtful planning. Can be done</p> <p>O - 8489 - 8020 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>8587</p>	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p>

	<p>Roads and infrastructure inadequate. Carbon footprint and global warming.</p> <p>O - 8587 - 8024 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8621	<p>Kay Eke [8025] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? With the current and future economic climate so bleak, is significant office expansion within the City Centre appropriate? Should not any development be based on a clear need, rather than spurious projections? Couldn't businesses be encouraged to relocate to the Norwich Policy Area by offering them an opportunity to attain purpose built accommodation and developing on this basis?</p> <p>O - 8621 - 8025 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8633	<p>Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? I believe that if Norwich expands to the proposed size it will lose its essential character and will function even less well as a socially cohesive city. It is vital that where homes are provided this is done in tandem with provision of appropriate employment opportunities</p> <p>O - 8633 - 8030 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8652	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Object to high number of proposed homes for random dispersion through small service villages</p> <p>O - 8652 - 8036 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8676	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Infill in villages only, it is not necessary to impose a further 1800 homes on small rural communities.</p> <p>O - 8676 - 8044 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8699	<p>mrs jane fischl [8031] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? No - I do not want to see radical expansion of the city. Its all about city centre homes and jobs to keep the city alive and vibrant</p> <p>O - 8699 - 8031 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8709	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Are the calculations right for SN NPA at page 20? The table at 1.11 shows a total of 9,000 new units for SN - including 1,800 on smaller sites. This is repeated at p 26 and more or less the same at p 46. Page 20 text says 9,000 dwellings in larger developments and an additional 1,800 elsewhere in SN NPA (i.e. total of 10,800 in SN NPA). Which is correct?</p> <p>O - 8709 - 8049 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8719	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? 32,000 dwellings are too many for the region in this downward recession. These figures in the existing climate are now grossly out of date.</p> <p>O - 8719 - 8045 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8771	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support</p>

	<p>the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>You have failed to provide adequate evidence that such development is either desirable, practical or achievable. Particularly, a) you have failed to explain the damaging effect of such development upon rural and village areas, and have not justified that, and b) you have failed to justify the need to perpetuate the cult of private motoring that a NDR will encourage, flying in the face of climate change minimisation - your public transport suggestions being tacked-on afterthoughts of little value.</p> <p>O - 8771 - 8060 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8806	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>We question how realistic and relevant some aspects are in light of the recession</p> <p>O - 8806 - 6869 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8896	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Hempnall Parish council fundamentally objects to the large scale growth envisaged. We would like to see a lower level of housing development and a reduction in the number of greenfield sites involved. We also believe that tying the provision of a Long Stratton by-pass to large scale housing development will negate its benefits. 1800 extra commuters into Norwich each morning</p> <p>O - 8896 - 2014 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8931	<p>Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Houses in Norwich stand empty - why build new ones?</p> <p>O - 8931 - 8079 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8941	<p>Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>We can not fill the empty offices in the city as it is! Why persist in building more - just because some expensive consultant said it was a good idea? Do the people of Norfolk need all these thousands of houses? If not, don't build them. Don't build the NDR - it is not necessary. Invest instead in the main line rail service to London. That will have to be almost rebuilt from scratch but it must be done and it would be far more useful than the NDR - which is totally unnecessary.</p> <p>O - 8941 - 8087 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8949	<p>Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>I do not want further development of the beautiful Yare valley, I want it for leisure and as a "green lung" for Norwich, so I object to the proposal to extend the Norwich Research Park.</p> <p>I do not want this excessive expansion for Norwich, growth should be slower and more organic. Jobs and homes should be much closer together to reduce the need for transport and commuting.</p> <p>I do not want the NDR, I want priority to be given to measures that will reduce the need for road transport.</p> <p>O - 8949 - 8088 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
8959	<p>MR Richard Edwards [7925] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>No. I don't want to see Norwich expand to the size of Nottingham</p> <p>O - 8959 - 7925 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9030	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>As in Q 3 Long Stratton and Wymondham lack the employment base to justify strategic housing growth.</p>

	O - 9030 - 4187 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -
9187	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employment locations: these are mostly in non-sustainable locations, particularly the airport and Hethel (!) - whereas non-car access has to be key. - Housing: it is the kind of housing and its layout that matters not just numbers. - Transport: the road schemes are out-moded and the public transport schemes are not enough. Your innovative new rail services will have to penetrate the city as tram-train <p>O - 9187 - 8114 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9229	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>No, growth not needed, recipe for economic disaster as has recently been shown</p> <p>O - 9229 - 4494 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9261	<p>Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>I do not think that the Norwich area should have so many additional houses. Once the brown field sites have been used up a halt should be called.</p> <p>O - 9261 - 8115 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9287	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p>

	<p>Long Stratton bypass should NOT be dependant upon 1800 houses. We should have one fully funded by Government. Long Stratton cannot support 1800 houses - where will people work? Either Norwich or Diss and roads (A140) are crowded at present</p> <p>O - 9287 - 5445 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9292	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? It seems that Norwich and environs is proposed to be turned into one vast business and retail park. This city has hugely important spiritual past, present & hopefully future. Culturally it is in need of regeneration, adjacent concert hall, better accommodation for visiting artistes - we need to attract really high class performers.</p> <p>O - 9292 - 8117 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9324	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Need better link from bypass to research park</p> <p>O - 9324 - 8123 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9380	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? Small development work better. These large developments will change the character of these places and not for the better.</p> <p>O - 9380 - 8124 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9506	<p>South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p>

	<p>No. The status of Trowse is unclear, and the note at the bottom of page 20 does nothing to clarify the situation.</p> <p>O - 9506 - 8142 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9513	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? As q3, will destroy this area, lots of office space currently vacant in Norwich, why do we need more? Do agree with expansion of Norwich Research Park</p> <p>O - 9513 - 8140 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9545	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? The provision of 9,000 + 3,000 in the Norwich City Council area as existing seems reasonable and possible and this would not involve greenfield sites. I agree that the expansion of office provision in the city centre and Jarrolds' expansion plans would be part of this. Expansion of higher education, Science and Research Park, Broadland Business Park, limited extension to Hethel Park , also extension of Rackheath Industrial area. I do not agree with the proposal of new development to serve major growth areas or that the proposed extra housing is required.</p> <p>O - 9545 - 8146 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9563	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? This is unnecessary, there is going to be a shortage of quality farmland and shortage of water as already stated. This is one of the driest parts of the country.</p> <p>O - 9563 - 6690 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9696	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>No mention of specific employment opportunities in Long Stratton where 1800 houses are proposed. Majority of occupants will have to commute to Norwich. Confirmation required that Long Stratton bypass will be dual carriageway.</p> <p>O - 9696 - 5446 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9722	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Far too much and too near Norwich.</p> <p>O - 9722 - 8174 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9758	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 15/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>This proposal will potentially destroy the area and risks turning the NE of Norwich into a huge business park with an associated toytown.</p> <p>O - 9758 - 8184 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9791	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>No, we do not support the strategy for growth. This strategy is now out of date and does not recognise recent changes in the financial services employment sector. The prospect of financial services employing 30% plus of Norwich/NPA residents is unlikely to continue. Financial Service organisations will restructure and will be much leaner in the UK. The Research Park has not expanded significantly in the last 14 years and there is little prospect of significant expansion in the future without substantial local and regional investment, beyond that already provided. Cambridge is the centre of Biotech development in the UK and provides a far more attractive option to expanding companies. The Strategy fails to consider in any detail diversifying Norwich's employment base beyond that which already exists. In addition it fails to address the needs of rural communities and</p>

	<p>the provision of local employment.</p> <p>O - 9791 - 7513 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9897	<p>Mr Peter Sutton [8219] - OBJECT Web - 27/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? There is too much growth proposed for the Old Catton/Thorpe/Sprowston triangle. The current road structure will not cope and significant improvements will have a huge detrimental affect on those living there. I cannot see a rapid bus service as being enough and any way how will it negotiate the traffic at peak times when it is most needed?</p> <p>O - 9897 - 8219 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9914	<p>Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? It would make the city too crowded and ruin the character of the areas concerned.</p> <p>O - 9914 - 6780 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
9922	<p>Ms Pat Brent [8065] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? No, I am not convinced that the level of growth is sustainable in the Greater Norwich area, particularly that the expected level of investment in 33,000 new jobs will be realised. To propose a significant increase in office space in Norwich when there is already a vast amount lying empty or with low levels of occupancy seems a waste of resources. Investment should be targeted towards existing local businesses and not towards attracting multinationals. In particular, I am concerned that businesses such as Roys of Wroxham or my local newsagent and Post Office will disappear in the light of new shops being inserted into the new 'villages'. We all know the new shops will be Tesco clones meaning roads are clogged with their huge trucks bringing in goods and the money spent in them disappears into the wider UK economy and doesn't remain in the local area. On no account should any further superstores be built. They are an absolute abomination blighting the countryside - Tesco</p>

Extra at Sprowston is appalling and personally I do not want to shop in a vast warehouse where no one knows each other. I accept that the economic landscape has changed somewhat since these proposals were first made but I was never convinced that such a huge swathe of new housing was ever necessary. First of all existing housing projects should be completed and evaluated to confirm if there is a demand for new houses. From what I have seen many developments have been mothballed and are awaiting funds for completion. Surely it would be better to take over these projects and complete them before destroying any further areas of countryside?

Following that evaluation further building should only take place on brown field sites - perhaps some of the empty office space in Norwich could be converted for housing?

I am unconvinced by the 'eco' veneer that has been applied to justify the expansion plans. There is a distinct lack of detail into how exactly environmentally sound any new building will be. Really any new houses should have, as a minimum, composting toilets, rain harvesting systems, solar panels, ground source heat pumps, Thermafleec insulation. However, I suspect that the same old building processes will be followed destroying yet more irreplaceable resources and releasing more carbon into the atmosphere.

I am also concerned at the provision of services. Can Anglian Water supply sufficient water and drainage capacity to the new developments? Judging by own experience the answer is no, as when the new housing at Rackheath was completed by water pressure plummeted!

Finally I think you should come clean on the real reasons behind some of these proposals which is to force through the building of Norwich Distributor Road which you can then use as the outer boundary of the City, create a Unitary Authority and implement a Congestion Charging system.

O - 9922 - 8065 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

9957

Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

The Transport Infrastructure is inappropriate. It is a list of schemes that have very uncertain outcomes and are unlikely to deliver the vision of sustainable growth. Transport infrastructure should be driven by travel requirements, not by the perceived need for certain infrastructure. We therefore believe that this whole reference to transport needs fundamentally changing. For the Norwich area to prosper whilst maintaining quality of life and addressing greenhouse gas, peak oil and health challenges there needs to be very significant modal shift. Basel in Switzerland has 75% of all trips by walking, cycling or public transport - other cities have even higher modal splits for sustainable modes. Greater Norwich needs to aspire to be amongst the best in Europe. This is likely to mean an overall reduction in car traffic whilst the area grows. We suggest therefore that the reference to transport should be:

" Transport provision will be based around the need for transport networks to operate more efficiently with a major shift to walking, cycling and public transport. Provision will include:

- Convenient and attractive walking and cycling networks
- Enhancements to the rail network with new rail halts...
- Efficient bus networks including bus rapid transit.
- A road network and parking policies that discourage unnecessary car use and operates efficiently."

O - 9957 - 6903 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

10073 **Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]** (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) -

OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd consider that the Core Strategy provides the opportunity to put in place a long term strategy for sustainable growth that will further promote Norwich as a regional city and will satisfy housing requirements for the Norwich area through the plan period and beyond. In promoting the Old Catton/Sprowston/Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth 'triangle' as a location for major growth, the Core Strategy fully supports the principle of an urban extension in the North East Norwich sector. This provides the opportunity to ensure that development is planned holistically for the delivery of sustainable communities in the area. It also accords with the fact that the principle of growth in North East Norwich has already been established in part through the development of Broadland Business Park. A sustainable urban extension will act to complement and support the vitality of the business park and vice versa.

We therefore broadly support the strategy for growth as set out in policy 2 of the draft Joint Core Strategy. However, we note inconsistencies with this policy and other parts of the strategy with regard to the housing allocations for the Broadland area. Policy 2 suggests that a maximum of 10,700 new dwellings will be accommodated in this area. Other parts of the strategy confirm that the area is expected to accommodate at least 10,000 dwellings after 2026. This should be reflected in Policy 2.

With regard to the transport infrastructure identified, as with our response to Question 2 above, we consider that Policy 2 includes bullet points that refer to both new rail halts that utilise the existing capacity of the Bittern Line and to the inner link road.

	O - 10073 - 8234 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -
10083	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>With an election pending in the not too distant future perhaps whoever gains power will actually listen to the people and let their democratic rights be respected. It is not acceptable for development on this scale to be foisted on the county. I have already commented on the NDR and the overdevelopment of the towns.</p> <p>O - 10083 - 8235 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10100	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Proposed strategy for growth should be within Norwich and within a new town at Long Stratton this will allow services to be properly provided instead of tacking onto existing services</p> <p>O - 10100 - 8239 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10237	<p>Mrs M/M Craven/Whattam [8256] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>The emphasis of large developments in a few key areas is to the detriment of Norfolk as a whole.</p> <p>O - 10237 - 8256 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10313	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>CPRE Norfolk is not in favour of the planned expansion of housing in Norfolk (particularly the levels and rates of growth in the NPA) believing it to be unsustainable on many levels. We have consistently objected to the housing numbers throughout</p>

	<p>the regional plan process.</p> <p>We consider that the strategy should only make allocations to 2021, in line with the timescale of the East of England Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). We do not see the need to extend timescales to 2026. The argument that PPS 3 requires a 15 year land supply is not valid, particularly as house build rates will fall a long way below targets during the recession. A further increase of housing numbers will have a number of adverse impacts, most significantly the premature release of greenfield land.</p> <p>In addition, we argue that the level of growth proposed in the Core Strategy was conceived in a very different economic environment and that planned levels and rates of growth must now be reviewed. It neither helps the delivery of objectives, or the credibility of the planning system, to continue with housing and job number targets which are clearly not viable given the current economic and social conditions.</p> <p>O - 10313 - 6826 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10338	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>Norwich Airport is not truly international and is already reducing flights.</p> <p>City centre offices are already vacant - why build more?</p> <p>O - 10338 - 8293 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10451	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?</p> <p>We do not want growth. No development</p> <p>O - 10451 - 8309 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10479	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support</p>

	<p>the proposed strategy for growth? Building houses on the scale you are planning will be an environmental disaster. Nice views and valuable farmland will be lost and replaced with a monotonous suburbia. No to large scale development.</p> <p>O - 10479 - 8310 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10532	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? These proposals for growth may have looked OK in past years but what account do they take of the present and future economic future. There are many brown field sites in Norwich where people could walk/cycle to work why are there not more homes being built there.</p> <p>As there are practically no large employers in South Norfolk I object to so many homes being built which will make the areas dormitory towns and villages leading to many more vehicle movements.</p> <p>O - 10532 - 8312 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10556	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? No growth necessary.</p> <p>O - 10556 - 8318 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10579	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10579 - 8319 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
10602	<p>Mr/Mrs Smith [8322] - OBJECT</p>

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

Whilst we consider the analysis in the Arup Study of job growth and land requirements to be a robust analysis, we consider that the Arup Study places insufficient emphasis on the availability of sites to drive job creation. The focus of the Arup Study appears to be on non-land use measures to deliver growth. We acknowledge the importance of such softer measures, however, we consider that a major element of the strategy must be to ensure that sufficient land is delivered to facilitate the provision of employment floorspace. Indeed, the Arup Study identifies (at para. 1.14) that there is a shortage of available land for development. Given this conclusion we are concerned that the Core Strategy fails to deliver sufficient sites of the right type in the right location at the right time and that this will be a constraint on development . The strategy is reliant on sites which are constrained and unlikely therefore to deliver, particularly in the short term.

Whilst we support growth of Science Park activity at UEA, this site is constrained by access and land ownership issues and specifically reserved to meet the needs of the high tech' sector. Studies demonstrate the importance of the growth in high tech' sector and we agree that land should continue to be reserved for such uses. However, as a result there is a need to ensure that the strategy provides for opportunities elsewhere for other economic sectors to grow.

We acknowledge the growth of the airport as an important driver of the local economy. However, the Arup Study suggests that this land will be required for uses directly-related to the airport. Such an approach is consistent with the approach previously pursued at Norwich and at other airports. Whilst such an approach supports growth of the economy there is a need to ensure that opportunities exist elsewhere for other non-aviation related businesses to grow. In addition, major growth at the airport will be dependent upon significantly improved access arrangements which are unlikely to be forthcoming in short to medium term.

Based on the recommendations of the Arup Employment Study the policy allocates growth at Longwater. Arup's conclusions appear to be based on comments in the supporting text in the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) regarding the future potential of such land. The comments in the SNLP do not constitute policy. It is necessary therefore to compare Longwater against other potential locations. The Arup Study does not appear to do this and further consideration needs to be given to the alternative locations for strategic employment provision. The Arup report also contends that Longwater is a good location for further business park activity. This is despite the fact that Longwater has proven to be an unattractive location for such activity over recent years. Longwater was allocated by the SNLP for B1/B2/B8 uses, but is dominated by retail and quasi-retail uses which in turn impacts on the perception of Longwater as a strategic location for industrial, office and warehousing development No evidence is advanced by Arup as to why the image of Longwater will change and become an attractive location for B1/B2/B8 users. Conversely, there is clear evidence that locations south of the City are strongly in demand for industrial, office and warehousing development.

	<p>In order to deliver the additional 250 hectares of land required to drive employment growth of the Norwich City Region additional strategic allocations are required. It is also important that sites are made available for development in the short term. Land at Harford Bridge, Ipswich Road should be identified in the Core Strategy as strategic employment location for early delivery. Harford Bridge is strategically located on the southern side of Norwich in an area which business demands as a location. It is well placed to build on the success of the Broadland Business Park as a location and is immediately available for development. It is well placed to build on the success of the Broadland Business Park as a location and is immediately available for development. Our clients continue to receive firm interest from employers and developers regarding the site, demonstrating that this site is an area of strong market demand as an employment location.</p> <p>A masterplan framework document has previously been submitted which sets out how the site could be developed sensitively to respect the river corridor, to enhance the gateway to Norwich and to help deliver the objectives for public access and habitat recreation in the Yare Valley.</p> <p>Land at Harford Bridge should be allocated as a strategic employment allocation.</p> <p>O - 10602 - 8322 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10714</p>	<p>Ms S Layton [8354] - OBJECT Paper - 26/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? I believe the development planned is too large.</p> <p>O - 10714 - 8354 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10761</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? No: Some question of why significant health employment development is expected at UEA/Research Park.</p> <p>O - 10761 - 7666 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10787</p>	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? For the reasons set out in answer 2 the transport infrastructure mentioned is wholly inadequate for providing sustainable growth in Norfolk. The same suggestions as answer 2 also apply.</p> <p>O - 10787 - 8360 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10802</p>	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? For the reasons set out in answer 2 the transport infrastructure mentioned is wholly inadequate for providing sustainable growth in Norfolk. The same suggestions as answer 2 also apply. When looking for innovative developments consider innovative reopening of rail lines (incorporating light rail and trams) rather than merely innovative new services.</p> <p>O - 10802 - 8361 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -</p>
<p>10818</p>	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? The Landowners consider that the Core Strategy provides the opportunity to put in place a long term strategy for sustainable growth that will further promote Norwich as a regional city and will satisfy housing requirements for the Norwich area through the plan period and beyond. The Core Strategy fully supports the principle of an urban extension in Wymondham. This provides the opportunity to ensure that development is planned holistically for the delivery of sustainable communities in the area. It also accords with the fact that the principle of growth in Wymondham has already been established through the provisions of contained in the East of England Plan. A sustainable urban extension will act to complement and support the vitality of the Town.</p> <p>The Landowners therefore broadly support the strategy for growth as set out in policy 2 of the draft Joint Core Strategy. However, the Landowners have the following comments:</p> <p>Employment development at strategic locations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land being promoted for a sustainable urban extension by the Landowners has a locational advantage in that it is in close

proximity to existing employment opportunities in Wymondham itself, Lotus Cars at Hethel and the Norwich Research Park. In addition employment opportunities are also available at Longwater. Each of these established employment areas have the capacity for improvement and expansion. This location also has the potential capacity to accommodate at least one additional district centre (as well as a number of neighbourhood centres), which would complement and improve the range of employment opportunities available. In addition, with planned and possible improvements to the transport infrastructure, growth in this location is also well placed to benefit from wider employment opportunities in, Norwich and the county hinterland and Cambridge.

- The Landowners support the growth of the knowledge economy, as highlighted in 8.14 of the Joint Core Strategy. There is the potential for growth in Wymondham to contribute towards the diversification of the economy by providing space for business start ups, which is complementary to aspiration to expand the knowledge economy. It is considered that policy 2 reflects the aspiration to expand the knowledge economy in the NPA.

Housing need

- The area of land being promoted by the Landowners for an urban extension to north east Wymondham extending to some 238 hectares coupled with other areas has the capacity to accommodate some 6,500 residential dwellings along with appropriate infrastructure.

Transport infrastructure

- See response at Question 2 above.

O - 10818 - 8362 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

10845 **Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

The Green Group originally proposed a more modest increase in housing for Greater Norwich area based on between 70% and 75% of the growth envisaged in the Joint Core Strategy. We calculated this from looking at Norwich's rate of population growth from 2004-9 (0.79% as opposed to a projected UK average of 0.7%) and projecting it to 2026 while also taking into account sites already allocated and a decline in the numbers per household. In the light of the current downturn, we would consider this at the top end of growth requirements based, as it is, on years of economic boom and relatively high levels of immigration which have since, to some extent, declined.

We would point out that what is currently proposed represents a more dispersed pattern of settlement at odds with the aims of sustainability and even contrary to the broad thrust behind the original Joint Core Strategy - Issues and Options. This is

particularly the case for the South Norfolk area, although some dispersal along the proposed route of the NDR also appears to be suggested for the Broadland area. Essentially, the problem with this approach would be that development is effectively 'bolted' onto existing communities which puts increased pressure on the existing services in that area, but does not concentrate large enough numbers to justify creating new locally situated service centres. To take schools as a particularly important example, we note that both Hethersett and Wymondham Secondary schools are over subscribed and there are bound to be practical limitations on their further expansion.

Currently the strategy is in danger of endorsing exactly the kind of suburban sprawl which any sensible long term planning strategy should be trying to prevent. We would argue that new homes need to be built to a similar density as the inner Norwich urban area, with largely a mixture of terraces or 4/5 floor developments. This kind of development would not necessarily make sense as additions to existing suburban and semi-rural areas and would in many cases be some distance away from services. Putting them within walking/cycling distance of new service centres and schools would make far more sense.

The approach of the Broadland area is broadly better as, with the eco-town, the pattern of development could potentially justify the creation of new schools and other services. We do acknowledge that, in the case of South Norfolk, there is no similarly suitable large brown field site and any locations proposed here for significant development should only be considered after thorough assessments of environmental impact - particularly on biodiversity and water supply - and suitability for a sustainable transport structure. We would, however, argue that, with the uncertainties of economic instability and catastrophic climate change, it is currently too early to be proposing the level of growth which would make large scale development on green field locations necessary. We note, however, a 3000 reduction in the overall number of houses proposed for new sites which is a welcome development and a timely adjustment for more uncertain economic times.

The number of homes designated for Norwich itself is broadly acceptable, although we think it's important to note that developments currently being undertaken, such as Anglia Square, are not building to the density once intended due to the market downturn. This seems contrary to the intention 'for small and medium scale redevelopments to increase densities' as stated in Policy 4 of the Technical Consultation. The danger is that any shortfall may increase pressure to 'infill' on green spaces at a later date if future demand for inner city housing increases. This would be an outturn we would very much resist. We would also express concern that the numbers of houses proposed for smaller sites in the South Norfolk NPA could mean overdevelopment in the vicinity of the environmentally sensitive Yare Valley area.

We also have major concerns with proposals regarding the following areas:

Cringleford:

The area identified in the proposals map is currently protected under South Norfolk policy ENV1 and ENV8 implying it to have 'identified assets important to the character of the landscape'. It is also currently valued according to ENV2 as a 'physical separation between settlements' and more particularly as part of the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone. This is the most blatant breach yet of the previously stated intention in South Norfolk's policy that: 'It is important that the road [ie south bypass] is not viewed as a hard edge up to which development could locate'. We would question why the current consultation does not refer to this important established principle so an informed debate can be had as to whether it should be contravened.

Long Stratton:

This area has the major disadvantage of being the furthest distance from Norwich and without the rail links enjoyed by Wymondham. The proposal to site houses here would very much represent car-based development which would be in contravention of the Spatial Vision's references to climate change and sustainability. Although development here would be linked in with the provision of the bypass, it is considered that funding from either Section 106 contributions or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would be insufficient to meet the expected cost.

The town is surrounded by attractive countryside (currently designated under ENV8) which includes two County Wildlife Sites of which Wood Green would possibly be affected by the planned bypass (this is unclear from the map provided). The above proposals represent at least a doubling of the town's households, thus significantly altering its character.

Wymondham:

The Technical Consultation described planned growth 'predominantly to the south and east of the town' whereas, this has been changed to 'around the town whilst maintaining the strategic gap to the north and northeast'. The proposals map, however, shows development precisely in this direction - we feel greater clarity is needed here.

We are pleased that the original proposal for 4000 houses has been reduced although we still have concerns the proposed number is still too high for Wymondham's market town character and the particular environmental constraints around the town. To the south-west of the town, is the Bay River valley currently protected under ENV13 as a 'Site of regional and local nature conservation interest' and flood risk zone. This, with an adequately proportioned buffer zone, would, one hopes, act as a barrier to westward expansion of development if it occurs as envisaged in the Technical Consultation. Not clear whether development is envisaged or the barrier is envisaged.

The 2008 application for 3000 homes by Pelham Holdings for land south of the town shows the kind of issues any development here would be confronted with. Natural England, for instance, launched a strong objection to the proposals pointing them out to be in contravention of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which, of course, would still take precedence over any new local planning policy. They viewed the development here as being a serious threat to biodiversity, or more specifically, to bats, water voles, otters and great crested newts in the immediate area. Seven County Wildlife sites are within or close to the development boundary including Silfield Nature Reserve. They also state that 'Of particular concern is the loss of species-rich wet meadows, semi-natural woodland and Important Hedgerows, and the consequent fragmentation and isolation of valuable pockets of habitat across the application site, which will be surrounded by development.'

Wymondham itself is, of course, an historic market town with its own unique heritage and identity. Development even on the scale proposed in options 2 and 3 would do much to erode the character of the town of which its residents have shown a strong desire to protect. A recent consultation exercise by Wymondham Town Council found that resisting further major development was a key priority of those that took part. It was also widely felt that improvement to services and infrastructure should come ahead of any development and that protection of the natural environment was of prime importance. The Town Council itself has committed to 'protect Wymondham's cultural and historic heritage' and, while favouring the provision of more affordable and special needs homes, foresees the securing of additional housing through small scale development only.

The other difficulty of development to the south of the town is the dividing effect of the railway line which would make it hard to integrate new housing with the rest of the community and thus further dilute the town's identity.

Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle:

The proposals here have changed in their form and emphasis from the proposals as detailed in the Technical Consultation of August 2008. One main difference is the specific incorporation of Old Catton and Thorpe St Andrew into the growth proposals which seems designed to follow the proposed route of the NDR, a road scheme to which, as detailed elsewhere, we are fervently opposed.

Misleadingly, the recent Rackheath Eco-Town consultation display boards made no mention of the NDR, and included a detailed map of the proposed development omitting the NDR route which would be crossing just to the south of the proposed eco-town area. A picture of a German tram was included, and yet, there have been no proposals along these lines in NATS. It is a common theme of the JCS that the road proposals seem rather more 'firmed up' than those for public transport, which may engender some cynicism that, given the very tight constraints on public finances we are going to be facing, that the public transport elements will be realized as much as hoped.

Rather worryingly, the consultation document also now states 'Should the eco-community proposals not continue the strategy will still promote growth at the same scale to the north east of Norwich'. The eco-town concept is crucial in winning any hope of support for large scale development from the existing community and has been used very much to this end. Merely in terms of public confidence in the consultation process, to discard the concept at this stage would be extremely counterproductive bordering on the disingenuous. It would also discredit any claim the strategy might have to satisfying its own sustainability aspirations. If it does go ahead, it is imperative that the eco-town does not just become an isolated 'flagship' element, but that the principles of sustainable development are applied to the whole development.

I would like to refer here to the 'Vision Statement for North East Norwich' as produced by Bidwells and Savills in February 2008 as a recent and relatively complete statement to date of developers' intentions. It also provides a revealing insight into how existing planning policy may be reinterpreted under the Joint Core Strategy.

Large parts of this area are characterised as ancient woodlands or historic parks and gardens and are protected under existing policy ENV10. In the Vision Statement, however, they are designated as 'Areas of Restricted Development'. It is stated that development on these areas would be 'unlikely', yet we already know that the proposed NDR directly borders one such area (to the West of Rackheath) and goes straight through another (Beeston Park). All of this begs the question of just how protected these areas are, particularly when post 2026 growth is contemplated. Other areas are currently restricted from development through designation as 'Area of Landscape Value (ENV5)' and yet, in the Vision Statement, are reclassified as having 'Potential Development Status'. This latter category does, however, also include County Wildlife Sites and current open space and recreational areas. It is rather bizarrely stated that development in these areas might be permitted to 'achieve sustainable outcomes' which further divests the term 'sustainability' of any consistent meaning. In summation, we would like the Joint Core Strategy to identify at an early stage as possible the positioning and form of protected green space so the public can make informed judgments as to the integrity of the proposals in this respect.

The above mentioned Vision Statement does place slightly more emphasis on 'low and zero carbon buildings' and yet, like the Public Consultation, still makes no firm commitments. It also talks of designing 'walkable neighbourhoods', yet the 'inter-related villages' concept espoused for the area in the Public Consultation seems to suggest a more dispersed, and therefore less pedestrian orientated, pattern of settlement. It is also difficult to understand how 'permeability and community integration across the NDR', as stated in the Strategy, is going to work in practice. The NDR will unavoidably denude the whole character of any adjoining settlement, not to mention protected open space.

O - 10845 - 8018 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

10881 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - **OBJECT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

The BLT consider that the Core Strategy provides the opportunity to put in place a long term strategy for sustainable growth that will further promote Norwich as a regional city and will satisfy housing requirements for the Norwich area through the plan period and beyond. In promoting the Old Catton/Sprowston/Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth 'triangle' as a location for major growth, the Core Strategy fully supports the principle of an urban extension in the north east Norwich sector. This provides the opportunity to ensure that development is planned holistically for the delivery of sustainable communities in the area. It also accords with the fact that the principle of growth in north east Norwich has already been established in part through the development of Broadland Business Park. A sustainable urban extension will act to complement and support the vitality of the business park and vice versa.

The BLT, therefore, broadly support the strategy for growth as set out in policy 2 of the draft Joint Core Strategy. However, the BLT have the following comments:

Employment development at strategic locations

* The BLT support the extension of Broadland Business Park due to its existing and potential capacity to accommodate a significant amount of employment opportunities to support new and existing communities in north east Norwich.

The proximity of the underused Bittern Line and the proposed rail halt on the business park provides an opportunity to create a mixed use centre centred around a sustainable public transport interchange. Currently, there is a

working population of circa 4,000 present on the business park, who could become the catchment for a substantial mixed-use development, which would be made more viable if developed in connection with a transport interchange at the proposed rail halt.

* The land being promoted for the sustainable urban extension by the BLT has a locational advantage in that it is in close proximity to existing employment opportunities at Broadland and St Andrew's Business Parks and Rackheath Industrial Estate as well as those on Salhouse Road and Roundtree Way. In addition employment opportunities are also available at existing district centres at Blue Boar Lane and Pound Lane. Each of these established employment areas have the capacity for improvement and expansion. This location also has the potential capacity to accommodate at least one additional district centre (as well as a number of neighbourhood centres), which would complement and improve the range of employment opportunities available. In addition, with planned and possible improvements to the transport infrastructure, growth in this location is also well placed to benefit from wider employment opportunities in Rackheath, Norwich and the county hinterland.

* The BLT supports the growth of the knowledge economy, as highlighted in 8.14 of the Joint Core Strategy. There is the potential for growth in north east Norwich to contribute towards the diversification of the economy by providing space for business start ups, which is complementary to aspiration to expand the knowledge economy. It is considered that policy 2 reflects the aspiration to expand the knowledge economy in the NPA.

Housing need

* The land being promoted by the BLT for an urban extension to north east Norwich comprises approximately 320ha of land and has the capacity to accommodate a significant number of residential dwellings along with appropriate infrastructure.

* The BLT note inconsistencies with this policy and other parts of the strategy with regard to the housing allocations for the Broadland area. Policy 2 suggests that a maximum of 10,700 new dwellings will be accommodated in this area. Other parts of the strategy confirm that the area is expected to accommodate at least 10,000 dwellings after 2026. This should be reflected

in policy 2.

Transport infrastructure

* With regard to the transport infrastructure identified, as with our response to Question 2 above, we consider that policy 2 includes bullet points that refer to both new rail halts that utilise the existing capacity of the Bittern Line and to the inner link road.

O - 10881 - 8366 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

11084 Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

No

Housing

We do not support the high levels of housing and employment growth identified, regarding the figures as incompatible with environmental protection. Most development will be built on greenfield sites, increasing travel distances and encouraging travel by car, especially if growth in NE Norwich is built in conjunction with a NDR. We do not believe the figures are realisable in the current economic climate.

To help ensure that housing is delivered sustainably, we recommend:

- adoption of the RSS brownfield target of 60%.

- strict phasing of development in line with the settlement hierarchy so that greenfield development does not commence before completion of brownfield.

- housing density targets. Compact housing helps to reduce the need to travel, supports frequency public transport and encourages walking and cycling.

Employment - we do not support the following proposals:

significant expansion of office provision in city centre. This is a return to the damaging policy of the 1960s/70s when large-scale offices were built in the city centre, to the detriment of its historic character. Forty years on, several buildings are earmarked for redevelopment (HMSO, Anglia Square and Norwich Union offices, St Stephens). There must be a balance between housing, commercial, retail and leisure development.

- a new business park associated with the Airport and focused on airport related uses. The location would be on the urban edge, with access reliant on a NDR. The scope for new airport related business uses is limited given the proximity to Stansted; Norwich Airport will continue to serve a largely local market. It is difficult to prevent conversion of buildings to non-airport related uses if they fall empty. An example is the former KLM call centre on Cromer Road which closed shortly after opening and re-opened as a bathroom showroom.

- an extension to Broadland Business Park. A planning application has been submitted for Broadland Gate (phase 3, advertised as a departure from the Broadland Local Plan), before implementation of Phase 2. NNTAG opposes Broadland Gate as the scheme would generate significant car travel. The promoters of Rackheath eco-town are relying Broadland Business Park to provide jobs. Expanding employment provision at Rackheath eco-town instead could reduce the travel distance between home and work.

expansion of activity at Hethel. Its rural location is entirely car dependent.

Transport infrastructure

We oppose a NDR, Long Stratton Bypass and A47 Junction Improvements for the reasons given to Q2. We support a BRT system and new rail halts at BBP and Rackheath. Our arguments are as follows:

- the proposed new major road infrastructure is poorly related in sustainability terms to the proposed spatial pattern. See our response to Q2.

- Instead, housing and employment must be connected up by public transport with direct cross city links via the city centre.

- constructing a NDR before BRT would encourage car-dependency.

- prioritising a NDR raises questions about the viability of bus and rail for serving growth. For example, in order to achieve the rail and public transport frequencies envisaged by the Rackheath eco-town promoter from the outset of development, (a rail service every 15 minutes to Norwich and new bus services every 10 minutes to Norwich City Centre and Norwich Airport Industrial Estate), financial support would be necessary, especially if rail and bus have to compete with car use made easier by a NDR. The S.106 budget outlined by the Rackheath eco-town promoter offers train station works, but no support for rail

services nor public transport. The Sustainability Appraisal of the JCS observes that without rail Rackheath would be car dependent

- the road infrastructure proposals derive from NATS, approval of which pre-dates the adoption of RSS in 2008. NATS runs to 2021 and not to 2025, the JCS Plan period and requires review.

Recommended changes

Housing:

add - New dwellings will be strictly phased to permit building on urban brownfield sites and on sites in sustainable locations in other parts of the NPA before greenfield sites can be released.

Employment:

- delete word "significant" to read "expansion of office provision in the City Centre";
- delete reference to new Airport business park;
- delete extension to Broadland Business Park;

Transport:

- delete the Norwich Northern Distributor Road
- delete Long Stratton Bypass
- delete Junctions improvements on the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass.
- Bus rapid transit to read: "a public transport system to include bus rapid transit for serving the NPA, with cross city links via the city centre".
- NATS will be reviewed and rolled forward to 2026.

O - 11084 - 8387 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

11143 JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth?

OBJECT Overall, we do support the proposed strategy for growth. However, we do not support the inclusion of the Long Stratton bypass, or the proposed growth at Long Stratton, for the reasons set out in our responses to questions 1 and 2.

O - 11143 - 6979 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q4) Do you support the proposed strategy for growth? -

Q5 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy area

Policy 2 (page 20) proposes the places where large scale growth will be focussed, in the Norwich Policy Area.

Q5 Looking at the proposals map (Appendix 0) do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q5 Total	120	14	58	53	125

Rep No.	Name of respondent [JDI reference number] Response e.g COMMENT, SUPPORT, OBJECT Method of response e.g. Web / paper, and date of submission
---------	--

7912 Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - **COMMENT**
 Web - 06/03/09
 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?
 Honestly, I have little experience with the north-east of Norwich, and find little need to go there. We work in the NRP, and use the A11 or A146 to travel out of Norfolk, and visit the coast on weekends with time available. I find the north-east difficult to access, and I hesitate to comment without seeing for myself how the NDR eases access. I look forward to Whitlingham connections planned, and think that brilliant dedicated cycle routes throughout the city and these suburban developments would transform transport by alleviating dependence on cars and unaffordable buses.

C - 7912 - 6885 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -

8068 Miss Janet Saunders [7875] - **COMMENT**
 Web - 23/03/09
 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?
 It is not clear but it appears that you plan to build the housing and then improve the road infrastructure to support it. I believe this is the wrong way round, and to only place emphasis on improving the road infrastructure for public transport priority would be a mistake as an increase in population will inevitably result in an increase in private transport, no matter how much you try and encourage people to get on the bus.

	<p>C - 8068 - 7875 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8202	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - COMMENT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? I cannot deal with this. I think revision will be needed because of rising sea levels predicted and the setback in resource allocation that can be expected from government</p> <p>C - 8202 - 7901 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8720	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? No to Wymondham. Yes to Norwich.</p> <p>C - 8720 - 8045 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8877	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? no comment</p> <p>C - 8877 - 8071 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8879	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p>

	<p>no comment</p> <p>C - 8879 - 8071 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9268	<p>Mrs Gray [5927] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Wymondham should not grow as planned without plans for secondary education. Too often families are encouraged to a place only to be told their child must travel to school this is NOT sustainable or good in the current drive on climate control</p> <p>C - 9268 - 5927 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9362	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Roads and public transport not good enough now, let alone for more housing, schools, number 1 priority to stop school runs, it has been seen that school closures lead to shops loss increases car use thus more roads required</p> <p>C - 9362 - 8120 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9640	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? We do not agree that the correct areas have been identified for more detailed planning for major growth because of the reasons outlined above. No reasonable alternatives have been examined. Our client's have put forward an alternative option for growth which to date has been ignored and no response has been received detailing why it is an unacceptable or unreasonable alternative, particularly as it is adjacent to a significant strategic and allocated employment location.</p> <p>C - 9640 - 7503 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>

<p>9778</p>	<p>Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? There is concern that the further development of Cringleford will have an impact on traffic into the city centre. Whilst there is a provision for a new primary school it is worrying that the secondary school issues remain unresolved at this stage.</p> <p>C - 9778 - 1974 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>9958</p>	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? No comment</p> <p>C - 9958 - 6903 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10013</p>	<p>notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? All other options indicate a higher level of strategic growth to the South of the City. Does this not have merit in locating growth in the more accessible parts of the area in Regional terms?</p> <p>C - 10013 - 6911 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10908</p>	<p>Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Some growth locations are sustainable and appropriate but some should only take smaller amounts of growth. The main focus of development will be the northern and</p>

	<p>eastern fringes of Norwich, Long Stratton, Easton and Wymondham. Concerns are, however, raised over the deliverability of all the proposed development areas. At present there is no contingency plan or back up sites should one or more of the proposals fail.</p> <p>C - 10908 - 8367 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
11099	<p>Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Some growth locations are sustainable and appropriate but some should only take smaller amounts of growth. The main focus of development will be the northern and eastern fringes of Norwich, Long Stratton, Easton and Wymondham. Concerns are, however, raised over the deliverability of all the proposed development areas. At present there is no contingency plan or back up sites should one or more of the proposals fail.</p> <p>C - 11099 - 8300 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
7949	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Only comment I would make is that it is essential to curtail a certain supermarket chain from destroying community choice and variety (e.g. not like the Unthank Road or Stalham). Provision should also be made for leisure, youth activities, sport, entertainment rather than purely commerce</p> <p>S - 7949 - 7809 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
7989	<p>Mr Keith Bigland [7843] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 14/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the</p>

	<p>proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? yes</p> <p>S - 7989 - 7843 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
7998	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? agree</p> <p>S - 7998 - 7851 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8087	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT Web - 26/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes, the correct areas have been identified if growth is going to happen</p> <p>S - 8087 - 7880 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8107	<p>Mr S Buller [7879] - SUPPORT Web - 28/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? .</p> <p>S - 8107 - 7879 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8112	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8112 - 7888 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8177	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8177 - 4796 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8226	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8226 - 4558 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8267	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8267 - 7912 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8293	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 13/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p> <p>Full</p>

	<p>S - 8293 - 7915 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8325	<p>Mr Geoffrey Loades [6873] - SUPPORT Web - 16/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? ONCE THIS IS AGREED THE OTHER OPTIONS PARTICULARLY 3 WHICH IS MUCH FLAWED SHOULD BE DISCARDED.HOWEVER THE JOBS AND POPULATION GROWTH FIGURES DO NEED TO BE FULLY SCRUTINISED AGAIN BEFORE AGREEMENT.</p> <p>S - 8325 - 6873 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8382	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 8382 - 7966 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8383	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 8383 - 7966 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8415	<p>Ed King [7965] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8415 - 7965 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8466	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8466 - 8016 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8516	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8516 - 7817 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8540	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8540 - 8021 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8564	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	<p>S - 8564 - 1976 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8727	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 8727 - 8053 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8973	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 8973 - 8092 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9102	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9102 - 8111 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9103	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p>

	<p>S - 9103 - 7111 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9149	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9149 - 2055 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9217	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9217 - 1828 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9352	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9352 - 7113 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9424	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Again a qualified yes as in our response to q3</p>

	<p>S - 9424 - 8127 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9449	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p> <p>S - 9449 - 8134 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9483	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? ..in some circumstances development can start before all the new facilities are provided - this worries me</p> <p>S - 9483 - 8139 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9598	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9598 - 8162 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9672	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9672 - 8047 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more</p>

	detailed planning for the major growth locations? -
9824	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9824 - 8198 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9874	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9874 - 2058 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9927	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9927 - 7015 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9928	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9928 - 7015 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>

<p>9949</p>	<p>Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd [8222] (represented by DPP LLP (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [8221]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9949 - 8222 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>9991</p>	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 9991 - 8228 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10025</p>	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 10025 - 8230 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10048</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 10048 - 2373 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10074</p>	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) -</p>

SUPPORT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? With regard to the map contained in Appendix 0 of the core strategy (page 69), we support the identification of the Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd's lands as part of the strategic growth location for North East Norwich.

We also welcome the inclusion of the North East of Norwich as a location for major growth in all 3 options set out in Appendix 0. It is considered that this area provides the most sustainable location for such growth due to its proximity to the City Centre and its potential to support self-sufficient communities.

It is acknowledged that the draft Joint Core Strategy is concerned with the 'broad locations' of growth in terms of its reference to the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth 'triangle'. It is Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd's intention to submit further and more detailed representations regarding their vision and proposals for a sustainable urban extension to North East Norwich as part of the consultation on the Area Action Plan being prepared by Broadland District Council, which will include more detail on the major growth area. However, we welcome that the principle of the broad location of the sustainable urban extension to North East Norwich being promoted through the Joint Core Strategy.

S - 10074 - 8234 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -

10160 Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [7674]) - **SUPPORT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? The strategy for growth, which like the Spatial Vision details the role to be played by smaller sites in sustainable locations, is also supported, as are the strategic employment locations at Longwater and Norwich Research Park/UEA.

S - 10160 - 8244 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -

10176 Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - **SUPPORT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the

	<p>proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 10176 - 8246 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10362	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? In principle, yes. The Parish Council fully supports the adoption of Appendix 0.</p> <p>S - 10362 - 2020 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10397	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 10397 - 8294 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10429	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 10429 - 8308 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10508	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10508 - 7215 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10611	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? The areas to the south of the city have already expanded sufficiently. There appears to be more logical opportunities to the north and north east although it is not logical to allow the proposed route of the NNDR to influence future settlement plans.</p> <p>S - 10611 - 8325 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10662	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 10662 - 8348 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10731	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 10731 - 1776 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10762	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p>

Yes

S - 10762 - 7666 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -

10870 Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - **SUPPORT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Taylor Wimpey Developments and Hopkins Homes do not consider that it would be possible to bring forward larger-scale development areas quickly. Given that proposition, it is entirely appropriate for the Public Consultation to recognise that the delivery of the growth agenda must incorporate a mixture of large scale and small/medium scale development locations, dispersed around the Norwich area in suitable/sustainable locations.

Our clients acknowledge the change in emphasis between the Issues and Options Consultation Report and the present Public Consultation as effectively described at paragraph 1.10 of the Public Consultation. Given that context, they broadly endorse Policies 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the Public Consultation as, in combination, they provide a policy framework/spatial strategy capable of delivering the objective enshrined in paragraph 1.10 of the present Consultation.

It is clear that the Costessey area broadly described in Appendix 0 is extremely well related to the strategic employment area at Longwater and the employment opportunities at Bowthorpe. It is equally relatively close to the Norwich Research Park and adjoins the Sainsbury's superstore and related retail facilities. The proposed Lodge Farm extension is served by a public transport corridor and is well located relative to the A47. Given the general intention of the Joint Core Strategy to seek a closer relationship between new housing, jobs and services, we would suggest that the general Costessey area as described in Appendices 0, 1, 2 and 3 provides strong support for the proposition that new housing be provided off Dereham Road, as an extension of the existing Lodge Farm development.

We have noted that the Longwater strategic employment location is shown on the plan at page 69 of the Public Consultation which illustrates the favoured growth option. The area at the western edge of Norwich exhibits strong sustainability credentials. As acknowledged at paragraph 1.10 of the Public Consultation, medium-size urban extensions, such as the

proposal regarding land to the west of the existing Lodge Farm development, can play a vitally important role in the short/medium term to generate the required initial momentum for the Norwich growth area.

We concur with the observation within the spatial vision at page 10 of the Public Consultation that investment at strategic and other employment locations "will have helped create a stronger economy." One of the areas identified therein for jobs growth is Longwater.

S - 10870 - 8363 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -

10882 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - SUPPORT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

In broad terms, the BLT agree with the extent of the strategic growth area, delineated in orange on the proposals map in Appendix 0.

This area encompasses the land being promoted by the BLT, which will be brought forward together as part of a single delivery vehicle to deliver a sustainable urban extension to north east Norwich. However, it is considered that this should be extended to include land to the east of Blue Boar Lane. The BLT also agrees with the proposition that the wider growth area encompasses the Broadland Business Park as this provides substantial employment opportunities important for new communities in this location.

The BLT consider that the land set out in appendix 1 is the most sustainable, accessible and coherent location for major growth in the NPA as it offers the best opportunity:

1. To link growth with existing, planned and potential opportunities for strategic transport improvements, including opportunities to incorporate rail, bus and park and ride services, create a link road and connect to the NDR;
2. To link together existing services, facilities and employment areas with existing and new residential communities;
3. To enhance the natural landscape and integrate this with new development to provide a valuable recreational resource to new and existing communities;

4. For the organic progression of the urban pattern of Norwich as it has strong links with the city, rather than creating isolated communities.
5. To develop a significant number of homes in a sustainable manner;
6. To accommodate social infrastructure that will have benefits for existing as well as new communities; and
7. To make the most of the attraction of the Broads and the coast.

The BLT are unable to comment on the deliverability of growth outside of their remit and therefore neither agree nor disagree with the extent of the growth area in so far as it extends outside of the area being promoted by the BLT.

In terms of more detailed planning for the major growth locations, the BLT have already started this process, by initiating an EbD process, championed by the PFBE. The purpose of the EbD process is the creation of a masterplan, which is the culmination of a collaborative approach with relevant stakeholders and the range of professional disciplines. The first stage of this process has been undertaken whereby members of the GNDP and its constituent local authorities together with other stakeholders have started to scope the issues associated with planning for growth in this area. The findings of this scoping exercise will supplement these representations. The next stage will, through a series of workshops, not only consult representatives of existing communities and other stakeholders on development proposals but proactively engage them in the creation of the vision for the urban extension as well as planning for the development itself. This ensures that existing communities and other stakeholders can communicate their concerns and specific requirements as well as being able to articulate how they envisage that the new development will deliver key objectives for growth and integrate communities.

S - 10882 - 8366 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -

10928 Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?

Yes

	<p>S - 10928 - 8368 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10952	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 10952 - 8369 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10976	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 10976 - 8176 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10999	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 10999 - 8370 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
11044	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT Paper - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? In respect of major growth - but more specifically include Aylsham as a main town Trowse and Blofield in the NPA.</p>

	<p>S - 11044 - 6955 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
11113	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 11113 - 8390 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
11129	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Yes</p> <p>S - 11129 - 2373 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
7926	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT Web - 08/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? the growth is not wanted here</p> <p>O - 7926 - 7812 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
7927	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT Web - 08/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? growth is not needed</p>

	<p>O - 7927 - 7812 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
7962	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - OBJECT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? the proposal to more than double the size of Long Stratton in exchange for a bypass is immoral as it is bribery</p> <p>O - 7962 - 6862 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8152	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - OBJECT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? What is the point of designing a plan out to 2026 that still includes a bottle neck for transport by having an incomplete ring road between the A47 and A1067</p> <p>O - 8152 - 7899 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8317	<p>Mr Anthony Knights [7922] - OBJECT Web - 15/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? There has been insufficient consultation on these sites, many are unsustainable in my opinion.</p> <p>O - 8317 - 7922 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8330	<p>Mr Brian Cleland [7938] - OBJECT Web - 16/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? There is a need to identify and exclude floodplains from areas where any development is planned.</p>

	<p>O - 8330 - 7938 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8354	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - OBJECT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? I am uncertain as to the final effectiveness of this strategy.</p> <p>O - 8354 - 6992 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8490	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? No map labelled appendix O - presume you mean page 69. Strategic employment sites OK but what happens if one wishes to go from Wymondham to elsewhere by public transport - do you have to hub into Norwich by bus and than out to say Poringland? Looks far to much like an urban sprawl rather than distinct locations</p> <p>O - 8490 - 8020 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8588	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Brownfield sites only</p> <p>O - 8588 - 8024 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8622	<p>Kay Eke [8025] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p>

	<p>The current proposals advocate urban sprawl and yet further disintegration of the character and identity of those villages surrounding the City Centre.</p> <p>O - 8622 - 8025 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8653	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p> <p>O - 8653 - 8036 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8677	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Appendix 1 is more appropriate</p> <p>O - 8677 - 8044 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8783	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? No</p> <p>O - 8783 - 8061 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8808	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? We believe Marlingford and Colton should be in the South Norfolk Rural Policy Area rather than the Norwich policy area.</p>

	<p>South Norfolk other rural parishes may also be uneasy about being included in the NPA</p> <p>O - 8808 - 6869 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8835	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Growth of Hethersett too great</p> <p>O - 8835 - 8064 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8898	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? A much more limited amount of development needs to be negotiated in line with ability of the area to accommodate growth without negative impacts on rurality and tranquillity. Locally the development of Long Stratton will impinge heavily on surrounding villages when commuters see "rat runs" along local roads. All new development should be steered towards brownfield sites</p> <p>O - 8898 - 2014 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
8932	<p>Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Wymondham does not have the capacity for 2,200 new homes</p> <p>O - 8932 - 8079 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9031	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Major growth should be within or adjacent to the Southern bypass and the proposed NNDR. Development at Long Stratton and Wymondham will inevitably exacerbate car-borne commuting and outward commuting to London and Cambridge.</p> <p>O - 9031 - 4187 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9146	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Because the A140 will not be able to sustain the amount of traffic without dualling</p> <p>O - 9146 - 8112 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9188	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? The major area is only there to justify the NDR.</p> <p>O - 9188 - 8114 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9262	<p>Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? The major growth locations proposed would just be adjacent of Norwich (Thorpe St Andrew, Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath - all of them except Long Stratton) as most services (except food) would have to come from Norwich. This would make a greater Norwich a gigantic suburb, the same as other large cities and each part would lose its distinctive characteristic.</p> <p>O - 9262 - 8115 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>

<p>9288</p>	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? No - keep Norfolk RURAL</p> <p>O - 9288 - 5445 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>9294</p>	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? No to increased settlement on the north side of Norwich as already explained. So far this side of the city has retained most of the unspoilt farming character which is Norfolk's most charming appeal, small farms. orchards, small forests, tranquil villages.</p> <p>O - 9294 - 8117 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>9325</p>	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Wymondham will be too large and will loose its character (also will start to merge with Hethersett).</p> <p>O - 9325 - 8123 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>9381</p>	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Large areas of housing cause problems.</p> <p>O - 9381 - 8124 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>

<p>9514</p>	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? As previous questions, 10,000 new homes is far too many for the Old Catton etc area. Even with the Northern Distributor road (if it gets built) the area cannot sustain such growth</p> <p>O - 9514 - 8140 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>9546</p>	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? I have explained my reasons in answers to other questions</p> <p>O - 9546 - 8146 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>9564</p>	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Already stated development not needed</p> <p>O - 9564 - 6690 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>9697</p>	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Concern over numbers in Long Stratton without detailed study of how this will impact on the village (town) in respect of employment, infrastructure, schools, parking, health services etc.</p> <p>O - 9697 - 5446 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>

<p>9723</p>	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? As above, you are wrecking the countryside near Norwich.</p> <p>O - 9723 - 8174 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>9759</p>	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - OBJECT Web - 15/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? The reasons for this objection are within previous comments.</p> <p>O - 9759 - 8184 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>9792</p>	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT Paper - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? No, we do not agree that Cringleford should have a further 1200 homes and do not accept that option 0 is the preferred option. Please see answers to question 1 for reasons.</p> <p>O - 9792 - 7513 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>9898</p>	<p>Mr Peter Sutton [8219] - OBJECT Web - 27/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? The development in the North East of Norwich - the Old Catton/Sprowston/Thorpe triangle is only there because it is convenient for planners to fill in behind the proposed new northern road. This development will destroy many acres of green fields and ruin the quality of life of those already living in the area. I object!</p>

	<p>O - 9898 - 8219 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
9915	<p>Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? It would make the city too crowded and ruin the character of the areas concerned.</p> <p>O - 9915 - 6780 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10084	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - OBJECT Web - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? See previous answers</p> <p>O - 10084 - 8235 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10101	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT Web - 30/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Brown field sites within Norwich and Long Stratton are the only sites appropriate</p> <p>O - 10101 - 8239 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10213	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - OBJECT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? No</p>

	<p>O - 10213 - 5864 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10301</p>	<p>mrs LISA ford [8282] - OBJECT Web - 07/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Hethersett is an old historic village - we do not want it turned in to a suburb of Norwich. Hethersett centre can not cope with increased traffic. Development of Hethersett would be detrimental to existing residents quality of life.</p> <p>O - 10301 - 8282 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10314</p>	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - OBJECT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? The strategy takes a 'greenfield-first' approach. The areas proposed as major growth locations will simply suburbanise large areas of rural Norfolk and impact heavily on the tranquillity of the local countryside and the character of market towns and villages.</p> <p>There are no policy targets for use of previously developed land and it is not clear how the strategy will be measured against the RSS brownfield target of 60%. Given this, and the level of greenfield land allocation proposed, the spatial objective (Objective 8) that 'the use of previously developed land will be prioritised to minimise the loss of agricultural land and countryside' is almost meaningless.</p> <p>CPRE would prefer an approach to strategic planning that focused more development in urban areas, rather than on greenfield land. To this end, we would like to see a scaling down of housing numbers in the NPA towns and villages of South Norfolk and Broadland, and at Rackheath. In line with this, the figure for new allocations for Norwich should be increased to take a larger proportion of all build in the NPA. A slowing of housing delivery targets would maximise opportunities for previously developed land as it becomes available.</p> <p>We strongly object to the north east growth triangle concept and the very large area it covers. It will have considerable impacts</p>

	<p>on the rural landscape of Broadland and contribute to a major loss of greenfield land and significant impacts on tranquillity, congestion, light pollution and rural character. It would also very badly skew the spatial strategy, being away from the major employment locations in the south west quadrant.</p> <p>The mismatch between the major growth location for housing (North-East) and the centre of gravity for employment opportunities (South-West) is a key weakness of the spatial strategy and further undermines the strategy's stated objective (Objective 11) to reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>O - 10314 - 6826 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10339</p>	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - OBJECT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Why include Cringleford? It's not suitable for such a large number of new houses - it would put severe strain on the A11 (already overcrowded at peak times).</p> <p>O - 10339 - 8293 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10452</p>	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? We will need food more than houses. We have built on far too much land as it is.</p> <p>O - 10452 - 8309 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10480</p>	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Norfolk is a county of agriculture and is the breadbasket of the UK. With predictions of a world food shortage in the next few years, it will be vital that Norfolk is retained as it is for the production of food. No further large development.</p>

	<p>O - 10480 - 8310 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10533	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? No for the reasons mentioned in 4</p> <p>O - 10533 - 8312 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10557	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Norwich and the surrounding parishes will be ruined by any further growth and development.</p> <p>O - 10557 - 8318 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10580	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10580 - 8319 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
10603	<p>Mr/Mrs Smith [8322] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? Harford Bridge should be shown on the Proposals Map as a strategic employment location.</p>

	<p>O - 10603 - 8322 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10636</p>	<p>Mr Alfred Townly [7878] - OBJECT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? No.</p> <p>Again it is obsessed with creating conurbation.</p> <p>It takes up greenfield & high grade farmland.</p> <p>Rackheath is not a brownfield site.Go and look at it .The concept of 10minn rail to Norwich would mean constant interruption of traffic flow at the rail/road junctions.</p> <p>It is stupid to block of Low Road,Middle Lane & Smee Lane.This will force even more traffic through Thorpe End Garden Village.</p> <p>O - 10636 - 7878 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10788</p>	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? The fact that roads are the only transport mode easily visible on the map says a lot. I believe that the lack of consideration and detail for public transport and reducing travel options compared to the detail produced for road expansion would result in the retro fitting of the sustainable options into the plans after they have already been based around car us. It is imperative that proper detailed plans are developed for sustainable transport infrastructure before any major road schemes are planned.</p> <p>O - 10788 - 8360 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>10803</p>	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - OBJECT</p>

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? The fact that roads are the only transport mode easily visible on the map says a lot. I believe that the lack of consideration and detail for public transport and reducing travel options compared to the detail produced for road expansion would result in the retro fitting of the sustainable options into the plans after they have already been based around car use. It is imperative that proper detailed plans are developed for sustainable transport infrastructure before any major road schemes are planned.

O - 10803 - 8361 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -

10819 North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? In broad terms, the Landowners agree with the extent of the strategic growth area, on the proposals map in Appendix 0 except that it should not include Long Stratton due to its poor quality transport links and few local job opportunities.

This area encompasses the land being promoted by the Landowners, which will be brought forward deliver a sustainable urban extension to both north east Wymondham.

The Landowners consider that the land set out in Appendix 1 is the most sustainable, accessible and coherent location for major growth in Wymondham it offers the best opportunity:

1. To link growth with existing, planned and potential opportunities for strategic transport improvements, including opportunities to incorporate rail, bus and park and ride services.
 2. Link together existing services, facilities and employment areas with existing and new residential communities;
 3. To enhance the natural landscape and integrate this with new development to provide a valuable recreational resource to new and existing communities;
 4. For the organic progression of the urban pattern of Wymondham as it has strong links with the city, rather than creating isolated communities.
 5. To develop a significant number of homes in a sustainable manner;
- To accommodate social infrastructure that will have benefits for existing as well as new communities.

O - 10819 - 8362 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -

10846 Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? The Green Group originally proposed a more modest increase in housing for Greater Norwich area based on between 70% and 75% of the growth envisaged in the Joint Core Strategy. We calculated this from looking at Norwich's rate of population growth from 2004-9 (0.79% as opposed to a projected UK average of 0.7%) and projecting it to 2026 while also taking into account sites already allocated and a decline in the numbers per household. In the light of the current downturn, we would consider this at the top end of growth requirements based, as it is, on years of economic boom and relatively high levels of immigration which have since, to some extent, declined.

We would point out that what is currently proposed represents a more dispersed pattern of settlement at odds with the aims of sustainability and even contrary to the broad thrust behind the original Joint Core Strategy - Issues and Options. This is particularly the case for the South Norfolk area, although some dispersal along the proposed route of the NDR also appears to be suggested for the Broadland area. Essentially, the problem with this approach would be that development is effectively 'bolted' onto existing communities which puts increased pressure on the existing services in that area, but does not concentrate large enough numbers to justify creating new locally situated service centres. To take schools as a particularly important example, we note that both Hethersett and Wymondham Secondary schools are over subscribed and there are bound to be practical limitations on their further expansion.

Currently the strategy is in danger of endorsing exactly the kind of suburban sprawl which any sensible long term planning strategy should be trying to prevent. We would argue that new homes need to be built to a similar density as the inner Norwich urban area, with largely a mixture of terraces or 4/5 floor developments. This kind of development would not necessarily make sense as additions to existing suburban and semi-rural areas and would in many cases be some distance away from services.

Putting them within walking/cycling distance of new service centres and schools would make far more sense.

The approach of the Broadland area is broadly better as, with the eco-town, the pattern of development could potentially justify the creation of new schools and other services. We do acknowledge that, in the case of South Norfolk, there is no similarly suitable large brown field site and any locations proposed here for significant development should only be considered after thorough assessments of environmental impact - particularly on biodiversity and water supply - and suitability for a sustainable transport structure. We would, however, argue that, with the uncertainties of economic instability and catastrophic climate change, it is currently too early to be proposing the level of growth which would make large scale development on green field locations necessary. We note, however, a 3000 reduction in the overall number of houses proposed for new sites which is a welcome development and a timely adjustment for more uncertain economic times.

The number of homes designated for Norwich itself is broadly acceptable, although we think it's important to note that developments currently being undertaken, such as Anglia Square, are not building to the density once intended due to the market downturn. This seems contrary to the intention 'for small and medium scale redevelopments to increase densities' as

stated in Policy 4 of the Technical Consultation. The danger is that any shortfall may increase pressure to 'infill' on green spaces at a later date if future demand for inner city housing increases. This would be an outturn we would very much resist. We would also express concern that the numbers of houses proposed for smaller sites in the South Norfolk NPA could mean overdevelopment in the vicinity of the environmentally sensitive Yare Valley area.

We also have major concerns with proposals regarding the following areas:

Cringleford:

The area identified in the proposals map is currently protected under South Norfolk policy ENV1 and ENV8 implying it to have 'identified assets important to the character of the landscape'. It is also currently valued according to ENV2 as a 'physical separation between settlements' and more particularly as part of the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone. This is the most blatant breach yet of the previously stated intention in South Norfolk's policy that: 'It is important that the road [ie south bypass] is not viewed as a hard edge up to which development could locate'. We would question why the current consultation does not refer to this important established principle so an informed debate can be had as to whether it should be contravened.

Long Stratton:

This area has the major disadvantage of being the furthest distance from Norwich and without the rail links enjoyed by Wymondham. The proposal to site houses here would very much represent car-based development which would be in contravention of the Spatial Vision's references to climate change and sustainability. Although development here would be linked in with the provision of the bypass, it is considered that funding from either Section 106 contributions or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would be insufficient to meet the expected cost.

The town is surrounded by attractive countryside (currently designated under ENV8) which includes two County Wildlife Sites of which Wood Green would possibly be affected by the planned bypass (this is unclear from the map provided). The above proposals represent at least a doubling of the town's households, thus significantly altering its character.

Wymondham:

The Technical Consultation described planned growth 'predominantly to the south and east of the town' whereas, this has been changed to 'around the town whilst maintaining the strategic gap to the north and northeast'. The proposals map, however, shows development precisely in this direction - we feel greater clarity is needed here.

We are pleased that the original proposal for 4000 houses has been reduced although we still have concerns the proposed number is still too high for Wymondham's market town character and the particular environmental constraints around the town. To the south-west of the town, is the Bay River valley currently protected under ENV13 as a 'Site of regional and local nature conservation interest' and flood risk zone. This, with an adequately proportioned buffer zone, would, one hopes, act as a barrier to westward expansion of development if it occurs as envisaged in the Technical Consultation. Not clear whether development is envisaged or the barrier is envisaged.

The 2008 application for 3000 homes by Pelham Holdings for land south of the town shows the kind of issues any development here would be confronted with. Natural England, for instance, launched a strong objection to the proposals pointing them out to be in contravention of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which, of course, would still take

precedence over any new local planning policy. They viewed the development here as being a serious threat to biodiversity, or more specifically, to bats, water voles, otters and great crested newts in the immediate area. Seven County Wildlife sites are within or close to the development boundary including Silfield Nature Reserve. They also state that 'Of particular concern is the loss of species-rich wet meadows, semi-natural woodland and Important Hedgerows, and the consequent fragmentation and isolation of valuable pockets of habitat across the application site, which will be surrounded by development.'

Wymondham itself is, of course, an historic market town with its own unique heritage and identity. Development even on the scale proposed in options 2 and 3 would do much to erode the character of the town of which its residents have shown a strong desire to protect. A recent consultation exercise by Wymondham Town Council found that resisting further major development was a key priority of those that took part. It was also widely felt that improvement to services and infrastructure should come ahead of any development and that protection of the natural environment was of prime importance. The Town Council itself has committed to 'protect Wymondham's cultural and historic heritage' and, while favouring the provision of more affordable and special needs homes, foresees the securing of additional housing through small scale development only.

The other difficulty of development to the south of the town is the dividing effect of the railway line which would make it hard to integrate new housing with the rest of the community and thus further dilute the town's identity.

Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle:

The proposals here have changed in their form and emphasis from the proposals as detailed in the Technical Consultation of August 2008. One main difference is the specific incorporation of Old Catton and Thorpe St Andrew into the growth proposals which seems designed to follow the proposed route of the NDR, a road scheme to which, as detailed elsewhere, we are fervently opposed.

Misleadingly, the recent Rackheath Eco-Town consultation display boards made no mention of the NDR, and included a detailed map of the proposed development omitting the NDR route which would be crossing just to the south of the proposed eco-town area. A picture of a German tram was included, and yet, there have been no proposals along these lines in NATS. It is a common theme of the JCS that the road proposals seem rather more 'firmed up' than those for public transport, which may engender some cynicism that, given the very tight constraints on public finances we are going to be facing, that the public transport elements will be realized as much as hoped.

Rather worryingly, the consultation document also now states 'Should the eco-community proposals not continue the strategy will still promote growth at the same scale to the north east of Norwich'. The eco-town concept is crucial in winning any hope of support for large scale development from the existing community and has been used very much to this end. Merely in terms of public confidence in the consultation process, to discard the concept at this stage would be extremely counterproductive bordering on the disingenuous. It would also discredit any claim the strategy might have to satisfying its own sustainability aspirations. If it does go ahead, it is imperative that the eco-town does not just become an isolated 'flagship' element, but that the principles of sustainable development are applied to the whole development.

I would like to refer here to the 'Vision Statement for North East Norwich' as produced by Bidwells and Savills in February 2008 as a recent and relatively complete statement to date of developers' intentions. It also provides a revealing insight into

how existing planning policy may be reinterpreted under the Joint Core Strategy.

Large parts of this area are characterised as ancient woodlands or historic parks and gardens and are protected under existing policy ENV10. In the Vision Statement, however, they are designated as 'Areas of Restricted Development'. It is stated that development on these areas would be 'unlikely', yet we already know that the proposed NDR directly borders one such area (to the West of Rackheath) and goes straight through another (Beeston Park). All of this begs the question of just how protected these areas are, particularly when post 2026 growth is contemplated. Other areas are currently restricted from development through designation as 'Area of Landscape Value (ENV5)' and yet, in the Vision Statement, are reclassified as having 'Potential Development Status'. This latter category does, however, also include County Wildlife Sites and current open space and recreational areas. It is rather bizarrely stated that development in these areas might be permitted to 'achieve sustainable outcomes' which further divests the term 'sustainability' of any consistent meaning. In summation, we would like the Joint Core Strategy to identify at an early stage as possible the positioning and form of protected green space so the public can make informed judgments as to the integrity of the proposals in this respect.

The above mentioned Vision Statement does place slightly more emphasis on 'low and zero carbon buildings' and yet, like the Public Consultation, still makes no firm commitments. It also talks of designing 'walkable neighbourhoods', yet the 'inter-related villages' concept espoused for the area in the Public Consultation seems to suggest a more dispersed, and therefore less pedestrian orientated, pattern of settlement. It is also difficult to understand how 'permeability and community integration across the NDR', as stated in the Strategy, is going to work in practice. The NDR will unavoidably denude the whole character of any adjoining settlement, not to mention protected open space.

O - 10846 - 8018 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -

11085 Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?
No.

Overall, we are concerned about the amount of growth planned for green field locations and the implications for travel and climate change.

Also, there needs to be a better spatial distribution of employment and housing. Most notably, there is a mismatch between the allocation of strategic employment to the SW of Norwich/A11 corridor and the designation of north-east Norwich as location for strategic housing. Linking up the SW and NE quadrants via a NDR and A47 Southern Bypass would encourage orbital car

journeys.

NNTAG opposes the designation of a NE growth triangle to be built in association with a NDR. It is clear that the designation is related to boosting the case for a NDR.

We are not unsupportive of north-east Norwich as a location for growth provided that a NDR is deleted and the area can be shown to offer the best available in the NPA for reducing the need to travel and transport's share of CO2 emissions. We believe that it is feasible to develop an urban extension in this location without a NDR, to be serviced by dedicated public transport links, rail and smaller-scale highways works (implementation of on-line improvements to Postwick junction, Broadland Business Park Link Road, Blue Boar Lane Link Road as outlined in Policy TSA2 of Broadland Local Plan, plus a short connection between the two new links). Further employment would be required in this location to reduce the amount of travel to employment sites elsewhere.

Rather than build the equivalent of a small town to the NE of Norwich (7,000 dwellings rising to 10,000 post 2026) and avoid creating a free-standing eco-community at Rackheath pre-2026, we believe that it may be more sustainable to split the proposed housing allocation between two or more locations so that growth is better related to strategic employment and to the urban area. We would like to propose a smaller housing allocation for NE Norwich and the investigation of land to the east of Norwich between Broadland Business Park and Great Plumstead for a site for an eco community which we consider may offer several advantages over Rackheath:

- Closer to city centre;
- Adjacent to a strategic employment site (Broadland Business Park);
- Development would form an extension to the urban area. At the same time, there is sufficient land for creating a green buffer between eco community and Great Plumstead, thereby avoiding the coalescence with neighbouring community;
- Proximity to existing residential population and employment could better support enhanced rail services with new rail halt at Dussindale new public transport services, without need for subsidy in early phases.

East of Norwich location also shares several benefits offered by Rackheath:

- Adjacent to Norwich to Sheringham railway line with land allocated for new rail halt at Dussindale;
- Accessible to established park and ride site and bus link to city centre.

- We are concerned about the implications of GNDP's preferred option for dispersed growth in South Norfolk area of NPA for public transport. The GNDP has ignored the consultant's report recommending development concentration in this area in order to achieve a step change. (Greater Norwich Joint Core Strategy, Public Transport requirements of Growth, Technical Note -

	<p>Appraisal of Emerging Option, Dec 2008).</p> <p>O - 11085 - 8387 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>
<p>11144</p>	<p>JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations?</p> <p>OBJECT</p> <p>Overall, we support the proposals identification of Long Stratton as a responses to questions 1 and 2.</p> <p>O - 11144 - 6979 - Policy 2 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area , (Q5) Looking at the proposals map do you agree that we have identified the right areas for more detailed planning for the major growth locations? -</p>

Response – Q6

City Centre

The city centre fulfils many functions and the strategy will influence the emphasis for the future. Policy 3 (page 21) gives the proposed policy which says that the main focus of city centre development should be retail, leisure, office and culture.

Q6 City Centre

The city centre fulfils many functions and the strategy will influence the emphasis for the future. Policy 3 (page 21) gives the proposed policy which says that the main focus of city centre development should be retail, leisure, office and culture

Q6 Do you support the proposed strategy for the city centre? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q6 Total	117	17	69	32	118

Rep No.	Name of respondent [JDI reference number] Response e.g COMMENT, SUPPORT, OBJECT Method of response e.g. Web / paper, and date of submission
---------	--

7913	<p>Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - COMMENT Web - 06/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Current conditions must suggest more retail space not a necessity. I would like to see more activity spaces available - ceramics, scrapbooking, knitting, beading, cooking, singing, theatre, etc. It's heartwarming to see the boys painting the fantasy figurines. Perhaps initially provided by councils in community centre format, and then taken up by entrepreneurs. Good to bring people to the centre for other than shopping. I am not talking about 8-week courses, and am not available mid-day in the week.</p> <p>C - 7913 - 6885 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
7963	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - COMMENT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? I doubt very much that that no of offices are going to be needed especially in the current economic climate which is not going to be solved overnight</p> <p>C - 7963 - 6862 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>

<p>8069</p>	<p>Miss Janet Saunders [7875] - COMMENT Web - 23/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? I'm sure you're right about how much additional office space will be required, but I also know from experience that many companies would prefer to be located in a well maintained, traditional building rather than in a characterless modern office suite. Perhaps more emphasis could be placed on bringing the existing office stock up to standard rather than leaping in and building new. Likewise with retail buildings. This would help in your endeavours to maintain the city centres character.</p> <p>C - 8069 - 7875 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>8113</p>	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - COMMENT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Retail expansion should be limited to an identified need. An oversupply will lead to a deterioration of retail standard</p> <p>C - 8113 - 7888 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>9218</p>	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p> <p>C - 9218 - 1828 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>9367</p>	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? No mention of factories or of producing any thing to sell. Manufacturing completely ignored, no good building houses and retail parks if no manufacturing to fill these shops. Locally produced products mean less transportation less green house gases</p> <p>C - 9367 - 8120 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>

<p>9477</p>	<p>Louisa Young [8135] - COMMENT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? You do need to include housing in the centre of the city. Keep existing and improve walking, cycling and green spaces. I think it is really important that people who live in an urban environment have contact with nature. The riverside walk is a precious resource for many people, another bridge near Jarrolds and the ability to walk along both banks of the river creates a pleasant oasis in a busy city.</p> <p>C - 9477 - 8135 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>9515</p>	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Partly support, but given Castle Mall is suffering and lots of retail outlets in the city centre closing where is the growth in retail coming from?</p> <p>C - 9515 - 8140 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>9910</p>	<p>Christopher Webb [8019] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Both Yes and No, in the sense that I think there should be provision for some residential areas in the City Centre, perhaps for adults rather than children.</p> <p>C - 9910 - 8019 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>10085</p>	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - COMMENT Web - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? This sounds reasonable</p> <p>C - 10085 - 8235 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>

10273 Norwich HEART (Mr Michael Loveday) [960] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

Without attempting to write the entire strategy, one example of the 'right' approach would be to understand how the historic walled City centre used to work (as recently as the late 1890's it had 80,000 people living within it - more than 10x what it currently has, its working population was significantly greater than the population now supported, it had a much larger amount of service infrastructure (shops etc) and people moved around largely by non mechanical means). It was a very vibrant although sometimes unpleasant place but used very efficiently. Today, large tracts of the centre are depopulated, there are significant areas of vacancy - in terms of sites and empty premises, densities in many areas are low for central urban locations and there is a very significant surface area turned over to vehicle related uses. Overlay this with a disjointed network of cultural assets in the widest sense (buildings, institutions, streets, spaces) which we should use more effectively but don't and a global demand for more homes, jobs and services and a series of different strategic opportunities begin to emerge - these could include redevelopment of 'spoiled' areas of the centre which have lost their way (King St to Ber St) in a much more complex and high density way; removal of wasteful traffic related infrastructure and the re-knitting of the urban grain to provide a more coherent urban fabric which responds to the needs for more homes and jobs (Northern City Centre/Inner Ring/Anglia Sq); a coalescent approach to urban fabric, public realm and cultural capital regeneration which allows these elements to work in a more integrated way and accommodate more activity (St Andrews/The Halls/Elm Hill)

C - 10273 - 960 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -

10285 Henderson Retail Warehouse Fund [8270] (represented by Savills(Manchester) (The Manager) [8269]) - COMMENT

Paper - 06/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

We previously provided comments in a letter, dated 17 April 2009, in relation to the forthcoming Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) (a copy of this letter is enclosed). Those comments confirm our request that the existing allocation of the Riverside Retail Park as part of the Primary Retail Area is carried forward into the new Local Development Framework. We confirm that the comments for the Core Strategy in this letter should therefore be read in conjunction with those comments.

Site Description and Planning Policy Allocation:

The Riverside Retail Park is a well established destination for retail land uses and the sale of both comparison and convenience goods. It is located within Norwich's defined City Centre and is an integral part of its overall attractiveness as a retail destination. The importance of the Retail Park has been recognised by Norwich City Council through its allocation as a Primary

Retail Area in the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (November 2004).

As well as forming part of the City centre, the Retail Park is part of a wider, purpose built commercial and residential development known as the Riverside Area. In addition to the retail land uses, the Area also contains: large format leisure operations (cinema, bowling and health and fitness club); a significant number of restaurants, bars and nightclub venues; and a large number of residential dwellings. In addition, Norwich City Football Club's Carrow Road ground is located adjacent to the south eastern corner of the Retail Park. The Retail Park is therefore well connected for other commercial and residential land uses within Norwich City Centre and provides genuine opportunities for linked trips which helps promote sustainable forms of development.

Policy 3 - Norwich City Centre:

In relation to Question 6, we support the strategy for the City Centre. We note that the strategy is to promote the role of Norwich City Centre as a regional centre.

The third bullet point states that one of the objectives to promote the strategy for the City Centre is by 'enhancing its retail function, providing for a substantial expansion of comparison retail floorspace of varied types and size of unit to provide a range of premises to 2021. This will be achieved through intensification of uses in the primary retail area and if necessary through its expansion; other shopping areas will be strengthened to provide for retail diversity, with a particular focus on enhancing the character of specialist retailing areas.'

We confirm that the Retail Park, which forms part of the Primary Retail Area and is an integral part of Norwich's retail provision, provides the GNDP with opportunities to realise the specific objectives of Policy 3.

In the light of the above, we consider that it is appropriate to include reference to the role that the Retail Park can (and should) play in assisting in meeting the Core Strategy's objectives to promote Norwich City Centre as a regional centre.

Appendix 5 - City Centre Key Diagram:

We note that Riverside Retail Park is identified on the Diagram as follows:

1. Areas of Change. Mixed use development sites with improved public realm;
2. Other shopping areas; and
3. Main focus of change - commercial.

As stated above, the Retail Park is allocated as a Primary Retail Area in the adopted Local Plan and the Council has confirmed

that it does not have any in principle objection to additional retail development at the Park. Its current allocation and support from the Council reflects the Retail Park's existing land use and functional link with the City Centre. It is for this reason that we have submitted representations in relation to the Site Allocations Development Plan (DPD) that the site's existing allocation as a 'Primary Retail Area' within the 'City Centre Retail Area' (or such named equivalents) is retained.

We also request therefore that the allocation as a 'Primary Retail Area' is also reflected on the City Centre Key Diagram.

Summary and Conclusions:

In the light of the above, we conclude that the integral role that the Retail Park plays within the overall attractiveness of Norwich City Centre as a retail destination, its current allocation and our request for this allocation to continue should be recognised within the Core Strategy as follows:

1. Policy 6: Reference to the role that the Retail Park can play in assisting the Core Strategy's objectives to promote the role of Norwich City Centre as a regional centre.
2. Policy 12: Broadening hierarchy designation for Norwich City Centre to include reference to the Retail Park.
3. Appendix 5 - City Centre Key Diagram: Allocating the Retail Park as a 'Primary Retail Area' within the 'City Centre Retail Area' (or such named equivalents) on the Diagram.

We also conclude that as emerging national policy indicates jobs in retail and other sectors have an important role to play in the economy, locations such as Riverside Retail Park and the retail sector in general should be recognised in Policy 15.

C - 10285 - 8270 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -

10315 CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT

Paper - 27/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

The strategy takes a 'greenfield-first' approach. The areas proposed as major growth locations will simply suburbanise large areas of rural Norfolk and impact heavily on the tranquillity of the local countryside and the character of market towns and villages.

There are no policy targets for use of previously developed land and it is not clear how the strategy will be measured against the RSS brownfield target of 60%. Given this, and the level of greenfield land allocation proposed, the spatial objective (Objective 8) that 'the use of previously developed land will be prioritised to minimise the loss of agricultural land and

countryside' is almost meaningless.

CPRE would prefer an approach to strategic planning that focused more development in urban areas, rather than on greenfield land. To this end, we would like to see a scaling down of housing numbers in the NPA towns and villages of South Norfolk and Broadland, and at Rackheath. In line with this, the figure for new allocations for Norwich should be increased to take a larger proportion of all build in the NPA. A slowing of housing delivery targets would maximise opportunities for previously developed land as it becomes available.

We strongly object to the north east growth triangle concept and the very large area it covers. It will have considerable impacts on the rural landscape of Broadland and contribute to a major loss of greenfield land and significant impacts on tranquillity, congestion, light pollution and rural character. It would also very badly skew the spatial strategy, being away from the major employment locations in the south west quadrant.

The mismatch between the major growth location for housing (North-East) and the centre of gravity for employment opportunities (South-West) is a key weakness of the spatial strategy and further undermines the strategy's stated objective (Objective 11) to reduce the need to travel.

C - 10315 - 6826 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -

10604 Mr/Mrs Smith [8322] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

A range of sites and locations will be required to meet the employment needs to 2026. We acknowledge that the city centre has an important role to play in terms of office development, however, the strategic employment sites will also be appropriate locations for an element of office development.

C - 10604 - 8322 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -

10691 Theatre Royal (Mr Peter Wilson) [54] - COMMENT

Paper - 28/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

I'd like to suggest that Policy 3 be expanded by adding the following bullet point:

	<p>"strengthening and cohering access to Norwich's cultural assets"</p> <p>and that the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy includes under "For those travelling into the city centre or around the Norwich area", something along the lines of:</p> <p>"We will improve public transport access to Norwich's cultural assets by developing bus routes that link them with the transport hubs, and by strategic development and promotion of the Park and Ride network"</p> <p>The reasoning behind this is that the Cathedrals, the Theatre Royal and other cultural venues attract over 2,000 people each day between them on average. I'm aiming to help more visitors and residents enjoy those cultural assets without using their cars in the city centre. This is particularly relevant in the evenings, when the cultural life of the city is at its busiest.</p> <p>C - 10691 - 54 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>10909</p>	<p>Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>ALP are not aware of any major issues that would prevent proposed development within the City Centre, but remain to be convinced this amount of development will be implemented in the timescale, because of the amount of the market made up of flats. Water supply is also an issue but sewerage capacity seems an issue.</p> <p>C - 10909 - 8367 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>11100</p>	<p>Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>PJH are not aware of any major issues that would prevent proposed development within the City Centre, but remain to be convinced this amount of development will be implemented in the timescale, because of the amount of the market made up of flats. Water supply is also an issue but sewerage capacity seems an issue.</p>

	C - 11100 - 8300 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -
7990	<p>Mr Keith Bigland [7843] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 14/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>fully support</p> <p>S - 7990 - 7843 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
7999	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 16/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>I think development of the City Centre is sensible as it has the infrastructure to cope with it (if improved as envisaged)</p> <p>S - 7999 - 7851 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8088	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 26/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Of course - what else should the focus of city development be on?!</p> <p>S - 8088 - 7880 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8153	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Can we please see if you can sell the currently empty offices before you build more?</p> <p>S - 8153 - 7899 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8178	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p> <p>S - 8178 - 4796 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8203	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Generally yes. But there are signs of some sectors already declining including the media, Norwich Union only centre use retailing losing out to supermarket saturation and the internet (Norwich people use this a lot). You need to curb the night time weekend economy and make more use of the market area at night.</p> <p>S - 8203 - 7901 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8246	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p> <p>S - 8246 - 4558 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8268	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p> <p>S - 8268 - 7912 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8294	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the</p>

	<p>City Centre? All</p> <p>S - 8294 - 7915 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8467	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8467 - 8016 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8517	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8517 - 7817 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8541	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8541 - 8021 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8565	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8565 - 1976 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>

<p>8654</p>	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - SUPPORT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? S - 8654 - 8036 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>8678</p>	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? S - 8678 - 8044 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>8721</p>	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Norwich should keep some of its 'old world' character and not just become like any other standard modern city. S - 8721 - 8045 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>8728</p>	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes S - 8728 - 8053 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>8784</p>	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? But in present economic conditions it may be a long time coming</p>

	S - 8784 - 8061 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -
8809	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8809 - 6869 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8899	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>These aspirations are fine. However, there is a priority need for affordable housing. This should be provided by local authorities and its provision should not be linked to a planning gain from the building of large numbers of other houses</p> <p>S - 8899 - 2014 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8934	<p>Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>NLA support this policy, especially the initial point about enhancing the historic city. This policy could be clarified and further strengthened by editing this to "protecting and enhancing the historic city, including its built, archaeological and environmental assets"</p> <p>S - 8934 - 8081 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8974	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 8974 - 8092 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -
9032	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>A mix of retail, leisure, office and housing gives a healthy sustainable balance.</p> <p>S - 9032 - 4187 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9088	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>The Broads Authority has responsibility for most aspects of the river's planning, navigation and conservation. The Authority would like to see reference to linking along (as well as to) the river corridor and addition of mention of access to and from the water itself. There are existing and potential further opportunities for access to and from the city by water navigation in small craft, hire and private sailing yachts and motorcraft and passenger service (tour or "water bus") vessels.</p> <p>The leisure / recreation importance of local residents and workers of the river and riverside (and other areas of the city centre) should be explicitly recognised. (These are not just environmental or tourism assets).</p> <p>The City Centre Diagram at Appendix 5 should indicate (albeit diagrammatically) the boundary between the Core Strategy area and that of the Broads Authority (i.e. the river edges).</p> <p>S - 9088 - 7986 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9104	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9104 - 7111 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9139	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p> <p>S - 9139 - 8111 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9150	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p> <p>S - 9150 - 2055 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9263	<p>Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? The only danger I can see will be applications for development of shopping malls on sites outside the centre which has happened and is happening to towns and cities in other parts of England. The proposed NNDR site would be a tempting prize for development alongside it.</p> <p>S - 9263 - 8115 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9343	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p> <p>S - 9343 - 8123 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9354	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9354 - 7113 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9382	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>However, it doesn't seem right for one main street in the city centre to be full of night clubs and bars and unpleasant at night and another to be an unofficial bus station. Hopefully no more blocks of flats will be built looking like those right next to the football club - even if they are nice inside.</p> <p>S - 9382 - 8124 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9450	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>S - 9450 - 8134 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9484	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>comment on page 21, 'enhancing its retail function' I suppose you have notices how many empty shops there are? Its quite depressing</p> <p>S - 9484 - 8139 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9547	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 9547 - 8146 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -
9599	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9599 - 8162 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9673	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9673 - 8047 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9698	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9698 - 5446 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9724	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9724 - 8174 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9760	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Web - 15/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>As long as existing older buildings are improved / replaced alongside this development.</p> <p>S - 9760 - 8184 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9825	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes, but not at the expense of sustainable communities offering retail facilities (food store) to minimise traffic/congestion etc.</p> <p>S - 9825 - 8198 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9875	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9875 - 2058 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9899	<p>Mr Peter Sutton [8219] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 27/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>I generally support this plan but with the reservation that questions the need for yet more retail and leisure facilities rather than housing. Housing in the City removes the pressure of commuting traffic on existing roads into the City.</p> <p>S - 9899 - 8219 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9929	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9929 - 7015 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9959	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9959 - 6903 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9992	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9992 - 8228 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10014	<p>notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10014 - 6911 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10026	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10026 - 8230 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>

<p>10075</p>	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? An urban extension to North East Norwich will be sustainable in that it will incorporate services and facilities that will meet the needs of future communities and reduce the need to travel. However, the City Centre accommodates major retail, culture, strategic services and a wider range of job opportunities that are easily accessible to future residents of the urban extension. These services and activities will act to support the urban extension and vice versa.</p> <p>S - 10075 - 8234 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>10177</p>	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p> <p>S - 10177 - 8246 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>10214</p>	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p> <p>S - 10214 - 5864 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>10259</p>	<p>The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? We support Policy 3 Norwich City Centre as the main focus for retail, leisure, office and cultural development. Town centres should be multi-purpose and succeed through a self-sustaining combination of working, living and leisure. Future leisure, arts and cultural facilities should be located within the town centre and be part of a successful mixed-use environment with visitors</p>

	<p>enlivening the surrounding area in the evening and providing regular custom for local bars and restaurants outside normal working and shopping hours to support an evening economy.</p> <p>S - 10259 - 8263 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10363	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>In principle, yes. Nevertheless, the Parish Council questions the Reasoned Justification statement that "Evidence shows that at least 100,000 m² of new offices will be required in the City centre up to 2021". In the current economic climate the reverse trends seems true and the evidence would therefore seem questionable as a major plank of the development strategy. Similarly enhancing the City's retail function must need re-evaluation in the light of future economic predictions.</p> <p>S - 10363 - 2020 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10430	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10430 - 8308 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10509	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10509 - 7215 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10612	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p>

	<p>We have already been extensively consulted on this by Norwich City Council Planning Dept to which we have already commented, especially concerning the Local strategic Plan and the Northern City Centre Area Plan which we fully supported.</p> <p>S - 10612 - 8325 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10663	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes, but the character of the city must be maintained.</p> <p>S - 10663 - 8348 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10732	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p> <p>S - 10732 - 1776 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10763	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes: Particular support to open spaces, green linkages and walking and cycling provision.</p> <p>S - 10763 - 7666 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10789	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? However, it is also important to ensure that it is easy to travel across the city centre as currently the main choice for getting across the city centre is the car. Bus services that go across the centre rather than directly to the bus station need to be developed and water buses should be considered as sensible route across the city centre.</p>

	S - 10789 - 8360 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -
10804	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>However, it is also important to ensure that it is easy to travel across the city centre as currently the main choice for getting across the city centre is the car. Bus services that go across the centre rather than directly to the bus station need to be developed and water buses should be considered as a sensible route across the city centre.</p> <p>S - 10804 - 8361 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10820	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>The proposed development in Wymondham provides the opportunity to maximise the benefits that can be generated from maintaining and strengthening the relationship between the city and the town, including supporting one another in terms of the provision and viability of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major retail; • Cultural attractions; • Strategic services; • Recreational activities; • A range of job opportunities; • Transport infrastructure. <p>The Landowners support a bus rapid transport system to link new communities with the city centre. It is also considered that this policy should mention the importance, success and possible expansion of park and ride facilities in contributing towards reducing congestion in the city centre.</p> <p>S - 10820 - 8362 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10847	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p>

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

The map provided is short on detail of existing roads and other landmarks and it is not always clear precisely where the keyed areas are referring to.

The first point to question is the status of the so-called 'green links'. The link following the Wensum for instance would be drastically fragmented by new developments up to the river's edge, particularly along Riverside and down river from Carrow Road. The same applies to the link through Area B to the centre which is heavily built up, and it is not clear whether that is referring precisely to King Street or how it relates to the existing green 'ridge' which runs from Bracondale and incorporates the Carrow Tower. There are issues also to be addressed with Lakenham Way and Marriotts Way to do with their maintenance and green space management resulting from unresolved questions of ownership and unclear lines of responsibility. Ideally, they need to be brought back fully into local authority ownership and, in the case of Lakenham Way, designated as either a park or nature reserve. We would also like to look into extending the Improved Public Realm from Area A towards St Stephens to link up with Lakenham Way.

As regards the leisure areas, we are happy with their location although there has been an unfortunate tendency that the late night economy has moved away from the traditional pub and become more concentrated in central urban areas. This has meant many less central communities have lost a focal point while the designated areas themselves are prone to public order problems.

We are generally happy with the areas designated as 'Areas of change' although we are still keen that the strategy focuses also on maintaining more outlying smaller retail centres such as those at Vauxhall Street or West Earlham.

The confirmation of proposals for a 'bus rapid transit network' is to be welcomed, yet we need assurance that both public and private sectors have the commitment to make any new routes/services work even if they don't show an immediate profit. It is worth pointing out that a sufficient regularity of service, preferably at least once every 15 minutes, is shown to dramatically increase usage as passengers become less reliant on timetables. The lessons from the unfortunately abandoned orbital bus scheme need to be learnt.

S - 10847 - 8018 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -

10883 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - **SUPPORT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?

An urban extension to north east Norwich will be sustainable in that it will incorporate the necessary services, facilities and infrastructure to meet the needs of existing and future communities. However, the extension is located in close

	<p>proximity to existing and planned improvements to the transport network, which will ensure that the urban extension has strong links with the City. This provides the opportunity to maximise the benefits that can be generated from maintaining and strengthening the relationship between the city and the new extension, including supporting one another in terms of the provision and viability of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Major retail; * Cultural attractions; * Strategic services; * Recreational activities; * A range of job opportunities; * Transport infrastructure. <p>The BLT supports the aspiration to promote Norwich as a gateway and to enabling a bus rapid transport system to link with new communities with the city centre. However, the policy should also include a commitment to improve walking and cycling routes linking the city to new and existing communities, strategic employment locations as well as recreational opportunities such as the Broads and the coast. It is also considered that this policy should mention the importance, success and possible expansion of park and ride facilities in contributing towards reducing congestion in the city centre.</p> <p>S - 10883 - 8366 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>10929</p>	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p> <p>S - 10929 - 8368 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>10953</p>	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Yes</p>

	S - 10953 - 8369 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -
10977	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10977 - 8176 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
11000	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 11000 - 8370 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
11045	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 11045 - 6955 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
11114	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Partly yes.</p> <p>We note that the reduction in new homes in Norwich in the favoured option (compared to options 1-3) has effectively occurred entirely in that part of Norwich outside the city centre. Without knowing the locations of existing allocations it is difficult to comment precisely, but we wonder whether the "minimum of 2,750 dwellings" in the city centre has been reviewed in the light</p>

	<p>of the revised allocation.</p> <p>Within the Greater Norwich area, by the criteria used by ORS in their June 2006 survey, Norwich has the highest pre-existing backlog of affordable homes, the highest on-going need for affordable housing and the highest under-provision of affordable housing from existing allocations. Since most of the new Norwich allocation is being targeted at the centre we believe that Policy 3 should be amended to emphasise that when allocating sites for housing development particular attention should be given to those which maximise the provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>S - 11114 - 8390 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
7872	<p>Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>no more destruction of the norwich and norfolk we know and love. no more senseless, wanton destruction of fields, woodland, and wildlife. we have far more offices and shops than needed, convert these and re-establish the empty houses and buildings and we can leave our green sites in and especially around norwich well alone</p> <p>O - 7872 - 7782 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
7928	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 08/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>too much growth will ruin norfolk</p> <p>O - 7928 - 7812 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
7950	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 10/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Whilst I can support most of this I object to the council's auto-phobia particularly in the evening; the charging for parking after 1800, the removal of on the road parking and proliferation of double yellow lines. I rarely go into Norwich at night because of these factors and the abysmal evening public transport. It is Norwich's loss...I do not have to spend my money with someone</p>

	<p>who makes life difficult. Control of daytime traffic is essential however.</p> <p>O - 7950 - 7809 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8057	<p>Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 19/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>There is no point in expanding the retail floorspace when there many shop units vacant - and likely to remain empty for the foreseeable future. Norwich already has two shopping malls when one would suffice.</p> <p>O - 8057 - 7870 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8357	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>I am concerned that the existing 'old buildings' which give Norwich its character would be knocked down to be replaced by new offices.</p> <p>O - 8357 - 6992 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8448	<p>Ian Harris [8007] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>I'm sorry, but using the word 'sustainable' a couple of times doesn't disguise the central message of massive economic growth linked to retail. This future vision will not be sustainable, because growth cannot be.</p> <p>O - 8448 - 8007 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8491	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Not all of it - need very mixed use. Why do we need more retail outlets - develop the malls. Norwich is fast becoming a mono</p>

	<p>retail area. Most of the individual and interesting shops have gone. What is there to be of interest to tourists in this? Norwich could be unique - do not make it like everywhere else. Much more housing could be above shops etc. It should not be necessary to use green space, Norwich has some incredibly awful buildings. Look at the riverfront! We need more good hotels not the hideous travel lodge by the bus station. Who agreed that?</p> <p>O - 8491 - 8020 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8589	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Living accommodation to reduce travel requirement of employment / work</p> <p>O - 8589 - 8024 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8775	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Of course it is hoped the emphasis will include the things you mention, but you fail to justify why these things should necessarily grow materially, and everything about climate change indicates that a shift away from material growth is essential, towards quite a different future, based on quite different values - if there is to be any worthwhile future at all - and you ignore this.</p> <p>O - 8775 - 8060 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8836	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Should be more growth within the urban area of Norwich including the fringe parishes</p> <p>O - 8836 - 8064 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8881	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>you will turn our vibrant city into a "visitor destination" We need more educational and employment facilities and improved transport from outside areas</p> <p>O - 8881 - 8071 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8942	<p>Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Norwich is already a city of culture - don't mess with it. Give the City Hall enough money to maintain / set up twinning initiatives. We do not need any more shopping malls - those we have are not full as it is. We have enough good shops in the city - any more would be overkill and would put many existing shops out of business.</p> <p>We have plenty of office space - if properly used and allocated. We have plenty of perfectly acceptable housing stock that can be renovated and let or sold. Use what we've got.</p> <p>O - 8942 - 8087 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
8950	<p>Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Many shops are closing in the City centre, proposals for increasing retail floorspace should be revised downwards. Steps should be taken to improve the range of shops in the City centre, there is a shortage of provision of furniture, electrical and DIY shops. These are currently mostly outside the centre and not accessible by public transport.</p> <p>I support walking and cycling provision but not just for visitors, it should include improvements to commuter routes and replacing routes that have been lost eg Wessex Street. Pedestrian routes must be separate from cycle routes and free from motor vehicles.</p> <p>O - 8950 - 8088 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9164	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the</p>

	<p>City Centre?</p> <p>Because no provision is made in the plan for disabled people who cannot use buses, rail, walking, cycling easily</p> <p>O - 9164 - 8112 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9189	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Not enough residential; too much leisure (already too much e.g. Prince of Wales Rd and Riverside); the proposals for sustainable transport access are inadequate. Why in particular should walking and cycling not be for residents?</p> <p>O - 9189 - 8114 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9230	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>No need for more retail too much now</p> <p>O - 9230 - 4494 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9290	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be developed - not greenfield sites and keep density at a sensible level. Too many new developments are built with not enough space for parking and thereby the quality of life for residents</p> <p>O - 9290 - 5445 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9298	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Why is culture bottom of the list? It is already a brilliant shopping centre. Our spiritual heritage is in danger of being buried by</p>

	<p>a welter of bargains! Better public transport would be simply marvellous, improvement of cultural facilities & heightened awareness of our great contributions to spirituality e.g. Julian of Norwich & artistic & literary figures.</p> <p>O - 9298 - 8117 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9411	<p>Mr David Gladwell [8126] - OBJECT Web - 01/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? No mention is made of provisions for Angling which is important in the City for those without travel wishing to fish the Wensum as free fishing around Carrow Bridge -Riverside Road to Bishops Bridge. Either side of the River this important Tourist facility could be catered for but is unmentioned/unrepresented whilst walking and cycling are.</p> <p>O - 9411 - 8126 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9425	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? See comments at q28</p> <p>O - 9425 - 8127 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9478	<p>Mr David Gladwell [8126] - OBJECT Web - 04/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? The route into Norwich from Beccles, Bungay, Lowestoft and villages on route (A146 & B1332)contain no provision for "Park and Ride" without travelling along the bypass (A47)some way. This involves congestion before Thorpe and the traffic lights exits. A greater consideration needs to be supplied for this as well because from such a park and ride point walking to the new "Broad" would be easily possible enhancing its leisure facilities and access potential, or by a short bus ride to it directly.</p> <p>O - 9478 - 8126 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9565	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Not applicable to Drayton</p> <p>O - 9565 - 6690 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9793	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT Paper - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? On balance, no we do not fully support this policy. Please see answer to Q4. Your evidence for new office space is now wrong, we will not now see the type of expansion of Financial Services that would have been predicted 6 - 12 months ago. Other industries e.g. creative and media are unlikely to expand quickly and will tend to follow economic trends. The other elements of the Policy 3 we would support; particularly the development of Norwich as a cultural centre.</p> <p>O - 9793 - 7513 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
9916	<p>Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? Too many new homes and not enough jobs. There are already too many people living in Norwich and too many unemployed.</p> <p>O - 9916 - 6780 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10102	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT Web - 30/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? The emphasis should be on housing within the City - not offices</p> <p>O - 10102 - 8239 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10340	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - OBJECT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the</p>

	<p>City Centre?</p> <p>We already have far too many shops - in both Castle Mall and Chapelfield units are vacant. Some in Castle Mall have been vacant for years! Norwich's historical identity is its true USP, not shops.</p> <p>Norwich needs a proper pedestrian zone, not one where vehicles are still allowed access.</p> <p>O - 10340 - 8293 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10453	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Build in the city, but not in the countryside.</p> <p>O - 10453 - 8309 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10481	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>The current recession should have made it clear that we as a nation have too much credit and have spent far too much on retail. The last thing we should be thinking of is relying on retail for jobs and economy.</p> <p>O - 10481 - 8310 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10534	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>All the development will mean more vehicles and congestion. Buses are not cheap and car use can often be cheaper. Cycling is dangerous and much more thought needs to go in to separate cycle routes.</p> <p>O - 10534 - 8312 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
10558	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>Recent development has spoilt the historical appeal of Norwich and all in the name of growth and greed.</p> <p>O - 10558 - 8318 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>10581</p>	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10581 - 8319 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -</p>
<p>11086</p>	<p>Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>We do not support giving greater priority to employment uses, in particular office development, at the expense of new housing. We wish to see maintained the more balanced approach of a mix of uses of the last 20 years.</p> <p>Policy towards Norwich city centre between the post-war and 1980s was characterised by replacement of housing by industrial, office and commercial developments out of scale with their historic surroundings. This policy resulted in the permanent disfigurement of the City's fabric and in some instances the street pattern (eg Anglia Square, St Stephens) which no amount of present day redevelopment can repair.</p> <p>Giving lower priority to housing would reduce the vibrancy and diversity of the city centre and make the streets less attractive places for walking and cycling outside office hours. It would reduce the opportunity for people to live within walking distance of work places and for building car free housing in the centre where there is greatest access to sustainable transport.</p> <p>We do not support the proposal for a substantial expansion of the comparison retail floorspace other than through intensification of existing uses and strengthening of existing shopping areas. One of our concerns is that expansion of comparison shopping would most likely be accompanied by additional car parking. On the other hand, we support the need for</p>

new small scale food stores both within and outside the primary shopping areas for serving city centre residential communities.

We support improvements to walking and cycling provision, though we would like to see added a reference to the creation of safe and continuous walking and cycling networks within and to/from the city centre. It is pointless creating safe conditions in the city centre unless the inner ring road is made less of a barrier to people on foot and bike.

We support sustainable transport access to and within the city centre, though we do not support the current version of NATS as it is predicated on a NDR.

Other improvements not referred to which we would like to see are:

i) adoption of a car parking strategy which supports management of travel demand. The City Council has allowed public car parking provision to expand in the city centre as a means of raising revenue and encouraging shoppers. This has undermined efforts to manage travel demand, (eg traffic impact of Chapelfield Mall on inner ring road). We should also like to see the Council reallocate public car parking for other uses such as housing and private car park owners redevelop private non-residential car parking land. We would like NATS to implement a workplace car parking charge.

ii) encouragement of biodiversity through planning eg green roofs and walls, more soft landscaping and tree planting as part of new developments. The city centre has low levels of green space and greenery for cooling down the hot city. More greenery would create a more pleasant environment and encourage walking and cycling.

We would like to see a review of the Northern City Centre Area Action Plan as we believe it is unsustainable, containing too much parking and retail, insufficient housing and open space and unsympathetic to its surroundings.

We recommend

Re-wording of the first para to read:

"Within the City Centre, a balance of uses will be maintained: retail, leisure, office, housing, cultural and some educational development."

3rd bullet point: delete "substantial"

3rd para: Replace housing figure to read, "A minimum of 4,000 dwellings will be provided in the city centre".

8th bullet point, re-word, "sustainable transport access to and within the city centre in accordance with the Norwich Area

Transportation Strategy, to be reviewed. This will promote Norwich as a gateway and enable a bus rapid transit system to link the new communities with the city centre as the hub."

Last line, re-word: "The Northern City Centre Area Action Plan will be reviewed".

O - 11086 - 8387 - Policy 3 Norwich City Centre (Q6), (Q6) Do you support this strategy for the City Centre? -

Response – Q7 – Q8

Remainder of Norwich Urban Area including the fringe parishes

The existing suburbs and the urban/rural fringes are key to successful development of the area.

Q7 Remainder of Norwich Urban Area including the fringe parishes

The existing suburbs and the urban / rural fringes are key to successful development of the area.

Q7 Do you support the proposals in Policy 4 (page 24)? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q7 Total	130	18	75	37	130

Rep No.	Name of respondent [JDI reference number] Response e.g COMMENT, SUPPORT, OBJECT Method of response e.g. Web / paper, and date of submission
---------	--

8049	<p>Mr Keith Jones [7536] - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? I have an interest in the following being implemented. ref Broadland DC Local Plan (replacement) 2006</p> <p>15.5: The District Council proposes to designate a Conservation Area covering those parts of Beeston St Andrews which are of special architectural or historic interest; once designated policy ENV16 will apply to the area.</p> <p>5.6: Part of Beeston is particularly attractive because of the relationship between the farm buildings, hall and their various parkland settings, as well as the wooded margins and area around Red Hall. The proposed Conservation Area may well extend in to the parishes of Spixworth and Sprowston.</p> <p>C - 8049 - 7536 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8204	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - COMMENT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Not completely. The Government clearly hasn't the money to pay for all further education development. I do not believe the</p>

	<p>northern distributor road will do as you say. It will be unsustainable especially now that we are approaching peak oil production.</p> <p>C - 8204 - 7901 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8343	<p>Age Concern Norwich (Phil Wells) [7957] - COMMENT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? It is not clear from this section whether the housing mix includes the needs of older people - and in particular local facilities to reduce transport needs and encourage community activity. Also the rapid transit bus network may result in exacerbating the increasing difficulty older people have in finding local bus stops - it could mean longer walks unless 'slow transit' systems operate on other routes.</p> <p>C - 8343 - 7957 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8407	<p>paul eldridge [7987] - COMMENT Web - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? in main i support these proposals the is in fact just one thing to object to and that is the NDR</p> <p>C - 8407 - 7987 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8426	<p>Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? There is no mention of sporting & leisure facilities being additionally provided, are these being taken into consideration?</p> <p>C - 8426 - 7771 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8449	<p>Ian Harris [8007] - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p>

	<p>I support the proposals for improving public transport, cycling and walking. However, this policy reveals its true colours when it refers to improving, 'the "gateways to Norwich'. The idea that our future plans should champion private motor cars coming into the City is looking increasingly anachronistic.</p> <p>C - 8449 - 8007 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8492	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? This all sounds really grand - not much to disagree with but given the development which has recently been allowed how can one really believe the councils will really carry out their plans?</p> <p>C - 8492 - 8020 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8629	<p>University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029] - COMMENT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Earlier reference in question 2 to the Colney Lane Bus Link has been made. It is made again in response to this question regarding policy 4 with particular reference a route linking the City Centre with a Thickthorn park-and-ride, the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital NHS Trust, (the Norwich Research Park) and the University.</p> <p>C - 8629 - 8029 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9077	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Possible need now for some shops to be changed to residential dwellings</p> <p>C - 9077 - 8109 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9089	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes ,</p>

	<p>(Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? The Broads Authority would wish to see the wording revised to recognise the need to work with the Broads Authority to achieve some of the objectives (e.g. links to Whitlingham, cycling/ walking network, East Norwich links to Broads etc)</p> <p>C - 9089 - 7986 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9299	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Many of these proposals are very welcome. Heathland habitats would be good and riverside walks. Great to have improved walking & cycling links. Good to encourage educational facilities.</p> <p>C - 9299 - 8117 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9750	<p>Mr David Holliday [8178] - COMMENT Paper - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Basically we are concerned by development around Drayton High Road, Low Road, Fakenham Road, Middletons Lane, Reepham Road, Cromer Road and Holt Road areas. We want all development to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Green/natural/open space is maintained, increased and enhanced allowing for designated public footpaths (and natural green routes/areas) linking up all the developments allowing for joined-up routes for walking recreation in all development areas and beyond; b) All new roads (and existing) will have frequent and safe crossing points for pedestrians; and c) All new (and existing) roads and footpaths are adequate (wide enough and safe) to carry the increased volume of traffic that will be generated without harming existing resident's safety and enjoyment of the areas. <p>C - 9750 - 8178 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10274	<p>Norwich HEART (Mr Michael Loveday) [960] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Beyond the centre, other opportunities exist to redevelop declining, obsolete or low density areas in ways that more</p>

	<p>appropriately reflect their original function and the corollary of this approach, apart from securing an urban, suburban and rural solution which more accurately reflects the local distinctiveness of Norwich as a place, would be to reduce demand for development on Greenfield sites, reduce the need to travel and therefore reduce the demand for expensive, transport related (and other) infrastructure .</p> <p>C - 10274 - 960 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10383</p>	<p>GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT Paper - 01/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Policy 3 Norwich City Centre: 10. There appears to be some overlap between the provisions of Policies 3 and 4 in relation to city centre regeneration priorities. The reference to the Northern Area Action Plan at Policy 3, and to the proposed dwelling allocation is helpful.</p> <p>Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area: 11. Policy 4 is crucial to the delivery of sustainable growth as it provides the framework for a significant part of the housing proposed for Norwich, particularly within Broadland. We welcome the commitment given to improving the 'gateways' to Norwich, to green the infrastructure provision, and to the enhancement of public transport provision along the principal radial routes connecting the city centre to major growth and employment locations.</p> <p>12. Clarification of the locations to which this policy refers, dwelling numbers, key dependencies and implications for phasing, would be helpful. This policy should include a reference to the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle Area Action Plan, and in relation to this area, we question whether this guidance provided is sufficient; we comment further on this matter below.</p> <p>C - 10383 - 7463 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10535</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - COMMENT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Most of the green space proposals will need policing which will not be provided.</p> <p>C - 10535 - 8312 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>

<p>10634</p>	<p>Ms Jane Chittenden [8329] - COMMENT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Essential to have affordable and convenient alternatives to car transport. Local rail, perhaps including trams, integrated with bus services</p> <p>C - 10634 - 8329 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10644</p>	<p>David Morris (Mr David Morris) [8335] - COMMENT Web - 11/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? The aspiration to regenerate 'tired' suburbs is welcomed, provided it is done in a holistic manner which encourages enterprise and promotes the development of mixed sustainable communities;</p> <p>The nature, type and location of uses on existing Employment allocations should be debated further, in order to create a positive policy framework which encourages the swift development of new employment opportunities and stimulates enterprise;</p> <p>The inclusion of residential on existing employment sites where appropriate should be welcomed, where it assists in creating a thriving and sustainable community;</p> <p>The move to increase densities within small and medium scale residential developments is welcomed.</p> <p>C - 10644 - 8335 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>11032</p>	<p>Mr Bernard Godding [8372] - COMMENT Paper - 14/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Firstly to welcome the concept of Norwich as a 'Learning City' - and to ask where in the infrastructure proposals this is provided for so that there is maximum availability of facilities - especially in the context of an ageing population?</p> <p>The strategy for Norwich seems dominated by the central core, with access between the peripheral communities severely</p>

	<p>restricted. This has historically led to the isolation of communities such as Bowthorpe and has led to longstanding estate communities such as North & West Earlham remaining either invisible or inaccessible due to perceptions invoked by the media. The two ring-roads & Southern Bypass do nothing to bring communities together and it would be helpful if this strategy gave more attention to such matters.</p> <p>C - 11032 - 8372 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
7914	<p>Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - SUPPORT Web - 06/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? comments as for previous.</p> <p>S - 7914 - 6885 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
7951	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - SUPPORT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Agree. We use the Marriot's way and it is great and would like to see much more like it</p> <p>S - 7951 - 7809 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
7964	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - SUPPORT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? a lot of Norwich especially the fringes needs tidying up!"</p> <p>S - 7964 - 6862 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8000	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? yes</p>

	S - 8000 - 7851 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -
8070	<p>Miss Janet Saunders [7875] - SUPPORT Web - 23/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Although I'm not sure what you mean by Social Regeneration</p> <p>S - 8070 - 7875 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8089	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT Web - 26/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Fine</p> <p>S - 8089 - 7880 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8114	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 8114 - 7888 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8154	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 8154 - 7899 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8179	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8179 - 4796 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8247	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8247 - 4558 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8269	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8269 - 7912 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8295	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 13/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Full</p> <p>S - 8295 - 7915 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8384	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 8384 - 7966 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -
8391	<p>Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8391 - 7012 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8416	<p>Ed King [7965] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8416 - 7965 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8468	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8468 - 8016 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8542	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8542 - 8021 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8566	Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT

	<p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8566 - 1976 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8655	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>S - 8655 - 8036 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8679	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>S - 8679 - 8044 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8722	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Great policy but in reality where will the money come from now less funding is available?</p> <p>S - 8722 - 8045 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8729	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8729 - 8053 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>

8785	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 8785 - 8061 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8837	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 8837 - 8064 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8901	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? These proposals are find and many deserve to be implemented without being tied to a large amount of new development</p> <p>S - 8901 - 2014 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8975	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 8975 - 8092 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9033	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9033 - 4187 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9105	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9105 - 8111 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9107	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9107 - 7111 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9151	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9151 - 2055 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9219	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9219 - 1828 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>

9231	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 9231 - 4494 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9355	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Only if there is sufficient affordable housing</p> <p>S - 9355 - 7113 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9426	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 9426 - 8127 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9451	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>S - 9451 - 8134 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9476	<p>Louisa Young [8135] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? I broadly agree with the above.</p>

	S - 9476 - 8135 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -
9485	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 9485 - 8139 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9516	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Much needed regeneration in these areas</p> <p>S - 9516 - 8140 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9548	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes, provided housing is limited the general proposals are sound. Item 9 page 46, no indication as to the sites agreed on plans for the 11,851 houses which have planning permission.</p> <p>S - 9548 - 8146 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9600	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 9600 - 8162 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>

<p>9699</p>	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 9699 - 5446 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>9725</p>	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 9725 - 8174 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>9761</p>	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - SUPPORT Web - 15/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes.</p> <p>S - 9761 - 8184 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>9794</p>	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - SUPPORT Paper - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 9794 - 7513 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>9826</p>	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p>

The Norwich Northern Distributor Road will greatly help Taverham play a fuller role within NUA.

We support this policy and the objective to support a range of opportunities for redevelopment, regeneration and enhancement.

We believe the proposals we have will retain and improve local services and retain and add to local employment. The existing and future buildings will be enhanced, townscape improved and as a site on a major route the gateway approach into the NUA will benefit.

The proposals will have little or no adverse impact on the "green infrastructure" and the development would support the objective of reducing the impact of traffic on residential areas.

Initial local consultation has taken place - there is a commitment to fully engage all stakeholders as the development process moves forward through the next stages. Taverham does not have a foodstore other than a "top-up" service and therefore a considerable journey is involved to carry out the main convenience shopping. This is not an attractive and sustainable option, involving in many instances a round trip of 10-13 miles and approximately 60 minute journey at peak times.

A major consideration in deciding where to shop is the excessive traffic, time taken and difficulty in accessing both Asda (Hellesdon) and Sainsbury's (Longwater), particularly at the weekends. Both stores "overtrade".

Budgen at Drayton is regarded as too small and limited - this largely falls into the top-up facilities alongside the two Tesco Express outlets.

Whilst this will be considered in greater detail in any retail impact study, it is clear that "clawback" will be achieved as part of the new proposed PPS6 changes. Retail spending is currently occurring outside the catchment area and by encouraging consumer choice and promoting competition the local community will benefit through increased and better local services in addition to new jobs and economic regeneration.

The proposed route of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road is welcomed. Until this fully encircles Norwich and meets the Southern by-pass the inevitable consequence of this new section is that the Fakenham Road into the city centre is likely to become even busier.

The garden centre, adjoining craft and country shopping centre and children's play barn are significant leisure and tourist destinations. The proposals are complimentary to the existing facilities, will encourage sustainable shopping patterns, reduce car trips and provide a balanced convenience shopping provision across the district with little or no adverse impact on the city

	<p>centre.</p> <p>The site is well serviced to encourage different modes of transport, both public (bus) and private provision (cars) are already established. Highway improvements as defined by the Core Strategy will result in site specific works which are likely to form part a the planning application.</p> <p>S - 9826 - 8198 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>9867</p>	<p>Hill Residential [8215] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr William Lusty) [7762]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>We acknowledge and support the opportunities that are identified for development in the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including the fringe parishes. We consider that it is very important that new development in the suburban area on the edge of Norwich must integrate with the existing edge of the City, to ensure that the impact of such development is minimised. However, we therefore consider that an additional opportunity should be added to Policy 4 with regard to the way in which greenfield development will be related to the existing edge of the built up area. We therefore consider that the following objective should be added to Policy 4:</p> <p>"For opportunities which are well related to the built up edge of the City and in good proximity to existing jobs facilities and services."</p> <p>We consider it essential that the greenfield development which takes place reflects sustainability objectives. It is therefore important that Policy 4 sets out our suggested objective, as part of a framework which the policy provides for consideration of sites for new development.</p> <p>S - 9867 - 8215 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>9876</p>	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9876 - 2058 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>

<p>9900</p>	<p>Mr Peter Sutton [8219] - SUPPORT Web - 27/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? I support area wide traffic restraint and restrictions on through traffic although I'm not sure how this could be achieved. I also support reduced speeds. Green infrastructure must be maintained and the also the rural fringe but I question the need for a water based country park at Bawburgh because I believe this site already has a user who would be adversely affected. The thought of a bus rapid transit network is attractive but I'm not sue how rapid it would be at peak traffic times.</p> <p>S - 9900 - 8219 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>9930</p>	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 9930 - 7015 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>9993</p>	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 9993 - 8228 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10015</p>	<p>notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes - In principle we support the proposals, however the identification of green links and infrastructure must have a meaningful purpose if they are to fulfil their objectives.Please refer to comments at Ques 25</p> <p>S - 10015 - 6911 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>

<p>10027</p>	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10027 - 8230 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10076</p>	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10076 - 8234 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10086</p>	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - SUPPORT Web - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Again, this sounds well thought out.</p> <p>S - 10086 - 8235 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10178</p>	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10178 - 8246 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10215</p>	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes ,</p>

	<p>(Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10215 - 5864 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10341	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? But these will only work if we have better public transport and improved pedestrian access to all of the city.</p> <p>S - 10341 - 8293 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10364	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10364 - 2020 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10431	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10431 - 8308 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10510	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10510 - 7215 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>

<p>10605</p>	<p>Mr/Mrs Smith [8322] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? The suburbs and fringes of the city have an important role to play in delivering the growth agenda. Development at Harford Bridge can help to meet a number of the objectives of the policy including providing access to employment, improving the gateways to the city and delivering riverside and river valley walks.</p> <p>S - 10605 - 8322 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10613</p>	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? We have previously supported this through the City of Norwich partnership consultations, having engaged fully in workshops on traffic and transport, environment and social issues. We are pleased to see the emphasis on the green infrastructure, cultural and economic development. The Greater Norwich plan enhances and supplements these plans. However we would like to have seen a fixed rail tram system from east to west of the city centre, such as they have in Croydon.</p> <p>S - 10613 - 8325 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10664</p>	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10664 - 8348 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10733</p>	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10733 - 1776 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>

10754	<p>Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048] (represented by J and J Design (Mr J R Shephard) [8358]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10754 - 7048 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10764	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10764 - 7666 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10790	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>One fact that this policy does not address is that many people now are living in houses on their own, which is a big contributor to the need for more housing. Investigating and implementing policies that encourage higher house occupancies could save a lot of unnecessary house construction.</p> <p>S - 10790 - 8360 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10805	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>One fact that this policy does not address is that many people now are living in houses on their own, which is a big contributor to the need for more housing. Investigating and implementing policies that encourage higher house occupancies could save a lot of unnecessary house construction.</p> <p>S - 10805 - 8361 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>

10821	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10821 - 8362 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10871	<p>Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>We agree with Policy 1 of the Public Consultation and the fact that it is envisaged that much of the new development will be focused on the urban area of Norwich, including urban fringe parishes such as Costessey. We endorse the proposition within Policy 1 that the scale of development will decrease at each level of the proposed settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>We agree with the observation at paragraph 7.5 of the Public Consultation that the existing suburbs and immediate urban/rural fringe "are a key to the successful development of the area. They are home to a significant number of people, businesses and environmental assets, and provide the links between the city centre and the surrounding area. There are a range of opportunities for redevelopment, regeneration and enhancement. The range of issues warrants a comprehensive and dedicated strategy." In the context of the Costessey area described in Appendix 0, an extension of the existing Lodge Farm development area would enable elements of Policy 4 of the Public Consultation to be addressed. For example, the extension of the Lodge Farm site, in conjunction with improvements to the A47 Longwater interchange, provides the opportunity to enhance the Dereham Road gateway to Norwich.</p> <p>The enlargement of the present Lodge Farm development will enable significant improvements to be secured in public transport, walking and cycling links, an outcome required by Policy 4 of the Public Consultation. Specific reference is made within that Policy to a significant enhancement of public transport on routes linking the City Centre to locations such as Bowthorpe/Costessey/Longwater.</p>

	S - 10871 - 8363 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -
10930	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10930 - 8368 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10954	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10954 - 8369 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10978	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 10978 - 8176 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
11001	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Yes</p> <p>S - 11001 - 8370 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
11046	Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT

	<p>Paper - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 11046 - 6955 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
7873	<p>Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>leave well alone the majority have spoken,especially in thorpe and sprowston. we love our fields, woodlands, and wild life. no more housing or roads. these are not wanted or needed.</p> <p>O - 7873 - 7782 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
7929	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 08/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>growth on this scale is not needed</p> <p>O - 7929 - 7812 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8318	<p>Mr Anthony Knights [7922] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 15/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>The NNDR and the vast junction at Postwick is not needed and completely wrong for 2010 in economic and sustainable terms</p> <p>O - 8318 - 7922 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8331	<p>Mr Brian Cleland [7938] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 16/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p>

	<p>The NNDR will not reduce traffic at a local level generated by eg parents taking children to school and then going on to work. No public transport strategy will address the problem of parents needing their car to react to a problem with their children while the latter are at school.</p> <p>O - 8331 - 7938 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8335	<p>MR Stephen Graveling [7940] - OBJECT Web - 16/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? No confidence in the Council to improve the areas mentioned as witnessed by the work terrible work done in Norwich centre and local areas under their control.</p> <p>O - 8335 - 7940 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8358	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - OBJECT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? I do not believe that this will all be achievable in the current economic climate. Nor that the development of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road is necessarily the answer to all transport problems. Surely investment in public transport would bring more of a return.</p> <p>O - 8358 - 6992 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8455	<p>Mr Peter Sergeant [7993] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? The increased high and medium density home building planned for most of the fringe parishes will merge to create a homogenous urban sprawl. This will not meet the intention to improve gateways or improve green infrastructure.</p> <p>O - 8455 - 7993 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8590	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? NDR will encourage more traffic and if built will close too many local roads limiting mobility within community</p> <p>O - 8590 - 8024 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8700	<p>mrs jane fischl [8031] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? No focus on the city centre and not on soulless urban sprawl</p> <p>O - 8700 - 8031 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8779	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? I think I have answered this already</p> <p>O - 8779 - 8060 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8810	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? We believe Marlingford and Colton should be in the South Norfolk policy area rather than the Norwich policy area - South Norfolk. We believe rural parishes should be consulted about whether they wish to be part of an urban policy area</p> <p>O - 8810 - 6869 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8883	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? put the emphasis on RE- development and keep off new sites</p>

	<p>O - 8883 - 8071 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8943	<p>Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? I object to the need to 'redevelop' whole areas. It usually means pulling down perfectly good buildings just to put them up again. Concentrate of developing the public transport network.</p> <p>O - 8943 - 8087 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
8951	<p>Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? I disagree with the statement that the NDR will "reduce the impact of traffic on residential areas" My experience of the Southern Bypass is that it creates additional noise and pollution and leads to fast traffic heading into residential areas, causing danger to pedestrians and cyclists. It has closed off pedestrian routes eg Earlham to Little Melton. It leads to motorists making longer journeys. I anticipate similar problems with the NDR, which I do not want.</p> <p>O - 8951 - 8088 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9166	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? I do not agree with the transportation strategy</p> <p>O - 9166 - 8112 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9190	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? 1. The NDR is the fly in the ointment here!</p>

	<p>2. The rest of the policies might be OK (they don't go far enough) but given the lack of priority given to any of them currently (I understand we might be about to lose lottery money for the Whitlingham link due to matters), I don't believe it!</p> <p>O - 9190 - 8114 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9264	<p>Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? What is meant by "tired" suburbs. If the idea is to demolish and rebuild I think this would be a major mistake (and very expensive). The only way to redevelop and get a higher density would be to make smaller gardens or to build multi-storey buildings. This would not improve the neighbourhood on the contrary.</p> <p>O - 9264 - 8115 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9326	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Distributor road will increase traffic.</p> <p>O - 9326 - 8123 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9375	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? As so many areas now are purchased, houses and not rented, they are mainly better looked after (there are odd exceptions) cannot see where extra heathland is coming from. With development going on ideas nice but unsustainable because of lack of funding you cannot expect public to always pay when so much of their money is misappropriated</p> <p>O - 9375 - 8120 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9383	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes ,</p>

	<p>(Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Increasing density often increase crime.</p> <p>O - 9383 - 8124 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9414	<p>Mr David Gladwell [8126] - OBJECT Web - 01/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? No mention or catering for Angling which has a high tourist and economic impact accounting for 1.3m anglers nationally and a large revenue expenditure. Contact the national organisation Angling Trust for consultation. Within Norwich storm drains still pass effluent into the river (near to Bishop's Bridge upstream outlet near old morgue) making insanity for craft moored downstream.</p> <p>O - 9414 - 8126 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9507	<p>South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? No. The intentions for the DG&U sites are unclear. The reference is to 'city centre to Deal Ground / Utilities', and it is not clear whether this includes the DG & U sites themselves, or just the corridor. On the assumption that it does include the sites, the nature of the 'physical regeneration opportunities' are unclear. The other regeneration areas identified at the end of policy 4 are already urban. I do not oppose the development of the DG&U sites in principle (although the practical issues are formidable). Given that it such a substantial area for possible new development, the policy should be clearer as to what is intended (or hoped for).</p> <p>O - 9507 - 8142 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
9566	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? The NDR will not improve traffic problems which already exist</p> <p>O - 9566 - 6690 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>

<p>9674</p>	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Reference WROXHAM, there is no identified local need for 200 homes. There is however a requirement for a minimum of affordable housing, say 20 properties. Further Wroxham should be removed from classification as a KEY SERVICE AREA to SERVICE VILLAGE.</p> <p>O - 9674 - 8047 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>9845</p>	<p>Mr Mike Linley [8200] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Wish to register my objection to any change in status in the farmland opposite my house that would enable it to be built upon (site at White Horse Lane, Trowse). Our row of converted barns are already in a flood zone and we are concerned that as our homes are at the bottom of the proposed sloping piece of land, there would be a risk of drains etc. overflowing. The fact that our houses are four feet below ground level at that side of the property would only make this worse.</p> <p>O - 9845 - 8200 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>9960</p>	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Do not understand the need to refer to the Northern Norwich Distributor Road. This is not the only way to reduce the impact of traffic on residential areas and on its own it is unlikely to do so. We suggest that this reference is omitted and the bullet points listed remain as these are appropriate solutions.</p> <p>O - 9960 - 6903 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10103</p>	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT Web - 30/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p>

	<p>Regeneration of tired areas within Norwich would be appropriate improved transport links. But smaller settlements should be left</p> <p>O - 10103 - 8239 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10167	<p>Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245] (represented by David L Walker Limited (Head office) [8182]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>The Deal Ground located in east Norwich has major physical/logistical and environmental issues that may restrict regeneration opportunities such as built development without adverse impact on adjacent landowners and business. Regeneration in this area should be limited to conservation and leisure uses.</p> <p>O - 10167 - 8245 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10316	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>We welcome the aspiration to regenerate suburban areas, improve local employment opportunities and retain local services, whilst protecting landscape settings. We are keen to see the line between city and rural clearly demarcated and protected.</p> <p>We welcome proposed improvement to cycle networks and footpaths between the suburbs and the city centre/major employment locations.</p> <p>In our view, traffic to residential areas will not be lessened by the building of the NDR. Building more roads simply increases car dependency, creates further congestion on all roads, and diverts money and resources from necessary investment in public transport. Traffic to residential areas would be more effectively reduced with an expansion of local bus services and improvement in rail links where appropriate.</p> <p>O - 10316 - 6826 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10454	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes ,</p>

	<p>(Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? The present hospital is overworked because of development which has already gone in the last few years.</p> <p>O - 10454 - 8309 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10482	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? We certainly need more hospital places as the current hospitals are unable to cope with the demands of the population at present. No development in rural areas.</p> <p>O - 10482 - 8310 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10559	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? Rural fringes will be ruined by an expansion of Norwich and any development.</p> <p>O - 10559 - 8318 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10582	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10582 - 8319 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
10715	<p>Ms S Layton [8354] - OBJECT Paper - 26/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? "Regeneration and redevelopment opportunities" look like horrible euphemisms for disregarding and wiping off the map well-established communities in Norwich city area containing many contented people (some who have bought their council houses</p>

	<p>and stayed). Seems like a boy's fantasy - if you can't be a soldier, the next best thing is to be able to say, "I ordered the demolition of all those houses". Totally disregarding the enormous assets these estates are, some just need "sprucing up" - by far a greener strategy.</p> <p>O - 10715 - 8354 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10848</p>	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>We are concerned that some of the developments on the 'urban fringe' could be characteristic of urban sprawl and also not provide enough services themselves to fully develop as communities. This has been very much the case with such settlements as Thorpe Marriott and Dussindale and the initial 'issues and options' sought to avoid this by proposing larger settlements and urban extensions that would be more self-supporting.</p> <p>The statement that 'Reduction of the impact of traffic on residential areas will be facilitated by the construction of the NDR' simply does not ring true. For instance, recent County Council advice for the City Council's planning department in respect of an application on Boundary Road foresaw 'the likely increased traffic arising from the Northern Distributor Road'. It must also be pointed out that the 'missing section' of the NDR between the A1067 and the A47 could force much traffic to detour into the city. The resulting congestion along Sweet Briar Road in particular will inevitably have a knock-on effect and cause delays for the rest of the outer ring road, impacting especially on Boundary Road which has recently been the possible subject of an AQMO. All this will mean that 'cut-throughs' to residential areas will continue and very possibly intensify.</p> <p>O - 10848 - 8018 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -</p>
<p>10884</p>	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?</p> <p>Opportunities sought</p> <p>* The BLT supports the retention and improvement of local services. Through a masterplanning approach to growth to north east Norwich, account will be had to existing local services within established neighbourhoods on the fringe of Norwich and consider how the location and composition of proposed neighbourhood centres can provide supplementary and accessible amenities to established communities.</p>

* The BLT supports the retention and improvement of local jobs. The north east sector of Norwich benefits from the presence of established employment areas and district centres that have the capacity for growth and expansion. Together, these comprise a significant number of job opportunities to support existing and new communities. In addition, the new urban extension will create capacity for an addition district centre and a number of neighbourhood centres, which will also increase employment opportunities in this area.

Proposals for the Green Infrastructure

* In masterplanning a sustainable urban extension to north east Norwich, the BLT will prioritise the creation of a high quality landscape as a setting for the development, which will enhance the landscape character of the north east fringe of the city generally. Areas of landscape/ecological interest will be retained and enhanced as part of the development masterplan, while new landscape features may be created.

* It will be important in developing a landscape character for the new growth areas to recognise a fundamental shift in the character of the area, from urban fringe towards becoming an integral set of neighbourhoods within the fabric of the city. While the preservation and enhancement of natural features are essential to establishing a high quality environment, such features must respond to a changing role in landscape, environmental, recreation and leisure conditions within the geography of the city.

* The BLT supports the establishment of a comprehensive cycle and walking network as this will be key to encouraging more sustainable modes of transport and in strengthening links between the city, new and existing fringe communities and the countryside. This will also act to encourage healthy living and to promote Norwich as a sustainable tourist destination.

Reduction of impact on travel

* The BLT support the concept of walkable neighbourhoods, which encourages the use of more sustainable modes of transport through ensuring that neighbourhoods are linked by a number of permeable routes and reducing the need to travel by co-locating a range of services and facilities.

* The BLT considers that this policy should also refer to the opportunity for an inner link road to be developed in north east Norwich. This would act to support growth in this location in advance of the NDR as it would support

north/south traffic, cycle and pedestrian movements around the periphery of Norwich and within the fabric of the new extension and encourage orbital movements between the Broadland Business Park to the south, Wroxham Road to the north, thus relieving pressure on existing arterial routes. It would also create easier access to the park and ride facility on the Wroxham Road, potentially encouraging more people to use this facility and in turn, reducing commuter traffic into the city.

Enhancement of public transport

* The BLT supports a bus rapid transport network on routes, linking the city to Thorpe St Andrew, business parks and strategic growth locations.

* This policy should also include reference to the opportunity to utilise the underused Bittern Railway Line. Consideration should also be given to reviewing the feasibility of an increased frequency of service on the line. This would act to increase transport choice, encourage modal shifts away from the use of the private car and promote more sustainable modes of transport. It would also increase connectivity to and from existing communities as well as supporting future communities. The BLT proposes that the potential for tram/train transit opportunities are fully explored.

Promoting Norwich as a Learning City

* The BLT supports the growth of the knowledge economy, as highlighted in 8.14 of the Joint Core Strategy. There is the potential for growth in north east Norwich to contribute towards the diversification of the economy by providing space for business start ups, which is complementary to aspiration to expand the knowledge economy. It is considered that policy 4 should reflect the aspiration to expand the knowledge economy in the NPA.

O - 10884 - 8366 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -

11087 Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4?

No.

NNTAG opposes a NDR for the reasons given to Q2. A NDR would not create 'elbow room' for sustainable transport measures such as traffic restraint as Norfolk County Council has claimed. The NDR MSBC Forecasting Report shows that traffic flows across north Norwich would rise by 0.04% in PM Peak Opening Year, with significant traffic growth on radial roads in NE Norwich of between 58% and 73% in AM Peak.

The JCS support for a NDR conflicts with other aims expressed by Policy 4, "protection of the landscape setting of the urban area" which we support. A NDR would damage the three historic parklands in NE Norwich area (Beeston, Rackheath and Sprowston) and which greatly contribute to the landscape setting of Norwich.

We support the proposal for a significant enhancement of public transport. However, a plan, timetable or funding have not been identified unlike a NDR. Giving priority to a NDR over public transport would have the effect of entrenching car travel behaviour.

The JCS advocacy of a NDR is unsound because it does not support RSS NR1 which seeks a modal shift to public transport, walking and cycling. NATS (approved in 2006) requires reassessment in line with RSS policies.

Recommended changes:

- delete reference to a NDR. Replace with:

"Reduction of the impact of traffic on residential areas will be facilitated by the:

- adoption of a hierarchy of routes;
- the establishment of homezones where appropriate;
- area wide traffic restraint, restrictions on through traffic and reduced speeds;
- comprehensive walking and cycling networks;
- further small scale measures to be identified in a review of NATS".

O - 11087 - 8387 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q7) Do you support the proposals in Policy 4? -

Q8 Remainder of Norwich Urban Area including the fringe parishes

The existing suburbs and the urban / rural fringes are key to successful development of the area.

Q8 Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration (page 25)? YES / NO

If no, please tell us what we have missed

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q8 Total	93	7	67	19	93

7982	<p>mr Daniel Yellop [7836] - COMMENT Web - 13/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? A Transport related comment: A bus and Park & Ride users lane from the airport turn off back to the A140 / Holt road roundabout, and along the A140 towards St Faiths if possible. To alleviate congestion, and improve bus punctuality along that corridor</p> <p>C - 7982 - 7836 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8862	<p>Mr Stephen Andrews [8066] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? It is important that the aim of "physical and social regeneration" is not used as an excuse to demolish perfectly good quality houses and replace them with more densely packed modern houses that lack the character and space of the originals. Even in the worst estates, the good aspects of traditional design can be seen. Spaces for children to play, paths for pedestrians, large gardens (many of which are beautifully cared for) and tree lined streets. This should not be sacrificed in the name of progress.</p> <p>C - 8862 - 8066 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9300	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes ,</p>

	<p>(Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? In the main yes - Mile Cross could use a little TLC.</p> <p>C - 9300 - 8117 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9549	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? I do not agree that the vast expansion is required nor that the NNDR road is required. It is possible due to the present financial crisis and recovery which could take ten years to achieve, the available funds should be used to finance the A11, A47 and Long Stratton bypass, all of which have been needed for many years past and still put back for lack of money except now possibly the A11. The other essential is improved bus and rail services.</p> <p>C - 9549 - 8146 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9961	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? No comment</p> <p>C - 9961 - 6903 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10317	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? The strategy takes a 'greenfield-first' approach. The areas proposed as major growth locations will simply suburbanise large areas of rural Norfolk and impact heavily on the tranquillity of the local countryside and the character of market towns and villages.</p> <p>There are no policy targets for use of previously developed land and it is not clear how the strategy will be measured against the RSS brownfield target of 60%. Given this, and the level of greenfield land allocation proposed, the spatial objective</p>

(Objective 8) that 'the use of previously developed land will be prioritised to minimise the loss of agricultural land and countryside' is almost meaningless.

CPRE would prefer an approach to strategic planning that focused more development in urban areas, rather than on greenfield land. To this end, we would like to see a scaling down of housing numbers in the NPA towns and villages of South Norfolk and Broadland, and at Rackheath. In line with this, the figure for new allocations for Norwich should be increased to take a larger proportion of all build in the NPA. A slowing of housing delivery targets would maximise opportunities for previously developed land as it becomes available.

We strongly object to the north east growth triangle concept and the very large area it covers. It will have considerable impacts on the rural landscape of Broadland and contribute to a major loss of greenfield land and significant impacts on tranquillity, congestion, light pollution and rural character. It would also very badly skew the spatial strategy, being away from the major employment locations in the south west quadrant.

The mismatch between the major growth location for housing (North-East) and the centre of gravity for employment opportunities (South-West) is a key weakness of the spatial strategy and further undermines the strategy's stated objective (Objective 11) to reduce the need to travel.

C - 10317 - 6826 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -

10716 Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT

Paper - 26/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

By this, are you asking, "What else can we demolish?"

C - 10716 - 8354 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -

7915 Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - SUPPORT

Web - 06/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?

Those are the areas I don't go, so I suppose there is a reason.

S - 7915 - 6885 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -

8001	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? yes</p> <p>S - 8001 - 7851 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8071	<p>Miss Janet Saunders [7875] - SUPPORT Web - 23/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? I am familiar with some of the areas highlighted and agree they don't really do Norwich justice.</p> <p>S - 8071 - 7875 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8090	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT Web - 26/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Great - I hope this can be funded</p> <p>S - 8090 - 7880 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8115	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 8115 - 7888 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8155	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8155 - 7899 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8180	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8180 - 4796 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8248	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8248 - 4558 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8270	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8270 - 7912 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8359	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>I agree.</p> <p>S - 8359 - 6992 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>

8469	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 8469 - 8016 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8493	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 8493 - 8020 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8518	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 8518 - 7817 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8543	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 8543 - 8021 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8567	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8567 - 1976 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8656	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>S - 8656 - 8036 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8680	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>S - 8680 - 8044 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8730	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8730 - 8053 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8735	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>I think Norwich should promote its research park more with an emphasis as a partnership to the one in Cambridge. The surrounding area of Norfolk should not lose its traditional agricultural identity and this should also be promoted. Many children in urban schools are unaware of many aspects of our country's food production.</p> <p>S - 8735 - 8045 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>

8786	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 8786 - 8061 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8838	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 8838 - 8064 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8906	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 8906 - 2014 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8976	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 8976 - 8092 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9034	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9034 - 4187 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9106	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>yes</p> <p>S - 9106 - 8111 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9108	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9108 - 7111 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9152	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9152 - 2055 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9167	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>I agree with the idea of a learning city but equal emphasis should be put on city college as well as the university and the physical and social regeneration of people should be for all of Norwich rather than some areas.</p> <p>S - 9167 - 8112 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>

9220	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9220 - 1828 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9232	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9232 - 4494 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9327	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9327 - 8123 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9356	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9356 - 7113 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9384	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9384 - 8124 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9427	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9427 - 8127 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9452	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>S - 9452 - 8134 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9486	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9486 - 8139 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9517	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9517 - 8140 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9601	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9601 - 8162 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9700	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9700 - 5446 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9762	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 15/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>S - 9762 - 8184 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9795	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9795 - 7513 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9827	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 9827 - 8198 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -
9877	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9877 - 2058 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9931	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9931 - 7015 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9994	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9994 - 8228 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10028	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10028 - 8230 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10077	Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) -

	<p>SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? We support the physical and social regeneration of these areas as it will make Norwich a more attractive place to live, work and visit.</p> <p>S - 10077 - 8234 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10087	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - SUPPORT Web - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? I agree with most of this section</p> <p>S - 10087 - 8235 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10104	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - SUPPORT Web - 30/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? If areas stay with Norwich boundaries</p> <p>S - 10104 - 8239 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10179	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 10179 - 8246 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10216	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes ,</p>

	<p>(Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 10216 - 5864 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10342	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 10342 - 8293 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10365	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 10365 - 2020 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10432	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 10432 - 8308 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10511	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 10511 - 7215 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>

<p>10614</p>	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes, although we wonder if there are opportunities for increasing the number of households to 'link up' existing settlements; it is difficult to know just by looking at the map. S - 10614 - 8325 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
<p>10665</p>	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes S - 10665 - 8348 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
<p>10734</p>	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes S - 10734 - 1776 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
<p>10765</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes S - 10765 - 7666 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
<p>10822</p>	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes ,</p>

	<p>(Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 10822 - 8362 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10885	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? We support the physical and social regeneration of these areas as it will make Norwich a more attractive place to live, work and visit. Priorities for regeneration in East Norwich The BLT support physical regeneration opportunities in east Norwich, including the development of a sustainable urban extension in the north east sector. The BLT also supports enhanced green linkages from the city centre to the Broads. Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area</p> <p>S - 10885 - 8366 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10931	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 10931 - 8368 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10955	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 10955 - 8369 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10979	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 10979 - 8176 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
11002	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 11002 - 8370 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
11047	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT Paper - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 11047 - 6955 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
11088	<p>Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Yes</p> <p>S - 11088 - 8387 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
7874	<p>Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] - OBJECT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? leave well alone. leave our fields, woodland, and wildlife, it is ours and what we have always known. This is the majority view,</p>

	<p>and does not matter what government or councillors say, if they are so keen to have what is not needed, than let these things happen on their doorstep.</p> <p>O - 7874 - 7782 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8205	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - OBJECT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? No. East Norwich should be reviewed. There is even more concern about flood risk now with latest figures for predicated sea-level rise.</p> <p>O - 8205 - 7901 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8332	<p>Mr Brian Cleland [7938] - OBJECT Web - 16/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? No initiative is mentioned to reduce the carbon footprint of the existing housing/commercial building stock.</p> <p>O - 8332 - 7938 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8591	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Brownfield sites only</p> <p>O - 8591 - 8024 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8776	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? Your own figures show that a NDR will increase traffic problems rather than decreasing them, and of course it will perpetuate the disastrous habit of private road traffic. Your argument that you will protect the rural setting of villages is bogus. Your plans</p>

	<p>for cycle networks is deeply flawed by your stupid practice of planting thorn hedges alongside cycle and foot paths (in the Plumsteads) to puncture tyres and damage dogs' feet. Your public transport plans are tacked-on and superficial, whereas government requires them to be fundamental.</p> <p>O - 8776 - 8060 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8811	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>No comment - it is for the residents of those areas to judge</p> <p>O - 8811 - 6869 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
8885	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>existing cycleways are not used, so why plan for more?</p> <p>O - 8885 - 8071 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9191	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>All the low-density suburbs (e.g. Dussindale and Thorpe Marriot) will need redevelopment in the foreseeable future, as car use will become more expensive.</p> <p>O - 9191 - 8114 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9266	<p>Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>The area defined is vague and I don't know what is meant by social regeneration. The history of so-called social regeneration is</p>

	<p>not a happy one.</p> <p>O - 9266 - 8115 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9378	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Regeneration another phrase, does not mean knocking down buildings and replacing with new, lots can be done to existing sites at a fraction of the cost, lots can be done with what we've already have</p> <p>O - 9378 - 8120 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9567	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Not applicable to Drayton</p> <p>O - 9567 - 6690 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9675	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Yet again having input into the original policy document re. Public Consultations, I cannot relate to current proposals for Wroxham and have reservations re. Rackheath. More work needs to be done.</p> <p>O - 9675 - 8047 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
9726	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>You are wrecking the countryside near Norwich.</p>

	O - 9726 - 8174 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -
<p>10168</p>	<p>Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245] (represented by David L Walker Limited (Head office) [8182]) - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? 4.1 With regards to Chapter 7 of the DPD, we understand that the Development Partnership has published a number of generic policies in respect of certain areas that will govern land use in such policy areas. The specific area of interest to our client Lafarge is the approach detailed in Policy 4.</p> <p>4.2 It is understood that the Deal Ground is still being promoted as a regeneration area despite a number of potential limitations in respect of flood risk, access, ecology and contaminated land. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment completed by the Greater Norwich Development Partnership confirms some of the Deal Ground as being within the functional floodplain, with much of the remainder being in Flood Zone 2. Thus, any built development or landraising within much of the Deal Ground would be in direct conflict with the generic and site specific provisions of PPS 25. In addition, the potential run-off implication on the adjacent area of ecological interest has the scope to create significant impacts both directly and indirectly. There is also the potential impact of flood water on the existing Trowse Depot, where a strategically important aggregates railhead and coated roadstone plant are in operation.</p> <p>4.3 Furthermore, the development of certain areas of the deal site that are not brownfield could generate conflict with the provisions of Policy 17 of the emerging Core Strategy.</p> <p>4.4 We therefore do not agree with the identified areas for regeneration (Question 8) on the above grounds. In addition, we note the continued lack of protection of the adjacent strategic site, which suggests a lack of continuity with County and Regional policy and guidance, in particular Policy T10 of the adopted East of England RSS and policy EMP9.1 of the City of Norwich Local Plan, and Policy MIN22 of the Norfolk Mineral Local Plan. Such sentiments are also conferred via emerging policy under the MWDF.</p> <p>O - 10168 - 8245 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
<p>10455</p>	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p>

	<p>We do not want Norfolk built up.</p> <p>O - 10455 - 8309 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10483	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Broadland and Norfolk attracts tourism because it is rural with pleasant countryside and the open space. Development will destroy the countryside and tourism will decline.</p> <p>O - 10483 - 8310 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10560	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>Re-generate the run down parts of Norwich. There is plenty of scope there.</p> <p>O - 10560 - 8318 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10583	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10583 - 8319 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -</p>
10849	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes , (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration?</p> <p>While broadly happy with the areas identified in Policy 4 as 'priorities for regeneration' our concerns persist that investment will be concentrated in out-of-town areas rather than the districts themselves. We would also point out, firstly, that there are significant areas of deprivation not included such as Lakenham, Tuckswood and the Heartsease and, secondly, that it is</p>

important for smaller 'pockets' of deprivation in such locations as Town Close and Thorpe Hamlet not to lose out in an over-simplified assignment of funding.

O - 10849 - 8018 - Policy 4 the remainder of the Norwich urban area, including fringe parishes . (Q8) Do you agree with the areas identified for regeneration? -

Response – Q9

Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area

Policy 5 (page 26) suggests a favoured option for the distribution of major housing and jobs growth (this and the other options previously considered can be found in Appendices 0,1,2, and 3)

Q9 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area

Policy 5 (page 26) suggests a favoured option for the distribution of major housing and jobs growth (this and the other options previously considered can be found in Appendices 0,1,2, and 3)

Q9 Do you agree with the favoured option fro the development in the Norwich Policy Area? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q9 Total	179	54	56	75	185

7916	<p>Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - COMMENT Web - 06/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Masterplan sounds good, hope the follow-through is good too.</p> <p>C - 7916 - 6885 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
7965	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - COMMENT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? We are always being promised more better public transport but this just doesn't happen most people will continue to use their cars increasing congestion and pollution</p> <p>C - 7965 - 6862 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8050	<p>Mr Keith Jones [7536] - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich</p>

	<p>Policy Area? The Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle is said to be dependant on the NNDR. However the promoters of the Rackheath Eco town insist that this element (3000 homes) is not. This should be clarified.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the 'green' credentials there will be an unsustainable increase in traffic from the Eco town to the Wroxham & Salhouse Roads if the NNDR does not go ahead.</p> <p>C - 8050 - 7536 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8072	<p>Miss Janet Saunders [7875] - COMMENT Web - 23/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Please include social clubs, sports facilities, pubs and restaurants amongst the houses to help turn housing estates into communities. No more characterless housing estates like Bowthorpe where there is nowhere for locals to meet each other. they might as well be living in a block of flats. Oh, and build more houses with decent sized gardens. We're supposed to be encouraging children to exercise but it's difficult for kids to kick a football around a garden the size of a postage stamp.</p> <p>C - 8072 - 7875 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8206	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - COMMENT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? I cannot comment on this except that you keep emphasising enhanced public transport, cycling and walking yet also serving to make care use easier through the NDR.</p> <p>C - 8206 - 7901 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8258	<p>pulham market parish council (mr laurence taylor) [7907] - COMMENT Web - 06/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>We feel that there should only be housing growth in the Long Stratton area after provision of a Bypass as the A140 is incapable of taking the increase in traffic.</p> <p>C - 8258 - 7907 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8427	<p>Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>More than comfortable with the locations identified as this already have good services available to its residents. From a sporting view point what is essential is that additional sporting facilities grow and develop in each of the identified areas as the majority of these areas are already running to maximum!</p> <p>C - 8427 - 7771 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8457	<p>Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>development anywhere depends on fulfilling environmental concerns - see Question 13</p> <p>C - 8457 - 953 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8754	<p>Highways Agency (Mr Eric Cooper) [8057] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p>

The Highways Agency agrees with the approach taken in developing the preferred option which is intended to offer a reasonable degree of locational choice for new development in locations with access to public transport routes which currently perform well or are prioritised for improvement as well as to a range of strategic employment opportunities.

C - 8754 - 8057 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

8884 ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT

Web - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

yes but there should be no further additions to major growth locations for the 1800 homes to be found on smaller sites in S Norfolk NPA as 1800 for Long Stratton to become a town is more than sufficient, and the 1800 homes could be found along the A140 giving more choice and avoiding a massive urban sprawl in Long Stratton thus minimising the impact on the character of Long Stratton as a result of it becoming a growth location.

C - 8884 - 7620 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

9057 Mr and Mrs G Watson [8103] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

We have recently visited one of your public consultation days and have therefore been made aware of the proposals within the Broadland and surrounding areas.

Whilst we were at the consultation day we were particularly keen to see on Map Ref: "Great and Little Plumstead 3" that our property and land which includes 32 acres are indicated as "Other potential sites" - This can also be seen as indicated on the map enclosed marked with a green outline neighbouring S25-04 which is already a residential site.

Also shown on the same map is a small area marked in orange. We also own this piece of land which currently occupies 8 garages and also neighbours S25-01 also a residential site, although this site is not shown as potential site we ask that it is added to the list of potential sites. We actually applied for planning permission for 6 flats on this site but was previously

	<p>refused.</p> <p>We would be happy for either sites to be developed therefore we would be grateful if you could look into these matters and should you need any further clarification then I will gladly be of assistance. Please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>C - 9057 - 8103 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9058	<p>Newton Flotman Parish Council (Mrs D Davidson) [2036] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Whilst accepting the need for additional housing to cater for an ever increasing population, we are concerned about the ability of the road infrastructure to cope, specifically with the proposed development of 1,800 houses at Long Stratton. Although the proposed Long Stratton bypass will remove one bottleneck, surely this will merely move the problem closer to Norwich. As a village situated adjacent to the A140 whose residents work mainly in Norwich, access on to this busy road is already difficult and this can only make matters worse unless there is a major redesign of the Flordon Road / A140 junction. Before endorsing the proposed development at Long Stratton, we would ask that consideration is given by the Partnership to improving access to the A140 of not just Newton Flotman, but of all villages using the A140 corridor to Norwich.</p> <p>C - 9058 - 2036 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9062	<p>Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>It is recommended that Policy 5 includes that all development is "secured by design" to minimise the potential of crime and disorder.</p> <p>C - 9062 - 7653 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9071	<p>Wymondham Heritage Society (Ms Irene Woodward) [1003] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>WHS welcomes the reduction in overall housing numbers for Wymondham and the undertaking to preserve the breaks between the town and neighbouring settlements. The document does seem to be silent on the question of how the necessary infrastructure improvements for Wymondham will be achieved; this is a matter of concern to us. However, the statement on page 67"expansion of the town centre of a quality that will retain and enhance the distinctive character of the historic centre" seems to be an introduction out of nowhere. We cannot see how any expansion of the town centre could be achieved because of its enclosed nature. It may also be said to conflict with Policy 17, Environmental Assets.</p> <p>C - 9071 - 1003 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9078</p>	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Possible need now for some shops to be changed to residential dwellings?</p> <p>C - 9078 - 8109 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9090</p>	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>No information is provided on the resulting size, distribution and structure of the population expected to arise from the proposed housing developments.</p> <p>C - 9090 - 7986 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9267</p>	<p>Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>The map doesn't give enough detail to make an intelligent decision.</p> <p>C - 9267 - 8115 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9526</p>	<p>Taylor Wimpey [7257] (represented by Peacock Short ltd (Georgina Challis) [7610]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>On behalf of Taylor Wimpey</p> <p>We are instructed by Taylor Wimpey Plc to make further representations on their behalf in respect of the Joint core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk.</p> <p>We fully support proposed policy 5 which identifies Long Stratton as major growth area and which proposes to allocate 1,800 new homes</p> <p>C - 9526 - 7257 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9656</p>	<p>Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Page 26 Policy 5</p> <p>"include sustainable drainage systems" Problems here at Long Stratton. "Include new primary schools - small scale employment" yet it says in spatial vision on page 9 to have access to suitable job facilities .. small scale? Will need large scale for Long Stratton!!</p> <p>Page 65 Appendix 0 the favoured option</p> <p>Moderate growth at Long Stratton - how can almost doubling of the houses in the village be called moderate - it is major!</p>

	<p>The strategy also promotes development at Long Stratton to achieve .. Further work is being undertaken to establish .. How can a proposal be put if this has not already been looked into and a way found?</p> <p>Page 66 A new secondary school, Why stop at secondary schools - pupils go on to high schools - they are also needed!</p> <p>Page 68 Much more information is needed before any yes or no to approval of the proposal can even be contemplated.</p> <p>The Government needs to be asked for the whole matter to be delayed - much more consideration needs to be given - residents need full info, plainly and simply before being asked for response. This is not democracy as it stands!! How can anyone who knows little about what is in the consultation document make considered responses.</p> <p>C - 9656 - 8165 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9692</p>	<p>Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement [8170] (represented by Brown & Co (Mr Charles E. Birch) [4042]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Following recent meetings we confirm the Trustees are committed to the incorporation of their land at Cringleford inside the A47 southern bypass and either side of the A11 link to be promoted for development in conjunction with the master-plan for the Barratt Strategic land as part of the Cringleford allocation on List 2A. The addition of this land brings significant advantage for highways issues and further works detailed in the Building Partnerships promotion will include the Trustees' land. We will be very pleased to meet to discuss this issue, and we welcome the opportunity to set up a time for a selection of the Trustees to attend a meeting with you to do so. During the next few weeks we propose to provide further information about the method for delivery as part of an immediate but phased approach to provide the necessary Norwich extension in conjunction with the vital additional infrastructure required for such additional mixed development.</p> <p>C - 9692 - 8170 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9815</p>	<p>East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 29/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>EEDA welcomes the growth option as set out under Policy 5. The approach taken recognises the significance of Norwich as a key regional city within the East of England in line with both the RES and Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and reflecting the</p>

principles of agglomeration. EEDA supports the favoured option as a logical approach directly reflecting the identification of Norwich as an Engine of Growth within RES. This is particularly important when taken with the approach to identifying sites for employment growth as set out in Policy 15 of the Core Strategy.

Whilst the role of the urban centre of Norwich is key, the RES also explicitly recognises the role that other centres and villages within the sub-region will play in facilitating growth through a balanced approach to housing and employment distribution. The roles highlighted for the main towns and key service centres in addition to Norwich, are also welcomed by EEDA. The role of these locations and their relationship to the main urban areas as part of an interdependent economic system is highlighted in the RES and their importance in considering appropriate levels of development, economic challenges and service provision are all critical to sub-regional success.

Policy 5 recognises the importance of these locations for mixed use development and growth. However, this policy focuses specifically on the growth of housing in these locations. EEDA is keen to see that this appropriately aligned with job creation and the provision of essential services and identifies the importance of enhancing the local and strategic connectivity of Norwich.

As recognised in your joint core strategy, successful and sustainable communities in both urban and rural areas need access to a broad range of services, transport, education, community and social facilities, ICT, quality environments, health and culture. The importance of these assets and infrastructure in promoting sustainable growth, economic success and inclusion cannot be overstated. EEDA have worked closely with sub regional partners in developing the Integrated Development Programme for the area and are pleased to see reference to supporting services for growth in Policy 5.

C - 9815 - 1509 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

9849 **Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203]** (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr James Alflatt) [8204]) - **COMMENT**
Paper - 22/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd supports the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area with strategic growth in Hethersett. However, in view of the above, the 1000 units indicated for Hethersett should be consider a minimum. Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd also supports the 1800 units proposed within the area referred to as 'South Norfolk smaller sites in the NPA and possible additions to named growth locations'. Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd would suggest that the site at Great Melton Road,

	<p>Hethersett would assist to deliver approximately 200 units of this 1800.</p> <p>Hethersett/Little Melton is situated very close to Norwich and nearby centres of activity, including Norwich Research Park, University of East Anglia, Norwich and Norwich University Hospital, Wymondham and the Longwater Employment Area. It is located on the A11, is very close to the Thickthorn Park & Ride site and has fast and frequent bus connections to Norwich and Wymondham. Hethersett therefore enjoys excellent public transport (bus) links to Norwich city centre, first-class road links (for freight and car travel) along the A11 corridor and (via Wymondham train station) good rail links to Norwich and Cambridge. The village also has a good range of shops and services meeting everyday needs.</p> <p>Bidwells and Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd have already undertaken work promoting land within Hethersett for future residential and associated development. Initial investigations (e.g. on utility services, healthcare, education and the natural environment) have highlighted the strengths of the location for future growth and development.</p> <p>C - 9849 - 8203 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9962</p>	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>C - 9962 - 6903 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10016</p>	<p>notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>In broad terms we do not object but would like to have seen further growth identified in the South of the Policy area as identified in the other 3 options.</p> <p>C - 10016 - 6911 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>

10049 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

On behalf of our client, Persimmon Homes Ltd, who have an interest in land at Norwich Common, Wymondham, we support in principle the favoured option in relation to housing growth, provided that the 2,200 dwellings proposed through urban expansion are located in a number of sites around the town as Appendix 0 of the Public Consultation document proposes and that the 1800 dwellings proposed on smaller sites in the South Norfolk part of the NPA includes adequate opportunities for such smaller sites to be developed at Wymondham, rather than in smaller less sustainable settlements. This approach is much more likely to achieve the delivery of the housing numbers required than one which concentrates development in one main location at Wymondham or disperses smaller developments too widely. Our client's land interest at Norwich Common, which we have been promoting through the Core Strategy and SHLAA processes, offers the opportunity to achieve a development early in the plan period of some 300 dwellings in a sustainable location, very well related to the local and strategic transport network and able to take advantage of improved bus services to Norwich city centre. It is also very well related to existing employment and social and community facilities and will not have a detrimental impact on the landscape setting of the town or on the strategic gap between the town and Hethersett.

We wish to also draw your attention to the detailed representations made on our client's behalf, as Technical Consultees, at the previous stages of consultation on this Core Strategy, which remain valid.

C - 10049 - 2373 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10063 RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Alan Presslee) [8160]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Support the provision of a minimum 2,000 houses on small/medium sites in the Broadland NPA, provided that:

- clarification is given that small and medium sites are expected to, generally, deliver ahead of the strategic sites.
- clarification is given that these represent minimal growth figures for each location.

	<p>- clarification is given that none of the minimum 2,000 Broadland small/medium sites allocation will be 'siphoned off' into the strategic growth locations' housing figures (ref. "...and possible additions to named growth locations").</p> <p>C - 10063 - 8232 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10147</p>	<p>R Smith [8243] (represented by Beacon Planning Ltd (Ms Jenny Page) [7833]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>The favoured option is supported. However, if the allocation for 2,000 on smaller sites in the NPA and possible additions to named growth locations is considered to be a minimum then this should be made clear.</p> <p>C - 10147 - 8243 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10154</p>	<p>Timewell [8209] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr John Long) [8211]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Timewell Properties Ltd notes and broadly supports the latest distribution of growth and the identification of locations for major change and development in the North Policy Area (revised Policy 5).</p> <p>Timewell Properties Ltd supports the Core Strategy's acknowledgement of the role that smaller sites in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) will have in delivering growth.</p> <p>Timewell Properties Ltd supports the level of growth proposed on small sites in the South Norfolk part of the NPA (1800 dwellings).</p> <p>Timewell Properties Ltd contends that in line with the East of England Plan's requirement, the levels of growth in all growth locations need to be expressed as minima to be achieved rather than ceilings to development.</p> <p>Timewell Properties Ltd supports the Joint Core Strategy's acknowledgement that settlements within the NPA will have a</p>

positive role to play in delivering growth.

C - 10154 - 8209 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10201 North East Norwich Consortium of Landowners [8249] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Paul Clarke) [8248]) -

COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Initially, and most importantly, in response to Question 9 in the JCS Consultation Document, the Consortium wishes to express its full support for the GNDP's identification of the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle as a 'strategic growth location' in JCS Policy 5. In the consortium's opinion, based on the technical work already undertaken, it is clear that the area is capable of providing at least 7,000 homes by 2026, rising to at least 10,000 homes beyond 2026.

The Consortium has in its control, approximately 400 hectares of land within the NNDR part of the 'growth triangle and is shown on the accompanying Vision document.' Approximately 200 hectares of which is considered suitable for residential development during the plan period, consisting mainly of 'unconstrained land', i.e. 'open' countryside land and sports pitches. A further 200 hectares of other land within the NNDR is the subject of statutory and non-statutory designations and policies such as Airport Safety Zone and Noise Contours, parks and gardens, Ancient Woodland, Important Landscape areas etc. Parts of this land will also be suitable for other uses, including commercial development, open space, possible country park, sports pitches and associated facilities and also longer term development areas (i.e. beyond the current plan period). Further to the land within the NNDR route, the Consortium also controls a substantial amount of land outside of it.

The latest Vision document follows on from the document prepared by Bidwells and Savills on behalf of the wider group of landowners in NE Norwich and submitted to the GNDP in February 2008. It focuses on the land west of Wroxham Road, and provides conceptual ideas of how this sector could come forward for development independently, but in co-ordination with land controlled by other Consortia elsewhere in the 'growth triangle'. The Consortium appreciates and shares the GNDP's aspirations for a co-ordinated response to delivering these strategic levels of growth in North East Norwich. The Consortium therefore wishes to re-emphasise its commitment to delivering a co-ordinated spatial planning response to the growth needs of the wide North East Norwich area and its willingness to work with other neighbouring consortia and land interests, including Rackheath Eco-Community (represented by Building Partnerships Ltd), and the Wroxham Road to Postwick Consortium (represented by Savills) to ensure that a comprehensive development package is brought forward, including 'area-wide'

infrastructure. We anticipate that the different Consortia's land will be brought forward and co-ordinated under the 'umbrella' of a North East Norwich Area Action Plan.

Consortium Progress:

The Consortium is close to securing an active developer interest in the land, to assist on its ongoing promotion through the planning process. It is expected that the name of the developer will be announced later in the Spring. Landowners have agreed the principles to ensure the land's delivery.

The Consortium continue to meet to discuss initial masterplanning work, building on the work already commissioned on their behalf which supported the group's previous submissions to the Joint Core Strategy Process. Further technical work will be commissioned to inform the land's promotion through the Broadland Council's Area Action Plan process, which is currently out to consultation until 1 June 2009: The main elements are anticipated to include:

1. Transport Assessment - to understand the transport implications and requirements of bringing forward the Consortium's land, and how it would link into existing transport networks and new ones such as the NNDR and transport infrastructure and facilities coming forward elsewhere in the NE Norwich area.
2. Land Budget - to understand and demonstrate the viability of proposals, including quantum of development, phasing and anticipated contributions to infrastructure and other services and facilities etc. This will be illustrated to identify development parcels and uses within the Consortium's control.
3. Planning and Delivery Statement - to summarise the results of the technical work and explain how the land would be brought forward for development, including information on phasing, co-ordination with other Consortia in respect of linking proposals; linking to existing communities in NE Norwich and contributing to shared infrastructure.

C - 10201 - 8249 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10234 Ms Jane Pond [8255] - COMMENT

Paper - 28/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

I see from the EDP that people living in local councils have been consulted - except one that is likely to be affected - the

residents of North Norfolk District council. We have opinions too and we are not being offered the chance to give them.

I am extremely worried about the effect these plans will have on tourism. The homes to be built are obviously funding the building of the Northern by-pass - but has anyone worked out the effect this is likely to have on tourism? I am sure there will be lots of statistics to show that tourists will be brought to the area much more quickly - possibly - but then what do you do with them? Unlike many other areas, you do not go through Norfolk, you go in it and then out again. Tourism is our biggest industry - £4bn or more to the local economy - and the side effect of this growth could be ruinous to the industry.

People come to Norfolk for the peace, quiet and the UNSPOILT nature of the area. If we turn into a built up area like Essex, it will lose very quickly its uniqueness and unspoilt beauty.

The proposals for the Rackheath area for huge housing - on top of the 1,000 homes planned for Sprowston, could have dramatic consequences for the Broads tourism.

People in this area will not just shop in Norwich, they are likely to shop in Wroxham and other areas too. Even in March, the queues trying to get into Wroxham & Hoveton are tailing back from the centre all the way to the railway bridge - what do you think it will be like in summer? By reaching out as far as Rackheath, it is likely that the area between Sprowston and Wroxham will then be linked by this development and is likely to be even more exploited for development in the future, bringing Wroxham as a suburb of Norwich.

I run a tourism business and already tourists are voicing fears over 'spoiling' the area with 'over development' and they despair over trying to get through Wroxham with the constant queuing for every journey.

C - 10234 - 8255 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10238 Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

The Parish Council recognises the need for additional development and housing provision, specifically to respond to the needs of single people and the requirement for social housing. However, the Parish Council wishes to make the following observations:-

- The Parish Council does not feel that sufficient analysis has been done to justify 1000 additional homes with the current facilities in the village.
- No rationale has been provided as to why the previous options submitted for consultation have been dropped. There could well have been a preference for a large development in excess of 1000 homes in a separate location away from Hethersett.
- Where will the 1000 homes be developed and will they be in one area?
- Any development should discourage traffic through the village centre and provide for direct access to main routes.
- A strategy is required to provide jobs, particularly local jobs, to support the increase in housing.
- Provision will be needed for additional shopping facilities in the village. The current centre of the village and associated shopping is inadequate.
- Any additional development should consider resolving the current traffic situation in Queens Road by provided access to the High School via Back Lane.
- Development should not take place in Lynch Green, Queens Road, South of the B1172 and around the Water Tower.

C - 10238 - 8023 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10244 Wymondham Town Council (Mr Len Elston) [7708] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

The Town Council has not re-considered the revised Joint Core Strategy and in particular Section 5 proposing an allocation of 2,200 new homes for the Town and its implications.

Firstly the Town Council is pleased that plans for 4,000 new homes (option 1) outlined in the previous consultation have now been ruled out, but is disappointed that the new proposals are for 2,200 homes whereas the original options were for 2,000 homes - a 10% increase.

As outlined in our letter dated 23rd September 2009 (copy herewith), the Council continues to re-iterate its concerns over the proposals. It is still felt that:

- The Town has been disproportionately targeted and it is difficult to justify the scale of the proposals when considered against other market towns and the existing size of Wymondham.
- Existing approved planning permissions on homes where construction has not yet been started should be included in the final determined allocation.

- There will be damaging effect on all aspects of the infrastructure.
- Our attributes as a Market Town will be weakened as it will become more of a dormitory settlement of Norwich.
- Social and cultural activities will decline.

In summary, whilst it is accepted that growth will take place, it should be on a controlled basis, maintaining and improving the quality of life for residents and not placing undue strains on infrastructure, social, health and educational facilities. The Council as the elected representatives of the town considers that 2,200 homes is excessive and welcomed and would request that further research is undertaken into the effects significant new housing will have on all aspects of life in the town and your proposals revised to a lower level.

C - 10244 - 7708 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10256 WM Morrison Supermarkets plc [8212] (represented by Peacock & Smith (The Manager) [8261]) - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

In addition, our client also supports the 'favoured option' in terms of future housing growth, as this seeks to concentrate growth within or immediately adjacent to the built up area of established settlements.

C - 10256 - 8212 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10265 Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

That being said my Council is still concerned at the volume of housing that is being proposed on the periphery of Norwich. It is noted that 1000 more are to be sited in the Costessey and Easton area. Costessey has/is already taken/taking a significant number of additional dwellings over those stated in this document with the projected increase in the numbers on Queens Hills by a minimum of 300; 49 recently passed on land at the Roundwell Pubic House site on Longwater Lane; 35 on the Saffron site in East Hills Road and 5 on Norwich Road. My Council therefore thinks it has already had its fair share of this allocation and should have no more.

My Council notes there is still a need to identify sites for 1800 or so dwellings as yet unallocated. It has considered all the sites which local landowners have asked to be considered for development in the LDF and feels development in these - in the main - green spaces within the Parish would be very undesirable, would change the character and identity of the Parish beyond all recognition and in many cases would contravene current policy. The only exception in its view is part of the land adjacent to the Lodge Farm development on Dereham Road. Whilst my Council would have concerns about the development extending to the Norwich Southern Bypass it has agreed it would be prepared to support an extension to the development of the Lodge Farm development (now called Fairhaven) up to the line of the access road to the original Lodge Farm subject to design, layout, access and commensurate community benefits. My Council estimates that this area of land should accommodate approximately 200 dwellings and therefore be a significant contribution towards this 1800.

C - 10265 - 7068 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10284 RSPB (East of England Regional Office) (Dr Philip Pearson) [8268] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Thank you for consulting the RSPB regarding the final draft of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. We are pleased to be able to offer comments. Our comments apply to the changes made to Policy 5 only. Our previous comments on the Joint Core Strategy as a whole remain unchanged.

In assessing this changes to the document, namely Policy 5 (locations for major change and development in the Norwich policy area), it is not currently possible to be confident on its soundness, as no revised Sustainability Assessment (SA) or Appropriate Assessment (AA) have been provided. The housing allocations are likely to have serious implications for water supply, water quality (as a consequence of increased sewerage), recreational disturbance and transport, which will likely have serious consequences for protecting and managing The Broads Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs). These documents are therefore vital in ensuring not only that the policies drawn up will not adversely affect Natura 2000 sites and other protected features, but also that the policies will be deliverable. If screening of the proposed developments and employment growth determines that the Plan may have an adverse effect on Natura 2000 sites, we recommend that the Council discuss this with Natural England and the RSPB as soon as possible.

Consequently, the RSPB is currently not able to support the housing option due to this lack of information.

We trust that these comments are helpful. If you have any further queries on the issues discussed above, please do not hesitate to contact me. We would be happy to meet to discuss our comments and to provide advice on developing the proposed plan further.

C - 10284 - 8268 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10289 Tasburgh Parish Council (Mrs Julie King) [7053] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Following the technical consultation in 2008, the major change to affect Tasburgh is the introduction of 1800 homes to be accommodated in smaller sites within the Norwich Policy Area of South Norfolk.

The growth level proposed for Long Stratton still concerns the Council and if it is to be taken forward, it must be done so with proper planning to accommodate the infrastructure needed.

C - 10289 - 7053 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10292 Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277] - COMMENT

Paper - 22/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

There is a general lack of clarity regarding possible additions (part of the favoured option of 1,800 dwellings) to allocations at 'named' growth locations in south Norfolk. Further details are requested to determine the locations and quantum of growth proposed. Therefore, it is not possible to comment in detail on all likely cross-boundary issues as the policy stands.

Notwithstanding the above, the scale of development proposed at Easton/Costessey is likely to have a detrimental impact on the trunk road network and compound existing traffic capacity and flow concerns between the Easton and East Tuddenham sections of the A47. Furthermore, the scale of development is at a level whereby the contributions that could be levied from

developments to mitigate the effects are unlikely to be sufficient. Significant public funds are likely to be required and there is no evidence presented to suggest that this will be forthcoming. Furthermore, the additional number of vehicle movements will be high and further evidence should be developed and presented to explain how the level of growth proposed can satisfactorily address transport issues.

C - 10292 - 8277 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10334 **Trafford Estate Rackheath [8291]** (represented by Brown & Co (Mr Charles E. Birch) [4042]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 27/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

The Trafford Estate land is situated immediately to the north of the current Rackheath Industrial Estate and is promoted as an appropriate extension to the industrial estate with significant access and Highways advantages for the whole area.

Our clients are in detailed discussions with the Eco Settlement Consortium and confirm that the area will now be promoted for delivery as part of the eco settlement providing Highways advantages and mixed employment and residential land as part of the wider scheme.

The property would still be appropriate for a single extension to the Rackheath Industrial Estate providing significant highways advantages compared with the current poor access to the B1151. Whilst it is envisaged to be part of the larger eco settlement, it could be delivered as an early phase and we would be happy to discuss this with GNDP with the eco settlement promoters if you need further information.

C - 10334 - 8291 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10407 **Easton College [3570]** (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Colin Campbell) [7597]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Changes from December 2008

We note that in its public statement in December 2008 GNDP and its partners proposed 1,000 dwellings at Easton as part of its

preferred approach. In the 2009 document this has been amended to Easton/Costessey. It is not clear on what basis on which this decision has been taken.

Other issues

We agree that local stakeholders should be involved in the masterplanning process, however, in Policy 5 we consider that reference to "an accredited design methodology" is unclear. These words are superfluous and can be deleted as in any event the most important factor is that a masterplan exercise achieves high quality design rather than whether or not it has been undertaken to a particular methodology.

C - 10407 - 3570 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10421 Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

You will appreciate that our focus is to stress the sustainability of building substantial new neighbourhoods north east of Norwich.

In this respect:

1. We question the sustainability of substantial growth in the satellite towns of Long Stratton and Wymondham
2. We feel that the site assessment pro-forma should attach more weight to sites falling within the strategically identified growth areas of North-East Norwich
3. We urge that due regard is given to economic factors bearing in mind that this housing will only be delivered by the private sector and if it is not economic it will not happen at all.

Representations have already been made to Broadland Council and to GNDP that a new neighbourhood in this location would contribute significantly to meeting growth targets for North East Norwich.

The development will be planned comprehensively in terms of both physical and social infrastructure.

Physical infrastructure

Work is already in hand in respect of highways, drains and public transport links.

Social infrastructure

The landowners' consortium is also working with the County Education Authority and other departments to ensure that schools,

	<p>community facilities and public open space is planned as an integral part of the development.</p> <p>Affordable housing</p> <p>A proportion of affordable housing offering both shared equity and rented tenure will be made available in cooperation with the relevant authorities.</p> <p>C - 10421 - 4187 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10606	<p>Mr/Mrs Smith [8322] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>We consider that there a strong grounds for an additional strategic employment allocation at Harford Bridge. The case for employment growth on the south side of the city is further strengthened by the identification of Long Stratton for strategic scale growth.</p> <p>C - 10606 - 8322 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10615	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 10/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Yes, in general. This has already been answered in the previous question</p> <p>C - 10615 - 8325 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10693	<p>Sunguard Homes [8320] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Glyn Davies) [7725]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Firstly, Chequers Road although split between the Parishes of Tharston and Long Stratton has, since the 1970s, always been</p>

considered as part of Long Stratton in planning terms. This has been verified by two local plan inspectors and is evidenced by the fact that the existing housing on Chequers Road and South Norfolk House and depot complex are located astride the administrative boundary of the parishes. Chequers Road, Tharston, should therefore, be considered in relation to the facilities available in Long Stratton to which it clearly relates, rather than the very limited community facilities available in Tharston. I am concerned that the Core Strategy continues to treat Long Stratton and the part of Tharston contiguous with Long Stratton separately. The Core Strategy needs to recognise that Long Stratton is considered to also include parts of Tharston. It is important that future planning decisions at Long Stratton are made on a spatial, rather than administrative, boundary basis.

C - 10693 - 8320 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10696 Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement [8170] (represented by Brown & Co (Mr Charles E. Birch) [4042]) - **COMMENT**
Paper - 27/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

1. Land ownership:

The property (Breck Farm, Taverham) extends to approximately 88 hectares in sole ownership. The owner has a history of delivering land for development and clearly understands the relevant processes.

2. Highways:

The Norwich Area Transport Strategy will refine the Norwich Distributor Road proposals and the role of Reepham Road will continue to play in the future transport strategy for Norfolk to confirm the side roads issues relating to the junctions with Fir Covert Road and the Reepham Road. However access is readily available both from the Reepham Road, Breck Farm Lane with some improvement we have already quantified and from at least two further accesses from Thorpe Marriott development. This access assessment demonstrates there are no barriers to development.

3. Service infrastructure:

A capacity study has revealed there are suitable supplies for electricity, telephone and gas supplies with some investment required for gas infrastructure in addition to the normal connection costs.

4. Water and drainage:

A capacity study has indicated suitable capacity for clean water. There are appropriate drainage outfall points into the existing over-sized foul drainage system in Thorpe Marriott for foul drainage.

Further major infrastructure upgrades may be necessary according to Anglian Water, but they have at this stage been hesitant to give clear advice because of the speculative nature of the enquiry.

Surface water drainage can be attenuated on site to provide a neutral site output connected into the surface water system through Thorpe Marriott.

There are no ownership or service infrastructure obstacles to the delivery of land for mixed residential employment amenity, affordable housing uses on our client's land.

Further ecology and landscape assessments can be undertaken to confirm the environmental status of this land.

It is clear that our client's land at Thorpe Marriott is suitable for small scale additional development of 20 hectares prior to construction of the Norwich Distributor Road and for further growth thereafter.

Infrastructure required for secondary schools and country park areas would necessarily demand a larger scale of development and should be phased in with future expansion or extensions.

Given all of the information provided we consider this land is appropriate as part of the Broadland sites allocation category.

C - 10696 - 8170 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10702 Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] - COMMENT

Paper - 15/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

As stated above, our previous comments still apply. In relation to Policy 5, our answers to questions 3-17 (previous consultation) also still apply despite the slight change in the growth option put forward within the policy.

Constraints - Flood Risk:

We expect development to be directed away from the flood zone, this refers to both residential development and the growth in employment areas.

Within Norwich City Centre flood risk is likely to be one of the largest constraints. This is likely to increase with climate change. It is expected that, at site allocations stage, any development proposed within the Flood Zone is justified and arguments set out why it cannot be located elsewhere based upon the application of the PPS 25 Sequential test. Further to this, the Exception test, as set out in paragraph D9 of PPS 25, may also be required. You need to be satisfied that the amount of development you are proposing is deliverable considering the flood risk constraints. This is also applicable to Policy 3. It should be noted that the production of hazard mapping within an updated SFRA may show that areas of the city are unsafe for residential/commercial development.

Furthermore, some of the proposed growth areas, for example Cringleford, Wymondham and Costessey also have some flood risk associated with them. Within such areas the amount of flood zone 1 available is relatively great in relation to the growth proposed. We therefore consider that the development should be located outside of the flood zone.

C - 10702 - 8352 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10717 Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT

Paper - 26/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

The NE Norwich "Growth Triangle" marked in orange/yellow on your map as a large-scale "strategic growth location" for 19000 houses. It appears along its south edge, to run exactly along the edge of the current built-up area. It therefore seems to include the garden centre (Wyevale) and the White House Farm area just north of Blue Boar Lane. This pick-your-own farm - Norwich's very own pick-your-own farm! - is within easy reach, zero or very few "food miles" away from the homes of 10s of 1000s of people. If Rackheath is to be an "eco-town" (and everyone else should be helped to live more eco-friendly as well!), then how cynical it would be to tarmac over this farm. It's a stone's throw away from houses and from Tesco Extra superstore and yet, a visit there is to the tranquillity of countryside. For social inclusion - their produce is half the price of all the supermarkets, is much fresher so keeps much longer, and it's educational for kids etc. and peaceful for older customers. They have many varieties of apple and pear and plum trees, and all the soft fruit, as well as some veg to pick. Also a greengrocer, ready-picked, cheaper than Tesco (but don't tell Tesco!). (It takes no time to fill a bag of apples).

We need to encourage this type of locally-available food option for people, not ignore it and build over it. To do so, and the claim to be building an "eco-town" would be farcical.

Please save the White House pick-your-own, and incorporate it into your plans.

C - 10717 - 8354 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10910 Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) -

COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

ALP do not agree completely with the Favoured Option and believe that Hethersett should be deallocated or reduced to 500 dwellings and that Long Stratton be withdrawn as an allocation or only a limited amount of development be allowed for in the plan period. Norwich urban area should be reduced to 2,000 from 3,000 dwellings because of the reliance on the flatted market. The extent of development in the Sprowston / Rackheath area should be reduced from 7,000 to 5,000 to reflect the ownership and infrastructure constraints to achieving this scale of development after taking onboard unimplemented commitments.

C - 10910 - 8367 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

11028 Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] - COMMENT

Paper - 15/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

The Core Strategy's indication that 1800 dwellings will also be allocated in the South Norfolk part of the LPA, including the growth locations is also supported.

With regard to housing delivery, the provision to negotiate on 40% affordable housing and a consideration of the viability of development is welcomed.

C - 11028 - 7175 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the

	favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -
11037	<p>Norwich Design Quality Panel (The Manager) [8375] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Regarding the quantities and locations proposed there is little or no evidence given (other than access to infrastructure) to suggest whether the communities proposed will be sustainable coherent and are actually in the right places to ensure we have thriving communities and what the process has been to arrive at the current conclusions - e.g. was one large new settlement considered? Why is residential development given such a low priority in the city centre and indeed within the built up area? Where is the evidence that the complete redevelopment of currently, or soon to be, obsolete areas has been assessed.</p> <p>Little evidence is produced which relates to the ideal size of communities, whether they are self contained or satellites to large conurbations. There has been considerable work done in this field to avoid mistakes of the past but none of this is referenced or drawn in as evidence to support the strategy.</p> <p>C - 11037 - 8375 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
11064	<p>Wymondham Consortium of Landowners [8218] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Rob Snowling) [8381]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>In summary, we consider that Wymondham, and moreover Wymondham South, is an inherently sustainable location for growth and fully support the GNDP's proposed allocation of 2,200 dwellings at Wymondham.</p> <p>C - 11064 - 8218 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
11073	<p>Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich</p>

Policy Area?

Yes to the 2,000 homes minimum on small/medium sites

Subject to clarification that these represent the minimum growth figures for each location and are not used to add onto the strategic growth locations

C - 11073 - 7535 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

11077	<p>Norfolk & Waveney Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust [1062] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Rob Snowling) [8381]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>We wish to support the GNDP's favoured option of 2,000 dwellings at smaller sites in the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area (NPA). Furthermore, we consider that redevelopment of the Hospital upper site is fully in accordance with the JCS and could help to deliver the proposed 2,000 dwellings in Broadland District.</p> <p>Please find enclosed a CD copy of our submission made to Broadland District Council last month. The enclosed documents demonstrate the overall deliverability of the site and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Planning and Delivery Statement prepared by Bidwells Planning- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and Concept Masterplan prepared by Sheils Flynn Landscape Architects- Accessibility Statement prepared by Millard Consulting- Stage 1 Servicing Strategy (Utilities) Appraisal prepared by Bidwells Engineering- Statement from Norfolk & Waveney Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust setting out its strategy for the rationalisation of the Hellesdon Hospital site and the ongoing provision of mental health care in Norwich <p>The following information provides a general overview of the project, its background and the enclosed submission, however, it should be read in conjunction with the documents referred to above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- In 2008 the Trust initiated a project to assess options to rationalise and redevelop its estate in Norwich. The findings of this work indicated that there is a substantial opportunity to rationalise Hellesdon Hospital and improve the efficiency of the Trust's
--------------	--

estate.

- Bidwells Planning has therefore been retained by the Trust to promote the upper part of the Hellesdon Hospital site (approximately 15ha) for residential and mixed-use development through the Broadland District Local Development Framework (LDF) Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) preparation process.

- The accompanying Planning and Delivery Statement and Concept Masterplan put forward and initial development concept for the redevelopment of the Hellesdon Hospital upper site, with reference to its physical and planning policy context. Together with the technical reports referred to above, these studies demonstrate the deliverability of the site and the overall scale of development that is currently proposed.

- In principle, the concept for the redevelopment of the site will be to form an attractive and sustainable community that integrates with the rationalised Hospital, the surrounding development and the countryside beyond.

- The redeveloped site will be comprised of: (i) the rationalised Hospital within the lower part of the site; (ii) approximately 7,000 sqm of B1 office use (including a possible new Headquarters building for the Trust, accommodation for the existing Broadland Community Mental Health Care Team and the existing Alcohol and Drugs Service Centre; (iii) approximately 380 residential dwellings, of which approximately 80 would be apartments within a mixed-use development area, and (iv) approximately 2,00 sqm of mixed-use accommodation, to include possible accommodation for leisure, community, convenience retail and employment uses (including live-work units).

- Redevelopment of the Hospital upper site would contribute towards Broadland District Council's growth targets (including its 15 year housing land supply) and it accords fully with sustainable development objectives.

- In short, the Hospital site represents an available, suitable and deliverable location for accommodating sustainable growth, in accordance with national, regional and local planning policy.

C - 11077 - 1062 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

11078 Residents of Gibbs Close, Little Melton [8385] (represented by Mr Alex Graham [8384]) - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich

Policy Area?

In summary, the residents are not persuaded on the evidence before them that the preferred option is the most appropriate strategic solution to accommodate the predicted housing and economic growth required. The reasons for this are set out below with reference to the questions and sections of the JCS:

1. It is acknowledged that strategic housing growth requirements must be accommodated to meet local need. In accordance with all key government guidance and planning policy however, (most notably PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development') any growth would need to be achieved in a sustainable manner by reducing the need to travel, maximising linkages to existing jobs, recreation and services, protecting environmental and heritage assets enhancing local distinctiveness and improving the well being of communities.

Generally, all four growth options put forward in the JCS focus on major expansion within the city. Promotion of high density development should be explicitly encouraged within the city centre in order to deliver the highest possible growth close to existing and established services, retail, jobs, leisure and public transport nodes. This part of the JCS is therefore supported.

3. Outside of the city it is of key concern that all four options heavily favour very large housing growth in only a limited number of locations. Housing should be spread among all centres in a managed way that builds sensitively on the character of each settlement, with the majority being given over to those areas that have large employment centres and existing retail and services and sustainable transport links such as rail connections. If this cannot accommodate the scale of growth required then strategic planning of a new town would seem a better solution as this would allow the effective funding and planning of necessary infrastructure.

4. In relation to the specific policies of the JCS we have the following comments and objections:

6. Policy 7 - Key Service Centres and Policy 5 Locations for Major Change

a. It is difficult to understand how Hethersett can be regarded as a Key Service Centre as it has only a handful of small shops and virtually no business employment uses. At para 7.21 of the JCS this is recognised, where it states "Hethersett has a small range of shops [and] limited employment provision due to its proximity to Norwich".

b. Approximately 500 new houses have been built in Hethersett by developer Wilcon Homes over the past 15 years, almost doubling the size of the village. This has not delivered any increase in local services. The proposal to add a further 1,000 houses within an, as yet, undefined location would irrevocably destroy the character and appearance of Hethersett village and surrounding villages directly contrary to Objective 8 of the

JCS.

c. Strategically, Hethersett and surrounding villages such as Little Melton have very little existing employment/ business space that would benefit from such large scale housing growth. The effect would be to create large dormitory housing estates that are parasitic mainly on the City. As Hethersett has no rail access, opportunities for sustainable travel and reducing the need to travel by car are minimal and contrary to Objectives 4 and 11 of the JCS.

d. The cumulative impact of growth along the B1172/ A11 corridor also needs to be given greater scrutiny. The evidence studies relating to transport only appear to take in to account the public transport requirements of growth and do not compare the effect of additional housing growth on the use of the private car. As the most likely method of public transport will be by bus, the effect on traffic generation and road capacity shared with the growth in car use along the local road network needs to be assessed.

e. The transport studies show for Hethersett that bus travel to Norwich will mean travelling along "unsuitable routes" at Hethersett Lane/ Earlham Road. It states that this access, which is mainly single lane road unsuitable for buses, would need to be significantly upgraded. The alternative is to use the B1172 to Thickthorn Interchange, but this is described as "congested" and likely to get worse. It is also clear that the Park and Ride facility at Thickthorn is close to capacity already. As such a series of bus priority measures would need to be put in place to assist public transport services and encourage their use, together with a significant expansion of Park and Ride facilities. It would be very unlikely that any significant proportion of these costs could be met from planning obligations flowing from the housing development.

f. Bus use, whilst predicted to grow by 2021, would still only account for 16% of trips. Along the B1172/ A11 corridor the peak level trips per hour for buses is expected to be 430 for Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford combined. This means that if the other 84% of trips are made by car, these would account for approximately 2,270 additional car movements per hour in the peak period along the B1172/ A11 corridor. Clearly a B road is not a suitable carrier of high volume peak hour traffic and congestion along this route will lead to increased use of even less suitable 'rat runs' such as Colney Lane/ Hethersett Lane and other cross country roads. This is clearly contrary to the aims of sustainable development, road safety, travel choice

and reducing the reliance on the private car advocated in Objectives 2, 3, 4 and 5.

g. Furthermore, the transport studies state that the projected level of peak demand from Hethersett by 2021 would only support a dedicated bus service operating every 30 minutes. Whilst it is unclear whether the compounded capacity of the buses have been taken in to account (ie a bus from Wymondham stopping at Hethersett and Cringleford would not be empty at each stop) based on the growth planned in the preferred option little improvement in bus services are likely, meaning the majority of movements will be by car, creating a clear conflict with the main aim of the JCS to see the development of sustainable communities.

h. Greater preference should be given to locations which have strategic rail access in order reduce the use of car travel and where there are already established employment concentrations that can be expanded. It would be artificial and contrary to normal market forces to try and establish new service and employment centres in Hethersett where there has been no demand previously in order to rationalise the extent of housing development as this would also sacrifice the viability of other established employment sites.

i. Such a scale of development would vastly increase the size of Hethersett and expand the settlement boundaries blurring or removing the separation from other smaller villages such as Little Melton. This is contrary to government advice and would serve only to provide large scale suburbs to Norwich, again eroding the character of each of these individual places.

j. There would be significant impacts on the community by replacing the incremental growth of the area with large scale development. The effect would be a reduced sense of community and belonging contrary to Objective 2 of the JCS.

k. There would be significant impacts upon the countryside and full assessments of impacts on wildlife, vegetation and general bio diversity would need to be prepared.

The Options at 1 and 2 are both directly contrary to the Spatial Vision of the JCS which states that Hethersett (as a 'key service centre') will "accommodate small to moderate levels of new housing (between 20 200 dwellings)" in accordance with local school, services and utility capacities. For other villages (which are taken to include Little Melton) the Spatial Vision states that there will be small scale development "consistent with village character" of between 10 20 dwellings. Neither of the first two options proposed accord with the scale of development that the Spatial Vision advocates, or what is appropriate based on character, sustainability and transport considerations. The preferred Option (0) shares the same concerns but simply on a reduced scale.

Overall, the residents do not support the Preferred Option 0 as it relates to the growth of the B1172/

A11 corridor for the reasons provided. Preference should be given to the potential new town near Mangreen, that can utilise pooled financial contributions and strategic planning to provide effective infrastructure and focussed public transport connections. A greater focus should also be given to expanding development at Diss to maximise its effect as an alternative commercial centre and employment location.

C - 11078 - 8385 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

11101	<p>Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>PJH believe that it cannot be demonstrated, because of the extent of constraints to delivery, that many of the other options can be substantially completed or completed at all in the relevant plan period. The test is whether RSS targets for the GNDP will be completed in the period 2001 to 2021.</p> <p>14 PJH's particular concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The ability to complete 3,000 units in Norwich City when the identified sites are largely dependent on flatted schemes, which is a part of the market that is dramatically oversupplied• The ability to deliver 7,000 dwelling sin North East Norwich. This size of allocation requires substantial coordination of the many ownerships and the infrastructure required to release the site. The principal constraint is the huge uncertainty over the funding and, therefore, the delivery of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road.• The ability to deliver 1,800 dwellings in Long Stratton. While it is understood the release of this development is to facilitate the longstanding Long Stratton Bypass, this development alone, by the admission of the promoters of the scheme cannot deliver the bypass. <p>Contingency Approach</p> <p>15 PJH recognises the merits of the Favoured Option but also recognises that the Favoured Option relies heavily on the delivery of other sites. PJH believes that a</p>
--------------	--

	<p>contingency approach needs to be incorporated in the Plan, such that in the event that the proposed sites do not come forward as predicted in the AMR, a replacement strategy is available.</p> <p>C - 11101 - 8300 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
7952	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - SUPPORT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Sorry but again only if the infrastructure comes first</p> <p>S - 7952 - 7809 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8091	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT Web - 26/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? This is sensible if we have to have development</p> <p>S - 8091 - 7880 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8116	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 8116 - 7888 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>

<p>8156</p>	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Don't try building at Long Stratton unless the bypass and other road improvements are achieved first.</p> <p>S - 8156 - 7899 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>8181</p>	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Provided a Long Sutton bypass is build</p> <p>S - 8181 - 4796 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>8249</p>	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 8249 - 4558 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>8271</p>	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p>

	<p>S - 8271 - 7912 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8296	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? None</p> <p>S - 8296 - 7915 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8349	<p>Spixworth Parish Council (Mrs R Rose) [1826] - SUPPORT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? The policy represents the realistic development opportunities for the area</p> <p>S - 8349 - 1826 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8360	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? I agree</p> <p>S - 8360 - 6992 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8519	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy</p>

	<p>Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 8519 - 7817 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8544	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 8544 - 8021 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8568	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 8568 - 1976 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8731	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 8731 - 8053 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>

<p>8787</p>	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 8787 - 8061 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>8977</p>	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 8977 - 8092 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9109</p>	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 9109 - 7111 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9153</p>	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p>

	<p>S - 9153 - 2055 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9221	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 9221 - 1828 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9357	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 9357 - 7113 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9428	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? A Qualified yes if there has to be the scale of development envisaged the areas identified are probably correct</p> <p>S - 9428 - 8127 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9453	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area</p>

	<p>Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>S - 9453 - 8134 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9487	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9487 - 8139 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9602	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9602 - 8162 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9617	<p>RW Kidner [8163] (represented by Bidwells Cambridge(310) (Michael Hendry) [7492]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>The recognition of the role that smaller sites within the Norwich Policy area and in particular those in South Norfolk can play in the delivery of the housing targets within the Norwich Policy area is welcomed. The favoured option of an additional 1,800 dwellings on smaller sites is welcomed but should be seen as a minimum in line with the regional spatial strategy. The council are reminded of the land promotion to the rear of Stoke Holy Cross primary school for approximately 40 dwellings and an extension to the school grounds. The council ought to consider the transport statement landscape and visual impact assessment</p>

	<p>and the utilities information provided as well as the indicative master plan submitted during previous rounds of consultation when considering sites within South Norfolk and the Norwich Policy Area for possible residential allocation.</p> <p>S - 9617 - 8163 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9676	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Yes, apart from comments above (Q8).</p> <p>S - 9676 - 8047 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9772	<p>Mr Michael Whalley [8189] (represented by King Sturge (Mr Mark Connell) [6455]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Yes. The continued inclusion of Blofield within the Norwich Policy Area (APPENDIX 4) is appropriate. Blofield has been consistently included in this area in past policy documents at the local level.</p> <p>The inclusion of Blofield within the NPA should be matched with housing allocations for the policy to be meaningful nevertheless. Blofield was not subject to a housing allocation in the Replacement Local Plan, or the previous Broadland Plan. There is a danger that without significant additional housing in the settlement, the village will stagnate and decline.</p> <p>New homes will help retain the indigenous population, which is necessary to support existing services and facilities, deliver much needed housing and encourage further investment in Blofield.</p> <p>S - 9772 - 8189 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9828	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/03/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>We would support the distribution of major housing and job growth in the areas defined within the Norwich Policy Area.</p> <p>We understand that in-fill land with Taverham and Thorpe Marriott has been identified for more modest scale residential development and we would support this also.</p> <p>Our proposals are not based upon future residential growth projections or planned developments as part of the total 21,000 new homes.</p> <p>S - 9828 - 8198 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9868</p>	<p>Hill Residential [8215] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr William Lusty) [7762]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Hill Residential support the distribution of growth that is specified by Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area. The policy specifies the provision of 7,000 dwellings in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle and 2,000 dwellings on smaller sites in Broadland in the Norwich Policy Area and through possible additions to named growth locations. The amounts of development proposed at these locations are considered appropriate, in view of the respective constraints upon them and the resultant opportunity for development.</p> <p>In terms of the St Faiths Road site, this would accord with either of the 'growth triangle' or 'smaller Broadland sites in the Norwich Policy Area' locations. However, owing to the size of the site and its direct relationship with the built up edge of the city, we consider that the site more appropriately relates to the location of smaller sites within Broadland within the Norwich Policy Area, than the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle, which we would understand to provide for developments of a substantial scale such as strategic extensions to the urban area.</p> <p>S - 9868 - 8215 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9869</p>	<p>Wymondham Consortium of Landowners [8218] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Mike Carpenter) [8217]) -</p>

	<p>SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Initially, and most importantly, in response to Question 9 in the JCS Consultation Document, we wish to express our full support for the GNDP's identification of Wymondham as a 'strategic growth location' in draft JCS Policy 5 (Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area).</p> <p>The site is located within close proximity to the town centre, railway station and other local services and facilities and has excellent rail connections with Norwich and the surrounding area. The proposed development site would contribute towards the GNDP's overall growth targets, it would accord fully with draft JCS Policy 5, and it would help to deliver the GNDP's favoured allocation of 2,200 new dwellings at Wymondham.</p> <p>S - 9869 - 8218 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9878</p>	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9878 - 2058 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9932</p>	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>YES - but there should be mention of the need to protect adjacent parishes from increased rat running (eg protect Little Melton from traffic avoiding the queues at Thickthorn)</p> <p>S - 9932 - 7015 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the</p>

favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

9951

Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation [8223] (represented by CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]) - **SUPPORT**
Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

This representation is submitted by CgMs Consulting on behalf of Barratt Strategic/John Innes Foundation.

The representation supports, in principle, the revisions to Policy 5, further described in Appendix 0 of the Technical Consultation document.

We welcome the identification of a strategic development location at Cringleford. The scale of development proposed in the policy could be accommodated on land between the existing built-up area of Cringleford and the Hospital, as identified on the plan in Appendix 0. However, in order to ensure an efficient use of land and the most sustainable pattern of development for this sector of the City, it will be important for this development to be viewed in the context of a master plan for the wider area to the east of A47 (including the Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital and Norwich Research Park) to create a unified new community. This may enable a larger scale of residential development to be accommodated in the wider area (potentially around 3900 units) and it will be important for the strategy to incorporate sufficient flexibility, demonstrating the preferred direction for strategic growth but leaving the numbers of dwellings to be finalised through the masterplanning exercise. The scale of residential development should be sufficient to ensure that the community is large enough to be viable in the long term. This new community should be well integrated, with layout and density ensuring that amenities, leisure, education, residential and employment spaces are all within walkable distances. There should be a clear and legible hierarchy of spaces, with distinctive character areas, green spaces and local centres, connected by public transport and pleasant walking and cycling routes.

The parties involved are committed to the delivery of a sustainable and viable development at Cringleford. The setting of the site, inside the A47, adjacent to key sources of employment and services and well served by public transport, makes this one of the most sustainable development locations in the Greater Norwich area. No significant barriers to delivery have been identified.

In light of the above, the figure of 1200 dwellings for strategic development at Cringleford is considered to be too prescriptive, as the area to the east of the Hospital, identified on the plan in Appendix 0, could itself accommodate 1500-2000 dwellings. If numbers are to be stated, then this should adopt the terminology of " a minimum of x dwellings". This form of words would be

consistent with the approach adopted in the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Linkages with proposed development at Hethersett, and with the south west development corridor as a whole, are supported, as is the development of bus rapid transport corridors crossing the city from north east to south west, as this will promote accessibility to jobs and services from the new growth areas. There will be direct access from the Cringleford strategic development to the A11 rapid transport corridor and to frequent services to the hospital site. This high degree of public transport accessibility, coupled with the close inter-relationship between residential, employment and education uses, will all help to deliver the low carbon city.

The revised Policy 5 refers to masterplanning "using accredited design methodology". This statement is unclear in that it does not specify which should be the accreditation body.

S - 9951 - 8223 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

9952 **Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath [8224]** (represented by CGMS Ltd (Mr Richard Atkinson) [7681]) - **SUPPORT**
Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

This representation is submitted by CgMs Consulting on behalf of Barratt Strategic/Manor Farm Rackheath.

The representation supports, in principle, the revisions to Policy 5, further described in Appendix 0 of the Technical Consultation document.

We welcome the recognition given to the fact that the Old Catton / Sprowston / Rackheath / Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle is a sustainable location for major development. The support which is given to the concept of an Eco-Community in the Rackheath part of the growth triangle is also welcomed, as is the commitment that such development should continue whether or not the Rackheath Eco-Community receives formal Eco-town status under the Government's current programme.

The scale of the proposed development in this sector (7,000 dwellings rising to 10,000 after 2026) is consistent with the proposals contained in the Concept Statement for the Rackheath Eco-Community.

The Introduction to Appendix 0 refers to "a major urban extension", however we would rather concur with the later reference

in the Appendix to " a series of inter-related new villages or quarters". Implementation of the Northern Distributor Road would reinforce the separation which already exists between the Rackheath and Sprowston areas, formed by historic parkland landscapes and areas of interest for nature conservation. The Rackheath Eco-Community is therefore expected to take the form of a self-contained settlement and would stand apart from development to the west of the Northern Distributor Road. However the proposals for the Eco-Community stress the importance of maintaining connectivity between Rackheath and proposed development areas inside the Northern Distributor Road. The latter development would be more properly described as an urban extension and should be fully integrated with the existing urban area.

Appendix 0 refers to delivery being dependent upon the implementation of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road. As far as the Eco-Community is concerned, travel planning is predicated on extensive provision of public transport (including the new rail station, high quality bus transit and walking and cycling - all of which are referred to in the Appendix). The implementation of the Northern Distributor Road would clearly deliver benefits to the Eco-Community in terms of its general accessibility, however over-reliance upon private vehicle movements would be actively discouraged in the Eco-Community. The promoters of the Eco-Community are working closely with the County Council to ensure that the proposal is consistent with the implementation plan for the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATS), which is currently in preparation. Delivery of the Northern Distributor Road will be important if the objectives of NATS are to be met and if a high quality public transport solution for Norwich is to be achieved.

Appendix 0 refers to "a new secondary school with an initial phase to open within the first 5 years". Preliminary discussions with the education authority, regarding the Eco-Community, have suggested that secondary school provision may not be required until later in the plan period. In the early years, it should be possible to meet the demand for secondary provision within the existing education system. The Eco-Community proposal therefore includes for an educational campus in the southern part of the development which can grow with the development and offer a range of educational opportunities as demand arises. Further discussions are to be held with the education authority regarding education provision for the Eco-Community and it is recognised that, in terms of secondary provision, the proposals will need to take account of other proposed development in the north-east sector of the city.

Within the wider strategy, the development of bus rapid transport corridors crossing the city from north east to south west is supported, as this will promote accessibility to jobs and services in the city centre, and elsewhere along this corridor, from the new growth areas. In addition there will be a need to ensure that other key employment sites within the city, such as the Airport Industrial Estate, are served by the high quality bus services.

The revised Policy 5 refers to masterplanning "using accredited design methodology". This statement is unclear in that it does not specify which should be the accreditation body.

	<p>The final paragraph of Policy 5 states "if an eco-community at Rackheath goes ahead it will be included in this total". However in Appendix 0 the point is made that the development should go ahead whether or not the Rackheath Eco-Community receives formal Eco-town status under the Government's current programme. It would therefore be more appropriate to state that "The development in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle is expected to rise to 10,000 dwellings eventually, of which a minimum of 5,000 dwellings should be provided in a new settlement at Rackheath".</p> <p>S - 9952 - 8224 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9995</p>	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 9995 - 8228 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10029</p>	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 10029 - 8230 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10161</p>	<p>Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [7674]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p>

	<p>Commenting on Policy 5 and the Locations for Major Change and Development in the Norwich Policy Area, again the identification of Costessey/Easton as a location for major growth is supported. The Core Strategy's indication that 1800 dwellings will also be allocated in the South Norfolk part of the LPA, including the growth locations is also supported.</p> <p>With regard to housing delivery, the provision to negotiate on 40% affordable housing and a consideration of the viability of development is welcomed.</p> <p>S - 10161 - 8244 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10180</p>	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10180 - 8246 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10206</p>	<p>Mr Paul Dunthorne [8216] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr John Long) [8211]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>In addition to the previously submitted representations, Paul Dunthorne wishes to make the following comments in respect of the current Joint Core Strategy (Reg 25) Consultation, (March 2009):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paul Dunthorne supports the identification of Rackheath as part of the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew "growth triangle" as a suitable location for strategic growth to accommodate 7,000 - 10,000 new homes. - Paul Dunthorne contends that even if Rackheath is not confirmed as an Eco-Town under the emerging Government Planning Policy Statement, that it still represents a suitable location for growth. - Paul Dunthorne suggests that land at Green Lane West can either form part of the Rackheath Eco-Community or be

developed as a separate entity with clear linkages and relationships with both the proposed Eco-Community and existing Rackheath.

Paul Dunthorne supports the Joint Core Strategy's confirmation of Rackheath as part of the North East Norwich "Growth Triangle" and its identification that the wider "Growth Triangle" is capable of accommodating between 7,000 - 10,000 new homes.

S - 10206 - 8216 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10272 Mr D Jeans [8265] (represented by Boyer Planning Ltd (Ms Caroline Pollard) [8264]) - **SUPPORT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Further to the above consultation we write in support of Policy 5 - locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area on behalf of Mr D Jeans.

The Policy suggests a favoured option for the distribution of major housing and jobs growth to the north east of Norwich in the Old Catton-Sprowston-Rackheath-Thorpe St. Andrew growth triangle and moderate growth at Wymondham, Hethersett, Cringleford, Easton/Costessey and Long Stratton.

The major urban expansion proposed in the growth triangle provides for a concentration of development of at least 7,000 dwellings, rising to a total of at least 10,000 dwellings after 2026. This amount of development proposed is capable of supporting the provision of further local services and infrastructure including education and public transport. This growth option is therefore the most appropriate in planning policy and deliverability terms.

Our client controls land adjoining Canfor Road at Rackheath that is available and well located for development to assist with the provision of housing within the Growth Triangle.

Policy 5 also suggests 2,000 dwellings at Broadland smaller sites within the Norwich Policy Area and possible additions to the named growth locations. This element of the strategy is also supported.

Previous consultations have involved the promotion of the above land adjoining Canford Road in Rackheath for a modest sized

	<p>housing development. The characteristics of the site and the scale of development which would result are commensurate with the nature of the existing village of Rackheath and will make an appropriate contribution to the provision of new housing as part of the overall strategy for the Norwich Policy Area.</p> <p>S - 10272 - 8265 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10343	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10343 - 8293 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10366	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Yes. The Parish Council fully supports the adoption of Appendix 0</p> <p>S - 10366 - 2020 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10422	<p>Ms Barbara Lockwood [8306] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 11/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Personally, I would accept the Rackheath development of homes.</p> <p>S - 10422 - 8306 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>

<p>10433</p>	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 10433 - 8308 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10512</p>	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 10512 - 7215 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10666</p>	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 10666 - 8348 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10735</p>	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p>

	<p>S - 10735 - 1776 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10766	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 10766 - 7666 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10872	<p>Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? The achievement of the necessary sustainable spatial strategy will arise via a combination of sites/locations, taking forward the comment at paragraph 1.10 of the Public Consultation. We endorse the observation at paragraph 8.1 of the Consultation which states that "sustainable neighbourhoods are a key element of the Vision for this strategy to 2026." When considered in the light of this spatial background, we agree with Policy 5 of the Consultation which requires all growth locations to achieve a high level of self containment "while integrating well with neighbouring communities." The Spatial Vision, Policy 2 and Policy 4 refer to the strategic employment location at Longwater and the anticipated significant enhancement of public transport between the City Centre and Bowthorpe/Costessey/Longwater. Given those important elements of the emerging strategy, we consider that the favoured growth option would secure a distribution of new housing which reflects the spread of strategic employment areas described in Policy NR1 of the East of England Plan and the transportation enhancements foreshadowed in Policy 4 of the present Consultation. Furthermore, development in accordance with the favoured growth option would provide the opportunity to secure enhanced gateways to</p>

Norwich as required by Policy 4 of the Public Consultation.

We have noted that Appendix 0 suggests that the favoured growth option requires an increase in capacity at the A47 Longwater junction. The GNPD will be aware of the fact that an improved junction layout in this general area will be achieved by the utilisation of part of the proposed Lodge Farm extension land.

The plan at page 69 of the Public Consultation shows a strategic growth location between the present Lodge Farm housing site and the A47. We support this clear policy guidance and contend that the proposed extension of the existing Lodge Farm development area is the most appropriate response to development in the Costessey area as it represents clearly a development form arising at the edge of the existing built-up area of Norwich. Given the strategy for the Norwich area established in the East of England Plan, the Joint Core Strategy should acknowledge that the key issue is the delivery of new housing in response to the identification of Norwich in Policy SS3 of the EEP as a Key Centre for Development and Change. Suitable sites at the edge of the existing built-up area of Norwich are best placed to address this strategic objective.

The allocation and implementation of the proposed larger development areas will encompass a number of years. That being the case, it is important to ensure that an adequate supply of housing land is maintained in the NPA, in accordance with the principles established in PPS3. Given the amount of new housing to be provided in the NPA, we do not consider that the housing land supply in the short/medium term can be achieved purely by means of the development of previously developed land or a reliance on a limited number of large urban extensions. A number of medium-size urban extensions, at the very edge of Norwich, should be brought forward to accommodate new housing in the short/medium term to ensure that the growth agenda for Norwich is not compromised in its initial phase.

The GNPD will be aware of the fact that our clients are presently implementing development at Lodge Farm at the edge of the built-up area of Norwich. We consider that the extension of that site to the west would address the strategic spatial objectives in the Public Consultation and provide an opportunity for new housing to be constructed in the short term. Our clients are already at present on site and an expansion of the existing area could readily be achieved once the appropriate planning permissions have been secured, enabling continuity in the delivery of housing.

An enlargement of the existing Lodge Farm development area would be appropriate and achievable/deliverable in the short/medium term, thereby ensuring that the momentum for

the Norwich growth area is achieved expeditiously. A planned extension of the Lodge Farm site represents a key element in the early delivery of the spatial strategy for the Norwich area anticipated in the East of England Plan. The availability of land at Lodge Farm under the control of our clients represents an important factor when considering the key issue of the delivery of housing in support of Policy NR1 of the East of England Plan. Its early release would be a significant building block in the implementation of the growth agenda. The strategic significance of Costessey was discussed during the course of the South Norfolk Local Plan Inquiry. When considering the Norwich Policy Area, the Inspector was of the view that the bulk of the new housing provision should be in locations on the edge of Norwich and in settlements with good communication links to the City. He indicated that he regarded Costessey as being in the highest category of housing location available within the Norwich Policy Area:

"In my overview of the settlement and other introductory paragraphs to Section 28 of Part 2 of this Report, I place Costessey in the highest category of housing location available to the District Council within the Norwich Area. Moreover, the objection land lies directly alongside one of the main radial routes into the City Centre, and midway between the major development areas of Bowthorpe and Longwater, so both large scale employment opportunities and retail facilities are close at hand."

Those comments were made in the context of the Inspector's assessment of the acceptability of new housing now allocated by virtue of Policy COS2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The Inspector's broad conclusions regarding the sustainability credentials of Costessey are equally valid in the context of the JCS and, accordingly, we would suggest that further housing could be provided on the north-western approach to Norwich.

Strategic Principle 3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan recognises that a major element of growth in the NPA is to be accommodated in the South Norfolk component of the NPA. In these circumstances, subject to environmental and infrastructure conditions, development is accordingly to be directed to locations selected because they will minimise the need for travel, and which have good access by public transport, cycling and walking. In broad terms, Costessey exhibits the necessary locational attributes that would suggest that it is capable of accommodating further growth to respond to the content of the EEP.

The SNLP acknowledges that Old Costessey and New Costessey offer a wide range of social and community facilities. Direct access to Norwich City Centre is provided along the A1074 Dereham Road whilst good access to the southern edge of the City is provided by the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass. It is noted that the settlement "is strategically very well

	<p>placed as a location for new development". Furthermore, when considering the Lodge Farm housing land allocation, the SNLP notes that that allocation is proposed "in recognition of Costessey's status as one of the District's prime sustainable locations for new housing."</p> <p>S - 10872 - 8363 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10932	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 10932 - 8368 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10956	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 10956 - 8369 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10980	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes</p> <p>S - 10980 - 8176 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>

<p>11003</p>	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Yes, in principle. Should be near good road links and brownfield sites wherever possible.</p> <p>S - 11003 - 8370 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>11048</p>	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT Paper - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Agreed in principle as there are unspecified opportunities in the NPA for 1800 units which should include sustainable locations such as Trowse and Blofield - see also Q15.</p> <p>S - 11048 - 6955 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>11115</p>	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Partly yes.</p> <p>We suggest that "Where applicable" is added at the start of the first paragraph of Policy 5 to avoid requiring things which are not necessary.</p> <p>For example, new primary healthcare facilities may not always be needed and suitable alternatives to SuDS may be necessary if there are problems with protection of groundwater or infiltration.</p> <p>In the particular case of Long Stratton promoting self-containment within the new growth area will be less relevant than</p>

promoting the integration of the new growth with the existing settlement and achieving a high level of self-containment for the enlarged settlement.

We accept that the actual subdivision of growth within the NPA is necessarily a matter of judgement in the context of the figures given at paragraph 8.4 of the Public Consultation document and, as such, may not be optimum for every location, particularly when considered against the likely requirements arising to 2031 in the review of the East of England Plan. We endorse the general principle of distributing growth to key locations in the NPA rather than concentrating all of it in and around Norwich which would have led to housing deprivation in central South Norfolk.

Policy 5 refers to Appendix 0. We have reviewed the context of Appendix 0 and would note that references to likely development totals are couched in the context of the term "about" or "around" a particular number of dwellings. Accordingly, we would suggest Policy 5 be amended to indicate that the dwelling figures described within the favoured option are "around" the number of dwellings identified. As presently presented, the figures in Policy 5 may be interpreted to represent the absolute maximum anticipated at each location for major development.

Appendix 4 identifies the extent of the Norwich Policy Area. That being the case, we agree with the suggested distribution of new development to key development locations across the NPA as a whole. Policies H1 and NR1 of the East of England Plan envisage a significant amount of new development being accommodated in the Norwich Policy Area. Policy NR1 of the EEP states that the broad extent of the NPA, based upon that of the previous Structure Plan, should be established in local development documents. We support the extent of the NPA shown in Appendix 4 and consider that adequate and appropriate key development locations can be identified within the NPA to deliver the scale of growth described at Policies H1 and NR1 of the EEP.

S - 11115 - 8390 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

11130 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - SUPPORT

Paper - 30/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

On behalf of our client, Persimmon Homes Ltd, who have an interest in land at Norwich Common, Wymondham, we support in principle the favoured option in relation to housing growth, provided that the 2,200 dwellings proposed through urban expansion are located in a number of sites around the town as Appendix 0 of the Public Consultation document proposes and

that the 1800 dwellings proposed on smaller sites in the South Norfolk part of the NPA includes adequate opportunities for such smaller sites to be developed at Wymondham, rather than in smaller less sustainable settlements. This approach is much more likely to achieve the delivery of the housing numbers required than one which concentrates development in one main location at Wymondham or disperses smaller developments too widely. Our client's land interest at Norwich Common, which we have been promoting through the Core Strategy and SHLAA processes, offers the opportunity to achieve a development early in the plan period of some 300 dwellings in a sustainable location, very well related to the local and strategic transport network and able to take advantage of improved bus services to Norwich city centre. It is also very well related to existing employment and social and community facilities and will not have a detrimental impact on the landscape setting of the town or on the strategic gap between the town and Hethersett.

We wish to also draw your attention to the detailed representations made on our client's behalf, as Technical Consultees, at the previous stages of consultation on this Core Strategy, which remain valid.

S - 11130 - 2373 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

7875

Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] - OBJECT

Web - 05/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

leave well alone, no more housing or road expansion, thus leaving norwich and norfolk how we have always known and loved it. no more buildings, fields, woods, or wildlife destroyed. listen for once to the majority.

O - 7875 - 7782 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

7881

Mr Paul Mallett [7783] - OBJECT

Web - 05/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Such unwarranted and unneeded large-scale destructive development in Wymondham will destroy what little is left of the town centre. The badly built (I was surprised at the number of poor methods used and how unlevel or 'wonky' roofs/walls were) off Greenland Avenue being a prime example of modern housing developments.

	<p>The developer has made a negative contribution to the town, no school/dentist/doctors surgery etc... built. Also as there are over 1,000,000 empty houses at present in England and Wales why build more? There must be a new junior and high school built in Wymondham before any more houses are built.</p> <p>O - 7881 - 7783 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
7893	<p>mr andrew gibbins [7788] - OBJECT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? There are two many houses around the A11 and A140, these roads are already over congested in peak times, major improvements would be needed.</p> <p>O - 7893 - 7788 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
7904	<p>mr david harper [7790] - OBJECT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? The area is already heavy populated & the road system at the moment can not handle any more traffic. The removal of the NHS Walk in Centre also puts an extra burden on the existing Health Centres.</p> <p>O - 7904 - 7790 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
7930	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT Web - 08/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? the numbers are too high maybe the growth should be diverted to north england or scotland</p>

	<p>O - 7930 - 7812 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
7939	<p>Mr Peter Boddy [7815] - OBJECT Web - 09/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? The proposed eco town will cause a vast increase in traffic and crime</p> <p>O - 7939 - 7815 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
7941	<p>mr David Jones [7816] - OBJECT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? I object to the building of more houses in Long Stratton. The A140 between Long Stratton and Norwich is unable to take any more traffic in peak periods,irrespective of the building of a Long stratton bypass .The Hempnall cross roads and the junction in Tasburgh are already difficult to make turns into against traffic and right turns across the A140 are particularly hazardous .More houses will make a bad position worse ..</p> <p>O - 7941 - 7816 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8002	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - OBJECT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? the numbers seem quite high and query if those areas can support that intensive growth.</p> <p>O - 8002 - 7851 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>

<p>8044</p>	<p>Shane Hull [7857] - OBJECT Web - 17/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Hethersett is already overpopulated as a village. It does not have the necessary infrastructure to support further housing development. The facilities and amenities are already at breaking point.</p> <p>O - 8044 - 7857 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>8058</p>	<p>Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870] - OBJECT Web - 19/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? All of the proposed options have concentrated the development in a few key areas. A more diversified approach would create fewer problems.</p> <p>O - 8058 - 7870 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>8252</p>	<p>R Barker [6805] - OBJECT Web - 05/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? The initial Joint Core Strategy document stated under heading 'INITIAL INDICATIONS'..... 'Long Stratton provides a range of local services and some local job opportunities. It is poorly related to strategic employment sites. Even with a bypass, road access and public transport accessibility to Norwich or to the south is poor. This might constrain employment growth in the village. It does not appear to be a suitable location for further investigation for strategic growth at this time'. COMMENT....How can Long Stratton now be considered suitable for the huge growth planned when it did not tick the correct boxes a year ago??</p>

	<p>O - 8252 - 6805 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8333	<p>Mr Brian Cleland [7938] - OBJECT Web - 16/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? No indication in this policy that businesses will be encouraged to place themselves in areas of new housing.</p> <p>O - 8333 - 7938 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8399	<p>Keeley Wilson [7979] - OBJECT Web - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? My objection is to the doubling in size of Long Stratton. This seems to go against any environmental considerations. 1800 new homes would bring about a massive increase in the amount of commuter traffic in this already traffic-choked part of the region.</p> <p>Due to the current volume of traffic, country lanes in the Long Stratton region are already dangerous for walking, riding or cycling. The proposals would only make this worse.</p> <p>It would surely make sense to build more homes in existing towns that already have employment opportunities in South Norfolk such as Wymondham and Attleborough.</p> <p>O - 8399 - 7979 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8400	<p>COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978] - OBJECT Web - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p>

Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Consultation

The JCS was discussed at the Committee Meeting for Colney Parish on 27th August 2008. There are many good ideas in the document especially those relating to the environment and village communities. However, concerns were expressed that the massive scale development envisaged was based on a Regional Spatial Strategy that was out of date and unsustainable. We therefore cannot support any of the large scale developments proposed and believe that building on this scale would have an adverse impact upon quality of life in the County.

Yours sincerely,

Hazel Martin

Clerk

4 Church Farm

Colney

NR4 7TX

Tel:457189

O - 8400 - 7978 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

8402 COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978] - OBJECT

Web - 21/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Colney Parish Meeting

The JCS was discussed at the Committee Meeting for Colney Parish on 14th April 2009. There are many good ideas in the document especially those relating to the environment and village communities. However, concerns were expressed that the massive scale development envisaged was based on a Regional Spatial Strategy that was out of date and unsustainable. We

therefore cannot support any of the large scale developments proposed and believe that building on this scale would have an adverse impact upon quality of life in the County.

Yours sincerely,
Hazel Martin
Clerk
4 Church Farm
Colney
NR4 7TX

O - 8402 - 7978 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

8470

Mr C Skeels [8016] - OBJECT

Paper - 23/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

The proposed housing in Hethersett, Cringleford and Wymondham should be scaled down. The other locations also appear to be over ambitious

O - 8470 - 8016 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

8494

Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT

Paper - 23/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Far too dense in suburbs - Cringleford / Hethersett cannot absorb 2,200 homes. Like in Wymondham already a horrid sprawl. 7000 is a ridiculous figure for Old Catton etc. There must be more creative ways of achieving dwellings. Local distinctive design is good - how come this has not been insisted on now?

O - 8494 - 8020 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

<p>8580</p>	<p>Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? The Parish Council does not feel that sufficient analysis has been done to justify 1000 additional homes with the current facilities in the village. Sustainable infrastructure improvements are needed to encourage additional use of roads/ walkways by pedestrians and cyclists? Current roads e.g. Henstead Road in the village are totally inadequate and could not cope with increased traffic from 1000 additional homes. Current infrastructure regarding Doctors, Schools, and Sewage is not adequate to cater for the impact of 1000 additional homes. Development should not take place in Lynch Green, Queens Road, South of the B1172 and around the Water Tower. O - 8580 - 8023 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>8592</p>	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Use brownfield sites only The impact of agriculture Carbon footprint O - 8592 - 8024 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>8623</p>	<p>Kay Eke [8025] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>This option encourages urban sprawl and will significantly increase the population of what are villages. How does the Strategy ensure that a vibrant and cohesive village life is maintained where there is a merging of boundaries to, in effect, create a greater Norwich and where there seems little infrastructural provision for maintaining community life?</p> <p>O - 8623 - 8025 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>8657</p>	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Prefer option 1</p> <p>O - 8657 - 8036 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>8681</p>	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Keep developments away from small villages.</p> <p>O - 8681 - 8044 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>8737</p>	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Too much development proposed for the historic market town of Wymondham. It will lose its character and turn into an urban</p>

	<p>sprawl. Its infrastructure is only just coping now and there is nowhere to park. 1,800 proposed dwellings for S.Norfolk's smaller villages are too much.</p> <p>O - 8737 - 8045 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8781	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Your options for the North Eastern triangle underestimate the impact they will have on the neighbouring areas, dependent as they are on the NDR, which in itself is unnecessary and counterindicated</p> <p>O - 8781 - 8060 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8812	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Marlingford & Colton should be in South Norfolk rural policy area not Norwich policy area - South Norfolk. As a rural parish we do not wish to be part of an area dominated by urban needs & where there is very little understanding of rural issues</p> <p>O - 8812 - 6869 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8839	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Overdevelopment of Hethersett with no employment planned within the parish</p> <p>O - 8839 - 8064 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>

8863	<p>Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>As discussed in the supporting Entec Settlement Assessment the proposed locations are unsustainable or have insufficient infrastructure , and as a result it is unsound. At current the favoured option is not compliant with PPS12 as it does not have a sound and robust evidence base and as a result is unsound.The favoured option is not deliverable and is not compliant with PPS 3. The favoured option proposed is not in compliance with Policy SS4 of the RSS, as the level of growth proposed at the Key Service Centre and villages is inappropriate as a result the option is unsound.</p> <p>O - 8863 - 7037 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8889	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Wymondham has been killed by development - no parking facilities, too many speedbumps damaging cars have forced shoppers out. we now have few shops left. there are no youth facilities, and almost no social opportunities except unsavoury pubs. so you will give us 2000 new homes - 4000+ problems. no thanks</p> <p>O - 8889 - 8071 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8907	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>We disagree with the total level of development projected. We hope that a future government will change the strategy in recognition of the special nature of the Norwich area. Relatively rural, tranquil areas are rare in tiny overcrowded Britain and deserve protection from the kind of overdevelopment envisaged in this strategy. We particularly object to the large scale development of Long Stratton which will have many negative impacts on Hempnall - increased traffic, light pollution etc</p>

	<p>O - 8907 - 2014 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
8928	<p>Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Wymondham is already swamped by housing estates and cannot support anymore homes. The doctors, dentists and schools are full to capacity and the road around the town are always congested. It is ridiculous to expect Wymondham to support another 2,200 homes - when will this end!</p> <p>O - 8928 - 8079 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9036	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Strategic development should not be directed towards satellite towns such as Long Stratton and Wymondham for the reasons stated previously. More development could and should be absorbed to the North and North East of Norwich: - around or on top of the airport and - outside the proposed NNDR, adjacent to the Wroxham railway line</p> <p>O - 9036 - 4187 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9112	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? I agree in general but consider that the figure of 7000 (1/3 of the total) is too high for the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew triangle</p>

	<p>O - 9112 - 8111 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9168	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? I do not agree with the idea of transportation designed around walking, cycling and public transport because I would become a prisoner in my own home and not be able to fulfil the requirements that the government put on disabled people of gaining employment and integration this for me and others like me would become isolation or back to the old days of institutions but this time to our own homes. This would apply to the elderly as well.</p> <p>O - 9168 - 8112 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9192	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? - The key element is development along the NDR - The transport (roads based proposals do not match the ostensibly green policies in Policy 5 (page26). - Wymondham - What's this about "Ketts County"? For a start the name is Kett not Ketts (if you mean his county you need an apostrophe) and the whole idea sounds like a travesty of all he stood for - and what 3000 people died for!</p> <p>O - 9192 - 8114 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9233	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Too much growth destroys existing communities</p>

	<p>O - 9233 - 4494 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9291	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Far too many houses across Norfolk</p> <p>O - 9291 - 5445 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9306	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? No to major development on the north side of the city. This is an area of great rural charm with natural parkland wonderful ancient spinneys, hedgerows and spinneys, fabulous bluebell woods and winding lanes. It provides a habitat to many of our smaller mammals and songbirds, notably the skylark and song thrush.</p> <p>O - 9306 - 8117 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9328	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? Old Catton triangle will be too large too much traffic. Wymondham ditto.</p> <p>O - 9328 - 8123 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
9385	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>No once again you are repeating question 5, too much taking place in one area, not evenly spread, Norwich will sprawl over vast amounts of much needed agricultural land, as there is already shortages of food, and this will be exacerbated if nothing is done to curb population explosion</p> <p>O - 9385 - 8120 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9386</p>	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Far too much new housing in the growth triangle and Wymondham. To gain growth status you were quite happy to destroy these areas!</p> <p>O - 9386 - 8124 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9446</p>	<p>Mr Geoffrey Champion [7854] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 01/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>I am concerned about Cringleford being swamped with a further 1200 homes. A community of 900 homes, we approved an additional 400 which grew to 750 and now may be increased to 1065. A further 1200 seems excessive. What are the implications for Thickthorn. The original 750 limit on Round House Park was set by the Dept of Transport now it appears that we can cope with 2265 homes feeding on to the roundabout. We need a new school to cope with the 750 houses already approved, how are we to manage a further 316 and then 1200 more.</p> <p>O - 9446 - 7854 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>

<p>9518</p>	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? For all the reasons outlined above, but neither do I believe that the alternative options would be sustainable ie 1, 2 and 3 for similar reasons</p> <p>O - 9518 - 8140 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9550</p>	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? No, as I have stated I do not agree to the housing totals</p> <p>O - 9550 - 8146 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9568</p>	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? As already stated in previous answer</p> <p>O - 9568 - 6690 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9641</p>	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p>

In this response we have commented upon the main body of the consultation document and responded to those questions posed where it was felt necessary to reply. With regard to the proposed options, set out in the appendices, we have restricted our comments to Appendix 0 - the favoured option.

We have had regard to the Inspector's notes - Norwich LDF Advisory Visit, January/February 2009. This indicates that the chosen strategy must be justified and founded on robust and credible evidence and that a rigorous approach to appraising all reasonable options will help to dispel any impression of justifying a predetermined stance (paragraphs 5 and 9).

We consider that not only has this approach not been followed in arriving at the "favoured option", but evidence exists to show that a predetermined stance is precisely the way in which those options put forward in the previous technical consultation, including the now "favoured option" has been arrived at. The introduction to the Final Report of the "Norwich Growth Area - Infrastructure Need and Funding Study" - December 2007, clearly states that the study has been conducted "in light of strategic predefined growth scenarios." (our emphasis).

This runs contrary to the advised way of preparing a Core Strategy which, in accordance with the Inspector's comments, outlined above, and as set out in PPS12 requires an appraisal of all reasonable alternative options.

As a consequence it is our view that the Core Strategy fails the 'test of soundness' as there is no examination or discussion about reasonable alternatives and why they are or are not considered appropriate. Given the stage now reached in the process this cannot be achieved without going back to first principles. Clearly the favoured outcome has been determined on the basis of a predetermined stance. This seriously questions whether the approach being taken complies with the East of England Plan adopted in May 2008.

An important consideration in assessing the provision of infrastructure, as part of assessing reasonable alternatives, should have been to assess those areas of the Greater Norwich Policy Area where spare infrastructure capacity might exist to be utilised for growth thereby reducing costs and assisting with the delivery of development, a significant component of the LDF process. Instead, the study has been tasked with examining the infrastructure capacity of specific predetermined areas.

Section 5 of the consultation outlines the spatial vision, indicating the locations for major new development. It states that where greenfield development is necessary it will be guided to areas with good access to Norwich, to a range of strategic employment locations and services, and where good public transport links exist or can be provided. A number of the chosen locations clearly do not meet these tests without various prerequisites being in place, e.g. the favoured growth option to the north-east requires the NNDR to be in place in order to deliver growth, and there is nothing in the consultation to suggest when that might permit delivery of the growth options to occur (paragraph 4.4, PPS12).

Objective 6 states that:

"...Wherever new homes or jobs are to be developed, existing supporting services must either already be adequate or should be provided at the right stage of a new development..." No evidence is put forward to suggest whether the favoured growth options are economic to develop in terms of the necessary infrastructure provision required.

With regard to Objective 10 - No evidence is put forward to show how, by encouraging newer communication and information technologies, rural isolation can be reduced. Whilst this may be true for some, a significant percentage of the rural population will remain reliant upon commuting to work in the higher order centres.

Objective 11 - Reducing the need to travel. We do not consider that all potential options have been assessed that would enable this objective to be met. The consultation states that preference will be given to locations where services, employment, shops, schools and recreation are accessible by walking, cycling and public transport, to reduce the need to travel by car. There is no evidence base to suggest that this can be achieved in the favoured growth options any better, or more efficiently, than elsewhere.

O - 9641 - 7503 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

9701

Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

I consider 1800 houses for Long Stratton is too many in the planned period. A survey of residents carried over by South Norfolk Council indicated two thirds wanted less than 1500. Yes we want a bypass, but no explanation has been provided as to why 1800 houses are required to help pay for this rather than say 1500. A detailed calculation of how much will be obtained from developers per house is required to provide a better understanding.

O - 9701 - 5446 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

9727

Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

You are wrecking the countryside near Norwich.

O - 9727 - 8174 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

9763

Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - OBJECT

Web - 15/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Reasons already stated.

O - 9763 - 8184 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

9774

Cemex [8191] (represented by Drivers Jonas 6951 (Mr Ben Simpson) [8192]) - OBJECT

Paper - 27/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

We write on behalf of our client CEMEX to submit representations in relation to the Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council Core Strategy Joint Core Strategy Public Consultation: Regulation 25 document. Our client understands that this Joint Core Strategy consultation relates to Policy 5 only and that our representations made to the Joint Core Strategy Regulation 25: Technical Consultation on the 26 September 2008 will still be taken into account.

For the purpose of this consultation, only two of the four CEMEX sites are relevant to Policy 5 (Wymondham and Lodge Farm, Bawburgh). However, CEMEX is separately making joint representations on the site at Wymondham with a consortium of landowners through Bidwells Consultants. These representations therefore only concern the land at Lodge Farm, Bawburgh (see location plan attached).

CEMEX considers that it is useful to highlight the key areas of support or objection that are most relevant to the site identified. Principally, our comments are made in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS 12) - local Spatial Planning (2008) and the 'tests' set out in paragraphs 4.51 - 4.52, for assessing whether a development plan is sound. Specifically, CEMEX wishes to ensure that the emerging policies within a new LDF are the most appropriate in all the circumstances, that they are founded on a robust and credible evidence base and ensure that the plan is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances and comply with National Planning Policy.

A short overview summary of the potential land uses that CEMEX considers would be appropriate for the Bawburgh site is set out below, which provides the basis for our representation to the Joint Core Strategy Policy 5 Consultation.

	<p>CEMEX Bawburgh: CEMEX's Bawburgh site is situated east of Bawburgh, next to Chapel Break. To the west of the site is the A47. The majority of the southern part of the site is within the Water Recreational Area (policy, BAW1) of the South Norfolk Local Plan (2007). CEMEX therefore urges the Council to consider the site's potential for leisure related uses or for a water sports venue.</p> <p>In our letter of representation to the Joint Core Strategy Regulation 25 Consultation in September 2008, CEMEX supported Option 1, which set out a target of 4,000 dwellings within the South West sector, as we consider this area to be a sustainable location for future growth.</p> <p>With regard to the South West region, and in particular Hethersett, residential development in this location would support a requirement for further recreational space. Hethersett is a sustainable settlement with many local amenities including a range of schools, a dental surgery and a number of other facilities. CEMEX therefore supports a focus for development in the South West sector (as proposed in Policy 5, Option 1) and consider their site in Bawburgh for water sports/recreational space.</p> <p>CEMEX considers the development of this site for such use to be in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation, Objective ii, which encourages:</p> <p>"The provision of appropriate leisure opportunities to enable urban and rural dwellers to enjoy the wider countryside."</p> <p>O - 9774 - 8191 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9796</p>	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>No, we do not agree that Cringleford should have a further 1200 homes and do not accept that Option 0 is the preferred option. Please see answers to Q1 for reasons. We strongly oppose any further development of Cringleford on this scale.</p> <p>O - 9796 - 7513 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9812</p>	<p>Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029] - OBJECT</p>

Paper - 23/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Long Stratton Parish Council does not support Option 0, the Partnership's favoured Option. It is apparent from the result of a survey undertaken by the Parish Council, via the Village Magazine, and views expressed by residents during a public participation period at a recent Parish Council meeting, that two thirds of those responding and giving views are against the proposal, with only one third of those responding being in favour of the number of new homes proposed and then only conditional upon a Long Stratton Bypass being in place first. Having considered the views of residents and debated the matter, the Parish Council objects to Option 0 and cannot support the proposal.

The Parish Council is concerned as to why the Option 0 proposal was made, given that the GNDP Issues and Options Report on which the residents were previously consulted, stated that "Long Stratton provides a wide range of local services and some local job opportunities. It is poorly related to strategic employment sites. Even with a bypass, road access and public transport accessibility to Norwich or to the south is poor. This might constrain employment growth in the village. It does not appear to be a suitable location for further investigation for Strategic Growth at this time."

The result of a survey carried out by South Norfolk Council, on the subject of major housing growth in Long Stratton in return for a bypass, indicated that 63.1% of respondents were in favour of less than 1,500 homes, as opposed to 36.9% being in favour of large or medium-scale development. Of the 63.1%, only 32.2% indicated up to 1,500 dwellings, the remainder being divided as to 15.8% for another number and 15.1% for no dwellings.

There is concern that Option 0 is now the preferred Option - circumstances have not changed and it is considered that answers should have been provided to relevant questions - for example, confirmation of forward funding for the bypass - before any responses were requested. The future of Long Stratton depends upon the results of the current Public Consultation, which did not go to every household.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PARISH COUNCIL OPPOSES THE PREFERRED OPTION 0.

O - 9812 - 2029 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

9862

Diocese of Norwich [2708] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr William Lusty) [7762]) - **OBJECT**

Paper - 27/04/09

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>The Diocese of Norwich welcome the various 'standards of design' listed within Policy 5 - Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area.</p> <p>In terms of the broad locations for major growth, the Diocese of Norwich consider that Wymondham represents a highly sustainable opportunity for further growth. Consequently, the Diocese of Norwich considers that Wymondham could be the subject of higher levels of growth than is envisaged by Policy 5. The Regulation 25 Consultation Technical Consultation envisaged that 4,000 dwellings could be forthcoming at Wymondham under Option 1. The Diocese consider that this would be a more appropriate growth requirement for Wymondham than is envisaged under Policy 5 as it is currently drafted.</p> <p>O - 9862 - 2708 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9901</p>	<p>Mr Peter Sutton [8219] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 27/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Once again I object to the huge development in the Old Catton/Sprowston/Rackheath/Thorpe triangle. This would destroy acres of green land, create a logistical nightmare and probably result in the disappearance of these parishes as they become subsumed into Norwich City. I also query the need for this number of dwellings in the first place.</p> <p>O - 9901 - 8219 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>9950</p>	<p>Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd [8222] (represented by DPP LLP (Mr Geoff Armstrong) [8221]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHED REPRESENTATIONS PREPARED ON BEHALF OF GLADEDAL (ANGLIA) LTD (DPP REF: GA/EC/1016008/10002EC)</p> <p>O - 9950 - 8222 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the</p>

favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

9953

Costco Wholesale UK Ltd [6950] (represented by RPS (Ms Zoe Auckland) [8225]) - **OBJECT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

These representations are submitted on behalf of Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Costco) who operate a number of wholesale warehouse clubs throughout the country, typically located on employment land. Costco is a sui generis membership warehouses club created to serve the wholesaling needs of the small to medium sized business owner. We agree with the Favoured Option in that it promotes employment development at strategic locations, although these representations seek a wider definition of 'Employment Use' within the Glossary of the Joint Core Strategy, to recognise employment generating sui generis uses. Representations were submitted on behalf of Costco to the previous Technical Consultation in August 2008, but the Technical Consultation did not include a glossary.

These representations seek an amendment to the employment definition as follows:

"Employment use: Use primarily for industrial, warehousing, office or other business uses falling within classes b1, b2 and b8 of the use classes order and closely related uses not falling within a use class, i.e. sui generis, but which are commonly found in employment locations. Generally other forms of employment such as retail entertainment etc. are covered by specific policies or policies for a specific area, e.g. the city centre."

Justification for amendment: The Joint Core Strategy should include a flexible definition of uses appropriate on employment land to create guidance for local authorities and developers and to promote a wide range of jobs.

The proposed definition recognises sui generis uses which are commonly found in employment locations. Sui generis uses are an established and accepted use of employment allocated land. They each generate employment often at greater levels than B1, B2 and B8. Sui generis uses are an important part of the economy.

The draft consultation PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Development) document was released in December 2007. Under the heading 'Recognising the needs of business', the document advises a flexible approach on employment land stating that:

"... local planning authorities should plan for, and facilitate a supply of land which will be able to cater for the differing needs

of businesses and the expected employment needs of the whole community, but which is flexible enough to be responsive to a changing economy or new business requirements. Local authorities should avoid designating sites for single or restricted use classes wherever possible, and avoid carrying forward existing allocations where this cannot be justified."

The policy document also recommends that local authorities should cater for a broad range of business types and include criteria based policies to facilitate a broad range of employment uses.

The adopted Broadland Local Plan, at Paragraph 5.11, accepts that some sui generis uses are appropriate on employment land. It states that:

"There are certain other uses which are "sui generis" (not within a specific use class) but are similar in nature to B1, B2 or B8 uses and provide employment. Proposals for such uses in employment sites will be considered on their merits."

In our opinion, an amended definition will assist Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Councils by providing additional clarity for both the Councils and developers by which to assess proposals and provides the flexibility needed to ensure that employment land is used, in the first instance, for a wide range of employment opportunities in support of the favoured growth option.

O - 9953 - 6950 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10078 **Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]** (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) -

OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd have consistently promoted Enquiry by Design as a planning and design tool, which engages the community, stakeholders, full design team and local interests at the outset of the master planning process. As such, we support the statement that all growth locations will be master planned to achieve the highest possible standards of design. It may be appropriate to suggest design methodologies without being specific.

We broadly support the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area, specifically with regard to the recognition of the Old Catton/Sprowston/Rackheath/Thorpe St Andrew growth 'triangle', which accepts the principle of major

growth in the North East Norwich sector.

However, with reference to our response to question 4 above, we note inconsistencies with this policy and other parts of the strategy with regard to the housing allocations for the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle. Although it is noted that growth in this area is expected to rise to 10,000, we consider that, for the sake of clarity and consistency, this be amended to state that growth in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle is expected to rise to at least 10,000 dwellings after 2026.

We note that the potential for further growth in the North East sector with the identification of 2,000 dwellings to be accommodated as possible additions to named growth areas. As highlighted above, it is anticipated that a sustainable urban extension in North east Norwich can accommodate growth over and above the 7,000 dwellings allocated for the Old Catton/Sprowston/Rackheath/Thorpe St Andrew growth 'triangle'. As such, we consider that the additional 2,000 dwellings could be accommodated in a sustainable urban extension to North East Norwich. This would have a number of benefits as it would ensure that these additional dwellings form part of a comprehensive master plan, which would also benefit from the necessary infrastructure provision identified through the master planning process.

O - 10078 - 8234 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10088 Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - OBJECT

Web - 28/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

This plan will swamp places that are already fairly developed and threatens to open them up to the building of houses on a mass scale, making Norfolk look the same as everywhere else in the country. Small centres of (historic) interest will be surrounded by a sea of estates. The Hethersett Cringleford, Wymondham numbers are totally unacceptable. I have the strongest objections.

O - 10088 - 8235 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10105 Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT

Web - 30/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich

Policy Area?

Development should be retained with the Norwich boundaries with a new town at Long Stratton

O - 10105 - 8239 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10195 Hopkins Homes Limited [8247] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - **OBJECT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

We do not agree with the 'favoured' option as the proposed distribution is not sustainable, it does not comply with national and regional policy and is not the most deliverable option for the area.

The favoured option proposed a significant amount of housing in Long Stratton, Hethersett and Cringleford. The amount of growth proposed at Long Stratton would more than double the size of the existing settlement. This scale of growth would be very hard to integrate, especially given that the settlement has limited facilities, as demonstrated in our supporting Settlement Assessment. The settlement has limited employment opportunities, and is not well linked to strategic employment sites. Long Stratton High School is over-subscribed. Hethersett also has limited employment opportunities. Hethersett is constrained by a lack of retail and healthcare opportunities. Hethersett High School is over-subscribed and whilst the relocation of the adjoining primary would provide additional capacity for growth at Hethersett and Cringleford, Hethersett High School is not within a sustainable distance of Cringleford. Whilst Cringleford is well connected to Norwich, key facilities are not within a walkable distance of the village.

As a main town in the settlement hierarchy, Wymondham has greater potential for accommodating growth than the smaller villages of Hethersett, Long Stratton and Cringleford. Wymondham has a diverse range of retail, employment and social facilities. The town is well connected with a railway station and a number of bus services. Whilst improvements are required to educational provision, these can be facilitated via development as set out by Norfolk County Council Children's Services in their responses to the Technical Consultation. A number of key stakeholders and delivery agents (EERA, EEDA, Anglian Water, Norfolk County Council, Breckland Council) stated that the previously suggested 4,000 dwellings in Wymondham was the most deliverable option as previously proposed. EERA stated that this option was the most compliant with the RSS, EERA also expressed concerns regarding growth at Long Stratton due to funding problems relating to the required bypass.

The favoured option has evolved considerably from the initial growth options considered in some of the evidence base

documents. For example, greater analysis is required of the impact of the favoured option with regards to retail, infrastructure, green infrastructure and employment, as a result the evidence should be updated.

PPS12 requires:

"Every local planning authority should produce a core strategy which includes:

- (1) an overall vision which sets out how the area and the places within it should develop;
- (2) strategic objectives for the area focussing on the key issues to be addressed;
- (3) a delivery strategy for achieving these objectives. This should set out how much development is intended to happen where, when and by what means it will be delivered. Locations for strategic development should be indicated on a key diagram; and
- (4) clear arrangements for managing and monitoring the delivery of the strategy."

A Local Development Framework must:

"set out as far as practicable when, where and by whom these actions will take place. It needs to demonstrate that the agencies/partners necessary for its delivery have been involved in its preparation, and the resources required have been given due consideration and have realistic prospect of being provided in the life of the strategy. If this is not the case, the strategy will be undeliverable."

Paragraph 4.6 states that:

"Core strategies may allocate strategic sites for development. These should be those sites considered central to achievement of the strategy. Progress on the core strategy should not be held up by inclusion of non strategic sites."

Paragraph 4.8 states:

"The core strategy should be supported by evidence of what physical, social and green infrastructure is needed to enable the amount of development proposed for the area, taking account of its type and distribution. This evidence should cover who will provide the infrastructure and when it will be provided. The core strategy should draw on and in parallel influence any strategies and investment plans of the local authority and other organisations."

Paragraph 4.9

"Good infrastructure planning considers the infrastructure required to support development, costs, sources of funding, timescales for delivery and gaps in funding. This allows for the identified infrastructure to be prioritised in discussions with key local partners. This has been a major themes highlighted and considered via HM Treasury's CSR07 Policy Review on Supporting Housing Growth. The infrastructure planning process should identify, as far as possible:

- infrastructure needs and costs;
- phasing of development;

- funding sources; and
- responsibilities for delivery."

At current the favoured option is not compliant with PPS12 as it does not have a sound and robust evidence base and as a result is unsound.

PPS3 states Local Development Documents should:

"set out a strategy for the planned location of new housing which contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Local Planning Authorities should, working with stakeholders, set out the criteria to be used for identifying broad locations and specific sites taking into account:

Any physical, environmental, land ownership, land-use, investment constraints, contamination, stability, flood risk, the need to protect natural resources, e.g. water and biodiversity and complex land ownership issues.

Accessibility of proposed development to existing local community facilities, infrastructure and services, including public transport. The location of housing should facilitate the creation of communities of sufficient size and mix to justify the development of, and sustain, community facilities, infrastructure and services." (Paragraph 38)

As discussed in the supporting Entec Settlement Assessment the proposed locations are unsustainable or have insufficient infrastructure and, as a result, the favoured option is unsound.

PPS3 states that sites should be developable, in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available for development, and could be developed at the point envisaged.

Once identified by the Local Authority, the supply of land should be managed in a way that ensures that a continuous five year supply of deliverable sites is maintained, i.e. at least enough sites to deliver the housing requirements over the next five years of the housing trajectory.

Development sites should also be achievable, the proposed housing trajectory should be robust and provide certainty. The favoured option proposes:

- 2,000 homes at Broadland smaller sites in the NPA and possible additions to named growth locations.
- 1,800 homes at South Norfolk smaller sites in the NPA and possible additions to named growth locations.

This approach lacks clarity and does not provide a clear deliverable, developable and achievable structure for the delivery of

housing within the Plan period. As a result, the favoured option is unsound as it is not compliant with PPS3.

Policy SS4 - Towns other than Key Centres and Rural Areas states that:

"Local Development Documents should define the approach to development in towns other than those listed in Policy SS3 and in rural areas. Such towns include selected market towns and others with the potential to increase their economic and social sustainability through measures to:

- support urban and rural renaissance
- secure appropriate amounts of new housing, including affordable housing, local employment and other facilities; and
- improve the town's accessibility, especially by public transport.

Local Development Documents should also consider the potential of other key service centres to accommodate development which is sympathetic to local character and of an appropriate scale and nature in relation to local housing and employment needs. For other rural settlements, they should seek to support the viability of agriculture and other economic activities, diversification of the economy, the provision of housing for local needs and the sustainability of local services."

The favoured option proposed is not in compliance with Policy SS4 of the RSS, as the level of growth proposed at the Key Service Centre and villages is inappropriate in relation to infrastructure and employment opportunities. As a result the option is unsound.

In line with the RSS a greater amount of housing growth should be allocated to Wymondham.

O - 10195 - 8247 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10217 Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - OBJECT

Paper - 30/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

2200 dwellings for Wymondham is too high a figure - 1000 should be the limit as otherwise the historic character of the town will be lost. There should be no development within 400 metres of any historic buildings in the open countryside otherwise the historic rural setting of the buildings would be lost.

O - 10217 - 5864 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10302

mrs LISA ford [8282] - OBJECT

Web - 07/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

I object to the amount of housing allocated to the South West of Norwich and Wymondham.

Cringleford is spreading further towards Hethersett and Wymondham is increasing in size significantly already - losing its identity as a market town and becoming a suburb for Norwich and even Cambridge. Hethersett will lose its village identity and community spirit with any further development.

Increased traffic in this area has become very noticeable with the existing new developments - increasing noise pollution and accidents for existing residents.

O - 10302 - 8282 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10318

CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - OBJECT

Paper - 27/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

The strategy takes a 'greenfield-first' approach. The areas proposed as major growth locations will simply suburbanise large areas of rural Norfolk and impact heavily on the tranquillity of the local countryside and the character of market towns and villages.

There are no policy targets for use of previously developed land and it is not clear how the strategy will be measured against the RSS brownfield target of 60%. Given this, and the level of greenfield land allocation proposed, the spatial objective (Objective 8) that 'the use of previously developed land will be prioritised to minimise the loss of agricultural land and countryside' is almost meaningless.

CPRE would prefer an approach to strategic planning that focused more development in urban areas, rather than on greenfield land. To this end, we would like to see a scaling down of housing numbers in the NPA towns and villages of South Norfolk and Broadland, and at Rackheath. In line with this, the figure for new allocations for Norwich should be increased to take a larger proportion of all build in the NPA. A slowing of housing delivery targets would maximise opportunities for previously developed land as it becomes available.

	<p>We strongly object to the north east growth triangle concept and the very large area it covers. It will have considerable impacts on the rural landscape of Broadland and contribute to a major loss of greenfield land and significant impacts on tranquillity, congestion, light pollution and rural character. It would also very badly skew the spatial strategy, being away from the major employment locations in the south west quadrant.</p> <p>The mismatch between the major growth location for housing (North-East) and the centre of gravity for employment opportunities (South-West) is a key weakness of the spatial strategy and further undermines the strategy's stated objective (Objective 11) to reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>O - 10318 - 6826 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10456</p>	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? We must stay as we are to try and stop the north and south poles from melting.</p> <p>O - 10456 - 8309 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10484</p>	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? The best way to minimise climate change is not to create huge amounts of CO2 by the development of houses and the building of roads. No large development.</p> <p>O - 10484 - 8310 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10536</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT Web - 09/06/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>There is too much development proposed for the South Norfolk and Broadland areas</p> <p>O - 10536 - 8312 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10561	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>There are currently nearly a million empty properties across the UK. We do not need any more. Besides the inability to provide sufficient water in this area makes this idea nonsense. We need to retain water in this region for food production.</p> <p>O - 10561 - 8318 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10584	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10584 - 8319 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
10657	<p>Goymour Properties Ltd. [8271] (represented by Andrew Martin Associates (Mr Michael Calder) [7689]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>We do not agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) for the following reasons:</p>

1. We have serious concerns with regard to the delivery of 7,000 dwellings at the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle;
2. The allocation for Broadland smaller sites in the NPA should not also relate to "possible additions to named growth locations";
3. We query the allocation of 1,200 dwellings at Cringleford; and
4. The allocation for Broadland smaller sites in the NPA should be increased from 2,000, given that the Royal Norwich Golf Club can contribute a significant number of dwellings (between 500 and 850) and we would not wish to see the development of this site constrained.

Details of our representations are set out below:

1. 7,000 dwellings at the Growth Triangle

Firstly, we query whether the quantum of development proposed can be accommodated on the ground. Appendix 0 identifies that the development will be in the form of an urban extension and will include at least 7,000 dwellings in the Plan period, rising to at least 10,000 dwellings beyond 2026.

In order to demonstrate the potential land take of the development proposed, we have prepared illustrative plans showing a number of development options (ref: 08074/04). These plans are based on the crude calculation of a development including 5,000 dwellings requiring around 250ha and a development including 10,000 dwellings would require around 500ha. The land parcels shown are based on the areas identified by Broadland Council as having potential for development but also exclude the existing urban areas. It should be noted that these plans are for illustrative purposes only and do not exclude any constrained land, such as woodland and the proposed Norwich Northern Distributor Road, which will bisect the development, or any buffers required to avoid coalescence between settlements. It can be concluded therefore that the land take for the level of development proposed is actually likely to be greater than shown on the illustrative plans.

With regard to the form of a single urban extension of the size proposed (in accordance with Appendix 0), it would need to broadly take the form proposed in Option 1. This would lead to settlement coalescence and result in a new community bisected by the proposed NNDDR.

Development in the growth triangle could take the form of two urban extensions as shown in the option 2. Whilst this would

lead to the creation of two new communities, it may possibly be contained by the NNDR.

Secondly, putting aside our concerns regarding the availability of sufficient land, we query whether the quantum of development proposed can be accommodated within the Plan period, within the growth triangle as it is a relatively small geographical area. In our experience, there is a time lag of around 5 years between the submission of an application for a site and first completions. In this case, we estimate that an application may be submitted by 2011 at the earliest, resulting in a first build year of 2016. This would require average annual completions of 636 dwellings in order to have built 7,000 dwellings by the end of the Plan period.

We consider that this is an unrealistic level and that a maximum of 400 dwellings per annum represents a more realistic estimate. It is our experience that even if there are a number of parcels being brought forward either on one site or within a limited geographical area, this average rate is unlikely to be exceeded as developers will build in line with market demand. Allowing for slightly slower completion rates initially, we estimate that 4,150 is a more realistic estimate for such a single area within the Plan period. A summary of this is set out below:

Year	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Completions required to achieve allocation	636	636	636	636	636	636	636	636	636	636	636	7,000
AMA estimate	200	350	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	4,150
AMA estimate of shortfall	2,850											

Although the calculations above provide a relatively crude assessment, we consider that the maximum allocation for the growth triangle should be 4,000 dwellings. More detailed workings will be required in due course to establish the exact quantum of development that can be achieved.

We are concerned that such a high level of development is proposed in this area when there are still so many uncertainties. We query whether there is sufficient infrastructure, e.g. sewerage, transport, to accommodate so much development. Clearly the Norwich Northern Distributor Road is an important element of the Council's strategy, yet it is unclear from the consultation document whether this distributor road has fixed funding or programme. Since it is recognised under paragraph 8.18 of the consultation document as transport infrastructure to "unlock growth" it is assumed that it is a pre-requisite for the new development. In light of the above, we consider that a development of the size proposed can not be accommodated within the growth triangle. PPS3 recognises the importance of a flexible supply of land for housing and the need for "available", "suitable" and "achievable" sites for housing and we do not believe that this is currently achieved within the Joint Core Strategy.

We consider that it is imperative that the Council examines the potential for development within the growth triangle in advance of setting the quantum of development to be achieved. Whilst we do not dispute that there are sustainability merits of providing new development in this area, further consideration needs to be given to the level of development that can be accommodated, having regard to other factors. A realistic assessment of housing capacity both within and beyond the Plan period needs to be made so that sufficient sites can be allocated elsewhere providing greater certainty that the housing target will be achieved and that there is contingency and flexibility within the strategy.

We are aware that Rackheath has been identified as a potential eco-town location (Draft PPS: Eco-towns - Consultation, 2009). In order for an eco-town location to be brought forward it will need to be "a new settlement, separate and distinct" and of sufficient size and have the necessary services to establish their own character and identity and so have the critical mass necessary to deliver much higher standards of sustainability (Draft Eco-town PPS, 2009). The Draft PPS goes on to state that eco-towns should make provision for a minimum of 5,000 and it is widely recognised that there is a direct correlation between settlement size and sustainability, making it desirable to achieve larger settlements where feasible.

Whilst Appendix 0 identifies that an "eco-community" may be progressed within the growth triangle in line with current proposals, it does not recognise that to be in accordance with the Draft PPS it would need to be a separate settlement of at least 5,000. Further it does not explain whether an eco-town would be in addition to the proposed urban extension. It is our view that there is insufficient land to provide even a small eco-town in this location, either as part of or in addition to the 10,000 dwellings proposed for the growth triangle without severely compromising the existing built and natural environment (see attached options 3 and 4 ref: 08074/04).

2. "Possible additions to named growth locations"

In light of our submissions above, it would be wholly unrealistic to apportion any of the allocation for the Broadland NPA smaller sites to the growth triangle. For the reasons set out above, we do not consider that the 7,000 figure is achievable within the Plan period, due to insufficient land and delay in delivery and to enable this figure to be increased is unrealistic. Around 2,850 of this allocation should actually be re-allocated to other parts of the Greater Norwich area, such as the Broadlands NPA.

3. 1,200 at Cringleford

The inclusion of 1,200 dwellings at Cringleford was not considered as part of the previous options for major development. There is no explanation as to why this development has now been included. As a new option this will require the application of a Sustainability Appraisal.

Although Cringleford lies in close proximity to the south-western edge of the City, it is currently a self contained settlement with a separate identity. A substantial expansion of 1,200 would cover between 40 and 50 ha and could result in coalescence with Norwich and a loss of identity.

4. Increased allocation for Smaller Sites in Broadland NPA

As identified above, we do not consider that all of the development proposed for the Growth Triangle can be achieved and this provides an opportunity to re-distribute dwellings during the Plan period. We consider that the allocation for the Broadland NPA should be increased given that the Royal Norwich Golf Club can contribute a significant number of dwellings (between 500 and 850) and we would not wish to see the development of this site constrained. In order to ensure that suitable sites are not constrained, it is our view that the Council should still seek a greater number of dwellings in the Broadland NPA, at least in accordance with the Council's previous Option 3 (Regulation 25: Technical Consultation Stage).

A position update and key characteristics relating to this representation site (in accordance with our previous representations to the Technical Consultation, September 2008) is provided below:

Detailed representations were submitted by Savills on behalf of the Members of the RNGC to Broadland District Council in August 2006. We do not consider that it is necessary to provide such detail at this stage to the Joint Core Strategy. However, in recognition of the potential of this site to make a significant contribution, we attach an indicative masterplan (ref: 08074/03a) and summarise the latest position and key characteristics of the site below:

Position Update:

- Goymour Homes has an interest in the planning and promotion of Royal Norwich Golf Club (RNGC) and is seeking residential development on this site. AMA is acting as agents for Goymour Homes.
- Members of the RNGC have voted in favour of selling the site to Goymour Homes and relocating to Weston Park Golf Club. They endorse the proposals as the site no longer fully meets their requirements. Restrictions on course expansion, due to the site being now surrounded by built development, together with the split nature of the site, have lead to Members seeking an alternative site for the golf course.
- The golf club will be relocated to the Weston Park Golf Club (which is just 11km from the representation site). This will enable Weston Park to be upgraded from an 18 hole course to a 27 hole championship facility. Membership of both courses has

lessened over recent years and the proposals will ensure survival of both clubs.

- In order to progress the development of this site, a meeting has been held with officers at Broadland District Council.
- The requirement for further technical studies has been identified and initial work has commenced. By the time of the next consultation, further updated information will be available.
- Since our last submission we have become aware of the HSEs zones for control of hazardous substances. We propose to develop this site in accordance with the HSE currently advise against residential development on the southern part of the site and therefore the indicative masterplan has been amended to show this.

Key Characteristics:

- The site is deliverable within the Plan period. The landowners and the developers are committed to bringing proposals forward;
- The site is capable of accommodating around 500 to 850 dwellings, contributing towards the housing requirements for the area;
- Development will provide affordable housing in accordance with the Council's requirements. It could also contribute towards improvements to local leisure and community facilities either by financial contribution towards existing facilities or on site provision;
- The development could include some non-residential uses such as offices or warehousing;
- The proposals would include on site open space which would be accessible for new and existing residents (unlike the golf course, which is restricted to members);
- Highly sustainable location within the existing urban built form of Norwich, adjoining existing employment and residential development;
- The site lies in close proximity to a wide range of facilities and services;
- The site benefits from existing bus routes connecting the site with the City Centre and the railway station. The proposals

would contribute towards public transport improvements, as necessary;

- Although Drayton Road suffers congestion at peak times, various junction improvements undertaken by the Council, coupled with the proposed Norwich Northern Distributor Road will improve the traffic in the vicinity of the site. Assessments will be undertaken with regard to the impact of the proposed development and appropriate mitigation measures will be implemented;
- Although this is a green field site, it is important to recognise that there is insufficient brownfield land to accommodate housing and therefore sustainable green field sites, such as this will come forward in the Plan period;
- Land lies within Flood Zone 1 and therefore the site is not at risk from flooding;
- The surface water from impermeable areas will be designed as a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS);
- The site is previously undeveloped and would not require decontamination; and
- Development would not affect any listed buildings or Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

O - 10657 - 8271 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

10823 North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - **OBJECT**
Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

We broadly support the favoured option for development in the NPA, specifically with regard to the recognition that Wymondham should accommodate growth. In addition support is given to the Catton/Sproston/Rackheath/Thorpe and St Andrew growth 'triangle', which accepts the principle of major growth in the north east Norwich sector. However, the Landowners have the following comments on the proposal for growth in certain locations.

In reading through the numerous documents made available through the process leading to this Regulation 25 Consultation it is plainly obvious there is little support for development or justification to impose development upon Long Stratton. The single reason given for development is the need for a bypass. Such a suggestion does not consider the issue of developing in sustainable locations the weakness of Long Stratton in this context is set out in the Sustainability Assessment.

	<p>Development in Easton is unjustifiable; it has no local facilities that can justify it being regarded as a sustainable location.</p> <p>Hethersett is a dormitory village totally reliant upon Norwich and Wymondham and provides few job opportunities.</p> <p>Conversely it is clearly demonstrated through the Sustainability Appraisal that Wymondham is the highest ranking location for growth outside Norwich City itself and this is recognised in The East of England Plan and indeed Option 1 of the preferred Options stage of the Issues and Options Consultation process November 2007 to February 2008.</p> <p>On the basis of sound planning principles Policy 5 should be redrafted to omit Hethersett, Easton and Long Stratton as locations for major change and development and raise the new dwelling provision Wymondham to 6,500.</p> <p>O - 10823 - 8362 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10850</p>	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Please see comments to questions 4 & 5.</p> <p>O - 10850 - 8018 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -</p>
<p>10886</p>	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>We broadly support the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area, specifically with regard to the recognition of the Old Catton/Sprowston/Rackheath/Thorpe and St Andrew growth 'triangle', which accepts the principle of major growth in the north east Norwich sector.</p> <p>The BLT are unable to comment on the deliverability of growth outside of their remit</p>

and therefore neither agree nor disagree with the extent of the growth area in so far as it extends outside of the area being promoted by the BLT. However, it is considered that the area being promoted by the BLT is the most sustainable and coherent location for growth. Whilst it is recognised that growth will need to be coordinated in terms of infrastructure, it is considered that the urban extension being promoted by the BLT will be a sustainable but integrated development, for the reasons set out above.

The BLT also has the following comments on the objectives for growth as set out in this policy.

Masterplanning

The BLT has initiated an EbD process, championed by the PFBE. The purpose of the EbD process is the creation of a masterplan as the culmination of a collaborative approach with relevant stakeholders and the range of professional disciplines. The first stage of this process has been undertaken whereby members of the GNDP and its constituent local authorities together with other stakeholders have started to scope the issues associated with planning for growth in this area. The findings of this scoping exercise will supplement these representations. The next stage will, through a series of workshops, not only consult representatives of existing communities and other stakeholders on development proposals but also proactively engage them in the creation of the vision for the urban extension as well as planning for the development itself. This ensures that existing communities and other stakeholders can communicate their concerns and specific requirements as well as being able to articulate how they envisage that the new development will deliver key objectives for growth and integrate communities. The outcome will be a masterplan for the urban extension, planned and designed with active involvement from Broadland District Council, local residents and other relevant stakeholders.

Deliver healthy, sustainable communities and locally distinctive design

The BLT promotes the concept of sustainable urbanism. The new urban extension will be located and designed to create healthy and sustainable communities by collocating a mix of uses that are easily accessible to existing communities and provide a range of services, facilities and employment opportunities to serve their needs and those of future communities thus reducing the need to travel. The new urban extension will also integrate a range of recreational opportunities and community facilities that promote health and well-being. In addition, it is anticipated that the

new urban extension will be designed to integrate and be sympathetic to the existing urban fabric whilst ensuring that new communities have a distinct character and sense of place.

Achieve a high level of self-containment while integrating well with neighbouring communities

The way in which growth is planned should help to build new communities and integrate them with existing ones. The concept of sustainable urbanism includes a mix of uses, services and facilities that are appropriately situated to generate a level of self-containment in order to provide people with the opportunity to interact with one another. Through the masterplanning process, the location of such facilities will be established in order to optimise the opportunity to provide additional amenities for existing communities, while providing viable centres to new communities. An important factor in this will be developing an understanding of the relationship between uses in order that public transport nodes are considered in relation to the location of education provision, which in turn, are traditionally located close to local shopping and other childcare facilities. This is to ensure that an adequate level of footfall can be established to benefit and sustain the viability of these functions and support more sustainable movement patterns.

Be designed around walking and cycling for local journeys and public transport for longer journeys

In creating sustainable communities, it is important that a range of essential local services are available within an easy walking distance of people's homes in order to minimise car journeys as well as providing focal points for the community to socialise and interact. This is a key principle of 'walkable neighbourhoods', which the BLT will incorporate within a new urban extension to north east Norwich. Each neighbourhood will also be linked by a series of permeable routes, which will also encourage more sustainable movement patterns.

The land being promoted by the BLT will link growth with existing, planned and potential opportunities for strategic transport improvements, including opportunities to incorporate rail, bus and park and ride services.

Include Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) on site or nearby energy generation, for example Combined Heat and Power and Cooling (CHCP) and water saving technologies

The BLT will, through the master planning process, explore appropriate methods

and best practices related to sustainable design and construction and, where possible, incorporate these into the design of the development including measures to reduce water and energy consumption and waste generation. It may be appropriate for a range of energy efficient and renewable energy technologies to be incorporated within development in the growth area. However, these should be considered in terms of viability and feasibility. In addition, the opportunity to create and utilise linked natural water features as sustainable urban drainage systems will be explored through the development of a green infrastructure framework. Include new primary schools, local retail and other services, small scale employment opportunities and primary healthcare facilities and ensure high quality telecommunications and adequate energy supply and sewerage infrastructure

The BLT acknowledge the need for new infrastructure to support the growth of the city, which relate to the need for new transport, social and utility/service infrastructure.

The delivery of such infrastructure requires the coordination of a range of public sector organisations and the private sector. As part of a potential EbD for the master planning of the north east sector, we anticipate the full range of public and private agencies concerned with the supply of infrastructure to be involved in the process. It is expected that the result of this exercise will be a detailed infrastructure requirement strategy.

Housing supply

With reference to our response to question 4 above, we note inconsistencies with this policy and other parts of the strategy with regard to the housing allocations for the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle. Although it is noted that growth in this area is expected to rise to 10,000, we consider that, for the sake of clarity and consistency, this be amended to state that growth in the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew growth triangle is expected to rise to at least 10,000 dwellings after 2026. It should be noted that the precise number of homes to be delivered depends on a variety of factors, including the mix and type of housing required. This will be determined through a detailed design process. Therefore, the core strategy should make clear, that such figures are for indicative purposes only and will not constrain the quantum of development.

We note the potential for further growth in the North East sector with the identification of 2000 dwellings to be accommodated as possible additions to named growth areas. As highlighted above, it is anticipated that a sustainable urban extension in North East Norwich can accommodate growth over and above the 7,000 dwellings allocated for the Old Catton/Sprowston/Rackheath/Thorpe and St Andrew growth 'triangle'. As such, we consider that the additional 2000 dwellings could be accommodated in a sustainable urban extension to North East Norwich. This would have a number of benefits, as it would ensure that these additional dwellings form part of a comprehensive master plan, which would also benefit from the necessary infrastructure provision identified through the master planning process.

O - 10886 - 8366 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

11023	<p>Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr John Long) [8211]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?</p> <p>Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd supports the continued identification of Wymondham as a strategic growth location in the "Favoured Options" and its role in the Spatial Vision. Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd contend that the next iteration of the Joint Core Strategy should acknowledge the need to allocate and release further land at Wymondham for commercial uses, to support the identified housing growth and contribute to a balanced settlement in terms of housing and job growth.</p> <p>Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd continues to contend that existing employment sites in Wymondham such as Ayton Road and Gateway 11 are currently full or very close to being fully occupied, with the majority of the other Wymondham sites identified in the Greater Norwich Employment Growth site and Premises Study being of a smaller scale and offering less scope for comprehensive development proposals. Also proposals for other new employment allocations at Wymondham are contingent upon major housing and infrastructure proposals coming forward, such as Pelham Homes scheme for South Wymondham whose delivery is by no means certain.</p> <p>Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd have demonstrated through previous material sent to the GNDP that there are no fundamental barriers to growth at east Wymondham, and that it is capable of delivery.</p>
--------------	---

Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd objects to the Core Strategy's objective (objective 5, page 13) that seeks to safeguard all employment sites for employment purposes. This approach is contrary to National Planning Policy in PPS3: Housing (para. 44) that requires the consideration of site allocations for employment land to be considered for other uses, including housing, if it is more appropriate.

Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd contend that the GNDP should therefore not automatically seek to safeguard all existing employment sites and allocations for their own sake. Some of these sites will inevitably be no longer fit for purpose for modern business and will be better given over to alternative uses. A thorough consideration of the appropriateness of existing sites and allocations is required before determining the level of new allocations required.

Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd contends that the Joint Core Strategy and subsequent site allocations documents will need to identify sufficient amounts of new employment land in strategic locations that is fit for purpose for modern business. In Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd's opinions, to seek to limit the amount of new employment land allocations on the basis that all existing employment sites will be safeguarded, irrespective of whether they are suitable for business use over the longer period and/or attractive to commercial developers, will put an artificial throttle on job growth.

Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd suggests that land to the east of Wymondham represents a suitable and available location for a commercial led mixed use area. The material previously submitted to the GNDP demonstrates a strategic employment location in this location is deliverable. Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd therefore contends that the next iteration of the Joint Core Strategy should acknowledge the need for new employment allocations in Wymondham and identify the east of the town as a general location for growth.

O - 11023 - 2425 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

11089 Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

No. For the reasons outlined in responses to Qs above.

Additional Comments

- The transport carbon impacts of the Favoured Growth Option should be assessed to test whether the strategy delivers urban growth which overall reduce the need to travel, especially by car, in accordance with PPS1 Planning and Climate Change.
- Ambiguity over the numbers of dwellings proposed for a Rackheath eco-community. Depending on the document read, they range from 3,400 to 10,000
- Ambiguity over location of the eco-community vis-a-vis a major urban extension to the north-east: the community may either straddle a NDR or lie to the east.
- Siting an eco community of 3,400 - 4,300 dwellings to the east of a NDR would create a free-standing settlement until completion of the urban extension to the west of a NDR; thereafter the two communities would remain severed by the NDR.
- Questions are raised over the viability of frequent rail and public transport services for serving a small free-standing settlement, especially if competing with a NDR.

Recommended Changes:

- deletion of growth triangle designation and re-balance amount of housing in north-east quadrant to create a better match with location of strategic employment sites to SW of city, at Thorpe St Andrew and in city centre.
- deletion of NDR. Bring forward a BRT system as providing a much better fit with proposed spatial pattern.
- concentrate rather than disperse growth to SW in order to support public transport.
- We would like to see a more extensive public transport network than is shown on the Favoured Growth Option Proposals Map.

We recommend changes to dwelling numbers as shown in the table below.

O - 11089 - 8387 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

11092 Tesco Stores Ltd [8388] (represented by Martin Robeson Planning Practice (Luke Raistrick) [7162]) - **OBJECT**
Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

No (agree in part). It is agreed that the North East sector (Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle) is the most appropriate location for the majority of housing growth in Norwich. It is also agreed that 7000 (rising to 10,000) homes should be delivered in this location. However, in terms of the other identified growth areas, it is felt that better locations exist than those listed in the Council's favoured approach.

The area of land to the north of the A47 southern ring road, along the A140 corridor would appear to be a more logical choice in planning terms - the area is well served by existing infrastructure;

- Park & Ride bus service providing fast and frequent links to the city centre along the A140
- Tesco Harford Bridge foodstore providing convenience and everyday comparison goods for south Norwich.

Growth in this area would also support general urban containment principles and reduce urban sprawl. The A47 also exists as a physical and logical boundary to growth in South Norwich.

O - 11092 - 8388 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

11145 JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area?

OBJECT

Overall, we support Policy 5. However, we do not support the identification of Long Stratton as a location for growth, for the reasons set out in our responses to questions 1 and 2.

O - 11145 - 6979 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), (Q9) Do you agree with the favoured option for development in the Norwich Policy Area? -

Response – Q10 - Q13

For Technical Consultees only

If you received the consultation document in Summer 2008 and were asked to respond then you are a technical consultee

Q10 (Technical consultees only)

Q10 What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q10 Total	37	34	0	3	37

8453 Frederick Watkins (Mr Frederick Watkins) [8013] - COMMENT

Web - 23/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Hethersett Village Hall Management Committee is concerned that the existing Village Hall facilities would be inadequate to serve an expanded village having 1000 extra houses. There would be a need to extend the hall with additional accommodation and facilities for the increased community, social, artistic and sporting activities that the proposed development of the village would generate. A developer contribution to help provide these facilities would be essential.

C - 8453 - 8013 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -

8458 Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] - COMMENT

Web - 23/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Outside of Norwich and NE Norwich the preferred option seems to have spread some development around all locations. As a result green infrastructure at a level appropriate to the scale of development and proximity to other development areas will need to be taken forward. See comments made for individual settlements within our response to the Technical Consultation.

C - 8458 - 953 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -

8755 Highways Agency (Mr Eric Cooper) [8057] - COMMENT

	<p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>The growth triangle will place further pressure on the A47 at the Postwick junction and it is recommended that the improvement proposed for this junction is tested with these additional dwellings in the traffic forecast. The Highways Agency would also recommend a sensitivity test be conducted for the full capacity of 10,000 dwellings to ensure that it can be adequately accommodated in the future</p> <p>It is suggested that checks are made to ensure the scaled down allocation within the Wymondham/Hethersett/Cringleford area, reaches the critical mass required to fund the necessary Public Transport improvements and upgrades to the A11/A47 Thickthorn interchange</p> <p>C - 8755 - 8057 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>8886</p>	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>junction improvements along the A140 which is an important growth corridor such as at the A47. Also some speed restrictions where it passes service villages like Tasburgh and Newton Flotman.</p> <p>C - 8886 - 7620 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>9037</p>	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>More local railway stations</p> <p>Possible use of light rolling-stock for short journeys</p> <p>C - 9037 - 4187 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>

	only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -
9059	<p>Newton Flotman Parish Council (Mrs D Davidson) [2036] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>Before endorsing the proposed development at Long Stratton, we would ask that consideration is given by the Partnership to improving access to the A140 of not just Newton Flotman, but of all villages using the A140 corridor to Norwich.</p> <p>C - 9059 - 2036 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
9061	<p>Chenery Drive Residents Association (Mr R. Craggs) [3412] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>We consider that in the event planners persist with this concept of a major development at Rackheath that it should not be developed until the Northern Distributor Road is at least largely completed. This essential infrastructure is so evidently necessary and has been raised by so many people, that we want to be assured that any development will be conditional on this NDR requirement being carried out?</p> <p>C - 9061 - 3412 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
9063	<p>Norfolk Constabulary 2659 (Mr Duncan Potter) [7653] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>(Q10,11,12) The infrastructure, opportunities and investment response, remains as per my previous letter of 25 September 2008 - except for:</p> <p>The proposed increased growth at Rackheath will make it likely that a facility for the local Police Safer Neighbourhood Team will be required in this new community.</p> <p>Resulting growth around the City of Norwich is likely to disproportionately increase the potential for crime and disorder in</p>

	<p>Norwich City Centre and the extent of Police resources required for this area. This is because it already has the highest crime demand of any Norfolk Safer Neighbourhood Team area (as reported in my last letter) and is the main draw from the proposed developments for the leisure, retail and night-time economy destinations.</p> <p>C - 9063 - 7653 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>9067</p>	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>The parish council have considered the Joint Core Strategy Document issued in March 2009.</p> <p>We wish to reiterate that the proposed scale of development to the north east of Norwich should only proceed after the provision of a proper solution to the upgrade of the Postwick interchange. As you will be aware there are proposals to extend the park and ride site and a planning application for the Broadland Gate Business Park is under consideration. Furthermore, in due course Phase 2 of the Broadland Business Park will be developed. All of this will add considerable strain to the Postwick interchange which is already operating at maximum capacity at peak times. As you can image residents of Postwick are seriously concerned about the effect of this additional traffic which apart from access / entry problems causes an increase in pollution and noise levels.</p> <p>C - 9067 - 7215 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>9091</p>	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>There is need to determine the likely impacts upon the Broads of this scale and distribution of development in the Greater Norwich Area - in terms of, for instance, recreational pressure from increased resident population, increase visitor numbers, effects on water quality and water quantity from the water cycle associated with large scale growth and also from increase or changing travel patterns. The Broads Authority consider that these impacts need to be fully assessed and that appropriate environmental mitigation measures identified and programmed. Such assessments need to be undertaken in advance of, and inform, decisions on the type and distribution of growth.</p>

	<p>C - 9091 - 7986 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>9093</p>	<p>National Grid (Mr Les Morris) [8110] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? Development proposals within the GNDP area will not have a significant effect upon National Grid's infrastructure, both gas and electricity transmission. It is unlikely than any extra growth will create capacity issues for National Grid given the scale of these gas and electricity transmission networks. The existing network should be able to cope with additional demands. The electricity and gas distribution companies in the area are EDF Energy Networks and National Gas Distribution. It will be these suppliers who should be contacted for further information regarding constraints and opportunities that the distribution networks may have on growth in the area, and not the transmission network which operates at a much more strategic level.</p> <p>Contact details are WW.energynetworks.org Information from the Plant Protection Team</p> <p>C - 9093 - 8110 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>9657</p>	<p>Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>Page ii - 1.11 how are they to be provided if development is to fund a bypass as well? Page 1 2.5 Would funding be guaranteed before the proposals are put into practice? Page 4 3.4 The strategy considered these growth targets to 20206 to help the Norwich area prepare for this unprecedented high level of growth - It identifies the supporting infrastructure needed to support growth and shows how the infrastructure will be funded. No info re this!! Page 20 Transport infrastructure will include - Long Stratton bypass. Need to have definite info that this will be provided and by funding by the Government!</p>

C - 9657 - 8165 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -

9850

Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr James Alflatt) [8204]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 22/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Notwithstanding the eventual size of the strategic allocation in Hethersett, Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd believes that there would be no significant infrastructure improvements needed to deliver a minimum of 200 new dwellings in Hethersett. As an example, Gladedale's site, land north of Great Melton Road, could accommodate up to 200 dwellings. There is predicted to be sufficient spare capacity in Hethersett's nursery and high schools to accommodate expected numbers of children from such a development, and Hethersett Junior School would only be above capacity by a relatively small number of pupils (circa 13).

Initial infrastructure capacity assessments have been undertaken, and there is believed to be adequate capacity in Hethersett's existing electricity, gas and water supply networks to adequately service growth of up to 200 dwellings. Foul drainage/waste water treatment capacity in Hethersett is also likely to be sufficient for the delivery of up to 200 dwellings, although Anglian Water has advised that some local improvements to the foul sewers in the vicinity of Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd's site would be needed.

Consultation was undertaken with the Primary Care Trust during the early stages of the preparation of the South Norfolk LDF and the PCT indicated that a Group Practice covers Hethersett, Cringleford and Mulbarton, with three premises. At the time of the consultation, the PCT indicated that expected expansion of the Cringleford surgery would release sufficient capacity to allow a development of up to 200 dwellings in Hethersett. They confirmed that, subject to satisfactory progression of the Cringleford expansion plans, they did not foresee any obstacle to meeting the healthcare needs of the proposed development.

A Transport Assessment of Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd's site (carried out in 2006) concluded that Hethersett had excellent public transport connections to and from Norwich and that additional traffic generated by a development of up to 200 dwellings could "easily be accommodated on the local road network in terms of traffic capacity". A copy of the TA has previously been submitted to South Norfolk Council.

C - 9850 - 8203 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -

9933

John Heaser [7015] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Little Melton Parish Council is concerned about increased traffic caused by the developments proposed for Hethersett and the increase in congestion at Thickthorn. Little Melton will turn into a through road unless measures are taken to reduce car traffic and to protect villages from rat running.

C - 9933 - 7015 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -

10079

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

We acknowledge the need for new infrastructure to support the growth of the city, including that identified by the Council, which relate to the need for new transport, social and utility/service infrastructure.

The delivery of such infrastructure requires the coordination of a range of public sector organisations and the private sector. As part of a potential EbD for the master planning of the North East sector, we anticipate the full range of public and private agencies concerned with the supply of infrastructure to be involved in the process. It is expected that the result of this exercise will be a detailed infrastructure requirement strategy. Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd is also looking to work closely with the developer for the Rackheath Eco-Community development with regard to the social and physical infrastructure required to ensure the development of sustainable communities in North East Norwich.

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd's landholdings are adjacent to the agreed route for the NNDR. It is acknowledged that the NNDR is a significant part of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy and is being promoted by EERA and by each of the constituent Councils of the GNDP as a key part of supporting overall growth within the sub-region. However, with reference to our response to question 2 above, even in the absence of the NNDR, it is considered that there is the opportunity to deliver a number of other cost effective initiatives that would provide significant improvements to the transport network and support increased and sustainable growth in the Norwich area.

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd anticipates the creation of an inner road which will carry orbital movement from Broadland Business Park in the south through to Wroxham Road. The provision of this route will enable the delivery of the urban extension and will also support north/south traffic movements around the periphery of Norwich. The North East sector of Norwich also offers the best opportunity to utilise the existing capacity on the underused Bittern Line (the Norwich-Sheringham railway line). The insertion of a rail halt within a new urban extension in North East Norwich, linking with the proposed Eco settlement at Rackheath, would create a new rail transit and public transport interchange, linked to the centre of Norwich and the wider national rail network. Consideration should also be given to reviewing the feasibility of an increased frequency of service on the line. This would act to increase transport choice, encourage modal shifts away from the use of the private car and promote more sustainable modes of transport. It would also increase connectivity to and from existing communities as well as supporting future communities.

We anticipate that, subject to full consideration of an inter-modal transport study, a sustainable transport plan will emerge from the master planning of the sustainable urban extension on North East Norwich. This will encourage walking and cycling in preference to car trips and will support the use of public transport. Further smaller scale transport infrastructure requirements may emerge from this exercise.

C - 10079 - 8234 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -

10148 R Smith [8243] (represented by Beacon Planning Ltd (Ms Jenny Page) [7833]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 20/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

It is logical to make the best use of existing infrastructure when considering suitable locations for development. This is particularly so in relation to the smaller scale developments where delivery can be brought forward quickly if the existing infrastructure already has the capacity to accommodate additional development.

C - 10148 - 8243 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -

10196 Hopkins Homes Limited [8247] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy

	<p>Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>The significant infrastructure requirements to support the favoured option should have been considered in detail of the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Assessment as required by PPS12. However, as illustrated within our Settlement Assessment the requirements in the South West of the Area are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long Stratton requires additional primary school and secondary school capacity, retail facilities, additional health care facilities, a bypass, public transport links and new employment areas. The level of infrastructure required cannot be delivered via developer contribution. - Hethersett requires additional primary school and secondary school capacity, retail facilities, additional health care facilities, and employment opportunities. The level of infrastructure required cannot be delivered via developer contribution. - Cringleford requires additional primary school and secondary school capacity, retail facilities, additional health care facilities, and employment opportunities. The level of infrastructure required cannot be delivered via developer contribution. - Wymondham requires additional primary school and secondary school capacity and some additional health care facilities. Much of infrastructure required can be delivered via developer contribution. <p>C - 10196 - 8247 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>10235</p>	<p>Ms Jane Pond [8255] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 28/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>Maybe the funds you will acquire through this massive development proposed in the Rackheath/Sprowston area should seriously consider the fact that they ought to be funding a Wroxham by pass as well as a northern distributor route.</p> <p>C - 10235 - 8255 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>10239</p>	<p>Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p>

	<p>Sustainable infrastructure improvements are needed to encourage additional use of roads/walkways by pedestrians and cyclists? Current roads, e.g. Henstead Road in the village, are totally inadequate and could not cope with increased traffic from 1000 additional homes. Current infrastructure regarding Doctors, Schools and Sewage is not adequate to cater for the impact of 1000 additional homes.</p> <p>C - 10239 - 8023 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>10250</p>	<p>Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 09/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>Policy 10 is called The Countryside. I found this misleading. Should it be called something like Development in the Countryside?</p> <p>C - 10250 - 8260 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>10276</p>	<p>Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>In relation to the proposed larger new developments, I would have hoped for some mention of the need for provision of new places of worship or extension of existing ones so as to provide for the needs of the new community. This might of course include provision for non-Christian faiths. This might not mean building new church buildings of a traditional kind as there is now a variety of models as to how faith presence might be expressed within a particular place. In our region, Cambridgeshire Horizons has commissioned research on this which is a useful starting point for discussion: the Executive Summary is at http://www.cambridgeshirehorizons.co.uk/documents/publications/research/faith_facilities_exec_summary.pdf. It is also relevant to mention the very positive impact of church presence within the Cambourne development near Cambridge.</p> <p>The Church of England already has a significant investment in Church Aided and Voluntary Controlled schools across the county (111 in all). We would be very pleased to be part of discussions concerning new schools or development of existing schools.</p>

C - 10276 - 8266 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -

10293 Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277] - COMMENT

Paper - 22/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

As indicated in the Council's response to the previous consultation, Breckland Council's emerging evidence to support growth proposals in Thetford, Attleborough and Snetterton Heath reveal that there are electricity supply and reinforcement issues that will require additional upgrades to facilitate long-term economic and housing growth along the A11 corridor. This will require a co-ordinated programme of joint evidence gathering to assess cumulative demand to the supply route from Norwich to Thetford as well as the need for likely upgrades to the supergrid, or new strategic supply cabling. This issue does not seem to have been highlighted in the consultation material.

There are also significant issues regarding the availability of water and waste water treatment along the A11 corridor as set out in the Council's evidence base underpinning the Core Strategy. The consultation material provides no indication that the strategy can be effectively delivered in regard to utilities capacity and it is considered that further work is needed to underpin the GNDP's preferred approach. Greater cross-border working with Breckland Council should be developed to consider the cumulative affects on utility along the A11 corridor in particular.

C - 10293 - 8277 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -

10408 Easton College [3570] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Colin Campbell) [7597]) - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

Policy 5 implies that all new major growth locations will be required to include "new primary schools, local retail and other services, small scale employment opportunities and primary healthcare facilities." We do not disagree that it is important that new developments provide for a range of local infrastructure needs, indeed we consider it essential in terms of building sustainable communities. However, until an audit of local facilities and capacities has been undertaken we consider it premature to require all those locations identified to provide these on-site. It may be that alternative locations provide the most

	<p>appropriate locations for siting community facilities. We do not see the need for the JCS to include a policy requiring this as the consideration of infrastructure needs is a matter of course in the consideration of any detailed proposals.</p> <p>C - 10408 - 3570 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>10457</p>	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? We do not want all this building.</p> <p>C - 10457 - 8309 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>10485</p>	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? No development.</p> <p>C - 10485 - 8310 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>10703</p>	<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] - COMMENT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? Constraints - Results of the Water Cycle Study (WCS): The WCS provides information on the relative constraints of development in the locations proposed. We assume that the findings of both Stage 1 and 2a have been taken fully into consideration in the formulation of the growth option proposed by the policy.</p>

Stage 2a of the WSC puts forward a number of options with which to supply the growth areas with Water. It should be ensured that the supply can be met. Stage 2b of your WSC should inform this further and we assume that consultation is taking place with the water companies. We also recommend that you consider how your aspirations for water efficiency compare with those of the water company. If the company is forecasting that houses will be built to a higher level of water efficiency than your current aspirations, supply issues could arise.

We wish to make you aware that the water quality aspect of the Review of Consents we are currently undertaking is nearing completion. On request we can provide further information which may aid you in locating your development with the least environmental impact.

Infrastructure needs:

We support the last bullet point which states that adequate sewage infrastructure will be masterplanned into the development. Development should be aligned with improvements in both water supply and waste water infrastructure and it should be ensured that the infrastructure is in place, and operational, in time for the development.

It needs to be ensured that development proceeds in areas where environmental capacity is available and where no deterioration in water quality will occur. This should be guided by the work undertaken to inform the WSC. Therefore, in order to protect water quality, development should not proceed until sufficient waste water infrastructure is in place.

Stage 2a of the WCS has assumed that there is no additional capacity within both the waste water sewer system and water supply network for the area. The need for additional sewer network will have to be considered carefully in terms of timing and cost.

Furthermore, a number of the STW works serving the area may require upgrading in order to protect the environment receiving their discharge. In particular, Whitlingham STW requires technological modifications for phosphate/nutrient removal. Without such modifications, the increased flow into the River Yare caused by the additional development may impact upon the downstream Broads SAC/Broadland SPA. Wymondham and Rackheath SPW, if to be used, may also require technical modifications and/or volumetric upgrades. Please refer to your WCS for further information.

You should be aware that Anglian Water is now forecasting lower growth than the RSS figures over the next 3-4 years reflecting its assumptions on the slow down in the housing market. The company forecasts that the rate of housing will increase after this time and the un-built quota will be made up in subsequent years. Therefore, although Anglian Water is forecasting the full RSS growth in the East of England Plan, the distribution of this growth and the infrastructure planning for it, may not match your expectations and you will need to consider this in your planning.

	<p>Furthermore, Anglian Water has just released its final business plan which sets out its forecasts of growth and infrastructure requirements for the AMP5 period. Anglian Water have also produced a water resources management plan statement of response which sets out details of the longer term water resource management plan. We assume that the Anglian Water have been consulted in the drafting of the Core Strategy, however, the above mentioned documents and their outcomes, will need to be factored into the planning of growth.</p> <p>C - 10703 - 8352 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>10767</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>Consideration on the impact on secondary care services.</p> <p>C - 10767 - 7666 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>10824</p>	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>It is acknowledge that there will be a need for new infrastructure to support the growth of the NPA, including that identified by the Council, which relate to the need for new transport, social and utility/service infrastructure.</p> <p>Development in Wymondham on the scale proposed in these representations offers an opportunity to maximise and expand upon previous investment in infrastructure provision, its linkages together with its own internal resources and provisions lends itself to economic growth and expansion.</p> <p>C - 10824 - 8362 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>10851</p>	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - COMMENT</p>

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

That improvements to transport links are needed, whatever the scale of development, is not in doubt. However, we must ensure that low carbon transport options, particularly the railways, are prioritised. Neither expansion of the road network nor increased air traffic fulfil the low carbon criteria. We would like to see that improvements to rural train services within Norfolk, along with the provision of a better quality bus service, are prioritised instead.

We also approve of an emphasis on encouraging new IT technologies to reduce the need to travel.

Considering that references to improving public transport are repeatedly made in the strategy there is precious little detail or firm commitment regarding improvements to bus links. The service needs a complete overhaul in the form of a Quality Bus Contract with commitments for guaranteed routes, greater frequency (less than 15 minutes between buses is shown to dramatically increase usage) and low fares. Greater clarity is needed on specific infrastructure requirements to do with a greater level of bus provision, such as the need for additional bus parking space. This could take the form of a new depot which would ease the current problems caused by buses waiting on both residential and arterial roads.

In general, bus corridors, guided bus ways, bus rapid transit, trams are all welcome but require huge investment which would not be possible with the huge sums planning to be diverted into the NDR project.

Similarly, why is there no mention of firm proposals for rail improvements? Rail improvements should form a major part of transport improvements here. The strategy appears fairly content with the level of existing work eg. improvements to Norwich to London line, East West Rail Consortium and greater frequency of the Cambridge train. Although rail improvements are out of the remit of this strategy, it could play a role in pressing for, for instance, improvements to the links with the North and East Midlands via Peterborough, or greater frequency of branch line services. We would also suggest that Norwich needs new rail freight facilities to handle larger volumes both on Riverside and/or at the eastern edge of the city. A really serious long term goal would aim to actually expand the rail network and reverse the historical errors of branch line closure.

To ease problems of congestion as well as minimisation of climate impact, we could also look into the idea of using Norfolk's network of waterways, with a preference for solar and electric powered craft, for transport of both people and goods. A river taxi in Norwich, for instance, might also serve as a popular tourist facility.

C - 10851 - 8018 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -

10887 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy

Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?

The BLT acknowledge the need for new infrastructure to support the growth of the city, including that identified by the Council, which relate to the need for new transport, social and utility/service infrastructure.

The delivery of such infrastructure requires the coordination of a range of public sector organisations and the private sector. As part of a potential EbD for the master planning of the north east sector, we anticipate the full range of public and private agencies concerned with the supply of infrastructure to be involved in the process. It is expected that the result of this exercise will be a detailed infrastructure requirement strategy.

The BLT landholdings are adjacent to the agreed route for the NDR. It is acknowledged that the NDR is a significant part of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy and is being promoted by EERA and by each of the constituent Councils of the GNDP as a key part of supporting overall growth within the sub-region.

However, with reference to our response to question 2 above, even in the advance of the NDR, it is considered that there is the opportunity to deliver a number of other cost effective initiatives that would provide significant improvements to the transport network and support increased and sustainable growth in the Norwich area.

The BLT anticipates the creation of an inner road, which will carry orbital movement from Broadland Business Park in the south through to Wroxham Road. The provision of this route will enable the delivery of the urban extension and will also support north/south traffic movements around the periphery of Norwich. The North East sector of Norwich also offers the best opportunity to utilise the existing capacity on the underused Bittern Line (the Norwich-Sheringham railway line). The insertion of a rail halt within a new urban extension in North East Norwich, linking with the proposed Eco settlement at Rackheath, would create a new rail transit and public transport interchange, linked to the centre of Norwich and the wider national rail network. Consideration should also be given to reviewing the feasibility of an increased frequency of service on the line. This would act to increase transport choice, encourage modal shifts away from the use of the private car and promote more sustainable modes of transport. It would also increase connectivity to and from existing communities as well as supporting future communities. The BLT proposes that the potential for tram/train transit opportunities are fully explored.

	<p>We anticipate that, subject to full consideration of an inter-modal transport study, a sustainable transport plan will emerge from the master planning of the sustainable urban extension in north east Norwich. This will encourage walking and cycling in preference to car trips and will support the use of public transport. Further smaller scale transport infrastructure requirements may emerge from this exercise.</p> <p>C - 10887 - 8366 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>10911</p>	<p>Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>In addition to the infrastructure requirements outlined in the response to question 2, there will be further significant infrastructure requirements needed to support the proposals put forward in the 'Favoured Option'. These are likely to be the A47 and its junctions and also at Whitlingham sewage treatment works which is nearing capacity. It is also to be highlighted that the Long Stratton Bypass is a prerequisite to support growth along the A140.</p> <p>C - 10911 - 8367 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>11049</p>	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>NH Ltd have already provided technical reports indicating that there is no sewage treatment works capacity issues which would prevent further estate scale development in Aylsham.</p> <p>C - 11049 - 6955 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>

<p>11093</p>	<p>Tesco Stores Ltd [8388] (represented by Martin Robeson Planning Practice (Luke Raistrick) [7162]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? (Please see Question 13 from the technical consultations (August 2008) copy attached). The 7000 new homes suggested for the North East of Norwich will require additional retail provision. It is logical for the planned district centre at Sprowston to serve the majority of the expected local need for services/facilities generated by the additional 7000 households - the centre already exists and is well served by public transport.</p> <p>C - 11093 - 8388 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
<p>11116</p>	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be?</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>Having reviewed the JCS evidence base and recent reports prepared by GNDP to support the review of growth options and the favoured option, we consider that all significant elements of infrastructure required to support growth have been addressed.</p> <p>We would however highlight that further work needs to be undertaken to refine the scale and form of the significant infrastructure improvements presented in the evidence base as they now relate to the favoured option, rather than the documents as currently worded which provide a comparison of various options for growth presented through the Technical Consultation.</p> <p>The reports that form the background identified as Transport Studies are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater Norwich Joint Core Strategy - Public Transport Requirements of Growth (November 2008) • Greater Norwich Joint Core Strategy - Public Transport Requirements of Growth - Technical Note - Appraisal of Emerging Option (December 2008)

• A47 Southern Bypass Junctions Capacity Assessment Report (November 2008)
Public Transport

The reports review the infrastructure and costs associated with providing public transport and improvement to key junctions on the A47 related to the range of growth options. The reports have been based on previous work and consideration of the various potential options for growth. Most notably the public transport reports have been based on the work contained in the EDAW Infrastructure Need and Funding Study (December 2007). The baseline position in relation to transport demand remains the same as the EDAW report with mode share analysis based on the 2001 Census for Travel to Work aggregated across the Norwich Policy Area. The figure that has been carried forward from the EDAW study relates to the existing bus mode share of 8%. The most recent assessment is used as the basis of patronage for peak hour bus services resulting from the options for growth and a target mode shift which will help cap the growth in peak hour car trips to 2011 levels across the NPA. We would observe that our analysis of the 2001 Census data shows that the existing mode share for public transport from Long Stratton is much higher than the average across the NPA.

The EDAW report assumes an overall mode share for public transport of 16% in 2021 and 20% in 2031 across the NPA. GNDP has revised these assumptions upwards in the more recent work to reflect that the growth areas will be expected to contribute a higher mode share than existing areas. The report considers that "it will be easier to influence travel demand in the new growth locations than it will be to change the mode choice for journeys within the existing urban area".

The emphasis of the NCC/GNDP assessment has been to consider the number of new bus services that will be required to deliver the required capacity for public transport in the future based on the growth required in the NPA as a whole which includes areas that will not be served by viable public transport, such as smaller settlements in Broadland and South Norfolk.

The capacity is based on a "turn up and go" bus service frequency of 10 minutes, which is considered to be the standard that will support mode shift of the desired level. The resulting services are being termed as Bus Rapid Transit which is carried through into the updated Norwich Area Transport Strategy with a vision for up to 6 routes radiating from Norwich City centre. It should be noted that these Bus Rapid Transit routes will share road corridors with normal bus priority facilities. There are supportive core bus routes, which include the A140 north of the A47.

A47 Junction Assessment

We have some concern that the A47 Southern Bypass Junctions Capacity Assessment Report only relates to a single growth Option D, which is similar to Option 1.

In consideration of the option of including development to the south of Norwich, the report simply comments that "other options have significant growth in the A140 corridor south of Norwich. In this instance the junction improvements [at A140 Harford interchange] required are up to £40.6m, as a solution as radical as proposed at A11 Thickthorn roundabout may be required".

This level of analysis can only be assumed to have included the previous Option for development of a new village at Mangreen, which has now fallen away and is not included in the favoured option. It is therefore considered that the scale of improvement at the A140 Harford Interchange will be significantly less and more in keeping with the options for improvement presented in the report.

The development Option D has been compared with the favoured option below:

The assessment has used this development option within the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS) SATURN model to determine the likely impacts of development on the A47 junctions. The model has distributed growth focused on Option D and will not necessarily have included the proposed capacity improvements to the junctions which will have been implemented by 2027.

As a result, we consider this will have created an imbalance of development related impacts particularly at the A140 Harford interchange. Whilst it is recognised that the scope of the assessment is necessarily high level at this stage, the conclusions being drawn on the scale of improvement have been exaggerated by these redistributed traffic effects within the model. The validity of the proposals in relation to the favoured option is therefore questioned and the work should be revised.

Education

We have sought to gain an understanding of the likely education requirements at Long Stratton. Applying CLG's projected reduction in average household size to the pupil numbers generated by existing and new houses in the C35 cluster we calculate that if 1800 houses are occupied by 2026 there will still be 66 spare places at Long Stratton High School, but a shortage of about 40 primary places per year group. A larger development can be achieved without the need to provide a new secondary school.

We have identified a need for a new 1.5 form primary school (with attached nursery) to be located conveniently for new

	<p>development at Long Stratton. We have not identified a need for any extension at the secondary school.</p> <p>C - 11116 - 8390 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
7931	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 08/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? not required if growth figure are cut</p> <p>O - 7931 - 7812 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
8640	<p>The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569] (represented by The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? On behalf of Norfolk Environmental Waste Services: It is essential that sufficient waste management capacity is planned in tandem or in advance of the chosen growth option. While this is a task of the Waste LDF it is important for the core strategy to recognise it.</p> <p>O - 8640 - 7569 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -</p>
8882	<p>Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? Long-Stratton requires additional primary school and secondary school capacity, retail facilities, additional health care facilities, a bypass, public transport links and new employment areas. This cannot be delivered via developer-contribution. Hethersett requires additional primary school&secondary school capacity, retail facilities, additional health care facilities, and</p>

employment opportunities. This cannot be delivered via developer contribution.

Cringleford requires additional primary school secondary school capacity, retail facilities, additional health care facilities, and employment. This cannot be delivered via developer-contribution.

Wymondham requires additional primary school and secondary school capacity, and some additional health care facilities.

Much of infrastructure required can be delivered via developer-contribution.

O - 8882 - 7037 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 10 (Technical consultees only) What additional infrastructure requirement would there be? -

Q11 (Technical consultees only)

Q11 What opportunities does this favoured option present?

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q11 Total	21	21	0	2	23

8459 Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] - [COMMENT](#)

Web - 23/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

The favoured option should be accompanied by a costed and prioritised GI Implementation Plan for the Greater Norwich area taking account of levels of development in all settlements. It is critical that this plan includes proposals for large scale new green space in areas previously identified within the Green Infrastructure Strategy, such as the Greater Mousehold Area and the area between Hethersett and Wymondham.

C - 8459 - 953 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -

8887 ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - [COMMENT](#)

Web - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

1800 homes on smaller sites in s norfolk NPA will offer choice for places to live but in a sustainable way if locations along the A140 are used such as Tasburgh. This is sustainable as the A140 provides good access to Norwich and Long Stratton, both major growth locations. There is already a good bus service along the A140.

C - 8887 - 7620 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -

9038 Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - [COMMENT](#)

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy

Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

Less use of private car

C - 9038 - 4187 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -

9851

Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr James Alflatt) [8204]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 22/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

As outlined above, Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd asserts that Hethersett can deliver not only the strategic growth identified in this consultation document, but in addition a large proportion of the 1800 units anticipated to be delivered from the smaller sites within South Norfolk's part of the NPA. Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd would conclude that they land north of the Great Melton Road can deliver a substantial proportion (up to 200 units) of this allocation. Given the large scale strategic growth anticipated for Hethersett and the other areas of the NPA, the Gladedale site referred to above could potentially start delivering houses during 2010, thus contributing to early delivery of housing in the GNPD area and contributing to the achievement of a 5-year housing land supply. It would be possible for this smaller site to be laid out and designed independently from any masterplan that may be prepared for a strategic allocation in Hethersett, without compromising the quality and delivery of the strategic allocation or inhibiting the delivery of this small site in Hethersett.

Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. has already undertaken a considerable amount of technical work to underpin the release of the subject land. A considerable amount of information about the site has already been forwarded to South Norfolk Council as part of previous LDF consultation exercises; for instance, a letter was sent to South Norfolk Council on 22nd November 2006 supplying additional technical information about the site (a Transport Assessment and a Landscape, Design & Access Statement). This site could therefore be brought forward swiftly for development, thus contributing to South Norfolk Council's 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd therefore concludes this Representation by re-confirming its support for the favoured option for development within the NPA which provides for both strategic scale allocations along with the allocation of smaller sites within the NPA (including possible additions to named growth locations) to ensure a continuous delivery of housing to meet the five year requirement for housing land supply.

C - 9851 - 8203 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees

	only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -
<p>10050</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?</p> <p>On behalf of our client, Persimmon Homes Ltd, who have an interest in land at Norwich Common, Wymondham, we support in principle the favoured option in relation to housing growth, provided that the 2,200 dwellings proposed through urban expansion are located in a number of sites around the town as Appendix 0 of the Public Consultation document proposes and that the 1800 dwellings proposed on smaller sites in the South Norfolk part of the NPA includes adequate opportunities for such smaller sites to be developed at Wymondham, rather than in smaller less sustainable settlements. This approach is much more likely to achieve the delivery of the housing numbers required than one which concentrates development in one main location at Wymondham or disperses smaller developments too widely. Our client's land interest at Norwich Common, which we have been promoting through the Core Strategy and SHLAA processes, offers the opportunity to achieve a development early in the plan period of some 300 dwellings in a sustainable location, very well related to the local and strategic transport network and able to take advantage of improved bus services to Norwich city centre. It is also very well related to existing employment and social and community facilities and will not have a detrimental impact on the landscape setting of the town or on the strategic gap between the town and Hethersett.</p> <p>We wish to also draw your attention to the detailed representations made on our client's behalf, as Technical Consultees, at the previous stages of consultation on this Core Strategy, which remain valid.</p> <p>C - 10050 - 2373 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -</p>
<p>10126</p>	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?</p> <p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd is to integrate new homes with jobs and community infrastructure. The geographic location of the land being prompted by Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd provides a unique opportunity to provide future residents with convenient access to the centre of the city of Norwich and Broadland Business Park, support economic growth,</p>

provide access to services and facilities and provide a range of employment opportunities for local people. In addition, the existing Bittern Line passes through the proposed location of the sustainable urban extension, which offers the opportunity to provide a new rail transit, linking the urban extension with the city, the wider sub-region and beyond.

This will be within a sustainable (i.e. walkable) urban footprint and critically, will link these key land uses and infrastructure with existing city fringe neighbourhoods as well as future communities to enhance amenity, sustainability and quality of life for all. The creation of a new urban extension in North East Norwich provides the opportunity to achieve this, while at the same time creating significant new capacity within the city for growth, which will serve to enhance and compliment the historic core of the city. The sustainable urban extension will be comprised by vibrant, self-sustaining communities which are integral to the city, but which do not place undue pressure on the historic core and existing civic infrastructure. Rather they develop as a new, attractive place in their own right.

In addition it will create the opportunities for:

- Improved connectivity between the city and fringe communities;
- Promoting sustainable modes of transport and creating 'walkable' neighbourhoods;
- Enhancing and maintaining important landscape features and biodiversity, which are important for informal recreation, health and well-being;
- The creation of more jobs and better access to employment opportunities;
- The enhancement of facilities for the existing working population at the Broadland Business Park;
- Delivering a choice of high quality housing within distinctive neighbourhoods;
- Innovative urban design which creates a sense of place;
- Increased services and facilities to serve local communities (both established and new);
- Sustainable design and construction, which encourages health, environmentally conscious lifestyles and reduces carbon dependency.

C - 10126 - 8234 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -

10197	<p>Hopkins Homes Limited [8247] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?</p> <p>The favoured option should seek to utilise the sustainability credentials of Wymondham further. As stated in the Issues and</p>
--------------	--

	<p>Options Core Strategy:</p> <p>"Wymondham is well related to Norwich and has a wide range of services and jobs. It has the Gateway 11 employment area and is close to the strategic employment site at Hethel. The town is well served by main roads, express buses and has regular and frequent train services to Norwich, Cambridge and beyond. While it is too far from Norwich to walk and, for most people, to cycle, it is small enough to encourage walking and cycling within the town. It appears to be a suitable Location for further investigation for strategic growth."</p> <p>Whilst the option allows for 2,200 new dwellings at Wymondham, a greater amount of housing can be supported in an appropriate manner. The opportunity to deliver a sustainable communities has been missed.</p> <p>C - 10197 - 8247 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -</p>
<p>10294</p>	<p>Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?</p> <p>There may be potential opportunities through the development of the Joint Core Strategy to present development options that would enable strategic infrastructure providers to develop long-term solutions to the constraints identified, particularly in relation to wider electricity and water supply. However, further dialogue with Breckland Council should be forthcoming to explore cumulative infrastructure capacity concerns more fully.</p> <p>C - 10294 - 8277 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -</p>
<p>10384</p>	<p>GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 01/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?</p> <p>Policy 5 Locations for major change and development:</p> <p>13. The commitment to master planning and high design standards is welcome. Either here or in Policy 13, the strategy could go further in terms of setting standards for sustainable growth, for example by creating a network of 'green' movement</p>

	<p>corridors, perhaps focused on the north east of Norwich and connecting the Broadland Business Park to Rackheath; in relation to Rackheath, consideration could be given to embedding eco-town standards within policy, and indeed across the Action Plan area.</p> <p>C - 10384 - 7463 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -</p>
10458	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? No development.</p> <p>C - 10458 - 8309 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -</p>
10486	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? No development.</p> <p>C - 10486 - 8310 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -</p>
10694	<p>Sunguard Homes [8320] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Glyn Davies) [7725]) - COMMENT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? Secondly, although strategic development in Long Stratton is constrained by the congestion on the A140 and the capacity of the junctions serving the village, this is not as severe as suggested in the GNDP documents published to date. Recent discussions with the County Planning and Transportation Department have shown that there is additional capacity available to provide for traffic from at least 100 new dwellings off the Swan Lane junction if the MOVA system were to be utilised in the existing</p>

	<p>traffic lights. This would be in addition to the limited capacity at the Flowerpot Lane lighted junction, previously provided by Sunguard, and which has not been completely taken up to date. There is capacity in the highway network to accommodate the remaining land owned by Sunguard Homes, which is the logical completion of the existing housing on Chequers Road. The Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal needs to acknowledge that there is a level of non-strategic growth that can be accommodated in Long Stratton (inc. Tharston) without the need for the construction of the bypass.</p> <p>C - 10694 - 8320 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -</p>
<p>10704</p>	<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] - COMMENT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? The growth proposed gives many opportunities. These include the provision of new green spaces, links and corridors, the improvement of water resources and waste water treatment provision as well as development which takes renewable energy and energy efficiency into account. Furthermore, there are great opportunities to take flood risk into account, and design schemes which incorporate SUDs wherever possible.</p> <p>C - 10704 - 8352 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -</p>
<p>10825</p>	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? The proposals for the development of Wymondham contained in these representations (6500 dwellings) are to integrate new homes with jobs and community infrastructure. The geographic location of the land being promoted by the Landowners provides a unique opportunity to provide future residents with convenient access to the town centre the city of Norwich and numerous employment opportunities , support economic growth, provide access to services and facilities and provide a range of employment opportunities for local people. In addition, the rail line and station and linkages in and out of Wymondham offer the opportunity to provide residents of the area an alternative link to the city, the wider sub-region and beyond.</p> <p>C - 10825 - 8362 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -</p>

10873 Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - **COMMENT**
Paper - 12/06/09
Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

We would note that the critical mass of population that could be achieved by way of the existing housing land allocations in Costessey and the provision of further housing as an extension to Lodge Farm could provide the opportunity to secure a quality public transport link along Dereham Road to Norwich city centre.

Dereham Road represents a public transport corridor into the centre of Norwich with a park and ride site in the vicinity of the junction between the A47 and Dereham Road. An extension of the existing Lodge Farm development area would make appropriate use of this existing facility and provide an opportunity to enhance its value. More bus priority can be promoted on this key radial route whilst equally recognising the need to ensure capacity is available for movement by private car.

New housing to the west of the present Lodge Farm development area would not require additional significant infrastructure to support its implementation. Our suggested extension of the present Lodge Farm development would not have a material impact upon the operation of the junction between Dereham Road and the A47. Access arrangements for a potential enlargement of the Lodge Farm site could incorporate a roundabout located on Dereham Road, to the west of the existing access to the Lodge Farm buildings, in order to provide sufficient and satisfactory access to the land concerned. In addition, the section of carriageway between that roundabout and the A47 junction could be constructed to dual carriageway standard, thereby providing sufficient stacking space for queuing vehicles on the approach to the grade separated junction. Furthermore, if necessary, a left turn filter onto the A47 southbound could be provided within the Lodge Farm extension area.

An extension of the existing Lodge Farm development area forms part of the favoured growth option illustrated on the plan at page 69 of the Public Consultation. The plan at page 69 shows development arising between the A47 and the edge of the existing built-up area of Norwich. Lodge Farm is situated within that general area. Our clients' land can play an important and significant role in the early implementation of housing to support the growth agenda for the Norwich Policy Area. The Lodge Farm extension forms a fundamental component of the favoured growth option and represents a sustainable extension of an

existing development area and can, accordingly, be delivered early in the process.

C - 10873 - 8363 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -

10888 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

The focus the BLT is to integrate new homes with jobs and community infrastructure. The geographic location of the land being promoted by the BLT provides a unique opportunity to; provide future residents with convenient access to the centre of the city of Norwich and Broadland Business Park; support economic growth; provide access to services and facilities; and provide a range of employment opportunities for local people. In addition, the existing Bittern Line passes through the proposed location of the sustainable urban extension, which offers the opportunity to provide a new rail transit, linking the urban extension with the city, the wider sub-region and beyond.

This will be within a sustainable (i.e. walkable) urban footprint and critically, will link these key land uses and infrastructure with existing city fringe neighbourhoods as well as future communities to enhance amenity, sustainability and quality of life for all. The creation of a new urban extension in north east Norwich provides the opportunity to achieve this, while at the same time creating significant new capacity within the city for growth, which will serve to enhance and compliment the historic core of the city. The sustainable urban extension will be comprised of vibrant, self-sustaining communities which are integral to the city but which do not place undue pressure on the historic core and existing civic infrastructure. Rather they develop as new, attractive places in their own right.

In addition it will create the opportunities for:

- * Improved connectivity between the city and 'fringe' communities;
- * Promoting sustainable modes of transport and creating 'walkable' neighbourhoods;
- * Enhancing and maintaining important landscape features and biodiversity,

which are important for informal recreation, health and well-being;

- * The creation of more jobs and better access to employment opportunities;
- * The enhancement of facilities for the existing working population at the Broadland Business Park;
- * Delivering a choice of high quality housing within distinctive neighbourhoods;
- * Innovative urban design which creates a sense of place;
- * Increased services and facilities to serve local communities (both established and new);
- * Sustainable design and construction, which encourages healthy, environmentally conscious lifestyles and reduces carbon dependency.

C - 10888 - 8366 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -

110912 Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) -

COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

By supporting in part the Favoured Option, ALP are content that the amount of growth proposed within the Regional Spatial Strategy can be achieved within the NPA. However, this is dependent on deliverability of core infrastructure needed to realise the development proposals, most notably the Long Stratton Bypass and the provision of the contingency proposal contained in these representations.

C - 10912 - 8367 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -

11094 Tesco Stores Ltd [8388] (represented by Martin Robeson Planning Practice (Luke Raistrick) [7162]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

Please see Question 15 from the technical consultation - August 2008 - copy attached.

C - 11094 - 8388 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -

11102 Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

By supporting in part the Favoured Option, PJH are content that the amount of growth proposed within the Regional Spatial Strategy can be achieved within the NPA. However, this is dependent on deliverability of core infrastructure needed to realise the development proposals, most notably the Long Stratton Bypass and the provision of the contingency proposal contained in these representations.

C - 11102 - 8300 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -

11117 The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

The spatial strategy to be advanced in the Joint Core Strategy must be capable of implementing Policies H1 and NR1 of the East of England Plan. Paragraph 13.68 of the EEP acknowledges that the Norwich Policy Area is one of the two locations with the highest level of growth in the region. The NPA is expected to be the main focus for the north-east of the region, and has the potential to develop further as a major cornerstone for long term economic development and growth. Paragraph 13.67 of the EEP states that there are opportunities to build on existing strengths, with Norwich and surrounding towns/villages benefiting from the city's status as a major economic driver for Norfolk. The policy framework established by the EEP envisages new development being concentrated in the Norwich Policy Area, the extent of which is defined at Appendix 4 of the Regulation 25 Public Consultation document. Long Stratton is a significant settlement within the NPA, containing a range of facilities/employment opportunities that provide a sound basis to support further growth.

We agree with the comment at paragraph 7.6 of the Public Consultation document that it will not be possible to accommodate all of the growth directed to the Norwich Policy Area within the urban area of Norwich and, as a consequence, other locations

in the defined extent of the NPA are required to accommodate the level of housing growth established for the NPA by virtue of Policy NR1 of the EEP. The EEP does not state that all the new housing growth must be accommodated in or at the edge of Norwich and, in that context, we agree with the observation in Policy 5 of the Public Consultation document that the GNDDP is proposing a combination of places for major growth in the NPA. The locations for this major growth set out in Policy 5 will provide the spatial dimension whereby the requirements of the East of England Plan can be delivered. The broad pattern of the proposed distribution of new housing reflects the spread of existing employment opportunities, social/community facilities and current public transport services. The direction of new growth to the suggested locations for major change in the NPA will enable enhancements to be made to those existing facilities and services to the benefit of both the existing community and future residents.

The favoured option, in the round, presents the opportunity to secure a spatial strategy which responds to the requirement set out in the East of England Plan in a manner which provides the scope to enhance existing communities.

Long Stratton is a significant settlement within the defined extent of the Norwich Policy Area containing a range of social/community services and local job opportunities. The ORS Study of Housing Need and Stock Condition (June 2006) identified that 37% of residents within the Long Stratton Housing Market Area worked within that same area and the provision of additional employment opportunities as part of development could build on that. It already has a well used public transport service to/from Norwich and further growth at Long Stratton provides the opportunity significantly to enhance that level of utility.

The accommodation of further growth at Long Stratton will deliver a bypass for the settlement, enabling important local environmental improvements to be achieved following the removal of existing levels of through traffic. The provision of the bypass constitutes the necessary catalyst to facilitate the regeneration of Long Stratton in environmental and physical terms.

The Inspector who reported to the Secretary of State in 2006 in connection with The Norfolk County Council (A140 Long Stratton Bypass) Compulsory Purchase Order 2005 acknowledged that Long Stratton experiences a number of problems associated with the high volumes of traffic that pass through it on a daily basis, leading to an adverse impact on the physical environment and the quality of life for the residents. The Inspector concluded that the objectives of a bypass at Long Stratton would address those problems. In these circumstances, the Inspector noted that there is a compelling need for a bypass in the public interest in order to address the current issues arising in Long Stratton and improve the environment/quality of life for residents, to support local businesses/the local economy, and pursue wider land use/transportation strategies for the Norwich area. The Inspector stated that traffic congestion at Long Stratton is recognised as a particular location having adverse impacts upon accessibility to/from Norwich. He endorsed the construction of a bypass to the east of the existing built-up area.

The identification of Long Stratton as a location for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area at Policy 5 of the Public Consultation document provides a robust/sustainable opportunity not only to address the policy background established in the East of England Plan but also to achieve local environmental improvements in conjunction with the delivery of a bypass which will improve accessibility to/from Norwich. Long Stratton is an established centre within the Norwich Policy Area and its inclusion within the list of locations for major change at Policy 5 will lead to the realisation of a number of important considerations as outlined above. Long Stratton already contains employment/education/community facilities which will readily form the basis of a sustainable expanded community.

The settlement is within the defined NPA and its identification in Policy 5 of the Public Consultation document constitutes a sound approach to addressing both the policy base of the East of England Plan and the scope to achieve local environmental/community improvements by delivering a bypass. Policies 2 and 16 of the Public Consultation document refer to the provision of a bypass at Long Stratton as part of the transportation infrastructure required to support growth in the Norwich Policy Area. The accommodation of further housing and employment at Long Stratton will provide the opportunity to deliver that beneficial element of new infrastructure.

C - 11117 - 8390 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -

11131 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - COMMENT

Paper - 30/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?

On behalf of our client, Persimmon Homes Ltd, who have an interest in land at Norwich Common, Wymondham, we support in principle the favoured option in relation to housing growth, provided that the 2,200 dwellings proposed through urban expansion are located in a number of sites around the town as Appendix 0 of the Public Consultation document proposes and that the 1800 dwellings proposed on smaller sites in the South Norfolk part of the NPA includes adequate opportunities for such smaller sites to be developed at Wymondham, rather than in smaller less sustainable settlements. This approach is much more likely to achieve the delivery of the housing numbers required than one which concentrates development in one main location at Wymondham or disperses smaller developments too widely. Our client's land interest at Norwich Common, which we have been promoting through the Core Strategy and SHLAA processes, offers the opportunity to achieve a development early in the plan period of some 300 dwellings in a sustainable location, very well related to the local and strategic transport network and able to take advantage of improved bus services to Norwich city centre. It is also very well related to existing employment and social and community facilities and will not have a detrimental impact on the landscape setting of the town or

	<p>on the strategic gap between the town and Hethersett.</p> <p>We wish to also draw your attention to the detailed representations made on our client's behalf, as Technical Consultees, at the previous stages of consultation on this Core Strategy, which remain valid.</p> <p>C - 11131 - 2373 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -</p>
<p>8865</p>	<p>Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?</p> <p>Long-Stratton requires additional primary school and secondary school capacity, retail facilities, additional health care facilities, a bypass, public transport links and new employment areas. This cannot be delivered via developer-contribution.</p> <p>Hethersett requires additional primary school&secondary school capacity, retail facilities, additional health care facilities, and employment opportunities. This cannot be delivered via developer contribution.</p> <p>Cringleford requires additional primary school secondary school capacity, retail facilities, additional health care facilities, and employment. This cannot be delivered via developer-contribution.</p> <p>Wymondham requires additional primary school and secondary school capacity, and some additional health care facilities. Much of infrastructure required can be delivered via developer-contribution.</p> <p>O - 8865 - 7037 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -</p>
<p>8878</p>	<p>Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present?</p> <p>The favoured option should seek to utilise the sustainability credentials of Wymondham further. The Issues and Options Core Strategy stated:</p> <p>"Wymondham is well related to Norwich and has a wide range of services and jobs. It has the Gateway 11 employment area and is close to Hethel. The town is well served by main roads, express buses and has regular and frequent train services to Norwich, Cambridge and beyond. It appears to be a suitable Location for further investigation for strategic growth."</p>

Whilst the option allows for 2,200 new dwellings at Wymondham, the opportunity to deliver a sustainable communities has been missed

O - 8878 - 7037 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 11(Technical consultees only) What opportunities does this favoured option present? -

Q12 (Technical consultees only)

Q12 How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q12 Total	17	17	0	2	19

8417	<p>Ed King [7965] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p> <p>The proposal presents an opportunity to develop a new business park associated with the airport. My company has land that that is capable of being developed in the short term that will enable the policy to be delivered.</p> <p>C - 8417 - 7965 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
8460	<p>Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p> <p>Norfolk Wildlife Trust intends that work on ecological networks and green infrastructure will remain a priority within our conservation work stream. As a result, we will continue to lobby for GI provision and will consider all proposals for partnership and project work in relation to GI</p> <p>C - 8460 - 953 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
8888	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p>

	<p>we have brownfield land for housing development we can deliver in Tasburgh.</p> <p>C - 8888 - 7620 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
9039	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p> <p>It links with Government policy</p> <p>C - 9039 - 4187 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
10051	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p> <p>Persimmon Homes Ltd's interest in this 9 hectare site at Norwich Common, Wymondham offers the opportunity to provide some 300 dwellings on a site very close to existing employment opportunities, very well served by existing community services and facilities and with good pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to the town centre and to Norwich. They are actively promoting this site through the LDF and SHLAA processes. It would be their intention to develop this site at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>C - 10051 - 2373 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
10127	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p> <p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd has a long term commitment to the sustainable development of the area. As such, their</p>

financial models are based on long-term investment as opposed to short-term returns. Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd are committed to achieving the long-term strategy for their land-holdings, which is consistent with good place making and will create a sustainable urban extension in North East Norwich to accommodate a significant amount of growth needed in the area.

However, the financial models to deliver this need to be carefully constructed in terms of timescales and yields for the relevant landowners in respect of acquisition of funds, cash flows and anticipated returns.

C - 10127 - 8234 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -

10198 Hopkins Homes Limited [8247] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - **COMMENT**
Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

Hopkins Homes seek to deliver a sustainable residential lead mixed use development in South Wymondham. Whilst their site can be delivered within growth proposed in Core Strategy, greater growth can be accommodated sustainably within Wymondham. The growth proposed at Hethersett, Long Stratton and Cringleford does not meet with the aims of sustainability or the vision of the Core Strategy. The development of small scale of sites (3,800 dwellings) is contrary to national guidance on housing land supply and there is a lack of robust evidence to support the approach taken by the GNDP.

C - 10198 - 8247 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -

10295 Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277] - **COMMENT**
Paper - 22/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

As indicated in the Council's response to the previous consultation in September 2008, the favoured option should be developed with close cross-border working to ensure that the investment priorities of strategic infrastructure providers can be co-ordinated to facilitate growth along the A11 and A47 corridors. This will ensure that strategic growth can be comprehensively planned despite the fact the Joint Core Strategy timetable remains behind that of Breckland Council's LDF.

C - 10295 - 8277 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -

<p>10459</p>	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? No development.</p> <p>C - 10459 - 8309 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
<p>10487</p>	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? No development.</p> <p>C - 10487 - 8310 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
<p>10705</p>	<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] - COMMENT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? We have no additional comments above those made within our answer to questions 6, 11 and 16 of the previous technical consultation (August - September 2008).</p> <p>C - 10705 - 8352 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
<p>10768</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p>

	<p>Investment strategies are in place for the next 5 years with an understanding that NHS funding will require commissioning of health services to be made in a tight financial climate.</p> <p>C - 10768 - 7666 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
<p>10826</p>	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? The Landowners are committed to achieving a long-term strategy for their land-holdings, which is consistent with good place making and will create a sustainable urban extension in north east of Wymondham to accommodate a significant amount of growth needed in the area.</p> <p>However, the financial models to deliver this need to be carefully constructed in terms of timescales and yields for the relevant Landowners in respect of acquisition of funds, cash flows and anticipated returns. To this end, the Landowners are in the process of creating a single, legal delivery vehicle.</p> <p>C - 10826 - 8362 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
<p>10874</p>	<p>Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? The implementation of the suggested Lodge Farm extension will plainly be well related to our clients' longer term investment strategies and both Taylor Wimpey Developments Ltd and Hopkins Homes are committed to supporting growth on the western edge of Norwich as shown on the plan at page 69 of the Public Consultation. The favoured growth option represents a logical and sustainable extension of our clients' present development at Lodge Farm.</p> <p>C - 10874 - 8363 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>

	only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -
10889	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p> <p>The BLT has a long-term commitment to the sustainable development of the area. As such, their financial models are based on long-term investment as opposed to short-term returns. The BLT are committed to achieving a long-term strategy for their land-holdings, which is consistent with good place making and will create a sustainable urban extension in north east Norwich to accommodate a significant amount of growth needed in the area.</p> <p>However, the financial models to deliver this need to be carefully constructed in terms of timescales and yields for the relevant landowners in respect of acquisition of funds, cash flows and anticipated returns. To this end, the BLT are in the process of creating a single, legal delivery vehicle and have initiated an EbD process championed by the PFBE. This has begun to identify the key and detailed issues associated with growth in this location.</p> <p>C - 10889 - 8366 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
11095	<p>Tesco Stores Ltd [8388] (represented by Martin Robeson Planning Practice (Luke Raistrick) [7162]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p> <p>Please see Question 16 from the technical consultation - August 2008 - copy attached.</p> <p>C - 11095 - 8388 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
11132	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy</p>

	<p>Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p> <p>Persimmon Homes Ltd's interest in this 9 hectare site at Norwich Common, Wymondham offers the opportunity to provide some 300 dwellings on a site very close to existing employment opportunities, very well served by existing community services and facilities and with good pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to the town centre and to Norwich. They are actively promoting this site through the LDF and SHLAA processes. It would be their intention to develop this site at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>C - 11132 - 2373 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
<p>8867</p>	<p>Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p> <p>The favoured option should seek to utilise the sustainability credentials of Wymondham further. The Issues and Options Core Strategy stated:</p> <p>"Wymondham is well related to Norwich and has a wide range of services and jobs. It has the Gateway 11 employment area and is close to Hethel. The town is well served by main roads, express buses and has regular and frequent train services to Norwich, Cambridge and beyond. It appears to be a suitable Location for further investigation for strategic growth."</p> <p>Whilst the option allows for 2,200 new dwellings at Wymondham, the opportunity to deliver a sustainable communities has been missed</p> <p>O - 8867 - 7037 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -</p>
<p>8872</p>	<p>Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?</p> <p>Hopkins Homes seek to deliver a sustainable residential lead mixed use development in South Wymondham. Whilst their site can be delivered within growth proposed in Core Strategy, greater growth can be accommodated sustainably within Wymondham. The growth proposed at Hethersett, Long Stratton and Cringleford does not meet with the aims of sustainability</p>

or the vision of the Core Strategy. The development of small scale of sites (3,800 dwellings) is contrary to national guidance on housing land supply and there is a lack of robust evidence to support the approach taken by the GNDP.

O - 8872 - 7037 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 12 (Technical consultees only) How will this link with your longer term investment strategies? -

Q13 (Technical consultees only)

Q13 Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q13 Total	22	10	6	7	23

8461 Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr John Hiskett) [953] - COMMENT

Web - 23/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

NWT does not feel that it is appropriate to support the favoured option in itself as we still retain concerns about the impacts of the total levels of growth proposed on the environment and the ability and willingness of the local authorities to provide adequate mitigation and compensation in the form of GI, SUDS and related methods. We will however, support projects in this area if they are clearly shown to mitigate and compensate for impacts on biodiversity and also to enhance biodiversity in line with government guidance.

C - 8461 - 953 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -

8756 Highways Agency (Mr Eric Cooper) [8057] - COMMENT

Web - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

The Highways Agency has no objection to the preferred option, provided that the necessary evidence can be provide to demonstrate it is deliverable and affordable and that the solution will not impeded the trunk road continuing to provide a safe and efficient strategic link to Norwich and East Anglia.

C - 8756 - 8057 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -

10052 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

On behalf of our client, Persimmon Homes Ltd, who have an interest in land at Norwich Common, Wymondham, we support in principle the favoured option in relation to housing growth, provided that the 2,200 dwellings proposed through urban expansion are located in a number of sites around the town as Appendix 0 of the Public Consultation document proposes and that the 1800 dwellings proposed on smaller sites in the South Norfolk part of the NPA includes adequate opportunities for such smaller sites to be developed at Wymondham, rather than in smaller less sustainable settlements. This approach is much more likely to achieve the delivery of the housing numbers required than one which concentrates development in one main location at Wymondham or disperses smaller developments too widely. Our client's land interest at Norwich Common, which we have been promoting through the Core Strategy and SHLAA processes, offers the opportunity to achieve a development early in the plan period of some 300 dwellings in a sustainable location, very well related to the local and strategic transport network and able to take advantage of improved bus services to Norwich city centre. It is also very well related to existing employment and social and community facilities and will not have a detrimental impact on the landscape setting of the town or on the strategic gap between the town and Hethersett.

We wish to also draw your attention to the detailed representations made on our client's behalf, as Technical Consultees, at the previous stages of consultation on this Core Strategy, which remain valid.

C - 10052 - 2373 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -

10128 Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd is committed to supporting a sustainable urban extension in North East Norwich and is developing the landownership and legal framework to deliver this effectively. Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd is also maintaining a dialogue with member authorities of the GNDP to ensure that the GNDP is aware of the development of these frameworks and that is assured of our commitment to the delivery of a sustainable urban extension.

	<p>C - 10128 - 8234 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
10296	<p>Breckland District Council (Mr Phil Mileham) [8277] - COMMENT Paper - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? The Council considers that insufficient evidence has been presented to suggest that the favoured option is justified and deliverable. There remains some questions as to whether the levels of growth proposed along the A11 and A47 corridors are the most appropriate in terms of mitigating the impacts of residential and employment growth on critical infrastructure.</p> <p>C - 10296 - 8277 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
10706	<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] - COMMENT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? We have no additional comments above those made within our answer to questions 7, 12 and 17 of the previous technical consultation (August - September 2008).</p> <p>C - 10706 - 8352 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
10827	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? The Landowners are committed to supporting a sustainable urban extension in north east of Wymondham and will link with others to plan a whole settlement strategy to deliver the scale of development described elsewhere in these representations.</p> <p>C - 10827 - 8362 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>

<p>10890</p>	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?</p> <p>The BLT is committed to supporting a sustainable urban extension in north east Norwich and is in the process of developing the landownership and legal framework to deliver this effectively. The BLT's commitment to supporting growth in north east Norwich is exemplified through their recent initiation of an EbD. The purpose of the EbD process is the creation of a masterplan as the culmination of a collaborative approach with relevant stakeholders and the range of professional disciplines. The first stage of this process has been undertaken whereby members of the GNDP and its constituent local authorities together with other stakeholders have started to scope the issues associated with planning for growth in this area. The findings of this scoping exercise will supplement these representations. The next stage will, through a series of workshops, not only consult representatives of existing communities and other stakeholders on development proposals but also proactively engage them in the creation of the vision for the urban extension as well as planning for the development itself.</p> <p>C - 10890 - 8366 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
<p>10913</p>	<p>Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?</p> <p>ALP propose changes to the Favoured Option. It would be irresponsible to suggest none of the proposed locations have constraints to delivery. Our extensive analysis of the other areas of proposed growth over the past three years indicates that the Favoured Option faces the least constraints, when compared with those appraised at the last round of consultation. The following section outlines the main growth areas</p>

in the Favoured Option and the objections ALP have.

North East Norwich - Sprowston / Rackheath

34 The Favoured Option supports 7,000 dwellings in the Sprowston / Rackheath area, an increase of 1,000 from the three options appraised at the last consultation stage.

ALP generally supports major development in this broad location but feels that up to 5,000 are capable of completion in the plan period.

35 As with the Mangreen proposal considered at the previous consultation stage, ALP strongly advise that continual monitoring of the development process is put in place to ensure that any delay in the provision of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road does not adversely affect development of new houses and infrastructure within the plan period.

Basis of Assumption:

Countryside Properties commissioned Colin Buchanan to examine how planned rates of housing growth proposed in draft RSS14 (December 2004) were likely to evolve.

Now fully adopted (May 2008), the Regional Spatial Strategy suggests how development might be best delivered, and at the same time considers how the housing targets and distribution proposed might best be achieved in terms of size, location and emerging development site areas that are being promoted by developers and local planning authorities.

37 The Buchanan study collates an evidence base of past housing development within the East of England region, and with regard to strategic sites, investigates the length of time required to obtain planning permission and begin construction, the time required to fully develop the sites, and maximum delivery rates at specific locations. Results from this analysis are considered in order to identify policy implications for delivery in the future. The study then compares this evidence base with emerging allocations and strategy to deliver housing growth proposed in draft RSS14.

38 The table in Figure 3 outlines the basis of Barton Willmore's assumptions for the 7,000 dwellings in North East Norwich and the relevant time scales applied to each aspect of the planning and implementation process.

39 By looking closely at the realistic amount of time required for the various stages it quickly becomes apparent that delivering North East Norwich before 2026 only

succeeds if an impossibly tight timetable is adhered. It should be noted that the Buchanan derived table is only based on larger sites, i.e. more than 50 dwellings capacity.

40 Figure 3 shows the realistic lead in period to be allowed for a typical large site, if starting with an allocation in the JCS following the Examination in Public. It shows that it can take five years from outline planning permission being granted to dwelling completions on the ground.

41 We are supportive of the North East Norwich proposals as long as they can be delivered in a workable plan but feel only 5,000 completions are achievable. There will need to be regular examinations of the timetable to ensure that each stage of the process is met on time. This in turn will ensure that the new houses and infrastructure will be built within the Development Plan period. The proposed monitoring/management policy should incorporate the timescales expected in the above timetable. Hence, the contingency approach is needed to allow for slippage in this programme of delivery.

Long Stratton

42 There is real concern that late delivery of the proposed bypass will lead to a delay in development of 1,800 new houses. It is therefore essential that funding and Compulsory Purchase Orders are in place from an early point in the development process to ensure that that 1,800 are built within the Development Plan period but development should not commence before completion of the By-pass. The same development profile assumptions used to appraise North East Norwich should be applied to Long Stratton. Given the need to achieve the road early in the programme we feel it is unrealistic to rely on this amount of development within the plan period.

C - 10913 - 8367 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -

11133 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - COMMENT

Paper - 30/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

On behalf of our client, Persimmon Homes Ltd, who have an interest in land at Norwich Common, Wymondham, we support

in principle the favoured option in relation to housing growth, provided that the 2,200 dwellings proposed through urban expansion are located in a number of sites around the town as Appendix 0 of the Public Consultation document proposes and that the 1800 dwellings proposed on smaller sites in the South Norfolk part of the NPA includes adequate opportunities for such smaller sites to be developed at Wymondham, rather than in smaller less sustainable settlements. This approach is much more likely to achieve the delivery of the housing numbers required than one which concentrates development in one main location at Wymondham or disperses smaller developments too widely. Our client's land interest at Norwich Common, which we have been promoting through the Core Strategy and SHLAA processes, offers the opportunity to achieve a development early in the plan period of some 300 dwellings in a sustainable location, very well related to the local and strategic transport network and able to take advantage of improved bus services to Norwich city centre. It is also very well related to existing employment and social and community facilities and will not have a detrimental impact on the landscape setting of the town or on the strategic gap between the town and Hethersett.

We wish to also draw your attention to the detailed representations made on our client's behalf, as Technical Consultees, at the previous stages of consultation on this Core Strategy, which remain valid.

C - 11133 - 2373 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -

8418 Ed King [7965] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - **SUPPORT**

Web - 22/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

The proposal fits neatly into our company's investment strategy which provides for the development of a new business park in the Norwich area in the next five years.

S - 8418 - 7965 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -

8890 ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - **SUPPORT**

Web - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?

yes see answers to previous questions.

	<p>S - 8890 - 7620 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
9040	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? Strategic developments might contribute to the project</p> <p>S - 9040 - 4187 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
9879	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT Paper - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? Yes</p> <p>S - 9879 - 2058 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
10736	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? Yes</p> <p>S - 10736 - 1776 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
10875	<p>Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?</p> <p>Policy 5 refers to the provision of 1,000 dwellings at Easton/Costessey. We consider that these two locations exhibit different spatial policy credentials and should not be considered together in the JCS. Costessey is part of the urban area of Norwich and is specifically identified as an urban fringe parish in Policy 1. Easton is physically separate from Norwich and is not named in Policy 1. Policy 5 should place the emphasis upon Costessey, not Easton, as a sustainable location for further growth. Our clients support Costessey as a growth area as shown on the plan at page 69 and contend that the land between the A47 and the edge of Norwich is more appropriate in spatial policy terms than Easton which is physically distinct from the city's built-up area.</p> <p>Policy 1 plainly places Costessey higher in the settlement hierarchy than Easton. As Policy 1 states that the scale of development will decrease at each level of the hierarchy, page 68 of the Public Consultation should be amended to make it clear that the housing to be accommodated at Easton is a residual figure after the appropriate allowance has been made for the capacity of the proposed Lodge Farm extension.</p> <p>S - 10875 - 8363 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
<p>8880</p>	<p>Hopkins Homes Ltd [7037] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?</p> <p>As stated previously in our response to question 9, we do not fully support the favoured option as it is not inherently sustainable or in compliance with national and regional planning policy.</p> <p>O - 8880 - 7037 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
<p>10199</p>	<p>Hopkins Homes Limited [8247] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy</p>

	<p>Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?</p> <p>As stated previously in our response to question 9, we do not fully support the favoured option as it is not inherently sustainable or in compliance with national and regional planning policy.</p> <p>O - 10199 - 8247 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
10460	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?</p> <p>No development.</p> <p>O - 10460 - 8309 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
10488	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?</p> <p>No development.</p> <p>O - 10488 - 8310 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
10769	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option?</p> <p>No: Not at this stage. The EDAW study has the sufficient detail of population growth projections to allow careful health care planning. Once this is announced, proposals can be presented to our board.</p>

	<p>O - 10769 - 7666 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
10852	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? Please see comments in questions 4 & 5.</p> <p>O - 10852 - 8018 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>
11096	<p>Tesco Stores Ltd [8388] (represented by Martin Robeson Planning Practice (Luke Raistrick) [7162]) - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? No (agree in part) as per the response to Question 9. There is support for the growth proposed at Sprowston, however additional growth should be planned in the vicinity of Harford Bridge also.</p> <p>O - 11096 - 8388 - Policy 5 Locations for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area (Q9) (Q10 - 13 Technical consultees only), Question 13 (Technical consultees only) Could your organisation commit to support the favoured option? -</p>

Response – Q14

Main Towns

Policy 6 (page 29) explains what main towns are and the part they play in the strategy. The proposed main towns are Wymondham, Aylsham, Diss and Harleston.

Q14 Main Towns

Policy 6 (page 29) explains what main towns are and the part they play in the strategy. The proposed main towns are Wymondham, Aylsham, Diss and Harleston.

Q14 Do you agree with the places proposed as **Main Towns** and the part they will play in the strategy? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q14 Total	122	29	60	35	124

7917	<p>Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - COMMENT Web - 06/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? It is difficult to understand how the jobs get provided.</p> <p>C - 7917 - 6885 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8051	<p>Mr Keith Jones [7536] - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? This supports my belief that required future housing development should be allocated around Norfolk rather than concentrated in one place</p> <p>C - 8051 - 7536 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8117	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - COMMENT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Wymondham needs improved access to the town centre and the provision of increased friendly car parking.</p> <p>C - 8117 - 7888 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8495	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Shall move to Aylsham at once - then I will know can't be made into a bigger sprawl.</p> <p>C - 8495 - 8020 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8510	<p>Sunguard Homes [8320] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Glyn Davies) [7725]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>The designation of Long Stratton as a main town is supported. It should however include the adjacent land along Chequers Road, administratively within Tharston Civil Parish which is part of the Long Stratton settlement in town planning terms. It should also be recognised that there is capacity for additional housing development of approximately 150 houses before the A140 bypass is built if the existing A140 junctions are enhanced using the latest MOVA computer controlled technology to manage the traffic signals.</p> <p>C - 8510 - 8320 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8593	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Brownfield sites only</p> <p>C - 8593 - 8024 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8710	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Where there are villages close to main towns and key service centres, is there not a case for limited development in them of both additional housing and associated small business capacity? A hub and spoke approach should prove advantageous in terms of reduced destruction of large areas of countryside and less travel to work. It also may assist in stemming the demise of such villages.</p>

	C - 8710 - 8049 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -
8909	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes they are the main towns but they should not be swamped by development. The overall housing numbers need to be reduced. Long Stratton should not be elevated to main town status</p> <p>C - 8909 - 2014 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9271	<p>Mrs Gray [5927] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>I could not find locations for major change and development in the NPA so don't know what I am commenting on regarding Wymondham</p> <p>C - 9271 - 5927 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9392	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Surely these all are or have been main towns. But by closing down various portions of their sustainability people have been to travel.</p> <p>C - 9392 - 8120 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9642	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>There is the potential for confusion with the "Main Towns" in that neither Aylsham, Diss nor Harleston are within the Norwich Policy Area and it should be made clear that these locations do not contribute towards the housing requirements/provision for</p>

	<p>the NPA.</p> <p>C - 9642 - 7503 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9658	<p>Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Page 30 7.15 Last paragraph "Long Stratton will have main town status - it states at Appendix 30 option 3 moderate growth at Wymondham and Long Stratton - this if 1500 houses at Long Stratton - it needs to be made known the number of dwelling considered to be moderate and which major development - if 1800.</p> <p>In that paragraph it states " The final number of new homes built in Long Stratton is intended to fund a bypass - this indicates we should not have a bypass until all homes were built - there is nothing definite about a bypass being provided before any development takes place!</p> <p>What is the range of community infrastructure?</p> <p>C - 9658 - 8165 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9764	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 15/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Insufficient knowledge of the areas concerned.</p> <p>C - 9764 - 8184 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9779	<p>Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Whilst the Parish Council agrees with the places proposed as main towns this would require that the infrastructure needs very careful consideration and planning.</p> <p>South Norfolk seems to have a disproportionate number of sites in a concentrated area i.e. around Wymondham. Large concentrations will put an increased burden on schools and health care that are already oversubscribed.</p>

	C - 9779 - 1974 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -
<p>9816</p>	<p>East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 29/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Whilst the role of the urban centre of Norwich is key, the RES also explicitly recognises the role that other centres and villages within the sub-region will play in facilitating growth through a balanced approach to housing and employment distribution. The roles highlighted for the main towns and key service centres in addition to Norwich, are also welcomed by EEDA. The role of these locations and their relationship to the main urban areas as part of an interdependent economic system is highlighted in the RES and their importance in considering appropriate levels of development, economic challenges and service provision are all critical to sub-regional success.</p> <p>C - 9816 - 1509 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9846</p>	<p>Spen Hill Developments Limited [8201] (represented by DPP LLP (Ms Chloe Renner) [8202]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>We broadly support the retail hierarchy suggested within the Issues and Options paper. In particular, we would support the identification of Diss as a 'main town'. The allocation of the centre is therefore consistent with the advice in PPS6 'Planning for Town Centres'.</p> <p>Our representations concern retail provision within Diss, and specifically the opportunities presented by our client's land to the south of Park Road, Diss. The site is allocated within the adopted 'South Norfolk Local Plan' for 'retailing and leisure purposes'. We support the continued allocation of this site to provide additional retail floorspace.</p> <p>We do not consider that our client's site should be brought forward in line with an Area Action Plan, as suggested by paragraph 7.11, given that the site would be able to be developed in the short term with an application likely to be before the Local Planning Authority within the coming months.</p> <p>Turning to assess the extent of the town centre, we consider that our client's land should be included within the defined town centre boundary. PPS6 'Planning for Town Centres' advises that the defined town centre boundaries should include "areas of predominantly leisure, business and other main town centre uses within or adjacent to the primary shopping area". The site is</p>

	<p>immediately adjacent to the 'Central Business Area', as defined within the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. Given the established commercial use and its allocation with the Local Plan for retail and leisure purposes, it is clear that that site is an important part of the town centre. This should be formally recognised and the 'Town Centre Boundary' should be extended to include land south of Park Road, Diss. The inclusion of the land within the defined boundary would maximise the potential to enhance the town centre's vitality and viability.</p> <p>C - 9846 - 8201 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9852	<p>Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8203] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr James Alflatt) [8204]) - COMMENT Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd opinion id that for the emerging Spatial Vision for the Norwich Policy Area to conform with the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) the provision of new homes across the Policy Area during the Plan period should be regarded as a minimum. Pending the review of the RSS (Policy H1) and given that the current provision set by the RSS significantly falls short of what is needed for the region based on evidence about housing pressure, affordability and household projections; it becomes increasingly important to consider the number of dwellings allocated in the Policy Area as a minimum. In view of this it is important to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility within the Partnership's emerging Spatial Strategy to allow for the delivery of a greater number of residential units throughout the Plan period to achieve higher rates of provision, subject to environmental and infrastructure constraints.</p> <p>C - 9852 - 8203 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9963	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>C - 9963 - 6903 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10089	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - COMMENT Web - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

Lucky Aylsham!

C - 10089 - 8235 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10207 Kier Land Ltd [8254] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Adam Nicholls) [7168]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

Kier Land Ltd has reviewed the current Regulation 25 Technical Consultation document. No changes have been made to the sections of the document dealing with Aylsham (principally Policy 6 and supporting text), so the comments made in response to the August 2008 Regulation 25 consultation still stand, with Kier Land Ltd's main point of contention that Aylsham should be allocated 300 dwellings. For the sake of completeness, these comments are repeated below.

Kier Land Ltd notes, however, the contents of the Evidence Report submitted to the GNDP Policy Group meeting on 18 December 2008. In it (pages 56 and 58), GNDP officers note that a number of respondents (including Anglian Water) queried whether the lack of sewerage capacity at Aylsham should be reviewed as a definitive constraint. Certainly it is Kier Land Ltd's view that, through appropriate investment, additional sewerage capacity could be made available at Aylsham (albeit perhaps not until post-2016). Kier Land Ltd is pleased that statutory consultees such as Norfolk County Council, Anglian Water, NHS Norfolk and Aylsham Town Council believe that there are no other significant constraints to growth at Aylsham, so asserts that an allocation of 300 dwellings should be made (commensurate with Diss and Harleston).

In this respect, the agreement that Stage 2B of the Water Cycle Study will include a specific examination of the sewerage position at Aylsham is welcomed warmly. Kier Land Ltd hopes that the results will confirm that the sewerage constraints in Aylsham are not as significant as currently stated in the Joint Core Strategy, and thus that an allocation of 300 dwellings could be made safely.

The reason given for the absence of housing allocation to Aylsham is that there is no spare capacity at Aylsham Sewage Treatment Works to accommodate further housing growth. However, Kier Land Ltd has made a pre-development inquiry to Anglian Water Services for its site in Aylsham; AWS's response is that additional wastewater transport/treatment capacity will be provided for sites allocated within the LDF from 2016. There are no other significant constraints to Aylsham accommodating housing growth commensurate with its Main Town status during the Plan period (to 2026). An appropriate amendment to the text should be made to say: "accommodate new housing growth that will be moderate in Aylsham (300 new homes)".

Policy 6 (Main Towns) allocates specific housing numbers each of the four chosen Main Towns. Aylsham is a thriving market town, well endowed with shops and services and it is recognised in paragraph 7.8 that Aylsham has available employment land and spare capacity in all its schools. Aylsham is well-placed to accept an appropriate allocation of housing to allow its continued organic growth. But because the sewage treatment works are currently operating at full capacity, no housing allocation is proposed (other than infill).

However, as outlined above, wastewater infrastructure capacity constraints in Aylsham would be lifted from 2016, should Aylsham be allocated any new dwellings in the Joint Core Strategy/Site Allocations DPD. Housing growth in the town could therefore take place in the years beyond 2016.

Kier Land Ltd is promoting its site at Burgh Road in Aylsham, and believes it will be able to deliver about 200 of the 300 dwellings sought for Aylsham. The initial SHLAA analysis (September 2008) finds that the site is at low flood risk, is not close to any hazardous installations, could be accessed safely and is well-located for local services and public transport connections to Norwich. A Transport Assessment is being undertaken to provide a more detailed assessment of access, highways and public transport connections. Other utility enquiry responses suggest that the cost of connecting the site to the main gas and electricity networks will be very low as existing infrastructure is already present.

In conclusion, Aylsham should be allocated a minimum of 300 dwellings, the same as Diss and Harleston.

Q: What additional significant infrastructure requirements would there be?

Whilst it is not possible to be certain at this juncture, it appears to Kier Land Ltd that the main infrastructure requirements to allow residential growth at Aylsham will be improvements to the wastewater treatment and water supply networks. However, improvement schemes for both are believed to be included in Anglian Water's longer-term plans.

Q: What opportunities can growth bring?

Aylsham is a bustling market town serving a wide rural hinterland. Allocating further housing in the town will help ensure balanced growth along with the planned expansion in employment areas. Kier Land Ltd believes that planned improvements to the wastewater treatment and water supply infrastructure will ensure that Aylsham will be able to continue to grow organically into the future.

Q: What are the constraints to delivering the proposed level of growth and how can these be overcome?

As described in the answers above, Kier Land Ltd believes that the only significant constraint to delivering growth of 300 dwellings in Aylsham is the delivery of improvements to the local wastewater infrastructure capacity (the need for new water supply infrastructure being a high cost for all Main Towns and Key Service Centres). It is apparent that this constraint can be

	<p>overcome by 2016 if suitable housing numbers and sites are included in the Joint Core Strategy/Site Allocations DPD (i.e. Anglian Water will provide the infrastructure). Other constraints are likely to be site-specific and relatively minor, which would be overcome through normal Section 106 agreements and planning conditions.</p> <p>C - 10207 - 8254 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10303	<p>mrs LISA ford [8282] - COMMENT Web - 07/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Increasing housing in Wymondham will not automatically be a good thing for the shops in the town centre - shops are closing in the town centre with the current development. The town is losing it's identity due to the large developments - this is what is causing the town centre to suffer (for example the opening of the large DIY store on the outskirts and it's effect on the business of the DIY store in Wymondham town centre)</p> <p>C - 10303 - 8282 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10489	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? No development.</p> <p>C - 10489 - 8310 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10537	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - COMMENT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Parking will be a problem in all these locations</p> <p>C - 10537 - 8312 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10698	<p>Kier Land Ltd [8254] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]) - COMMENT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as</p>

	<p>Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>One of Kier Land Ltd's main concerns in the current iteration of the Core Strategy is the treatment of Aylsham. Although classed as one of the four 'Main Towns', it is not proposed to make a housing allocation for Aylsham because of the lack of spare capacity in the town's sewage works. The agreement that Stage 2B of the Water Cycle Study will include a specific examination of the sewerage position at Aylsham is welcomed warmly. Kier Land Ltd hopes that the results will confirm that the sewerage constraints in Aylsham are not as significant as currently stated in the Joint Core Strategy, and thus that an allocation of 300 dwellings could be made safely.</p> <p>C - 10698 - 8254 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10718	<p>Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 26/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>I agree with valuing the specialness of market towns, but the intrinsic value of established communities in Norwich should also be respected and enhanced, rather than ... in order to justify demolition and replacement with "high density" systems which contain elements which are socially flawed due to their layouts.</p> <p>C - 10718 - 8354 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10791	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>All expansions of existing main towns need to be matched or exceeded by measures to reduce the need to travel and to provide sustainable transport provision. It would be desirable to leave all development areas in a better state for sustainable transport than before.</p> <p>C - 10791 - 8360 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10806	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>All expansions of existing main towns need to be matched or exceeded by measures to reduce the need to travel and to provide</p>

sustainable transport provision. It would be desirable to leave all development areas in a better state for sustainable transport than before.

C - 10806 - 8361 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10915 Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) -

COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

The RSS East of England Plan proposes that market and other towns should also accommodate significant levels of growth. They should have the potential to increase their social and economic sustainability through measures to support regeneration and improve their accessibility, especially by public transport. Four main towns have been identified, Aylsham, Diss, Harleston and Wymondham. ALP support these proposals. However, in the case of Wymondham, which is the only 'main town' to be designated with major development and the only main town within the NPA, we believe the proposed infrastructure improvements will come forward as a result of the proposals supported under the Favoured Option.

67 In light of the above statement, ALP do not need to comment on questions 15, (Main Towns) or questions 16 (Service Villages) or 17, 18 and 19 (Other Places).

C - 10915 - 8367 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -

11079 Residents of Gibbs Close, Little Melton [8385] (represented by Mr Alex Graham [8384]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

5. Policy 6 Main Towns

a. Aylsham

No further growth is proposed at Aylsham despite it being the fourth largest centre outside of Norwich with available employment land and spare capacity at all of its schools. The reason given is that the sewage treatment works is at capacity. In much the same way as school capacity and other infrastructure requirements can be funded through financial contributions from development, there seems to be

	<p>insufficient justification to discount the ability of such contributions to improve sewage infrastructure. This should be explored further in order to allow capacity at this 'main town' to be maximised before looking to settlements lower in the hierarchy.</p> <p>b. Diss Diss has the largest number of shops and services outside Norwich, a railway station and good public transport links. It is of a sufficient distance from Norwich in order for it to thrive in this way, exploiting a different catchment area to Norwich. With significant new retail space planned and existing public transport infrastructure in place, far more development potential should be planned here than the envisaged 300 houses. In a complimentary way, its growth will also draw traffic towards it from areas north, reducing the pressure for all trips/ movements to be focussed towards Norwich.</p> <p>c. Wymondham By contrast, the JCS recognises that Wymondham due to its proximity to Norwich, loses much of its trade to the city. It therefore seems counterproductive to seek 2,200 new homes in this location. Not only would this stimulate further out commuting to Norwich, it would harm the historic market town character which the JCS says it wishes to preserve (Objective 8).</p> <p>C - 11079 - 8385 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>7884</p>	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Major market towns must be allowed to expand, but not by just using supermarkets, they have virtually killed Diss's town centre as has the lack of access and free parking, it is quicker for us to use the Eye post office rather than the Diss one, absolutely crazy.</p> <p>S - 7884 - 7787 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>7966</p>	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - SUPPORT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as</p>

	<p>Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Diss is currently dying on its feet and needs help to prevent the business area becoming a dead area. Again the bribery for a by pass at Long Stratton the shops here are described as being good but compared with Harleston are pathetic</p> <p>S - 7966 - 6862 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8003	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? I think there is a need to regenerate the site at Park Road Diss but there has already been a lot of development along Victoria Road and query if the school, doctors etc can cope with the number of people proposed - same comments for Harleston.</p> <p>S - 8003 - 7851 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8060	<p>Cedric Brown [7871] - SUPPORT Web - 19/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? I am very concerned that Aylsham has had further development without the infrastructure (in particular drainage and surface water disposal) being in place</p> <p>S - 8060 - 7871 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8157	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? What plans are there for services infrastructure shortcomings?</p> <p>S - 8157 - 7899 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8182	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	<p>But does Cittaslow status still exist in Diss or funding has been withdrawn/ ceased?!</p> <p>S - 8182 - 4796 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8207	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes, but what happens if Wymondham and Harleston becomes a citta-slow town? You should be seeking to apply the citta-slow philosophy to all towns.</p> <p>S - 8207 - 7901 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8232	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8232 - 4558 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8272	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8272 - 7912 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8297	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? full</p> <p>S - 8297 - 7915 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>8428</p>	<p>Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8428 - 7771 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8471</p>	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8471 - 8016 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8545</p>	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8545 - 8021 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8569</p>	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8569 - 1976 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8606</p>	<p>Tacolnaston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8606 - 2059 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8732	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8732 - 8053 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8788	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>But what about North Walsham</p> <p>S - 8788 - 8061 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8813	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Subject to the views of residents in these towns</p> <p>S - 8813 - 6869 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8840	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8840 - 8064 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>8964</p>	<p>Ms Rosemary Mann [7706] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8964 - 7706 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8978</p>	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8978 - 8092 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8995</p>	<p>Mr CM Sparrow [8093] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8995 - 8093 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9110</p>	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9110 - 7111 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9115</p>	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9115 - 8111 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9154	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9154 - 2055 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9169	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9169 - 8112 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9223	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9223 - 1828 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9234	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9234 - 4494 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>9429</p>	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9429 - 8127 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9454</p>	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>S - 9454 - 8134 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9488</p>	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9488 - 8139 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9603</p>	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9603 - 8162 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9677</p>	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p>

	S - 9677 - 8047 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -
9728	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9728 - 8174 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9797	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes, broadly we agree with Policy 6. The scale of expansion is low relative to the size of these towns, with the exception of Hethersett.</p> <p>S - 9797 - 7513 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9880	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9880 - 2058 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9934	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9934 - 7015 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>9996</p>	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9996 - 8228 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10030</p>	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10030 - 8230 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10053</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10053 - 2373 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10129</p>	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10129 - 8234 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10181</p>	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as</p>

	<p>Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10181 - 8246 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10218	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10218 - 5864 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10344	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? But you run the risk of changing the character of Wymondham if it is overdeveloped with too many houses and shops.</p> <p>S - 10344 - 8293 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10367	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10367 - 2020 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10398	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10398 - 8294 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>10434</p>	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10434 - 8308 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10513</p>	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10513 - 7215 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10616</p>	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? This would seem to respond to the demand for housing for local people in their own local areas.</p> <p>S - 10616 - 8325 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10737</p>	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes, in principle, but require clarification as to how suitable expansion of Aylsham Town Centre would be achieved. The Town Council would be opposed to out of centre retail development.</p> <p>S - 10737 - 1776 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10770</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as</p>

	<p>Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10770 - 7666 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10828	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10828 - 8362 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10853	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? NOTE: In the descriptions of Main Towns and Key Service Centres, Diss and Harleston are identified as requiring a new water supply for any further development, while growth in Aylsham, Hethersett, Reepham and Wroxham is shown to be limited to varying degrees at present by existing sewer capacity. The common recurrence of these themes points to a likelihood that they will be major issues with the scale of development envisaged and it is surprising that descriptions for some of the larger developments proposed, such as North East Norwich or Wymondham, omit mention of these vital prerequisites.</p> <p>S - 10853 - 8018 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10891	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10891 - 8366 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10933	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as</p>

	<p>Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10933 - 8368 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10957	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10957 - 8369 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10981	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10981 - 8176 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
11004	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 11004 - 8370 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
11050	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT Paper - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? But see earlier response reference to Aylsham where the alleged sewer capacity issues needs to be further reviewed.</p> <p>S - 11050 - 6955 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>11134</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 11134 - 2373 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>7876</p>	<p>Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] - OBJECT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? leave well alone</p> <p>O - 7876 - 7782 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>7882</p>	<p>Mr Paul Mallett [7783] - OBJECT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? No further destruction of Wymondham town centre must take place. Have we not learned anything from the destruction of Norwich city centre by knocking down the wall, Magdalen Street for the flyover, st stephens street to name a few. No more shopping space is needed, simply better use of existing units/buildings and using the new gateway estate.</p> <p>O - 7882 - 7783 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>7907</p>	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd (Mr Terence Harper) [6956] - OBJECT Web - 06/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Aylsham should be proposed for sizable housing allocations (say 500 houses), being ideally suited and NOT actually restricted by sewerage discharge - AW have recently confirmed that (i) there is current capacity for 400 dwellings and (ii) they have already submitted for an extension to the Works to Ofwat as part of their AMP5 Price Review and although the earliest start for extension at the treatment works would be 2013, if phased housing development no problem is foreseen.</p> <p>O - 7907 - 6956 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

7942	<p>mr David Jones [7816] - OBJECT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? You say in the text that Long Stratton will have main town status . The shopping ,service and community facilities do not support this . The extra traffic on the A140 from new houses can not be accommodated ...</p> <p>O - 7942 - 7816 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8253	<p>R Barker [6805] - OBJECT Web - 05/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? You now include Long Stratton as a 'Main Town'</p> <p>The response of Long Stratton residents was 36.9% wanting development of more than 1500homes whilst 63.1% wanted less or NO development.</p> <p>Long Stratton is at present a village. What has happened to democracy ? - you have ignored the majority views of residents and reneged on the promise of 'Protecting the special character of our towns and villages'....Long Stratton residents have been betrayed. (South Norfolk Conservatives are even stating in their latest leaflet that they have kept this promise !! - THIS IS UNTRUE AND TOTAL BETRAYAL</p> <p>O - 8253 - 6805 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8361	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - OBJECT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Significant investment in terms of building new sewage/water facilities is needed before Aylsham, Diss and Harleston can even be considered as 'main towns ' and Long Stratton will require major development before it reaches this status. Only Wymondham already fulfils the criteria.</p> <p>O - 8361 - 6992 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>8385</p>	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? The decision not to make a new housing allocation at Aylsham is based on the mistaken assumption that sewage treatment cannot easily be provided. Our consultants have demonstrated that sewerage treatment can easily be provided for a new allocation by extending the existing STW, or by building an on-site STW.</p> <p>O - 8385 - 7966 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8520</p>	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Harleston should be excluded as the lack of commercial bus operation means a growth (larger) in now sustainable travel</p> <p>O - 8520 - 7817 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8624</p>	<p>Kay Eke [8025] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Surely main towns should be allocated in terms of their proximity to Norwich. If the intention is to reduce travel etc, would it not make more sense to develop those towns which are furthest away from the City Centre and thereby provide their residents with enhanced facilities.</p> <p>O - 8624 - 8025 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8658</p>	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Long Stratton should remain as a service centre only</p> <p>O - 8658 - 8036 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>8682</p>	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Long Stratton should not be classed as a small town</p> <p>O - 8682 - 8044 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8739</p>	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? It will ruin the character of Wymondham.</p> <p>O - 8739 - 8045 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8892</p>	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Wymondham does not lose retail trade to Norwich - trade has been driven out by SNDC policy. compare with Dereham</p> <p>O - 8892 - 8071 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8933</p>	<p>Miss Rachel Buckenham [8079] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Wymondham cannot sustain significant growth, its doctors, dentists and schools are already full and the roads are extremely busy</p> <p>O - 8933 - 8079 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9025</p>	<p>Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as</p>

	<p>Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? No Strongly disagree that Aylsham does not have the capacity for additional growth given the capacity in the town for employment and the services provided. It is identified as having the fourth highest level of shops and services outside Norwich, available employment land and spare capacity at its schools.</p> <p>O - 9025 - 7535 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9041	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Strategic development in the satellite towns is unsustainable for the reasons stated</p> <p>O - 9041 - 4187 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9193	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? You should choose to use a railway lines - so DBS and Wymondham are OK but not Aylsham and Harleston - take Hoveton / Wroxham and N. Walsham instead.</p> <p>O - 9193 - 8114 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9293	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? No 'MAIN TOWN' for Long Stratton, small amount of development with NO bypass so we can remain RURAL</p> <p>O - 9293 - 5445 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9329	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as</p>

	<p>Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Wymondham will be too large and unsustainable.</p> <p>O - 9329 - 8123 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9358	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Acle need to be included as it has good transport links (i.e. trains & frequent buses)</p> <p>O - 9358 - 7113 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9387	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Too many houses for Wymondham.</p> <p>O - 9387 - 8124 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9519	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Disagree with overall strategy BUT these towns could do with investment especially DISS</p> <p>O - 9519 - 8140 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9560	<p>Cllr John Francis Pitt-Pladdy [8147] - OBJECT Web - 06/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? 1. Process too 'top-down' 2. Infrastructure needs not fully assessed. 3. Planning guidelines too opaque for public to understand.</p>

	<p>4. Full traffic surveys of towns required as part of overall plans.</p> <p>O - 9560 - 8147 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9569	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Not applicable to Drayton</p> <p>O - 9569 - 6690 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9702	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>As mentioned previously, 1800 in Long Stratton is too many without specific employment areas to support this number and with certainty that infrastructure will keep pace with development, so existing residents are not affected. More commuting to Norwich will increase already large traffic flows on A140. [N.B. in response to Q3, respondent suggests more development in main towns of Diss and Harleston - RB]</p> <p>O - 9702 - 5446 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9829	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 30/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Aylsham, as BDC's only market town, should be allocated housing subject to a satisfactory conclusion being reached on sewage!</p> <p>O - 9829 - 8198 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10106	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	<p>Whilst investment in improvements in these areas is valid the proposed housing development is too large</p> <p>O - 10106 - 8239 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10241	<p>Mr Duncan Smith [8257] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>I write with reference your public consultation under 'Regulation 25'. I object strongly to the building of lots of houses in and near to Norwich. It is destroying the countryside and making us like the huge built-up areas in the Midlands and London.</p> <p>O - 10241 - 8257 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10319	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>CPRE Norfolk recognises that market towns listed may need to accommodate some growth within the spatial strategy for the Greater Norwich area. Of greater concern is how this development will be sensitively integrated into the existing settlement and its wider landscape. We would like to see specific policy commitments on the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and use of appropriate local materials, in this section.</p> <p>However, in our view, the level of growth proposed at Wymondham needs to be lowered (in line with our comments under Q5). An addition of 2200 homes will lead to a population increase of 40%, putting too much pressure on local services and significantly affect the historical character of the town. A new housing estate will not enhance the special qualities of Wymondham or its surroundings, but simply set apart the old part and the new part of the town in a striking way.</p> <p>We cannot support the principle of delivering new homes in Long Stratton simply to provide developer subsidy for a bypass. The need to make Long Stratton a Main Town is thus questionable.</p> <p>O - 10319 - 6826 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10461	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as</p>

	<p>Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? No development.</p> <p>O - 10461 - 8309 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10562	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? Leave things as they are.</p> <p>O - 10562 - 8318 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10585	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10585 - 8319 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10667	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - OBJECT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? No. I believe that Wymondham has already been saturated with development and that Aylsham and Harleston are too far from Norwich to provide economical public transport links as well as having a strong rural identity which would be swamped by additional large development. Diss on the borders of the county could be developed further to provide jobs locally and the rail network to London improved and made more reliable.</p> <p>O - 10667 - 8348 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
11118	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

For clarity the achievement of "Main Town" status by Long Stratton should be referenced within Policy 6, not just within the supporting text, in the same way as Wymondham, noting that it is a location for major change and development in the Norwich Policy Area.

O - 11118 - 8390 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -

11146 JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy?

OBJECT

We support the proposed level of growth for Aylsham, Diss and Harleston, which appears to be founded on a credible evidence base. However, we object to the inclusion of Long Stratton in the supporting text, as this village is not a main town; we object to the proposed housing development which would see it elevated to main town status, as set out in our responses to questions 1 and 2. With regard to Wymondham, we support its identification as a main town, and a location for major change and development.

O - 11146 - 6979 - Policy 6 Main Towns (Q14), (Q14) Do you agree with the places proposed as Main Towns and the part they will play in the strategy? -

Response – Q15

Key service centres

Policy 7 (page 31) explains what key service centres are and the part they play in the strategy. The proposed key service centres are listed in this policy.

Q15 Key service centres

Policy 7 (page 31) explains what key service centres are and the part they play in the strategy. The proposed key service centres are listed in this policy.

Q15 Do you agree with the places proposed as **Key Service Centres** and the part they will play in the strategy? YES / NO
If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q15 Total	120	30	62	34	126

7918	<p>Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - COMMENT Web - 06/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Restrictions on number of second-homes, especially in these picturesque villages are a necessity. This will assure that the infrastructure you will provide will be used by people living and working locally.</p> <p>C - 7918 - 6885 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8118	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - COMMENT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Is building on productive land a sustainable policy?</p> <p>C - 8118 - 7888 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8208	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - COMMENT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? This is for the people in the proposed places to decide.</p> <p>C - 8208 - 7901 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8409	<p>pete eldridge [7990] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Web - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>An extra hundred houses in Hingham would place an intolerable strain on the school which does not have facilities to cope with this extra number.</p> <p>Whilst temporary classrooms could be in place to teach the children the other infrastructure in the school is missing.</p> <p>There would need to be building programme to provide a Hall space able to accommodate the number of children coming both from the recent new homes and these others.</p> <p>C - 8409 - 7990 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8594	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Brownfield sites only</p> <p>C - 8594 - 8024 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8645	<p>Mr Alan Cant [8032] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>I would like the report to say that pressure to meet housing targets will not cause planning authorities to look more favourably on higher density proposals, particularly in respect of village sites which deserve developments sympathetic to existing surrounds and highways. (E.g. the scheme put forward by developers for the Beccles Road "Express Plastics" site in Loddon, which many local residents responded to, highlighting its inappropriate urban character).</p> <p>C - 8645 - 8032 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8659	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	<p>Long Stratton should be a service centre, not main town.</p> <p>C - 8659 - 8036 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8711	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - COMMENT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Where there are villages close to main towns and key service centres, is there not a case for limited development in them of both additional housing and associated small business capacity? A hub and spoke approach should prove advantageous in terms of reduced destruction of large areas of countryside and less travel to work. It also may assist in stemming the demise of such villages.</p> <p>C - 8711 - 8049 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8814	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? No comment. This should be judged by local residents</p> <p>C - 8814 - 6869 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8910	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes these are the key service centres but many of these places have already suffered from over-development. Great care is needed to protect what remains of their character</p> <p>C - 8910 - 2014 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9395	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

Are these not already important locations with out giving them fancy new names to confuse people into thinking otherwise

C - 9395 - 8120 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

9624 Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

The settlements appear to have been selected solely on the presence of a certain level of services. No evidence is provided that any assessment of how these settlements actually function has been undertaken, or that the issues raised by the Countryside Agency's publication „The Role of Rural Settlements as Service Centres. have been addressed.

It is difficult to reconcile the assessments of some of the individual settlements in the „Reasoned Justification. text with the scale of the housing development proposed. For instance, Acle is said to have environmental and infrastructural constraints, and only limited potential for job growth, yet up to 200 houses is proposed here. This is said to be because no allocations are to be made at Aylsham, but why the two settlements should be linked in this way, or how this overcomes the constraints mentioned, is not made clear. In respect of Brundall it is said that there are various constraints and more sustainable locations for housing elsewhere, yet up to 50 houses is proposed here.

The Authority remains to be convinced that 200 houses at Loddon and (a resultant total of) 350 at Wroxham/Hoveton will be in the best interests of these settlements and the wider context of the Broads and the Norwich area.

Overall it appears that despite the term „Key Service Centres. the approach to these settlements is primarily concerned with the allocation of housing numbers. The Authority would wish to see more evidence presented of consideration of the particular needs and potentials of the individual settlements in respects other than accommodating further housing development.

One of the key challenges in further developing small settlements such as these in such close proximity to a major city, is how this can avoid them becoming, or becoming further entrenched as, satellite/commuter settlements to Norwich. More explicit recognition of this challenge, and how it is to be addressed, would be helpful.

The Broads Authority recognises the need for additional housing development in rural areas, but believes that the scale and location of this needs to be very carefully chosen. Detailed

	<p>analyses of the function, constraints, and potential of individual settlements should inform and justify the plans. It may well be that this has taken place, but the evidence for this is lacking in the text provided.</p> <p>No information is provided on the changes in resulting size, distribution and structure of the population expected to arise from the proposed housing developments.</p> <p>C - 9624 - 7986 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9643</p>	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Same as for question 14, it should be made clear that some of the Key Service Centres do not contribute towards the housing requirements/provision of the Norwich Policy Area.</p> <p>C - 9643 - 7503 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9773</p>	<p>Mr Michael Whalley [8189] (represented by King Sturge (Mr Mark Connell) [6455]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Blofield continues to be considered a Key Service Centre. This is supported. However, a greater amount of housing should be directed towards the settlement.</p> <p>As the document recognises, Blofield already benefits from a number of facilities which could support additional housing. For example, a village hall, primary school, convenience store, local GP surgery and good bus links all service the area. There is justification for additional development in this Key Service Centre. The current allocation of up to 50 dwellings should be increased to over 100 dwellings.</p> <p>In that regards, the extra clarification note inserted into the last draft document (page 31) is welcomed. This appears to allow additional development beyond the housing numbers identified (for those Key Service Areas which are within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA)). Potentially, this includes Blofield.</p> <p>The principal of the note is therefore supported. However, it is felt that there would be merit in either increasing the range in development capacity in Blofield or incorporating the note into the policy text to remove any ambiguity.</p>

	<p>New homes will help retain the indigenous population. This is necessary to support existing services and facilities, and encourage further investment in Blofield. Indeed, in submissions to Broadland's own site specific allocations, proposals have been lodged for a mixed use scheme comprising of sheltered housing, retirement care and affordable and private housing units. An opportunity exists to improve the framework for such a scheme, by increasing the housing allocation for Blofield explicitly.</p> <p>The draft core strategy is supported. Growth is correctly focussed in the Norwich Policy Area, and Blofield is recognised as a Key Service Area within this designation. Furthermore, a specific allocation of housing for the settlement is also considered appropriate. However, the amount specified is too low. Whilst the insertion of a new clarifying note provides flexibility to develop over the specified threshold of 50 dwellings, a more explicit allocation (for over 100 dwellings) would better help bring development forward.</p> <p>C - 9773 - 8189 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9786</p>	<p>East Carleton Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1997] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Another concern is that the current infrastructure is already overstretched and the key service centres will not have sufficient development to fund the additional services such as schools and health care to support both the planned expansion in the key service centres and the neighbouring rural villages reliant on these services.</p> <p>C - 9786 - 1997 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9817</p>	<p>East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 29/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Whilst the role of the urban centre of Norwich is key, the RES also explicitly recognises the role that other centres and villages within the sub-region will play in facilitating growth through a balanced approach to housing and employment distribution. The roles highlighted for the main towns and key service centres in addition to Norwich, are also welcomed by EEDA. The role of these locations and their relationship to the main urban areas as part of an interdependent economic system is highlighted in the RES and their importance in considering appropriate levels of development, economic challenges and service provision are all critical to sub-regional success.</p>

	C - 9817 - 1509 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -
9964	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>C - 9964 - 6903 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10090	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>This is acceptable if Hingham and Hethersett numbers are cut down.</p> <p>C - 10090 - 8235 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10149	<p>R Smith [8243] (represented by Beacon Planning Ltd (Ms Jenny Page) [7833]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>The policy highlights that allocations will be subject to any specific servicing constraints.</p> <p>The wording in italics highlights that settlements within the NPA will be considered for additional development.</p> <p>It is therefore logical that those settlements in the NPA with few servicing and infrastructure constraints are well placed to deliver additional development. The reasoned justification following the policy provides brief comments on the key service centres. The four settlements within the NPA are Blofield, Brundall, Hethersett and Poringland. Hethersett is identified for major growth, 1,000 dwellings, although it is noted that its sewer capacity to accommodate this level of growth is in question.</p> <p>Poringland is not identified as having any further growth and it is unclear why it is still referred to as these policies are identifying areas for new growth rather than referring to existing commitments. Clearly there are existing commitments across the GNDP area which are contributing to the Regional Spatial Strategy target but are not referred to in policy elsewhere in the</p>

document.

Blofield and Brundall both identified as having shops and services are both considered unsuitable for additional housing growth other than of a limited scale as the view is there are more sustainable options in the NPA.

This is disputed. Blofield in particular is highly suitable for additional development. It has none of the infrastructure or environmental constraints identified at other Key Service Centres. The proximity of the settlement to Norwich should be considered an advantage in terms of sustainability. The settlement is on the A47 major distributor route. Blofield is already reasonably well served with public transport to Norwich and the Broadland Business Park but would directly benefit from proposal to improve public transport links on major distributor routes.

Further consideration must be given to selecting the most appropriate sustainable settlements where housing can be delivered within the plan period.

C - 10149 - 8243 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10164 Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

With regards to Question 15, we agree with the identification of Wroxham as a Key Service Centre. The village has a significant role as a Key Service Centre, servicing a wide rural area.

We note that North Norfolk District Council has responded to the GNDP that they consider that the growth of Wroxham is consistent with the identification of Hoveton as a secondary settlement in the North Norfolk Core Strategy. Wroxham and Hoveton in effect act as a single settlement, which is a significant centre for boat building and boat hiring. Despite a decline in boat hire businesses, this sector continues to be critical to the economy of the area. The North Norfolk Core Strategy proposes a 10ha employment allocation as well as a residential allocation at Hoveton. Residents in Wroxham would benefit from additional employment opportunities in Hoveton.

Wroxham is a sustainable location, well served by public transport via both train and bus to Norwich and other key destinations and this will form an important part of the transport strategy.

It is considered that the development could provide the opportunity for public open space and community playground facilities.

There is currently a shortage of provision in Wroxham, further discussion will be undertaken with the Parish Council to seek their views on these matters.

Scale of Growth: The role of Wroxham and the scale of proposed growth should not be lightly set aside or diluted.

We note that there is currently limited proposed development at Aylsham due to current advice from the Water Cycle Study. However we understand that the Stage 2b study is undertaking further research into this matter and therefore, the level of development for Aylsham may change. However, we consider that any change should not result in a redistribution of the numbers of dwellings from Wroxham.

The level of growth for the Key Service Centres should be appropriate to maintain their role and it would be inappropriate to reduce the number of dwellings should further locations be identified.

C - 10164 - 7175 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10320 CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT

Paper - 27/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

CPRE Norfolk recognises that the settlements listed may need to accommodate some growth within the spatial strategy for the Greater Norwich area. Of greater concern is how this development will be sensitively integrated into the existing settlement and its wider landscape. We would like to see specific policy commitments on the protection of local distinctiveness, the promotion of good building design and use of appropriate local materials, in this section.

We would like to see housing allocation in this area directly address local housing needs - we would welcome a policy commitment on affordable housing in this section.

We have reservations about the large scale development of Hethersett and, in our view, its role in the strategy as an outlying extension of Norwich.

C - 10320 - 6826 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10462 Mr David Smith [8309] - COMMENT

Paper - 03/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places

proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?
No development.

C - 10462 - 8309 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10490 Mr I T Smith [8310] - COMMENT

Paper - 03/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?
No development.

C - 10490 - 8310 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10697 Mr A Semmence [6362] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Darren Cogman) [4024]) - COMMENT

Paper - 04/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

As previously indicated in the response to the Regulation 25 Technical Consultation in September 2008 Mr A Semmence continues to strongly support the identification of Hingham as a Key Service Centre in the settlement hierarchy. Hingham, as a market town has a good range of day-to-day facilities and services including a primary school, post office, a variety of shops, village hall with playing fields, Church's, medical surgery, dentist, library and employment area.

The local highway network and public transport bus services also provides Hingham with direct access to other employment opportunities and a wider range of facilities available in Wymondham, Norwich, Watton and East Dereham.

In this context Mr A Semmence continues to consider it right and proper that Hingham is allowed to grow to meet both the housing and employment needs of not only the Town but also its rural hinterland. In this way it will not only further support existing services and facilities but also have the potential to attract additional ones.

Notwithstanding this broad support Mr A Semmence contends that the emerging policy approach to limit growth within Hingham to 100 dwellings is too restrictive given the significant period involved (2006-2026), restricting the ongoing housing needs of local people. It is held that the figure of 100 dwellings, in the context of Hingham today which has a population of 2078 in 944 households (2001 Census) should therefore be increased.

Mr A Semmence once again suggests that in accordance with the East of England Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy), that growth

targets for the Key Service Centres should not be expressed as ceilings to development, rather that they are minimum targets to be achieved and go beyond in appropriate circumstances, such as to achieve sustainability objectives and to deliver mixed and balanced communities.

As indicated during the previous Reg. 25 Technical Consultation, in conclusion, Mr A Semmence contends that given the level of services that it possesses, Hingham should accommodate sufficient development to meet the needs of the community. As such it is suggested that as a Key Service Centre (Policy 7) Hingham should accommodate at least 100 new dwellings, as well as employment or service development appropriate to the needs of the Town and its immediate surroundings. Further growth will be accommodated where it can be demonstrated that it would contribute to meeting the needs and requirements of the Town and its surroundings and where sufficient capacity exists or can be provided to serve the growth and where it would not unduly impact upon existing environmental assets.

In conjunction with the above broad comments Mr A Semmence would also like to remind the Partnership of the information already submitted to support his site off Hall Close, Hingham (SNC Site ID No. 232) in conjunction with the accompanying Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) addressing Highway/Access matters as well as Utility provision via a Stage One Drainage, Flood Risk and Servicing Strategy Statement. As such Mr A Semmence has sought to demonstrate that this site is Suitable, Available and Achievable/Deliverable.

C - 10697 - 6362 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10792 Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

All expansions of existing key service centres need to be matched or exceeded by measures to reduce the need to travel and to provide sustainable transport provision. It would be desirable to leave all development areas in a better state for sustainable transport than before.

C - 10792 - 8360 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10807 Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

All expansions of existing main towns need to be matched or exceeded by measures to reduce the need to travel and to provide

sustainable transport provision. It would be desirable to leave all development areas in a better state for sustainable transport than before.

C - 10807 - 8361 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10916 Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) -

COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

There are ascribed benefits with the Favoured Option and the favoured locations.

These include the Long Stratton ByPass and the NNDR which presents the opportunity for major growth to North East of Norwich, but we do not believe they will be achieved. We do, however, believe there are real opportunities to be achieved to expanding Wymondham and we refer to these below.

Opportunities associated with large scale development in Wymondham

Transport and Movement

44 Further to the highway based improvements, the Favoured Option would also see major improvements to public transport services between Wymondham and Norwich. Most notably these would include a new high speed bus service and train station improvements which would enable a higher frequency of services to both Norwich and Cambridge.

45 Large scale development in Wymondham would also create improved walking, safe cycling routes and green infrastructure networks. Using the example of Wymondham, it is proposed that new networks would link with existing networks and other new developments, most notably those in South West Norwich.

Education Provision

46 Recent analysis from Norfolk County Council Education Services shows that the majority of schools in Wymondham are either at capacity or approaching capacity. Large scale development in Wymondham would create the capacity for a new 420 pupil primary school. This facility is most likely to be located in the South Wymondham area close to the railway station.

47 For a new secondary school Wymondham would have to expand by approximately 5,000 to 7,000 dwellings, and consequently the proposals outlined in the Favoured Option would not result in a new facility. However, using the Norfolk County Council School Children multiplier outlined on page 5 of the 2008 Obligation Standards document, we can see that the proposed 2,200 new dwellings will create in the region of 5,038 new residents (multiplier of 2.29). Of these 705 would be of High school age (multiplier of 14 per 100). These new pupils would be catered for in an expanded secondary school.

Town Centre Improvements

48 Large scale development in Wymondham would result in the expansion of the town centre of a quality that will retain and enhance the distinctive character of the historic place. This can be undertaken through a working partnership with the Local Authority and Town Council.

Existing Facilities Base

49 Barton Willmore has prepared a Facilities Audit of the PGO's outlined in the Issues and Options Document (Nov 2007) in order to provide important information to support representations for residential development in Wymondham.

50 Initial desk top research carried out on existing facilities and services utilising GIS, IQ Promap technology and site visits concluded that Wymondham, in terms of distance to those facilities identified, ranked 1st amongst the 10 other Potential Growth Options (PGOs) consistent with those identified in the JCS Issues and Options document. The settlements were then ranked for access to the following facilities measured from the central point for each of the PGOs:-

- Dentists
- Doctors
- Nursery Schools
- Secondary Schools
- Primary Schools
- Supermarkets/Convenience Stores
- Community Centres
- Railway Stations
- Libraries
- Hospitals
- Open Space/Recreation

- Sports facilities
- Golf Courses
- Post Offices

Figure 4 indicates that the only settlement to offer all the 14 facilities surveyed is South Wymondham which ranks first, followed by North West (Breck Farm), South West and North West (Horsford Manor). North Wymondham ranks joint 5th with Long Stratton.

Figure 5 shows that once both the incidence and coverage of facilities is taken into account there is very little difference between the top four ranking PGOs. North West (Horsford Manor) ranks first with North East inside (Racecourse) and South Wymondham in joint second place. Again, North Wymondham ranks fifth.

53 The facilities audit thus illustrates that Wymondham, and in particular the area around South Wymondham enjoys access to a wide range and large number of existing facilities and services, making it a highly sustainable location for larger scale development. Evidence from the EDAW study, discussed in Section 2 of the Facilities Audit, demonstrates that urban extensions to existing settlements demand less up front infrastructure and, as a result, are not subject to the types of delay and risk associated with housing growth in isolated, standalone locations.

54 One key advantage in terms of infrastructure of South Wymondham is the existence of a railway station which offers great potential to expand and increase the frequency of services to Norwich and further afield thereby increasing the town's sustainability. The only other PGO to benefit from a railway station is North East outside (Mousehold Farm).

55 Focusing development in Wymondham therefore creates the opportunity to use and enhance existing facilities, whilst building new facilities such as a 420 pupil primary school. This analysis shows that Wymondham is one of, if not the best location for growth in the GNDP.

Retail Provision / Capacity

56 Wymondham is the largest market town in the area but loses retail trade to Norwich due to its relatively close proximity and bus/rail links. In assessing various options/scenarios for future growth in Wymondham, Barton Willmore has undertaken a preliminary retail capacity work on Wymondham which updated a previous 2005

study.

57 From the retail assessment, it is clear there is support in national planning policy (i.e. PPS6) for retailing of an appropriate size to serve district and local centres. However, the lack of Development Plan support for development in Wymondham and for additional convenience retailing outside of the town centre means that any foodstore provision within the South Wymondham site will have to be justified on the basis that it can be primarily supported in expenditure terms by the development itself.

58 The current convenience goods (foodstore) provision in the town centre is poor. In addition, the only out-of-centre foodstore in the immediate vicinity of the town is the Waitrose store on Norwich Road adjacent to the North East Wymondham Development Area.

59 The South Norfolk Council Retail Study (November 2004), prepared by Chase and Partners, concluded that the need or capacity for further convenience goods floorspace in Wymondham is not as expansive as for comparison goods. The study further concluded that whilst further provision in town centres is to be encouraged regardless of capacity calculations, further provision outside of the town centre is unnecessary. Whilst we have reservations regarding some of the assumptions in the study, we broadly agree with Chase & Partners that based on the current catchment population and having regard to the size and retail function of Wymondham (i.e. our scenario 1 assessment), there is limited convenience goods expenditure capacity to support further convenience goods floorspace in the town.

60 In terms of the location for a main foodstore, given the reservations expressed by GVA Grimley in their Retail and Town Centres Study (October 2007) in respect of the potential impact of new retail floorspace as part of any new residential development on the overall vitality and viability of Wymondham town centre, and considering the location of the Waitrose store in relation to the North East Wymondham site, we suggest that a main foodstore could form part of a larger scale development as long as it is closely aligned with the Town Centre.

Joint Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment November 2008 (JCS SA Nov 2008)

61 Within the JCS Sustainability Appraisal it is stated that development at Wymondham would have good access to a range of local facilities and job opportunities. Wymondham already has a strong established community which should assist the

establishment of community spirit. Of all the locations under consideration, it has the widest range of town centre uses outside Norwich.

62 The document goes on to state "Wymondham is further from the range of job opportunities at Norwich than many alternative locations, but is a well established employment location in its own right and has already demonstrated its ability to attract employment investment. The town also enjoys good strategic links by train to Norwich and Cambridge, widening employment opportunities which are readily accessible. Of all the locations under consideration, it has the widest range of town centre uses outside Norwich".

63 In summary the document states "There are a number of positive factors which suggest Wymondham is a good location for growth. The biggest question mark concerns its distance from Norwich compared with other locations. However, there are mitigating factors in the form of good existing rail connections, including a rail connection to Cambridge, and the fact that Wymondham is located on the best performing radial corridor in Norwich in public transport terms. Priority measures to ensure buses can access this are the key prerequisite. In this respect, this location is likely to perform best when combined with major growth at the south west to facilitate the continuity of public transport priorities."

64 From the above analysis contained within the JCS Sustainability Assessment it is clear that Wymondham is already considered the most sustainable location within the GNDP for major development, including that in the contingency study.

How will this link with your longer term investment strategies?

65 The provision of 2,200 dwellings at Wymondham will lead to investment strategies linked to bringing forward the particular development location, in particular, drainage and transportation solutions will be required to unlock the development.

New investment in retail and leisure facilities will occur and contributions will provide for improvements to education, health, libraries and social services.

However, this scale of growth is not able to lead to the scale of investment needed to bring forward a whole settlement strategy of major planning benefits. With a greater scale of growth, say 6,500 dwellings and new employment, more comprehensive solutions are achievable in terms of new access to the A11, new secondary education as well as primary schools, new health centres and major open space provision. This has been demonstrated in our previous brochure on the South and North Wymondham Options submitted at Issues and Options stage in February

2008.

C - 10916 - 8367 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

11062 Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

We note that North Norfolk District Council has responded to the GNDP that they consider that the growth of Wroxham is consistent with the identification of Hoveton as a secondary settlement in the North Norfolk Core Strategy. Wroxham and Hoveton in effect act as a single settlement, which is a significant centre for boat building and boat hiring. Despite a decline in boat hire businesses, this sector continues to be critical to the economy of the area. The North Norfolk Core Strategy proposes a 10ha employment allocation as well as a residential allocation at Hoveton. Residents in Wroxham would benefit from additional employment opportunities in Hoveton.

Wroxham is a sustainable location, well served by public transport via both train and bus to Norwich and other key destinations and this will form an important part of the transport strategy.

It is considered that the development could provide the opportunity for public open space and community playground facilities. There is currently a shortage of provision in Wroxham, further discussion will be undertaken with the Parish Council to seek their views on these matters.

Scale of Growth: The role of Wroxham and the scale of proposed growth should not be lightly set aside or diluted.

We note that there is currently limited proposed development at Aylsham due to current advice from the Water Cycle Study. However we understand that the Stage 2b study is undertaking further research into this matter and therefore, the level of development for Aylsham may change. However, we consider that any change should not result in a redistribution of the numbers of dwellings from Wroxham.

The level of growth for the Key Service Centres should be appropriate to maintain their role and it would be inappropriate to reduce the number of dwellings should further locations be identified.

We have previously emphasised that in line with the East of England Plan growth targets should not be expressed as ceilings to development therefore, the housing figures for the Joint Core Strategy are not a ceiling to be distributed around settlements.

Spatial planning requires considered approach to determine suitable locations and quantum of growth in order to achieve sustainability objectives.

The determining factor of the appropriate level of growth should be based on the ability of the area to accommodate growth in terms of landscape and infrastructure capacities, the need to meet local housing and employment requirements and to help support village services and facilities.

Technical Supporting Evidence:

We are confident that the current level of growth can be accommodated in Wroxham and have already submitted information regarding these aspects to Broadland District Council in response to their request for Initial Site Concept Forms (copy included for information).

We have consulted Norfolk County Council on the potential infrastructure, service and amenity requirements arising from this proposal. At October 2008 they estimated that from a development of 200 dwellings it would be expected that there would be 17 nursery children, 51 primary school children and 28 High School children. It was stated that there were spare places at both the nursery and high school level. The letter from Norfolk County Council indicated that financial contributions could be made to satisfy education provision.

St Johns Primary and Broadland High School are both in Hoveton. We note the commentary on education provision in Hoveton in the North Norfolk Core Strategy which stated that pupil numbers in the Broadland High School catchment area are declining and there is scope for expansion of the existing sites, so it should be achievable to accommodate pupils generated from the proposed levels of housing.

We note that Environment Agency has flagged up that there is significant areas which are subject to flood risk around Wroxham. The area of land subject to this representation is to the south of Wroxham and is outside of the areas of risk of flooding as annotated on the Environment Agency's maps.

An initial transport and access appraisal has assessed that access to these sites can be achieved to minimise the effect of turning movements upon throughput on the B1140, which is a main distributor route. This report has been submitted to Broadland District Council through the Site Allocations Process. Plus an Ecology Study has also been submitted. Both demonstrate that there are no technical barriers to the delivery of this site.

C - 11062 - 7175 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

<p>11068</p>	<p>Mr R W Kidner [5016] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Generally yes. However, with regard to Poringland specifically there is clearly a need for a new employment area as a consequence of inadequate planning in the past. It is suggested that a well planned mixed development could redress the imbalance that exists in the village.</p> <p>C - 11068 - 5016 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>11103</p>	<p>Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Loddon is an attractive service settlement with a historical centre and a range of shops and services. The settlement also boasts good links to Norwich and nearby towns. A range of local industrial, business, retail and tourism job opportunities will be encouraged in line with the needs of housing growth. New development off 200 dwellings is proposed to 2026. Due to the rage of facilities in Loddon and Chedgrave, plus excellent links to Norwich, we believe that up to 350 new dwellings should be allocated to Loddon.</p> <p>Deliverability Concerns 12 PJH are committed to working with South Norfolk Council to deliver the Favoured Option which would see 1,800 new homes built on smaller site, in South Norfolk. However, they believe the allocation in Loddon should be increased from 200 new dwellings to 350 new dwellings.</p> <p>C - 11103 - 8300 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>7885</p>	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? All villages must be allowed to grow. If they are not they become dormitories, families are broken up, less local employment</p>

	<p>becomes available more fossil fuels are used to go to work. If there is no growth like everything else they will die.</p> <p>S - 7885 - 7787 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
7967	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 12/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>This is a much more reasonable proposal than swamping other communities with huge numbers of houses</p> <p>S - 7967 - 6862 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8004	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 16/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>As long as these towns have the necessary facilities to support the number of houses proposed.</p> <p>S - 8004 - 7851 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8158	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8158 - 7899 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8184	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8184 - 4796 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

8233	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8233 - 4558 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8273	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes, but subject to much improved parking/capacity in Loddon</p> <p>S - 8273 - 7912 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8298	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? full</p> <p>S - 8298 - 7915 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8362	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? I agree</p> <p>S - 8362 - 6992 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8429	<p>Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8429 - 7771 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8436	<p>J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003] (represented by Robert Doughty Consultancy Limited (Mr Robert Doughty) [8002]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Support the recognition of Loddon as a Key Service Centre, but would prefer a greater allocation of housing for the period up to 2026, as 100-200 dwellings is a small number when considering the length of time.</p> <p>S - 8436 - 8003 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8472	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8472 - 8016 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8521	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8521 - 7817 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8546	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 8546 - 8021 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -
8570	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8570 - 1976 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8607	<p>Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8607 - 2059 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8683	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Long Stratton should be a key service centre only.</p> <p>S - 8683 - 8044 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8733	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8733 - 8053 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8790	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8790 - 8061 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8965	<p>Ms Rosemary Mann [7706] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8965 - 7706 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8979	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8979 - 8092 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8996	<p>Mr CM Sparrow [8093] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8996 - 8093 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9042	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 9042 - 4187 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -
9111	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9111 - 7111 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9116	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9116 - 8111 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9155	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9155 - 2055 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9170	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9170 - 8112 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9224	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9224 - 1828 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9359	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9359 - 7113 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9388	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9388 - 8124 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9430	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9430 - 8127 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9455	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	S - 9455 - 8134 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -
9604	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9604 - 8162 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9729	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Small development</p> <p>S - 9729 - 8174 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9765	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - SUPPORT Web - 15/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes.</p> <p>S - 9765 - 8184 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9830	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9830 - 8198 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9881	Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT

	<p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9881 - 2058 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9935	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9935 - 7015 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9997	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9997 - 8228 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10031	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10031 - 8230 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10130	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10130 - 8234 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10182	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10182 - 8246 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10219	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10219 - 5864 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10345	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10345 - 8293 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10368	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10368 - 2020 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>10399</p>	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? So long as proposed development is sympathetic to existing village. The Council only wants up to 100 new houses in Acle in the next 15 years. S - 10399 - 8294 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10435</p>	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes S - 10435 - 8308 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10514</p>	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes S - 10514 - 7215 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10538</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - SUPPORT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? These areas appear to be able to support the new housing S - 10538 - 8312 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10539</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - SUPPORT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places</p>

	<p>proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Appears sensible</p> <p>S - 10539 - 8312 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10617	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes, new dwellings would need this provision</p> <p>S - 10617 - 8325 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10618	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes this seems to respond to local needs - it is good that local shops and services will be protected</p> <p>S - 10618 - 8325 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10668	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10668 - 8348 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10738	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10738 - 1776 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>10771</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10771 - 7666 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10829</p>	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10829 - 8362 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10854</p>	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10854 - 8018 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10892</p>	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10892 - 8366 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10934</p>	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10934 - 8368 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10958	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10958 - 8369 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
11005	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>In the main. Care should be taken at Loddon to avoid "rat running" through rural villages. Access to A146 a priority for any housing in Loddon/Chedgrave.</p> <p>S - 11005 - 8370 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
11051	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>But only modest growth identified for Blofield is a missed opportunity. There are sustainable locations for further housing development beyond the 50 identified as Blofield is close to Norwich with good public transport links and employment opportunities nearby at Thorpe.</p> <p>S - 11051 - 6955 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
7877	<p>Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>leave well alone for obvious majority views</p>

	O - 7877 - 7782 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -
7906	<p>Mrs Lucy Perry [7800] - OBJECT Web - 06/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Hethersett is a nice size at the moment and has suitable infrastructure (just about enough - i understand roads, schools and doctors are pretty much at their limit). It does not need to be any bigger as this would ruin the feel of the village. It has expanded within the natural boundaries of the village and that growth should not now be exceeded. Residents like being in a village that size - which is why most residents wanted to live here in the first place I believe, I can't imagine that anyone would want Hethersett to get any larger!</p> <p>O - 7906 - 7800 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
7908	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd (Mr Terence Harper) [6956] - OBJECT Web - 06/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Aylsham should not be missing from this list and should be proposed for sizable housing allocations (say 500 houses), being ideally suited and NOT actually restricted by sewerage discharge - AW have recently confirmed that (i) there is current capacity for 400 dwellings and (ii) they have already submitted for an extension to the Works to Ofwat as part of their AMP5 Price Review and although the earliest start for extension at the treatment works would be 2013, if phased housing development no problem is foreseen.</p> <p>O - 7908 - 6956 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
7943	<p>mr David Jones [7816] - OBJECT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? There are already traffic problems in Tasburgh -primarily volume and speed - and no police enforcement . No development should be allowed until these issues are resolved..</p> <p>O - 7943 - 7816 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>8045</p>	<p>Shane Hull [7857] - OBJECT Web - 17/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Hethersett has been an attractive village since the Doomsday Book was written! It has unfortunately grown already to that of a small town but without the necessary infrastructure to support its existing population notwithstanding any further growth. The schools in the village and other amenities cannot support any further growth.</p> <p>O - 8045 - 7857 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8075</p>	<p>mr steve kittle [7753] - OBJECT Web - 24/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? I consider that Poringland should be allocated further housing, even though existing allocations have not been built, as there is an ample supply of further land available. This would even up the lopsided appearance of the village. Close proximity of the Southern Bypass adds to the attraction together with Poringland being the only non conservation site in the area.</p> <p>Why has the existing allocation not been completed as there has been more than sufficient time, the economy was not in recession and Poringland is a very sought after village to live in?</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Steve Kittle</p> <p>O - 8075 - 7753 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8392</p>	<p>Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? We object to the proposal in policy 7 that there should be no further housing allocations at Poringland/Framingham Earl and have put forward a proposal for a mixed use development of housing, employment and educational purposes.</p>

	O - 8392 - 7012 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -
8496	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? To many in Hethersett, likewise in Reepham (unless infill) and Wroxham</p> <p>O - 8496 - 8020 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8625	<p>Kay Eke [8025] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? The weighting of Hethersett compared to the other Key Service Centres can hardly be called "modest" and will add to the village's dormitory status. Whilst the principle of Key Service Centres is accepted, I think greater consideration needs to be given to how and where development is undertaken.</p> <p>O - 8625 - 8025 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8841	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Planned growth of Hethersett too great compared to other key service centres</p> <p>O - 8841 - 8064 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8999	<p>Mr & Mrs Roger Brown [5038] - OBJECT Web - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? 1. Conflict with Spatial Planning Objectives 6,7,10 & 11. 2. Village facilities extremely limited.</p>

	<p>3. Suggested building plot wholly inappropriate.</p> <p>4. Small business proposals in Yelverton already refused.</p> <p>5. Local roads, in all directions, totally unsuited to any increase in traffic. however limited.</p> <p>O - 8999 - 5038 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9026	<p>Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>No</p> <p>Disagree with proposed allocation for 100 to 200 dwellings in Reepham. The school is over capacity, there are limited local services and the local road network is insufficient to accommodate such large scale growth</p> <p>O - 9026 - 7535 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9194	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>No commitment to improved public transport.</p> <p>O - 9194 - 8114 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9235	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Hetherset and Acle too much</p> <p>O - 9235 - 4494 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9295	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Each village listed could have more substantial development so that, Wymondham, Hethersett, Cringleford, Long Stratton etc could have fewer houses</p> <p>O - 9295 - 5445 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9330	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Hethersett will be too large and will start to merge with Wymondham, too much traffic and unsustainable</p> <p>O - 9330 - 8123 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9416	<p>Mr David Gladwell [8126] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 01/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Little consideration is given to the River Chet or the facilities which can thrive on it such as Angling. Pyle's Mill is little publicized as a public amenity. Will sewage facilities for new properties result in increased discharges into the River. Car Parking charges have begun to make this Area more unattractive than it was.</p> <p>O - 9416 - 8126 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9503	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Mostly yes but Reepham sounds as if it cant cope with the proposed new houses</p> <p>O - 9503 - 8139 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9520	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? These areas will lose their 'charm' if they are further developed. Wroxham is regularly at a standstill in the summer months owing to traffic increase</p> <p>O - 9520 - 8140 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9551</p>	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? No. I do agree with Aylsham and Diss statements. Harleston I agree for local residents only - not to be a growth area. I do not agree to further major expansion of Wymondham as considerable expansion has already taken place and further development has been approved in recent months. Long Stratton bypass need urgent action. I see no reason for housing to be provided by the bypass. A limit for expansion of 1,800 houses should be linked to no further expansion and this total of houses should be developed over the next 50 years. Government funds should be found for the cost of the bypass. A 106 agreement for the houses should be for community infrastructure and green belt areas, bus services etc. Hethersett should only have a limited housing allocation which could infill sites available within the development area, say 200 houses. I do not see requirements for extra local employment. A firm commitment should be made to develop a green belt area between Hethersett and Wymondham and no further planning permission be given between Hethersett and Wymondham - farming in this area must be protected. I agree with proposals for Hingham only for a very limited extension of the industrial estate. I agree with the statement for Loddon except that the housing should be limited to 100 dwellings. Poringland - I agree with the statement. Reepham: I agree with the statement but subject to only 100 houses being build. There has been considerable new housing in recent years and urban spread in this sensitive area should be avoided.</p> <p>O - 9551 - 8146 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9552</p>	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? No. Acle housing should be limited to 100 dwellings agina local requirements. Agree with Blofield statement. Agree with Brundall statement.</p>

	<p>Comments from Q14 repeated: I do agree with Aylsham and Diss statements. Harleston I agree for local residents only - not to be a growth area. I do not agree to further major expansion of Wymondham as considerable expansion has already taken place and further development has been approved in recent months. Long Stratton bypass need urgent action. I see no reason for housing to be provided by the bypass. A limit for expansion of 1,800 houses should be linked to no further expansion and this total of houses should be developed over the next 50 years. Government funds should be found for the cost of the bypass. A 106 agreement for the houses should be for community infrastructure and green belt areas, bus services etc. Hethersett should only have a limited housing allocation which could infill sites available within the development area, say 200 houses. I do not see requirements for extra local employment. A firm commitment should be made to develop a green belt area between Hethersett and Wymondham and no further planning permission be given between Hethersett and Wymondham - farming in this area must be protected. I agree with proposals for Hingham only for a very limited extension of the industrial estate. I agree with the statement for Loddon except that the housing should be limited to 100 dwellings. Poringland - I agree with the statement. Reephams: I agree with the statement but subject to only 100 houses being build. There has been considerable new housing in recent years and urban spread in this sensitive area should be avoided.</p> <p>O - 9552 - 8146 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9570</p>	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? It would be over developed</p> <p>O - 9570 - 6690 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9678</p>	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Alternative proposal Wroxham should be reclassified as a SERVICE VILLAGE. I agree other proposed centres statement Hoveton is presently 'North Norfolk'. This consultation references Broadland D.C. the current proposals re. housing 150 at Hoveton? +200 at Wroxham +3,500 at Rackheath are unrealistic re. employment - road systems - countryside.</p>

	O - 9678 - 8047 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -
9703	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Long Stratton should not become a town until it has sufficient employment opportunities to support it. An in-depth plan should be drawn up to show how this will work. Long Stratton is already very much a dormitory village. It will become a dormitory town without proper planning.</p> <p>O - 9703 - 5446 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9798	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>No. As stated above, there is insufficient consideration of the need to disperse homes, services and employment to a broader geographical area within the NPA and beyond. The hierarchy need to be considered.</p> <p>O - 9798 - 7513 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9863	<p>Diocese of Norwich [2708] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr William Lusty) [7762]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>The Diocese of Norwich consider that it is appropriate to propose 100 dwellings at Hingham, as specified within Policy 7 'Key Service Centres'. However, it is considered that the 100 dwellings proposed at Hingham should be viewed as a minimum. The constraints to growth at Hingham are not insurmountable and the opportunity to provide further housing development at the village should not be dismissed, if constraints to growth in excess of 100 dwellings can be overcome. For example, high school capacity limitations could be addressed through appropriate developer contributions. In terms of local shops and facilities, new residential development could also comprise new local shops and services to further underpin the sustainability of Hingham as a location for further growth.</p> <p>The Diocese of Norwich object to the presumption that no further allocations will take place at Poringland / Framingham Earl.</p>

	<p>Paragraph 7.24 of the consultation document confirms that a number of housing commitments have not been built and that on this basis, no new allocations will be proposed. The Diocese of Norwich would question why development of these sites has not been forthcoming and whether there is a need to revise allocations at Poringland / Framingham Earl. Furthermore, the existence of allocations, either being built out or not, should not be reason in itself to resist further allocations. Additional housing allocations could further support existing and new job opportunities and also bring about improved provision of local shops and services.</p> <p>Consideration should therefore be given to whether allocations at Poringland / Framingham Earl should be reviewed and that in addition to existing allocations or a like for like replacement of existing allocations, The Diocese of Norwich consider that it would be appropriate to allocate land for a further 100 dwellings in continuing to maintain the viability of Poringland / Framingham Earl as a Key Service Centre.</p> <p>O - 9863 - 2708 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9979</p>	<p>Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] - OBJECT Paper - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? No - Disagree with proposed allocation for 100 to 200 dwellings in Reepham. The school is over capacity, there are limited local services and the local road network is insufficient to accommodate such large scale growth</p> <p>O - 9979 - 7535 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10107</p>	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT Web - 30/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Housing development should be retained within Norwich on brownfield sites and at a new town in Long Stratton where the development can be properly planned</p> <p>O - 10107 - 8239 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10304</p>	<p>mrs LISA ford [8282] - OBJECT Web - 07/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places</p>

	<p>proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Adding 1000 dwellings to Hethersett is a ridiculous large amount of new homes - it is not, as described, a modest scale development for the village. These new homes would be used I believe by people commuting in to Norwich for work - meaning a loss of the village community and a more commuter belt feel to the village (or town as it would become). The historic centre of Hethersett could not cope with the increase in traffic and through traffic without affecting existing residents quality of life.</p> <p>O - 10304 - 8282 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10563	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? Leave things as they are.</p> <p>O - 10563 - 8318 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10586	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10586 - 8319 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10982	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? They are too dominant in relation to the Service Villages with too great a proportion of new housing allocated to them.</p> <p>O - 10982 - 8176 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
11029	<p>Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] - OBJECT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places</p>

proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?
Based on its sustainable location, as highlighted above, we support the proposal for further employment development in Poringland, but consider that there should be further residential development proposed to allow a choice of locations and a range of housing product. Whereas the current proposal has a very high dependency on the completion of a single development by Norfolk Homes.

Therefore we object to the fact that Poringland has not been allocated further housing numbers.

O - 11029 - 7175 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

11147 JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy?

OBJECT

We believe that the proposed level of development at Long Stratton is inappropriate, and it should not be used to fund the proposed bypass; our full argument is set out in our responses to questions 1 and 2. Long Stratton should be recognised in Policy 7 as a Key Service Centre. As such, it should be allocated growth of only around 20-50 new homes, as noted in the August 2008 Reg 25 Core Strategy.

O - 11147 - 6979 - Policy 7 Key Service Centres (Q15), (Q15) Do you agree with the places proposed to be Key Service Centres and the part they will play in the strategy? -

Response – Q16

Service villages

Policy 8 (page 34) explains what service villages are and the part they play in the strategy. The proposed villages are given in this policy.

Q16 Service villages

Policy 8 (page 34) explains what service villages are and the part they play in the strategy. The proposed service villages are given in this policy.

Q16 Do you agree with the places proposed as **Service Villages** and the part they will play in the strategy? YES / NO
If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q16 Total	129	32	63	38	133

8209	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - COMMENT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Same as Q15, But what about post offices, pubs, allotments?</p> <p>C - 8209 - 7901 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8430	<p>Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? You must also consider the amount of open green space / sporting & leisure facilities within these villages.</p> <p>C - 8430 - 7771 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8595	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Brownfield sites only</p> <p>C - 8595 - 8024 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8712	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Where there are villages close to main towns and key service centres, is there not a case for limited development in them of both additional housing and associated small business capacity? A hub and spoke approach should prove advantageous in terms of reduced destruction of large areas of countryside and less travel to work. It also may assist in stemming the demise of such villages.</p> <p>C - 8712 - 8049 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8751	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>You missed off the provision of a post office. Infill can look ugly and overburden small villages, e.g. insufficient drainage.</p> <p>C - 8751 - 8045 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8760	<p>Ms Sarah Smith [8059] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Proposal S39-02A is not sustainable to the Service Village classification within the GNDP LCS settlement category. The existing classification is correct.</p> <p>C - 8760 - 8059 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8815	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>No comment. This should be judged by local residents</p> <p>C - 8815 - 6869 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8895	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>service villages along the A140 like Tasburgh can play a bigger part in places for new homes and the A140 is an important growth corridor with a good bus service north and south and close to Long Stratton. Places like Tasburgh could take up to 200 new homes as a result and this should be reflected when the settlement hierarchy is re examined.</p> <p>C - 8895 - 7620 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9017	<p>Mr Robert Hall [8098] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>The proposed larger site, specifically S39-02a and S39-02 are unsuitable due to the lack of infrastructure. No impact assessment has been done</p> <p>C - 9017 - 8098 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9397	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Is this not the same question as 15</p> <p>C - 9397 - 8120 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9475	<p>Louisa Young [8135] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Surely you need more than a journey to work bus service, this restricts the way and type of work that people can undertake to full time 9 to 5 office work.</p> <p>C - 9475 - 8135 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9644	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Explanation should be provided as to why those Service Villages located within the NPA should be considered for further development when the criteria for their selection are as set out in paragraph 7.27.</p> <p>C - 9644 - 7503 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9679	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes - + one addition (above)</p> <p>C - 9679 - 8047 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9744	<p>Ms Fae Whalley [8177] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Adam Nicholls) [7168]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Ms Whalley agrees with Ditchingham's categorisation; the village has a shop, garage, primary school, village hall, pub and good journey to work bus services to Norwich, Diss, Beccles and Bungay, so is well placed to accept housing growth. However, this growth need not necessarily be limited to 10-20 dwellings. Ditchingham's settlement boundary is drawn very tightly around the village, and there are several sites, including land owned by Ms Whalley's family at Loddon Road, which would appear to be able to be developed for residential dwellings without seeming to extend development into the open countryside. Ditchingham's proximity to Bungay (only about 1.5 miles distant) also means that villagers have easy access to the excellent shopping, employment and social facilities available there (e.g. swimming pool, library, high school etc), so it could reasonably accommodate a greater level of provision than would normally be expected for a Service Village outside the GNDP area. Ms Whalley and family's land could accommodate approximately five dwellings, and so she asserts that Ditchingham should be identified as being suitable to accommodate at least 20-30 dwellings, rather than the 10-20 highlighted in Policy 8.</p> <p>C - 9744 - 8177 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9780	<p>Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

The Parish Council agrees with the places proposed as Service Villages, but careful planning needs to ensure that they provide sufficient services to cope with the enlarged community particularly services for the elderly and young people which are currently insufficient and therefore growth of services needs to cater for the current lack of provision plus the additional needs the proposed growth would bring.

It is felt that there could be a danger that some of the "Other Villages" could gradually become part of a nearby Service village and lose their identity and "voice".

C - 9780 - 1974 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

9858

Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd [8210] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr John Long) [8211]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 27/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

This letter is a response to the Joint Core Strategy Technical Consultation (as amended) March 2009. It supports Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd's previous submission to the original consultation in September 2008. The original September 2008 submission still stands and Crane and Sons (Farms) Ltd request that it is given due regard as part of the GNDP's considerations and decisions on the next version of the Core Strategy. The original submission is attached to this letter. In addition to the previous submission, Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd wish to make the following points on the current consultation document:

- Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd note and support the 'footnote' to Policy 8, that suggests that the settlement hierarchy will be examined and that flexibility will be introduced to determine the quality of development to be accommodated at settlements.
- Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd's previous submission to the Joint Core Strategy (Sept 08) sets out the criteria against which growth allocations should be considered. These comments still stand.
- Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd's previous submission to the Joint Core Strategy (Sept 08) sets out the reasons for Marsham to be identified as a location for sustainable growth. These comments still stand.

Conclusion: Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd support the GNDP's acknowledgement that the Joint Core Strategy needs to adopt a more flexible approach to accommodating growth at settlements. Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd contend that the Joint Core Strategy should have a greater recognition of the importance that settlements outside of the Norwich Policy Area, including Marsham, will have in accommodating sustainable growth.

	<p>Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd suggest that the levels of growth to be accommodated at settlements should be appropriate to their size, role and function in order that they maintain their important role of service centres serving rural communities.</p> <p>Crane and Son (Farms) Ltd contend that new development at Marsham will have an important role in underpinning existing services and facilities and helping to address social inclusion issues, through improved access, to more suitable housing and job opportunities.</p> <p>C - 9858 - 8210 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9965</p>	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>C - 9965 - 6903 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10032</p>	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>YES but: The identified Service Villages currently have strictly defined development boundaries. What is proposed to guide the provision of the required 10-20 new dwellings per Service Village? A review of the development boundaries currently indicated in the Broadland District Local Plan will need to be reviewed or provision made for a flexibility of development outside of these boundaries.</p> <p>In many cases these 10-20 additional dwellings will be best and only accommodated outside of the currently defined settlement boundaries. Areas that present a logical extension of residential areas and areas that already exhibit residential development should be identified and acknowledged in Policy as the best way to meet the requirements of 10-20 new dwellings.</p> <p>We would also discourage the numerical target of 10-20. New housing developments should be provided at a level that addresses current housing needs and to address government targets seeking more housing provision. The Council should not impose a restrictive target. Each proposal for new development should be assessed individually and treated on its own merits taking into consideration aspects such as design, scale, local context and sustainable locations.</p>

	<p>The spread of residential development to the east of Buxton, along The Street, is an established area of residential development, outside of the settlement boundary. This area identified as further residential dwellings could be accommodated here, while maintaining the character of the area and providing dwellings within walking distance of the services within Buxton.</p> <p>C - 10032 - 8230 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10150</p>	<p>R Smith [8243] (represented by Beacon Planning Ltd (Ms Jenny Page) [7833]) - COMMENT Paper - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? There would appear to be an inconsistency in how this designation has been applied particularly in relation to those settlements where a service village has been defined as comprising two settlements. This is particularly so in the case of Lingwood. This is proposed to include Burlingham. However, it would be more logical to include Strumpshaw which is larger and closer than both North and South Burlingham to Lingwood. This means the services in Lingwood are more accessible to residents of Strumpshaw being within both cycling and walking distance than for residents in North or South Burlingham. As such this is a more sustainable choice for inclusion as part of a service village.</p> <p>C - 10150 - 8243 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10155</p>	<p>Timewell [8209] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr John Long) [8211]) - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Timewell Properties Ltd objects to the failure of Policy 8 (Service Villages) to identify Little Melton as a Service Village in the Norwich Policy Area. It is Timewell Properties Ltd contention that Little Melton has the range of services and facilities or easy access to them to enable its identification as a Service Village.</p> <p>Timewell Properties Ltd supports the intention to re-examine the NPA villages in the hierarchy and the quantity of development to be accommodated. Timewell Properties Ltd previous submission to the Joint Core Strategy (Sept 2008) set out in the criteria against which growth allocations to villages should be considered. These comments are still relevant.</p> <p>Timewell Properties Ltd supports the GNDP's acknowledgement that settlements within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) have a more positive role in accommodating growth. Timewell Properties Ltd supports the levels of growth to be accommodated as such settlements in the South Norfolk part of the NPA (1800 homes), but suggests that it should be expressed as a minimum figure to be achieved rather than a development ceiling. Timewell Properties Ltd contend that this approach will enable a</p>

continual supply of new homes in the NPA in the period before the major growth locations begin to deliver new housing. Timewell Properties Ltd suggests that Little Melton is a suitable location for accommodating growth and the site of Gibbs Close is capable of accommodating up to 60 homes.

C - 10155 - 8209 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10202 Mr Robert Debbage [6972] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Adam Nicholls) [7168]) - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

The comments made in response to the August 2008 Regulation 25 consultation still stand, with Mr Debbage's main point of contention that Alington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton should be considered (by virtue of their proximity and the fact that these villages 'share' many services) as acting functionally as a Service Village. For the sake of completeness, these comments are repeated below.

However, Mr Debbage has also noted the contents of the Evidence Report submitted to the GNDP Policy Group meetings on 18 December 2008. In summarising and analysing the responses made to the September 2008 consultation, officers recommend (in Question 26, page 68) that the purely mechanistic definition of a Service Village if it meets the four criteria (village hall, journey to work bus service, primary school and food shop) should be replaced by a more flexible system in which 'points' will be accrued for the presence of a number of criteria in addition to the current four. The conclusion of this changed approach is that those settlements which meet or exceed a given 'score' across a wider range of criteria would then be designated as a Service Village.

Mr Debbage would support such a change, so long as there is still some flexibility in the application of the criteria (i.e. that any 'essential' criteria are kept to a minimum) and with the proviso that Alington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton should be considered to act together as a Service Village. Together, these settlements have a primary school, pub, church, two village halls, garage, post office & foodstore, farm shop, sports pitch and good journey to work bus services to Norwich.

C - 10202 - 6972 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10266 Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Service Villages: Between 12 and 24 homes on average in each settlement is not enough to keep local business viable. Many

	<p>service villages have had little or no growth for years and they need more people to be more viable and that must mean more development!</p> <p>C - 10266 - 7068 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10290	<p>Tasburgh Parish Council (Mrs Julie King) [7053] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Tasburgh Parish Council are still of the opinion that the appropriate level of development for Tasburgh would be around 10-20 homes, as long as they were constructed in a sympathetic manner.</p> <p>I have attached to this email Tasburgh Parish Council's Development Policy.</p> <p>C - 10290 - 7053 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10297	<p>The Thelveton Estate (Sir Rupert Mann) [8279] (represented by Brown & Co (Mr Charles E. Birch) [4042]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>We write on behalf of Sir Rupert Mann following earlier representations in conjunction with Pegasus Planning Group on the core strategy as part of the Regulation 25 2008 Consultation. The comments referred to before all still remain in force and we wish also to re-stress our client's opinion that the categorisation of Dickleburgh, Scole and Burston as "service villages" with a need for allocations is appropriate. We re-stress also that we consider Diss to be an appropriate site for further residential development.</p> <p>Our clients has appropriate land adjacent to each of these settlements that he will be pleased to discuss and promote with more detail to confirm there are no planning obstructions to the prompt delivery of sites and that land will be made available, Further detail will clearly need to be forthcoming once GNDP has confirmed the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>C - 10297 - 8279 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10321	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed</p>

	<p>as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>We agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and welcome the commitment to limit housing allocations in rural areas. The note that this commitment is not binding for Service Villages within the Norwich Policy Area is of concern and needs clarification. Some flexibility is welcomed but this should be in isolated cases and for local housing need only - a 'bottom-up approach'.</p> <p>Housing allocation in these areas must directly address local housing needs - we would like to see specific policy commitments on affordable housing in this section.</p> <p>We welcome the commitment to protect local amenities.</p> <p>C - 10321 - 6826 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10463	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>The odd one or two in the villages could be accepted for local people.</p> <p>C - 10463 - 8309 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10491	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Allow a small number of rentable or affordable houses for local people. No large scale development.</p> <p>C - 10491 - 8310 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10600	<p>Mr G Barnes [8321] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Darren Cogman) [4024]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 21/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Mr G Barnes cautiously welcomes Policy 8, Service Villages, and the identification of Tasburgh as such that will be expected to accommodate 10 to 20 new dwellings. He also welcomes the fact that Tasburgh is contained within the Norwich Policy Area</p>

(NPA) and that it will subsequently be considered for further development in accordance with the favoured option (Policy 5).

As recognised within the reasoned justification to Service Villages Tasburgh has a range of services considered essential to support small scale growth including a Village Hall with pitches and children's play area, School, Post Office and shop, Church, Garage, as well as bus service provision. Mr G Barnes therefore supports the principle of growth within Tasburgh, but considers that the emerging policy approach of limited growth in such villages to 10 to 20 new dwellings is too restrictive, and not adequately justified. Mr G Barnes suggests in accordance with the East of England Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy), that growth targets for the Service Villages should not be expressed as ceilings to development, rather that they are minimum targets to be achieved and go beyond in appropriate circumstances, such as to achieve sustainability objectives and to deliver mixed and balanced communities. In this context Mr G Barnes cautiously welcomes the consultation document's statement that "In light of comments received at the previous stage, the settlement hierarchy will be re-examined to review the identification of villages at the lower end of the hierarchy, the quantity of development that should be accommodated and how to introduce appropriate flexibility."

Mr G Barnes contends that with the increasing costs of travel, people may be less willing to travel where services and facilities are locally available. As such it is imperative that efforts are made to secure the ongoing viability of these for the longer term benefit of existing and potential residents. One way of achieving this is to provide a flexible planning approach for sustainable growth, rather than an arbitrary cap (numbers) on development as appears in Policy 8.

In conclusion, Mr G Barnes contends that in order to provide the Joint Core Strategy with the flexibility needed to ensure Service Villages (Tasburgh) (Policy 8) are allowed to grow to meet the needs of the community, that the wording should be changed to accommodate at least 10 to 20 new dwellings as well as small scale employment or service development appropriate to the needs of the villages and its immediate surroundings. Further growth will be accommodated where it can be demonstrated that it would contribute to meeting the needs and requirements of the village and its surroundings and where sufficient capacity exists or can be provided to serve the growth and where it would not unduly impact upon existing environmental assets.

C - 10600 - 8321 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10619 Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - COMMENT

Web - 10/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

This seems right but the local residents should know best

	<p>C - 10619 - 8325 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10719	<p>Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT Paper - 26/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? I think affordable housing for long-term residents of a local area should be a priority.</p> <p>C - 10719 - 8354 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10793	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? All expansions of existing key service centres need to be matched or exceeded by measures to reduce the need to travel and to provide sustainable transport provision. It would be desirable to leave all development areas in a better state for sustainable transport than before.</p> <p>C - 10793 - 8360 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10808	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? All expansions of existing main towns need to be matched or exceeded by measures to reduce the need to travel and to provide sustainable transport provision. It would be desirable to leave all development areas in a better state for sustainable transport than before.</p> <p>C - 10808 - 8361 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8061	<p>MR MIKE HOWARD [7872] - SUPPORT Web - 19/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? I believe my village of Rockland St Mary to be able to take up to 20 houses including approximately 10 'starter homes' already</p>

	<p>under consideration. The further 10 should be for private build and be compatible with those of the Bee Orchid Way development. The pre-requisite village facilities do exist.</p> <p>S - 8061 - 7872 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8119	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8119 - 7888 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8120	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8120 - 7888 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8185	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8185 - 4796 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8234	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8234 - 4558 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>8274</p>	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes - number spoken of (10 - 20) is the maximum that this village could support.</p> <p>S - 8274 - 7912 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8299</p>	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Full</p> <p>S - 8299 - 7915 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8348</p>	<p>Spixworth Parish Council (Mrs R Rose) [1826] - SUPPORT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? This accurately represents the role of this parish</p> <p>S - 8348 - 1826 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8363</p>	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p> <p>S - 8363 - 6992 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8440</p>	<p>MR Philip Hearsum [8004] - SUPPORT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	<p>Lingwood must remain as stated in this document as a service village The 10/20 proposed houses should be only in s39-01 The Parish council is making a huge error and I feel do not understand the village and their plans for extra houses should be quashed. The village is not well enough supported, either by infrastructure or amenities to support the parish views as well as the destruction of areas with landscape value(s39-02 and s39-02a) against landscape policy</p> <p>S - 8440 - 8004 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8473	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8473 - 8016 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8522	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8522 - 7817 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8547	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8547 - 8021 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8571	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed</p>

	<p>as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8571 - 1976 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8608	<p>Tacolnaston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8608 - 2059 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8791	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? And I also believe that post offices should be encouraged to provide banking and other official services to rural communities</p> <p>S - 8791 - 8061 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8842	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8842 - 8064 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8911	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? These settlements should continue to have development area boundaries no mention of this on page 34</p> <p>S - 8911 - 2014 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>8980</p>	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8980 - 8092 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9002</p>	<p>Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? The proposed larger site S39-02a is in excess of the requirement area to meet the service village classification</p> <p>S - 9002 - 8094 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9006</p>	<p>Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? See Q3 proposed area is too large for Lingwood under the definition service village [S39 - 02 & 02a]</p> <p>S - 9006 - 8095 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9021</p>	<p>Mr and Mrs Peter Tann [8099] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9021 - 8099 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9043</p>	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9043 - 4187 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9113	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9113 - 7111 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9117	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9117 - 8111 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9156	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9156 - 2055 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9171	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9171 - 8112 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>9225</p>	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Except that justification is not necessarily correct, some villages that don't fully qualify employ more people than villages that do! S - 9225 - 1828 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9236</p>	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Also post offices needed S - 9236 - 4494 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9272</p>	<p>Mrs Gray [5927] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes S - 9272 - 5927 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9360</p>	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes S - 9360 - 7113 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9389</p>	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed</p>

	<p>as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9389 - 8124 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9431	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9431 - 8127 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9456	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>S - 9456 - 8134 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9489	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9489 - 8139 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9538	<p>Noble Foods Ltd [8149] (represented by Steve Abbott Associates (Mr Richard Percy) [8144]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? On behalf of Noble foods Ltd</p> <p>Yes. However, the indicative level of appropriate residential development is un-necessarily restrictive and should be seen as an overall guideline rather than a maximum figure.</p>

	S - 9538 - 8149 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -
9605	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9605 - 8162 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9618	<p>RW Kidner [8163] (represented by Bidwells Cambridge(310) (Michael Hendry) [7492]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>The designation of Stoke Holy Cross as a service village is welcomed however the suggestion that these villages could only accommodate between 10 and 20 dwellings should be revised in light of the favoured option set out in Policy 5 and representations already made. The level of growth in service villages within the Norwich Policy Area should be determined by the need for homes, level of service provision, infrastructure capacity and deliverability. Development in sustainable locations should not be arbitrarily capped but be determined on a settlement by settlement basis. Given the level of service provision at Stoke Holy Cross and its location within the Norwich policy area it is proposed that an area to the rear of Stoke Holy Cross primary school, off Five Acres, be developed for approximately 40 dwellings and an extension to the school playing field.</p> <p>S - 9618 - 8163 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9680	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9680 - 8047 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9704	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed</p>

	<p>as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9704 - 5446 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9730	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9730 - 8174 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9766	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - SUPPORT Web - 15/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Sufficient consideration must be given to transport to secondary schools / higher education also.</p> <p>S - 9766 - 8184 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9831	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9831 - 8198 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9882	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT Paper - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9882 - 2058 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>9919</p>	<p>stephen eastwood [7962] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? The proposed larger site specific proposal S39-02a is not sustainable to the Service Village classification contained within the GNDP LCS settlement category. The existing classification is correct - Please see Question 21 & 28. S - 9919 - 7962 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9936</p>	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes S - 9936 - 7015 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10091</p>	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - SUPPORT Web - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? This seems sensible S - 10091 - 8235 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10131</p>	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes S - 10131 - 8234 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10183</p>	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes, BUT: The identified Service Villages currently have strictly defined development boundaries. What is proposed to guide the provision of the required 10-20 new dwellings per Service Village? A review of the development boundaries currently indicated in the Broadland District Local plan will need to be reviewed or provision made for a flexibility of development outside of these boundaries.</p> <p>In many cases these 10-20 additional dwellings will be best and only accommodated outside of the currently defined settlement boundaries. Areas that present a logical extension of residential areas that already exhibit residential development should be identified and acknowledged in Policy as the best way to meet the requirements of 10-20 new dwellings.</p> <p>We would also discourage the numerical target of 10-20. New housing developments should be provided at a level that addresses current housing needs and to address government targets seeking more housing provision. The Council should not impose a restrictive target. Each proposal for new development should be assessed individually and treated on its own merits, taking into consideration aspects such as design, scale, local context and sustainable locations.</p> <p>The spread of residential development to the east of Buxton, along The Street, is an established area of residential development, outside of the settlement boundary. This area identified as further residential dwellings could be accommodated here, while maintaining the character of the area and providing dwellings within walking distance of the services within Buxton.</p> <p>S - 10183 - 8246 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10220</p>	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10220 - 5864 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10346</p>	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 10346 - 8293 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -
10369	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10369 - 2020 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10400	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 28/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10400 - 8294 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10515	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10515 - 7215 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10669	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10669 - 8348 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10739	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10739 - 1776 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10772	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10772 - 7666 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10830	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10830 - 8362 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10855	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>We would like to point out that the promotion of organic farming and renewable energy, being relatively 'jobs-rich', could present improved rural job opportunities.</p> <p>S - 10855 - 8018 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10893	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10893 - 8366 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10935	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10935 - 8368 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10959	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10959 - 8369 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
11052	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 11052 - 6955 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
7878	<p>Mr Stephen Streeter [7782] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>leave well alone enough said</p> <p>O - 7878 - 7782 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

7886	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - OBJECT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? The service growth should be allowed in more villages e.g. Burston and villages like Burston, all villages should be allowed planned growth and services to those villages improved. .</p> <p>O - 7886 - 7787 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
7887	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - OBJECT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? If you allow planned growth in all villages you lessen the impact and objections on those few that have been chosen as special needs.</p> <p>O - 7887 - 7787 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
7888	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - OBJECT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? It is wrong to only allow infill within boundaries, this does not help affordable housing which is much needed in all villages. all villages should be allowed planned growth both within boundaries and outside, the latter is especially important regards affordable housing</p> <p>O - 7888 - 7787 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
7984	<p>Mr Robert McKee [7840] - OBJECT Web - 13/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? In recent years Wroxham has been reduced to almost no facilities for residents. Developing more houses would exacerbate this problem. With the loss of local employment Wroxham has become no more than a dormitory town and with further residential development there is the danger of it becoming no more than a large housing estate.</p>

	<p>O - 7984 - 7840 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8005	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - OBJECT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Some of these villages have already had developments and even a small number will overburden the facilities that the villages have (and don't have ie mains drainage).</p> <p>O - 8005 - 7851 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8052	<p>Mr Keith Jones [7536] - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? These are insufficient numbers. An increase in allocation to these places will reduce the pressure on concentrated areas in NE Norwich and will strengthen the communities.</p> <p>O - 8052 - 7536 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8159	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - OBJECT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? You missed the main essential for services in the provision of a post office or bank.</p> <p>O - 8159 - 7899 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8497	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? II agree that small (possibly infill types) in these villages would be fine but they should not have more on top because of favoured option</p>

	O - 8497 - 8020 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -
8511	<p>Sunguard Homes [8320] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Glyn Davies) [7725]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>The boundary of the Civil Parish of Tharston includes land immediately adjoining Long Stratton, particularly along Chequers Road. This area has been considered as part of Long Stratton in town planning terms for the last 40 years and therefore should be subject to the policies applicable to Long Stratton rather than Tharston. This should be made clear in the policy.</p> <p>O - 8511 - 8320 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8643	<p>Mr Steve Dowall [8033] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Lingwood is regarded as a service village but the site proposal S39-02A is not sustainable within that classification</p> <p>O - 8643 - 8033 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8660	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Tasburgh is not a service village.</p> <p>O - 8660 - 8036 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8684	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Tasburgh is not suitable for anything other than infill development and could not sustain the high level of development associated with a proposed service village.</p>

	<p>O - 8684 - 8044 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8736	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Brooke should not be classified as a "Service Village". It has few local services, relies on Poringland for its everyday needs, has no proper food shop, no medical services, very few shops, and no spare capacity in the sewage system. The school is at full capacity. Apart from limited infill development, there are no opportunities for development without damaging the character of the village (including the Conservation Area) or breaking into open countryside and damaging its high landscape value. Brooke should be classified as an "Other Village" with infill development within a defined development limit.</p> <p>O - 8736 - 8053 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8966	<p>Ms Rosemary Mann [7706] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? We feel Wicklewood should be included as a service village. We have shop premises but no shop, village pub and businesses</p> <p>O - 8966 - 7706 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8997	<p>Mr CM Sparrow [8093] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Larger developments are not sustainable and would change the character of the village</p> <p>O - 8997 - 8093 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9010	<p>Mr Philip Smith [8096] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? The proposed larger site specifically S39-02a and S39-02 are unsuitable due to the lack of infrastructure. No impact assessment</p>

	<p>has been carried out</p> <p>O - 9010 - 8096 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9013	<p>Mr KD White [8097] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>The larger site is not sustainable</p> <p>O - 9013 - 8097 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9195	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Not enough commitment to real improvements to local services or public transport.</p> <p>O - 9195 - 8114 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9296	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Each village listed could have more substantial development so that, Wymondham, Hethersett, Cringleford, Long Stratton etc could have fewer houses</p> <p>O - 9296 - 5445 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9331	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Tasburgh, Stoke Holy Cross & Newton Flotman do not need to be bigger or spoiled, they are close enough to other large service villages.</p>

	O - 9331 - 8123 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -
9508	<p>South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>No. Trowse meets the criteria in 7.27 and 7.29, (added to which it is within walking distance of the City centre) but is not listed as a Service Village. Attention has already been drawn in previous correspondence with SNC planners to the possibility of some limited mixed residential / commercial development on the May Gurney site, which I think would receive local support. Elsewhere in Trowse, there are few opportunities for as few as 10 -20 new dwellings, but paradoxically an easier opportunity for more substantial development, which would be resisted. The concern of Trowse is that it will lose its river valley policy protection and be targeted for a much higher level of greenfield housing development. The absence of a 'service village' designation for Trowse and its designation as an urban fringe parish suitable for unspecified development (see Q&A 3) does nothing to reassure. The consultation document is either deliberately or carelessly imprecise as to what Trowse might expect.</p> <p>O - 9508 - 8142 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9521	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Again, you will destroy the charm of these villages and the reason people choose to live in them</p> <p>O - 9521 - 8140 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9553	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>I agree in general to Policy 9 but villages with * rating should contain much more detail as to the future of the village and also firm boundaries imposed with no development outside these areas up to 2026 and beyond this date. Proposals for consultation by the public should be made for each village.</p> <p>O - 9553 - 8146 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

9571	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>We disagree with the over development policy</p> <p>O - 9571 - 6690 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9625	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>The rationale for the selection of the proposed service villages, and the part they will play in the strategy is not made clear.</p> <p>Consultees are being asked to approve a strategy which is not set out in the document. The note at the middle of page 34 suggests that an unspecified additional amount of development will be considered at some of these settlements. The note at the end of page 34 suggests that the identification of which villages are assigned to this category, the amount of development they will be allocated, are subject to change, and that an unspecified flexibility is also to be incorporated. Therefore it is difficult to see what it would be that an indication of support for this policy would relate to.</p> <p>Even without the notes there appears to be a discrepancy between the draft policy, which mentions 10 to 20 new dwellings per settlement and lists 26 settlements (i.e. 260 to 520 dwellings), and the supporting text which mentions 300-600.</p> <p>The settlements appear to have been selected on the presence of certain basic services. No evidence is provided that any assessment of how these settlements actually function has been undertaken, or that the issues raised by the Countryside Agency's publication „The Role of Rural Settlements as Service Centres. have been addressed.</p> <p>There is no mention of any assessment of the environmental capacity of the settlements to accommodate development; the sustainability of developing further housing in locations with very limited local services and employment opportunities, especially within car commuting range of the city but generally impractical for public transport or walking/cycling; or how such development can be reconciled with conserving the historic character and local distinctiveness that some of these settlements still retain. As such it is</p>

	<p>not clear how this policy will contribute to Objective 6 (ready access to services), Objective 8 (protect the built and natural environment), Objective 9 (minimise contributors to climate change) or Objective 11 (reduce the need to travel).</p> <p>The Policy states that local shops and services will be protected. This is a laudable aim, but regrettably recent experience suggests there are few tools available to local authorities to achieve this. This underline the precarious basis of this particular policy, as the limited services used to justify selection of these settlements may well in some cases disappear in the not too distant future. At the same time the scale of development proposed is unlikely to result in the preservation of services that would otherwise disappear.</p> <p>No information is provided on the changes in resulting size, distribution and structure of the population expected to arise from the proposed housing developments.</p> <p>O - 9625 - 7986 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9718</p>	<p>Ingleton Wood LLP [8171] (represented by Ingleton Wood LLP (Nicole La Ronde) [8172]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 12/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>A few of the villages identified as service villages (and located outside the Norwich Policy Area)are considered to be sustainable locations capable of supporting higher levels of growth. e.g Dickleburgh near Diss.</p> <p>O - 9718 - 8171 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9799</p>	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>No. As stated above, there is insufficient consideration of the need to disperse homes, services and employment to a broader geographical area within the NPA and beyond. The hierarchy need to be reconsidered.</p> <p>O - 9799 - 7513 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9982</p>	<p>GF Cole and Son [8226] (represented by ASquared Architects (Mrs Jayne Taylor) [7042]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed</p>

	<p>as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Objection : see below</p> <p>The list of service villages excludes Great Moulton. We feel that this village should be considered further for this status, given its role in the local area in relation to surrounding dispersed rural settlement. The village and its dispersed surrounding settlement area includes a number of local facilities, and supports an existing range of housing development. Additional affordable housing has recently been pursued, identifying local need and underlining the role of the settlement as an appropriate focus to support such a provision.</p> <p>Identifying the settlement as such a service focus and enabling new housing development of an appropriate scale would facilitate the provision of further affordable housing through a balanced mixture of development. It would also enable, through considered re-assessment of the existing tightly drawn village boundaries, the provision of other facilities for the settlement. For example, the creation of functional open space alongside new housing development could provide a new village green uniting the existing dispersed development areas within the settlement.</p> <p>A number of sites have been suggested, including those put forward on behalf of Mr Eric Cole, for housing development within the dispersed area of the settlement. These provide a range of small scale opportunities for housing development from which the most appropriate future growth of the settlement could be selected, alongside the adjustment of the development boundary of the village to enable windfall and infill developments to contribute also.</p> <p>O - 9982 - 8226 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9998</p>	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Bunwell as a recognised sustainable community should be included as a Service Village.</p> <p>O - 9998 - 8228 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10108</p>	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT Web - 30/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Development should be retained with norwich on brownfield sites and at a new town in Long Stratton</p>

	O - 10108 - 8239 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -
10333	<p>Burston & Shimpling Parish Council (Mrs P Anderson) [8290] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>The Parish Council feel that Burston (and Shimpling) should not be included in the category of Service Village for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neither Burston nor Shimpling have a village hall; 2. Neither Burston nor Shimpling have a food shop; 3. Whilst an infrequent bus service serves part of Burston, there is no bus service serving any area of Shimpling; 4. Burston only has a primary school. <p>It is noted from the consultation document that service villages will be expected to accommodate 10 to 20 new dwellings. However, it is felt that due to the above, Burston (and Shimpling) do not have the necessary services available to support expansion of this scale and should be included in the Policy 9 section - Other Villages.</p> <p>O - 10333 - 8290 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10436	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>I don't think this can work due to lack of public transport and public services.</p> <p>O - 10436 - 8308 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10540	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Object to Stoke Holy Cross being included for the following reasons. Roads unsuitable already very busy with accidents, dangerous bends unenforced speed limits and insufficient pavements. Chaotic school car parking. Shop on verge of</p>

	<p>closing, poorly stocked and has poor parking. Food shopping done in Norwich or Poringland. Poor roads to Norwich. Expensive buses not used. Very small village hall. Pub now a restaurant. Very limited road link to A140. How will local shops and services be protected these are just words.</p> <p>O - 10540 - 8312 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10564	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Leave villages as they are.</p> <p>O - 10564 - 8318 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10587	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10587 - 8319 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10983	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Each potential housing site should be assessed on its own merits and more new housing should be allocated to these service villages to stimulate village economies.</p> <p>O - 10983 - 8176 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
11006	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Living in Rockland St. Mary - a village identified - I have concerns. The imposition of additional housing and the</p>

"suburbanisation" of a village which follows is detrimental to existing residents. We might have a shop, PO and village hall, but even relatively small-scale development affects a village. No activities for teenagers. No evening bus service - a car is essential. Many villagers are concerned.

O - 11006 - 8370 - Policy 8 Services Villages (Q16), (Q16) Do you agree with the places proposed as Service Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

Response – Q17

Other Villages

Policy 9 (page 36) explains the strategy for the other villages.

Q17 Other villages

Policy 9 (page 36) explains the strategy for the other villages.

Q17 Do you agree with the places proposed as **Other Villages** and the part they will play in the strategy? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q17 Total	113	28	59	29	116

7983	<p>Mr Daniel Yellop [7836] - COMMENT Web - 13/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? I would support some housing in small villages that are mentioned, so that the increased population, however small can support local services, such as the local pub and village store, so they don't close, and people have to travel further for low order goods</p> <p>C - 7983 - 7836 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8323	<p>Mr Geoffrey Loades [6873] - COMMENT Web - 16/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Other villages can benefit from modest growth to prevent further decay. Some villages could benefit by looking at shared facilities.</p> <p>C - 8323 - 6873 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8596	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Brownfield sites only</p> <p>C - 8596 - 8024 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>8661</p>	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - COMMENT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Should include Tasburgh.</p> <p>C - 8661 - 8036 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8713</p>	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - COMMENT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Where there are villages close to main towns and key service centres, is there not a case for limited development in them of both additional housing and associated small business capacity? A hub and spoke approach should prove advantageous in terms of reduced destruction of large areas of countryside and less travel to work. It also may assist in stemming the demise of such villages.</p> <p>C - 8713 - 8049 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8816</p>	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? No comment. This should be judged by local residents</p> <p>C - 8816 - 6869 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9303</p>	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Each village listed could take more houses to lessen the huge developments in other areas</p> <p>C - 9303 - 5445 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9400</p>	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>There will always be a need for property in small village areas but these must be affordable to the population employed locally, not just holiday homes or large properties for the rich or better off bankers etc</p> <p>C - 9400 - 8120 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9626</p>	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Note this is Question 17, not 16 as on the response form.</p> <p>The Broads Authority welcomes the provision for small scale business or service development in villages, especially those such as Broome, Cantley, Earsham and Gillingham in the vicinity of the Broads area, to help redress the past loss of local employment and services to housing, and to help develop vibrant and sustainable communities.</p> <p>No explicit planning justification is provided, though, for the development of further housing in the settlements listed, and given the high number of settlements listed it is difficult without explanation to understand the strategic planning rationale for this.</p> <p>The settlements appear to have been selected on the presence of a village hall and primary school. No evidence is provided that any assessment of how these settlements actually function has been undertaken,.</p> <p>The Reasoned Justification states that settlements with few or no local services would not be sustainable locations for significant new development. It is not clear on what basis it would be sustainable if those few services included a village hall and a school. It is stated that this „minimal level of essential services...reduces the need for car trips., but it is difficult to envisage that the total number of car trips resulting would be much different because of the availability of these two facilities and no evidence is presented on this point.</p> <p>The significance and rationale for any of these settlements being „considered for sustainable development' under the proposed Policy 5 is not made clear.</p> <p>It is not clear how Paragraph 7.30 relates to this policy, and whether „Other Villages. are considered a subset of the villages that have few or no services, or are considered to be in distinction from them. If the former why are villages said to be unsustainable locations for</p>

	<p>„significant development. are considered sustainable locations for (not insignificant) infill and small groups of housing? If the latter, what is the paragraph doing on this page; where is the policy that gives effect to the provision for „housing to provide for local needs. in the villages other than „Other Villages.; and why when the supporting justification refers to development in „places with basic essential services. there is no such caveat in the Policy itself, which would permit development whether or not these were present?</p> <p>C - 9626 - 7986 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9666	<p>Mr Richard Rallison [8167] - COMMENT Web - 11/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? I live in a part of Alington that has access on foot to a bus route to Norwich via the A146. There is a farmshop selling food in walking distance sitting on the Bergh Apton side of my road. By definition my location is a Service Village. However we currently sit outside the existing development boundary for Alington/Yelverton, where there is a limited bus service and no food shop.I feel that local consultation should take place as to where the new village development limit is positioned to ensure that any new local housing does have access to suitable facilities.</p> <p>C - 9666 - 8167 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9775	<p>Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd. [8193] (represented by RPS (Ms Kathryn Money) [7662]) - COMMENT Paper - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? We write on behalf of our client, Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd, in response to the invitation to comment on the changes to the Core Strategy document, which is currently the subject of public consultation, We note that comments made previously do not need to be re-submitted. Please can you therefore take the comments we made previously in response to the Technical Consultation on behalf of Gladedale, relating to their land interest at Hempnall, as our client's response to the current consultation in relation to this particular settlement.</p> <p>C - 9775 - 8193 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9781	<p>Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? N.B. There is no primary school in Bracon Ash as stated in point 7.31.</p> <p>C - 9781 - 1974 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9966	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? No comment</p> <p>C - 9966 - 6903 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10156	<p>Timewell [8209] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr John Long) [8211]) - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Notwithstanding Timewell Properties Ltd objection to the Core Strategy's failure to identify Little Melton as a Service Village, the suggested approach in Policy 9's (Other Villages) "footnote" that settlements identified in the policy within the NPA, will be considered for further development as supported.</p> <p>C - 10156 - 8209 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10203	<p>HJ Spratt & Sons [8250] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (The Manager (Bidwells)) [8251]) - COMMENT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Specifically, with reference to Question 17, they agree that Talconeston (inc Fornsett End) village should be included in Policy 9 "Other Villages" as it has a range of services and facilities or easy access to them and plays an important part in sustaining the network of rural settlements which together support the rural community.</p> <p>In order for these "Other Villages" to continue to survive and be sustainable, it will be necessary to ensure that provision is made within any adopted Policies which allow for the construction of small groups or infill developments of houses within these villages. It is important that limited residential development is provided for within these rural settlements particularly to</p>

	<p>meet the needs of the rural community.</p> <p>C - 10203 - 8250 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10204	<p>Mr Nicholas Evans-Lombe [8252] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (The Manager (Bidwells)) [8251]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Specifically, with reference to Question 17, they agree that Little Melton village should be included in Policy 9 "Other Villages" as it has a range of services and facilities or easy access to them and plays an important part in sustaining the network of rural settlements which together support the rural community.</p> <p>In order for these "Other Villages" to continue to survive and be sustainable, it will be necessary to ensure that provision is made within any adopted Policies which allow for the construction of small groups or infill developments of houses within these villages. It is important that limited residential development is provided for within these rural settlements particularly to meet the needs of the rural community.</p> <p>C - 10204 - 8252 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10205	<p>Duke of Grafton [8253] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (The Manager (Bidwells)) [8251]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Specifically, with reference to Question 17, they agree that Woodton village should be included in Policy 9 "Other Villages" as it has a range of services and facilities or easy access to them and plays an important part in sustaining the network of rural settlements which together support the rural community.</p> <p>In order for these "Other Villages" to continue to survive and be sustainable, it will be necessary to ensure that provision is made within any adopted Policies which allow for the construction of small groups or infill developments of houses within these villages. It is important that limited residential development is provided for within these rural settlements particularly to meet the needs of the rural community.</p> <p>C - 10205 - 8253 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10267	<p>Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068] - COMMENT</p>

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Other Villages: Again sustainability only comes with more people - more people will require more places to live and work. There has to be more development in villages to achieve this.

C - 10267 - 7068 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10291 Bunwell Parish Council (Mr John Pennell) [8276] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Bunwell Parish Council has considered the consultation document in detail and considers that, in the main, it is as good a document as can be created given the pressures from external sources. However, the Council has concerns over the implementation of Policy 7 (Key Service Centres), Policy 8 (Service Villages) and Policy 9 (Other Villages) and the classification of Bunwell therein.

background: Bunwell is on the edge of South Norfolk with Breckland just one village away. It lies between the four market towns of Long Stratton, Diss, Wymondham and Attleborough and residents have to travel at least five miles to reach one or other of these over roads which are not really suitable for pedestrians or cyclists. As such we have tried to create a sustainable village where residents can carry out most of their activities within the village itself and that is indeed being achieved. We have also noticed more and more residents of neighbouring villages using our facilities. As such Bunwell is already a Service Village.

The Criteria: It also meets the four criteria specified under Policy 8 on page 34. We have a bus service to take people to work; we have a thriving village hall; we have a thriving and popular primary school; we have a village shop selling food, milk, bread, local produce, papers and a wide range of other goods; also a butchery, a post office, a petrol outlet and a good working garage. Additionally we have just opened a Sports Hall, which together with our football pitch, cricket square and play area is extremely popular with people from miles around. The cricket club has five teams and over 100 members (and many children); the Brownies and Guides have nearly 100 members and the football club and table tennis clubs have gone from strength to strength. A scout troop has just set up in the village as well and there are plans for more clubs such as archery and badminton to use the sports hall once the extension is completed.

Unlike many other villages we have several larger employers in the village: Eastons (hauliers), Dale Foods (speciality food

manufacturer) and Harvey's (poultry and meat processing) as well as other smaller employers. There is probably enough employment in the village for all the residents who wish to work.

Housing and the Built environment: There are 80 'affordable housing units' in the village (although some have been purchased under the right to buy). This total includes 50 in Greenways, several other blocks and a further five on a new development. We are currently, in conjunction with South Norfolk Council and Saffron Housing, actively exploring sites for more affordable homes.

We have also analysed the new housing stock built in the village in recent years and note that it has expanded at about 1% per year with 38 new houses being built in the last ten years. We foresee this rate of expansion continuing in the future, but are concerned that at the moment it is largely 'unplanned' and almost random, with continuing infill. So we are currently working on a Parish Design Statement, which will give our views on where and how it should take place. The Parish Design Statement will also give our views on how employment opportunities in the village can be expanded. The Parish Design Statement is reaching the consultation stage (with both South Norfolk and the whole village) and we hope to have it completed by the end of the year.

Children: The parish feels that these are the future of the village and spends over 30% of its precept supporting their activities. The Parish Council is also very pleased to note that between the last census in 2001 and 2008 (health authority data) the number of children under 18 in the village has increased from 206 to 236.

Not only does a substantial proportion of the adult population participate in all of the decision making processes, but we also have a thriving youth committee, which meets monthly.

Services: We have an adequate water supply, a sewage system that works, a reasonable electricity supply and fair to good broadband connections throughout the village. The bigger roads in the village are capable of handling more traffic and there are several places where future development can be sited with good access to all these services.

All of this pro-active stance has been recognised not only by the South Norfolk Alliance, but also by South Norfolk Council.

You will see from the above that we do fit into the parameters for a service village and the Parish Council has asked me to write pointing this out and to ask if you will move our village from being a Policy 9 village to a Policy 8 village as we feel unless we do manage our growth over the next 20 years, the village will stagnate.

C - 10291 - 8276 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

<p>10322</p>	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? We agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and welcome the commitment to limit housing allocations and retain development boundaries in rural areas. The note that this commitment is not binding for Other Villages within the Norwich Policy Area is of concern and needs clarification. It is not clear what is meant by sustainable development in this context. Some flexibility is welcomed but this should be in isolated cases and for local housing need only - a 'bottom-up approach'. Housing allocation in these areas must directly address local housing needs - we would like to see specific policy commitments on affordable housing in this section. We welcome the commitment to protect local amenities. C - 10322 - 6826 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10464</p>	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? No development. C - 10464 - 8309 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10492</p>	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? No development. C - 10492 - 8310 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10620</p>	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - COMMENT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as</p>

Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?
please refer to previous answer

C - 10620 - 8325 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10690 Messrs P & A Jackson [8351] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Darren Cogman) [4024]) - **COMMENT**
Paper - 04/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Messrs P and A Jackson cautiously welcome the consultation document's statement that "In the light of comments received at the previous stage, the settlement hierarchy will be re-examined to review the identification of villages at the lower end of the hierarchy, the quantity of development that should be accommodated and how to introduce appropriate flexibility". This approach would appear to be a sensible way in which to consider the range of villages that fall into the Other Villages categorisation, although at this stage it remains unclear what "will only accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings and small scale business or services" actually means in practice.

As indicated in previous supporting correspondence the host site is located close to the centre of the Village, being immediately adjacent to the Carleton Rode VC Primary School and opposite All Saints Church. In addition to these adjacent services, Carleton Rode also has a Village Hall. As such, Carleton Rode has several essential services that reduce the need for car trips. In addition, the nearby village of Bunwell also provides a number of complementary essential services.

In this context, it is acknowledged that 'Other Villages' such as Carleton Rode should have defined development boundaries that will accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings. However, in acknowledging this, Messrs P and A Jackson contend that there needs to be sufficient flexibility in the quantum of development to ensure that the policy wording is not so restrictive as to restrict any practical growth in such locations. Messrs P and A Jackson also suggest that in accordance with the East of England Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy), that growth targets as a whole should not be expressed as ceilings to development, rather that they are minimum targets to be achieved and go beyond in appropriate circumstances, such as to achieve sustainability objectives and to deliver mixed and balanced communities.

As such, it is considered that Carleton Rode, whilst recognising its relatively restricted services, should be allowed to grow to a sufficient extent to meet the housing and employment needs of the local area and further underpin existing services (such as the Primary School) and facilities and potentially attract new ones.

C - 10690 - 8351 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10695 Mr G Mackintosh [8284] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Darren Cogman) [4024]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 28/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Mr Graham Mackintosh cautiously welcomes the consultation document's statement that "In the light of comments received at the previous stage, the settlement hierarchy will be re-examined to review the identification of villages at the lower end of the hierarchy, the quantity of development that should be accommodated and how to introduce appropriate flexibility". This approach would appear to be a sensible way in which to consider the range of villages that fall into either the Service Villages or Other Villages categorisation. As outlined below, Mr G Mackintosh would suggest that an employment base should also be a service considered essential to support growth, along with those of Village Hall, journey to work bus service (to Norwich and/or a Key Service Centre), Primary School and Food Shop as Policy 8 suggests. In order to provide a suitably flexible policy Mr G Mackintosh suggests that Service Villages should have four of the five criteria outlined.

Notwithstanding the comment above, and what would appear to be flexibility in both the quantum of development and the settlement hierarchy itself, Mr G Mackintosh continues to object to the identification of Barford as an 'Other Village' in the settlement hierarchy as the policy wording potentially appears to restrict any practical growth.

Whilst recognising that these villages will have development boundaries, it remains unclear what "will only accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings and small scale business or services" actually means in practice. It is also therefore unclear whether the level of 'growth' attributed to Barford over a significant period (2006 - 2026) will actually sustain the existing village of 508 people in 211 households (2001 Census).

Barford has a range of facilities including a primary school, public house, church, village hall with playing fields and hairdressers. It also has bus service provision to the higher order settlements of Hingham, Watton and Norwich.

Considered to be of critical importance, Barford also has an employment base on the B1108 Watton Road with the Fiat Garage, Barford Van and Truck Hire, and moreover Barford Industrial Estate that provides a relatively significant range of business units. As such, Barford would therefore appear far more sustainable in employment terms than some of the other settlements listed within the 'Other Villages' category. Mr G Mackintosh continues to strongly suggest that access to local employment should therefore be considered as a service also essential to support growth.

As such, Mr G Mackintosh considers that the village be allowed to grow to a sufficient extent to meet the housing and employment needs of the local area and further underpin existing services (such as the Primary School) and facilities and potentially attract new ones.

With the presence of an employment base, it is therefore suggested that Barford should be located within the higher order settlement category of 'Service Village'. Such a categorisation would allow relatively small scale growth that could be sensitively related to the form, character and setting of the village whilst also providing affordable housing in triggering the requisite threshold. Such housing would enable local people to remain living in the communities in which they grew up.

Notwithstanding this, Mr G Mackintosh also contends that the current emerging policy approach of limiting growth in such villages (Service Villages) to 10 to 20 new dwellings is too limiting, and not adequately justified. Mr G Mackintosh suggests that in accordance with the East of England Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy), that growth targets for the Service Villages should not be expressed as ceilings to development, rather that they are minimum targets to be achieved and go beyond in appropriate circumstances, such as to achieve sustainability objectives and to deliver mixed and balanced communities.

Mr G Mackintosh contends that with the increasing costs of travel people may be less willing to travel where services and facilities are locally available. As such, it is imperative that efforts are made to secure the ongoing viability of these for the longer term for the benefit of existing and potential residents. One way of achieving this is to provide a flexible planning approach for sustainable growth, rather than an arbitrary cap (numbers) on development as appears in Policy 8.

Mr G Mackintosh suggests that a suitable approach should require more detailed assessments of the social and economic needs and requirements of individual settlements, assessments of the capacity of infrastructure, services and facilities in settlements to accommodate growth and judgements on the environmental capacity of areas to accommodate growth without unduly impacting on environmental assets. In essence there needs to be consideration of what each of the settlement needs to ensure its ongoing sustainability.

In conclusion, Mr G Mackintosh contends that Barford should not be designated as an 'Other Village', but rather as 'Service Village' given the presence of the employment base that should be considered a essential service to support sustainable growth. In order to provide the Joint Core Strategy with the flexibility needed to ensure Service Villages (Policy 8) are allowed to grow to meet the needs of the community, Mr G Mackintosh suggests that the wording should be changed to accommodate at least 10 to 20 new dwellings as well as small scale employment or service development appropriate to the needs of the villages and its immediate surroundings. Further growth will be accommodated where it can be demonstrated that it would contribute to meeting the needs and requirements of the village and its surroundings and where sufficient capacity exists or can be provided to service the growth and where would not duly impact upon existing environmental assets.

C - 10695 - 8284 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

<p>10794</p>	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? All expansions of existing key service centres need to be matched or exceeded by measures to reduce the need to travel and to provide sustainable transport provision. It would be desirable to leave all development areas in a better state for sustainable transport than before.</p> <p>C - 10794 - 8360 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10809</p>	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? All expansions of existing main towns need to be matched or exceeded by measures to reduce the need to travel and to provide sustainable transport provision. It would be desirable to leave all development areas in a better state for sustainable transport than before.</p> <p>C - 10809 - 8361 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>11075</p>	<p>Duke of Grafton [8253] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (The Manager (Bidwells)) [8251]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Specifically with reference to Question 17 they agree that Woodton Village should be included in Policy 9 "Other Villages" as it has a range of services and facilities or easy access to them and plays an important part in sustaining the network of rural settlements which together support the rural community.</p> <p>In order for these "Other Villages" to continue to survive and be sustainable it will be necessary to ensure that any provision is made within any adopted policies which allows for the construction of small groups or infill developments of houses within these villages. It is important that limited residential development is provided for within these rural settlements particularly to meet the needs of the rural community.</p> <p>C - 11075 - 8253 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

7889	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? This flexible approach is the key to village growth and should be applied to all villages and not caste in stone as it is today, peoples needs change and planning should be more flexible to accommodate those changes.</p> <p>S - 7889 - 7787 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8160	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8160 - 7899 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8161	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8161 - 7899 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8186	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? But the road network in Bressingham is not suitable for even small scale businesses with larger vehicles except adjacent to the A1066</p> <p>S - 8186 - 4796 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8210	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8210 - 7901 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8235	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8235 - 4558 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8275	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8275 - 7912 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8300	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Full</p> <p>S - 8300 - 7915 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8326	<p>Mr David Cantrill [7934] - SUPPORT Web - 16/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? I feel that small scale, well designed and environmentally conscious development should be supported, particularly if it helps retain younger people in villages which are currently decaying due to the largely affluent, retired population, and the</p>

	<p>commuting fraternity who treat the villages as dormitories. The soul of villages must be restored which may be achieved if people can afford to work and LIVE in them. The few services that exist stand a chance of surviving if more people were present to use them - particularly when villages become inward facing rather than outward. New community/cooperative based enterprises may also develop.</p> <p>S - 8326 - 7934 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8364	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p> <p>S - 8364 - 6992 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8474	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8474 - 8016 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8498	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8498 - 8020 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8523	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p>

	S - 8523 - 7817 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -
8548	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8548 - 8021 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8572	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8572 - 1976 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8609	<p>Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8609 - 2059 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8792	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8792 - 8061 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8897	ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - SUPPORT

	<p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>agree</p> <p>S - 8897 - 7620 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8913	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>We are pleased that Hempnall is defined in this group and wish to remain as an "other village". Please do not re-define us</p> <p>S - 8913 - 2014 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8981	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8981 - 8092 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9044	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9044 - 4187 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9114	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 9114 - 7111 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -
9118	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9118 - 8111 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9157	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9157 - 2055 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9172	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9172 - 8112 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9237	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9237 - 4494 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9273	Mrs Gray [5927] - SUPPORT

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9273 - 5927 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9344	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9344 - 8123 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9361	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9361 - 7113 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9390	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9390 - 8124 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9432	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 9432 - 8127 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -
9457	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>S - 9457 - 8134 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9490	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9490 - 8139 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9522	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? But in line with all other questions, other villages need access to services, but not substantial growth</p> <p>S - 9522 - 8140 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9606	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9606 - 8162 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9705	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9705 - 5446 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9731	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9731 - 8174 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9767	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - SUPPORT Web - 15/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes.</p> <p>S - 9767 - 8184 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9832	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9832 - 8198 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9883	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT Paper - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p>

	S - 9883 - 2058 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -
9937	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? YES - BUT it is a nonsense to say that a village is not suitable for 'significant new development' and then say that it will be considered 'because it is in the Norwich Policy Area'. That seems to be leaving a very large door wide open !!!! It makes it impossible to give a reasoned answer to this question!</p> <p>S - 9937 - 7015 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10092	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - SUPPORT Web - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Again, this seems acceptable.</p> <p>S - 10092 - 8235 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10132	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10132 - 8234 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10221	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p>

	S - 10221 - 5864 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -
10347	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10347 - 8293 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10370	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10370 - 2020 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10401	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 28/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10401 - 8294 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10516	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10516 - 7215 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10670	Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT

	<p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10670 - 8348 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10740	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10740 - 1776 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10773	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10773 - 7666 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10831	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10831 - 8362 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10856	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>We would like to point out that the promotion of organic farming and renewable energy, being relatively 'jobs-rich', could</p>

	<p>present improved rural job opportunities.</p> <p>S - 10856 - 8018 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10894	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10894 - 8366 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10936	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10936 - 8368 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10960	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10960 - 8369 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10984	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10984 - 8176 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>11007</p>	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? I believe Rockland should be in this category. We are a south Broads village with many holidaymakers and walkers visiting for the rural environment, not to see more housing.</p> <p>S - 11007 - 8370 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>11053</p>	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT Paper - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Yes</p> <p>S - 11053 - 6955 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>7968</p>	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - OBJECT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Other villages are going to be frozen in aspic with no chance of regaining infrastructure that has been lost during the last 50 years</p> <p>O - 7968 - 6862 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8006</p>	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - OBJECT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? These villages have all had "SMALL" infill that that in some cases means the village facilities and services are an a maximum. Some have been outside the development boundaries and that does not appear to be in line with council policies. The whole issues need to be looked at ie requirements of people already in the villages and no just where more houses can be put to fulfil a quota but without reference to the knock on effect on facilities, school, lack of any public transport etc. in those villages.</p> <p>O - 8006 - 7851 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>8251</p>	<p>Mr John Seville [7086] - OBJECT Web - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Other Villages - Some of the villages identified in this category are larger villages with a good range of services that could support small scale development. These should be identified under a separate policy(s) or the existing Policy 9 should be modified to categorise villages by a settlement hierarchy: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Larger villages with a good range of services including journey to work bus service (to Norwich and/or a Key Service Centre). 2) Villages with a good basic range of services. 3) Villages that have few or no local services. <p>By doing this any flexibility with respect development within "Other Villages" would become more transparent.</p> <p>O - 8251 - 7086 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8336</p>	<p>Mr Steve Horrocks [7941] - OBJECT Web - 16/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local Needs Housing approach is being poorly implemented. 2. Long-standing infrastructure improvements have not been made - inhibiting housing development. 3. Once infrastructure is improved, limited mixed private/social housing at better-suited locations could more successfully meet our Alington/Yelverton's community needs. <p>O - 8336 - 7941 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>8393</p>	<p>Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? The policy is too restrictive and there should be more villages identified within this category to ensure the continued</p>

	<p>sustainability of the village communities.</p> <p>O - 8393 - 7012 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8410	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>We believe that the policy as currently drafted does not provide for the continued sustainability of the smaller villages.</p> <p>O - 8410 - 7966 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8685	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Tasburgh should be classified as an 'other' village.</p> <p>O - 8685 - 8044 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8738	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Brooke should be included as an "Other village", as it is only capable of accommodating infill or small groups of dwellings, and small scale business or services development. Any other development would adversely affect the form and character of the village (most of which is a Conservation Area), or break into open countryside and damage its high landscape value.</p> <p>O - 8738 - 8053 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8752	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Spooner Row is not a stand-alone village as it is within the parish of Wymondham and we have been considered under the Wymondham proposals.</p>

	O - 8752 - 8045 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -
8843	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>O - 8843 - 8064 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
8967	<p>Ms Rosemary Mann [7706] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Wicklewood needs to grow to keep out very good village school going and allow a shop to be opened. Also to allow our children to live in the village. This village needs to grow.</p> <p>O - 8967 - 7706 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9196	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>You are turning your back on rural life. You dismiss the possibility of rural villages ever being sustainable which is callous.</p> <p>O - 9196 - 8114 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
9227	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Villages that do not qualify have been gradually expanding over the years and have proved to be sustainable in this day and age.</p> <p>O - 9227 - 1828 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

<p>9573</p>	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? As per previous</p> <p>O - 9573 - 6690 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9645</p>	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? We do not agree with the places proposed as Other Villages because the reasoned justification explaining that these settlements are reliant on the services of larger centres for everyday needs and that new development would not necessarily help retain or attract services owing to the ever increasing population thresholds required to support them, also apply equally to Service Villages. Indeed the description of such settlements could equally apply to Hethersett where 1,000 houses are proposed to be allocated.</p> <p>O - 9645 - 7503 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9752</p>	<p>MRS JENNIFER HALL [8180] - OBJECT Web - 14/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? The road system around Alington/Yelverton is very poor and will not support an increase in vehicular movement.</p> <p>O - 9752 - 8180 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>9800</p>	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT Paper - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? No, As stated above, there is insufficient consideration of the need to disperse homes, services and employment to a broader geographical area within the NPA and beyond. The hierarchy need to be reconsidered.</p> <p>O - 9800 - 7513 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

9859 Felthorpe Parish Council (Mr Chris Copsey) [8213] - OBJECT

Paper - 27/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

The Introduction (2.3) states, 'The challenge ahead is to ensure that future development is managed to protect and enhance the local and global environment and people's quality of life while still meeting the needs of current and future generations, ensuring a sustainable future'.

The Council after due consideration felt that Felthorpe by not warranting inclusion into the 'Other Villages' designation may suffer detriment to the community and thereby not 'ensuring a sustainable future' for 'future generations'. The criteria ignored the existence of an award winning pre-school establishment whilst in other respects, according to Policy 9, Felthorpe fits the guidelines to the aforesaid Policy. Essential services are promoted for reducing 'the need for car trips' but this Council has previously stated with regard to the building of the NDR that The Street in Felthorpe will become a popular short-cut for vehicles wanting a route to the West of the City thereby negating the required aim and further reducing the opportunity for Felthorpe to acquire sustainability through selective development.

Policy 9 also states that, 'the settlement hierarchy will be re-examined to review the identification of villages at the lower end of the hierarchy, but no indication is given of timetables, consultation or methodology or whether 'the review' will be part of the Joint Core Strategy or a policy that may be introduced at a later date. There is also some concern at the introduction of a hierarchy of villages as this would imply that villages will not be accorded equal consideration with regard to either policy input or development.

It is therefore the decision of this Parish Council to object strongly to Policy 9 of the Joint Core Strategy regarding 'Other Villages'.

O - 9859 - 8213 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

9983 GF Cole and Son [8226] (represented by ASquared Architects (Mrs Jayne Taylor) [7042]) - OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Objection: see below

We note that the list of villages within this policy excludes Great Moulton. We have previously noted that this settlement has

also been excluded from the group of larger villages referred to as Service Villages, and suggested that this omission should be reconsidered. However, if it is decided to continue to exclude the settlement from Policy 8, it is very important that at least its status should be recognised as a significant village within Policy 9.

The current settlement boundary is drawn tightly around separate parts of the settlement, and should be re drawn to enable additional small scale mixed housing development to be provided to meet local demand from the surrounding rural area, and to support existing facilities.

Identifying the settlement as such a focus and enabling new housing development of an appropriate scale would facilitate the provision of further affordable housing through a balanced mixture of development. It would also enable, through considered re-assessment of the existing tightly drawn village boundaries, the provision of other facilities for the settlement. For example, the creation of functional open space alongside new housing development could provide a new village green uniting the existing dispersed development areas within the settlement.

A number of sites have been suggested for housing development within the dispersed area of the settlement, providing a range of small scale opportunities for housing development from which the most appropriate future growth of the settlement could be selected, alongside the adjustment of the development boundary of the village to enable windfall and infill developments to contribute also

O - 9983 - 8226 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

9999

The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Bunwell has all the requirements, and more to be regarded as a Service Village.

O - 9999 - 8228 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10033

The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

NO - Development within 'Other Villages' should not necessarily take preference over new development on the edges of 'Service Villages' and up. The Council should at this stage direct development towards developing small scale schemes on edge

of Service Villages prior to locating housing in the 'Other Villages'. This will result in housing developments that are more sustainable due to existing services and infrastructure.

Development should be allowed to come forward where suitable sites arise in close proximity to existing dwellings, local services and in a manner that reflects local context, thus allowing settlements to evolve gradually as they have done historically.

O - 10033 - 8230 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10068 The Greetham Trustees [7606] (represented by Strutt and Parker (Mr David Williams) [7605]) - OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

With regard to the places proposed as Other Villages, it is considered that Spooner Row should be categorised at a higher level of the settlement hierarchy. The village is 15 miles from the centre of Norwich, one of the region's main settlements, and three miles to the south east of Wymondham, the largest town in South Norfolk. The village is also approximately 3 miles from Attleborough in Breckland District, which is prioritised as the market town for substantial growth by the Breckland District Submission Core Strategy. Attleborough is a major focus for employment and residential growth, with a range of existing services including a local high school currently with spare capacity for additional pupils.

The village itself has developed along Station Road, on which the railway station, village school and village hall are all located. The village pub, the Boar, which is located at the intersection of Station Road and Chapel Road provides a further community focus. The village has a daily bus service, however a more frequent bus service between Wymondham and Attleborough can be reached within a journey time of approximately 15 minutes on foot from the centre of the village. In addition, Spooner Row is rare in that it is a relatively small village with a railway station. The station is currently used infrequently with a single service stopping daily at the station between Attleborough and Wymondham.

It is considered that Spooner Row has greater capacity for development than the rest of the villages at the Other Village level of the settlement hierarchy. Residential development within the village would take advantage of its proximity and links to two surrounding market towns, Wymondham and Attleborough, its location within the NPA and the existing transport infrastructure located in the village, while also contributing to the development of better public transport connections within the GNDP area, as advocated by Objective 6 of the Vision section of the document.

Spooner Row could therefore provide a level of growth currently reserved for the Service Centres, while still fulfilling the role

of settlements in rural areas of the GNDP area, as stated in the spatial vision, which is being a focal point for the community to have better access to quality jobs, healthcare and education facilities and shops, while retaining its distinctive Norfolk character and will continue to be working and tranquil, recognising the Broads, and other locally and nationally important habitats.

When considering the function of Other Villages and the part that they will play in the GNDP strategy, there are a number of factors which need to be taken into account. The reasoned justification for Policy 9: Other Villages states that the area contains a large number of villages that have few or no local services, and would not provide a sustainable location for significant new development and that some of these places with basic essential services would be capable of accommodating very limited infill development without effecting the form and character of the villages.

We consider that the document does not provide the opportunity to develop sufficient levels of housing for the settlements at lower levels of the hierarchy. While it is recognised that the majority of growth should be directed towards Norwich and that the character of the rural area should be retained as a priority, there is a danger that housing growth in the GNDP area will be skewed too heavily away from the 40 other villages and 25 services villages to their detriment in terms of sustainability.

The identification and prioritisation of settlements that fall within this category and that are located inside the NPA, goes some way towards addressing the potential imbalance, however at this stage it is unclear of the level of development that will be acceptable in these locations and how it will be supported. A clear strategy for development in these locations is particularly important for the districts of South Norfolk and Broadland which are predominantly rural in character. In South Norfolk for example Wymondham is one of four Main Towns in the NPA, there are two key service centres in the South Norfolk NPA, four service villages and six other villages in the South Norfolk NPA. It is important that these settlements continue to be sustainable.

In order to be sound, the Core Strategy should be sufficiently robust, flexible and deliverable, conforming with regional and Government planning policy. PPS3 paragraph 38 states that housing should be provided, not only in market towns and local service centres but also in villages in order to enhance or maintain their sustainability.

Along with Government planning policy, the population trends outlined in the Government's Commission for Rural Communities' recent State of the Countryside Report 2008 and last years review of the Living Working Countryside by MP Matthew Taylor provide further evidence to support a more diverse spread of housing allocations across more rural areas. This is relevant in the Joint Core Strategy area and in particular settlements such as Spooner Row that are within the NPA. The State of the Countryside Report reinforces the view that the population of rural England continues to rise faster than the country as a whole. Through analysis of the trends, the report concludes that this is mostly due to people moving out of cities and into rural areas particularly Norfolk and Lincolnshire. The report also picks up on the trend of migration from Norwich to the

surrounding districts and in addition the high percentage of net internal migration from over 100km away to South Norfolk and Broadland districts within the GNDP area. Living Working Countryside (known as the Taylor review) (DCLG 2008) states that 16% rural population growth is projected by 2028, compared with 9% in urban areas. South Norfolk and Broadland are likely to be particularly susceptible to this trend, and the distribution of housing within rural areas of the NPA should reflect this.

Suggested Changes

Under paragraph 7.29 of the Core Strategy, it is stated that the settlement hierarchy will be re-examined to review the identification of villages at the lower end of the hierarchy, the quantity of development that should be accommodated and how to introduce appropriate flexibility. We agree with this approach and consider that Spooner Row in particular is suitable to be included in a higher level of the settlement hierarchy as a Service Village. The Reasoned Justification for Policy 8 sets out the services considered to be the most essential to support small scale growth. Spooner Row only lacks a food shop, however due to its prominent location in close proximity to two market towns, its inclusion in the Norwich Policy Area and the transport infrastructure situated at the village core, that it can fulfil the role of a Service Village and accommodated a greater level of development. The East of England Plan encourages a more specific approach to development in smaller villages and prescribes careful examination of how a settlement or groups of settlements function is required, not purely an analysis of the service base to determine the best solutions for each area.

O - 10068 - 7606 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10109 Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT

Web - 30/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Development of houses should not take place in these areas

O - 10109 - 8239 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -

10184 Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?

Development within 'Other Villages' should not necessarily take preference over new development on the edges of 'Service Villages' and up. The Council should at this stage direct development towards developing small scale schemes on edge of Service Villages prior to locating housing in the 'Other Villages'. This will result in housing developments that are more

	<p>sustainable due to existing services and infrastructure.</p> <p>Development should be allowed to come forward where suitable sites arise in close proximity to existing dwellings, local services and in a manner that reflects local context, thus allowing settlements to evolve gradually as they have done historically.</p> <p>O - 10184 - 8246 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10437	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Again, lack of public transport and services.</p> <p>O - 10437 - 8308 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10541	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>Some of these villages have better road links and facilities than the service villages and should be re-examined.</p> <p>O - 10541 - 8312 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10542	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy?</p> <p>All villages should have be considered for limited development which should be in keeping with current development. Developing around farm buildings seem sensible.</p> <p>O - 10542 - 8312 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
10565	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as</p>

	<p>Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? Leave villages as they are.</p> <p>O - 10565 - 8318 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>
<p>10588</p>	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10588 - 8319 - Policy 9 Other Villages (Q17), (Q17) Do you agree with the places proposed as Other Villages and the part they will play in the strategy? -</p>

Response – Q18

Countryside

Policy 10 (page 38) explains the strategy for the countryside.

Q18 Countryside

Policy 10 (page 38) explains the strategy for the countryside.

Q18 Do you agree with the approach being proposed for the **Countryside?** (some smaller villages and hamlets are defined as countryside for the purposes of this strategy) YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q18 Total	105	18	69	19	106

8073	<p>Miss Janet Saunders [7875] - COMMENT Web - 23/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? I have noticed that many people choose to retire to some of the smaller villages because they like to get away from noisy neighbours, which realistically young families normally become. Please be careful not to build 'affordable housing' in these areas as it is very easy to ruin people's twilight years this way unless there really are sufficient work opportunities available close by.</p> <p>C - 8073 - 7875 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8431	<p>Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? What does limited mean when in regards to leisure and tourism facilities?</p> <p>C - 8431 - 7771 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8597	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p>

	<p>Brownfield sites only</p> <p>C - 8597 - 8024 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8900	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>yes but not the conversion of farm barns for housing or employment which is not sustainable nor in keeping the character of rural locations generally. these buildings require substantial alteration and there is considerable loss of amenity due to the supporting "development" required in their effective use for something they clearly were not designed to be.</p> <p>C - 8900 - 7620 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8915	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Broadly speaking this seems OK. Greater care needs to be taken with regard to the setting up of commercial enterprises in the countryside to ensure that they do not transform an area into an urban island e.g. Seething industrial estates lights create a motorway service area look</p> <p>C - 8915 - 2014 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9402	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>The Countryside is at peril with over development as urban spread, very strict control needed as stated above, essential yes anything else no, electricity gas water sewerage must be available</p> <p>C - 9402 - 8120 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9458	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being</p>

	<p>proposed for Countryside? Whilst there may well be a need for more housing in the area around the city of Norwich, it should not be forgotten that many people who live in small villages outside, also need new, hopefully cheap housing development so that they can stay and work where they were born and not be ousted out by high property prices designed for weekend visitors.</p> <p>C - 9458 - 8134 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9627</p>	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? The Broads Authority would wish to see a much more positive element to the policy setting out the sort of countryside the Joint Core Strategy is aiming for, and the changes being promoted to achieve this. As it stands the proposed policy does, unfortunately, read like a development control policy rather than a core strategy policy. Neither the Policy, as currently worded, nor the supporting text, makes a case for the value of the countryside, and the benefits of its enhancement. Paragraph 7.32 implies that protection and enhancement of the countryside needs to be balanced against the rural economy and accessibility of services. The quality of the countryside in and around the Joint Core Strategy area is a key driver for the local economy, through both tourism and the „quality of life. drivers for business and workforce location. It is important that the Joint Core Strategy should explicitly recognise this basic strategic consideration , and put those occasions where there may be some tension between countryside and economic or service considerations into their proper context.</p> <p>C - 9627 - 7986 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9659</p>	<p>Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Policy 10 7.32 Agricultural land - need these to be protected . How if taken for development?</p> <p>C - 9659 - 8165 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>

<p>9782</p>	<p>Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? The Parish Council would like to see some small developments in all villages. This would share the requirement for additional homes and help the sustainability of smaller communities. This policy is felt to be deficient as it is unlikely to achieve any development as it lacks conviction and commitment to any homes being provided in "The Countryside".</p> <p>C - 9782 - 1974 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9967</p>	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? No comment</p> <p>C - 9967 - 6903 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>10242</p>	<p>Mr Duncan Smith [8257] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Please ensure that there are allotments available, preferably within walking distance. Government and Councils encourage the use allotments, but few new developments seem to have them.</p> <p>C - 10242 - 8257 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>10323</p>	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? The policy statement is too focused on how development in the countryside can be accommodated, rather than an appreciation of the countryside itself. The policy should focus on measures to protect the countryside from any loss of beauty, tranquillity or diversity.</p>

	<p>Care needs to be taken with farm diversification schemes, rural businesses and any form of industrial expansion in the countryside to ensure that the character of rural areas is protected, particularly with respect to the design of buildings, light and noise pollution levels and the impact on neighbouring households.</p> <p>We welcome affordable housing outside development boundaries in appropriate locations.</p> <p>C - 10323 - 6826 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10409	<p>Easton College [3570] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Colin Campbell) [7597]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Policy 10 specific reference should be made to the need to support agriculture and related industries. Given the importance to and influence of agriculture on the countryside we consider a new opening sentence should be added to this policy "Support will be given for proposals which enable the agricultural industry to innovate, remain competitive and exploit synergies with environmental industries and research/education institutions." Paragraph 7.33 needs to be similarly amended.</p> <p>C - 10409 - 3570 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10414	<p>Honingham Thorpe Farms Limited [8296] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Colin Campbell) [7597]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>In Policy 10 specific reference should be made to the need to support agriculture and related industries. Given the importance to and influence of agriculture on the countryside we consider a new opening sentence should be added to this policy "Support will be given for proposals which enable the agricultural industry to innovate, remain competitive and exploit synergies with environmental industries." Paragraph 7.33 needs to be similarly amended.</p> <p>C - 10414 - 8296 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10493	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>No to any large developments. Just a few affordable and rentable houses should be allowed for local people.</p>

	<p>C - 10493 - 8310 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10621	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - COMMENT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Agree with justified reason but people who live and work in these localities should know best</p> <p>C - 10621 - 8325 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10720	<p>Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT Paper - 26/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? "countrydie" - as no explanation found, I don't know exactly what you mean by this term.</p> <p>I think Norwich being a vibrant city at the heart of a rural working agricultural county, it's what makes it special and a great place to be and live. I think respecting the mutual needs of each other, of these 2 aspects, should be at the core of any future development around the Norwich area.</p> <p>C - 10720 - 8354 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
7890	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? It must be right to support some of the villages, be it historical,enviromental.</p> <p>S - 7890 - 7787 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
7953	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - SUPPORT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Need to include internet broad band access in the plan.</p>

	S - 7953 - 7809 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -
7969	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 12/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>I agree with small scale conversion of unused agricultural buildings etc in the countryside</p> <p>S - 7969 - 6862 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8046	<p>Shane Hull [7857] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 17/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>S - 8046 - 7857 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8092	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 26/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>We need as little development in the countryside as possible</p> <p>S - 8092 - 7880 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8122	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 29/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8122 - 7888 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8162	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 8162 - 7899 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8187	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? See comments to Q17 (road network in Bressingham is not suitable for even small scale businesses with larger vehicles except adjacent to the A1066)</p> <p>S - 8187 - 4796 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8211	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 8211 - 7901 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8236	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 8236 - 4558 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8276	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8276 - 7912 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8301	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 13/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Extensions to Country properties should be discouraged as these lead to property price levels rising beyond the reach of Countryside workers. eg land workers and labourers</p> <p>S - 8301 - 7915 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8365	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>-</p> <p>S - 8365 - 6992 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8475	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8475 - 8016 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8499	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8499 - 8020 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>

8524	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 8524 - 7817 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8549	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 8549 - 8021 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8573	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 8573 - 1976 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8662	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - SUPPORT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>S - 8662 - 8036 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8686	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p>

	S - 8686 - 8044 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -
8740	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8740 - 8053 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8793	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>I also believe that landowners and farmers and others might be further encouraged to restore their traditional buildings in the interests of diversification</p> <p>S - 8793 - 8061 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8845	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8845 - 8064 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8982	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8982 - 8092 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>

<p>9045</p>	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 9045 - 4187 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9119</p>	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 9119 - 8111 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9122</p>	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 9122 - 7111 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9158</p>	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 9158 - 2055 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9173</p>	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9173 - 8112 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9238	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9238 - 4494 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9274	<p>Mrs Gray [5927] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9274 - 5927 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9301	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9301 - 5445 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9345	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9345 - 8123 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>

<p>9363</p>	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 9363 - 7113 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9391</p>	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 9391 - 8124 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9433</p>	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 9433 - 8127 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9491</p>	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 9491 - 8139 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9523</p>	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9523 - 8140 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9554	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9554 - 8146 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9607	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9607 - 8162 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9681	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes, other than previous comments</p> <p>S - 9681 - 8047 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9706	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9706 - 5446 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>

<p>9732</p>	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 9732 - 8174 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9768</p>	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - SUPPORT Web - 15/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes.</p> <p>S - 9768 - 8184 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9833</p>	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 9833 - 8198 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9884</p>	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT Paper - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 9884 - 2058 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>9938</p>	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9938 - 7015 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10000	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10000 - 8228 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10093	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Fine</p> <p>S - 10093 - 8235 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10133	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10133 - 8234 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10222	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10222 - 5864 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>

<p>10348</p>	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? But so long as small-scale development only is permitted.</p> <p>S - 10348 - 8293 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>10371</p>	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? In principle, yes but given the number of houses needed there should perhaps be a little more flexibility when it comes to Countryside Villages, and not just in the shape of affordable units, especially if they have good communication links and have adjoining amenities/facilities.</p> <p>S - 10371 - 2020 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>10402</p>	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 10402 - 8294 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>10438</p>	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 10438 - 8308 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>10517</p>	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 10517 - 7215 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10671	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes, but greenfield sites must be protected.</p> <p>S - 10671 - 8348 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10741	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 10741 - 1776 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10774	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 10774 - 7666 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10795	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p>

	S - 10795 - 8360 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -
10810	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10810 - 8361 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10832	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10832 - 8362 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10857	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10857 - 8018 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10895	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10895 - 8366 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10937	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 10937 - 8368 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10961	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 10961 - 8369 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10985	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 10985 - 8176 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
11008	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p> <p>S - 11008 - 8370 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
11054	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT Paper - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Yes</p>

	S - 11054 - 6955 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -
8007	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 16/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>The problem with this issue is that exception sites on agricultural land mean that the farmers who own them get rich out of the scheme but there is no benefit for the village ie already no facilities etc.</p> <p>O - 8007 - 7851 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8121	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 29/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>I object to the emphasis on affordable housing.</p> <p>Any new housing should not detract from the existing character and standard in any area.</p> <p>O - 8121 - 7888 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8394	<p>Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>The policy as currently drafted includes too many of the smaller villages as being open countryside and ignores the need to maintain the sustainability of the smaller village communities.</p> <p>O - 8394 - 7012 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8421	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>The policy as drafted includes too many small villages as being within open countryside and ignores the need to maintain the</p>

	<p>sustainability of the smaller villages.</p> <p>O - 8421 - 7966 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8714	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Why no mention of the new technical study of possible new settlements in SN NPA area? MUST set criteria for this in an unbiased way preferably with consultation. What assumptions are being made???</p> <p>O - 8714 - 8049 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8758	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Too many old agricultural buildings - which form part of the rural character of Norfolk - are being converted. Important wildlife which live and breed in them. e.g. barn owls are being displaced.</p> <p>O - 8758 - 8045 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
8817	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>We question how the Norwich Policy Area can encompass areas of countryside as there are clear differences between urban and rural needs and priorities</p> <p>O - 8817 - 6869 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9197	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Nothing useful on countryside access - people will still drive there! You need a properly though through green access strategy.</p>

	<p>Also it is not clear that you will allow sustainable development and developments linked to agricultural (including small holdings) or forest operations</p> <p>O - 9197 - 8114 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9241	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>The justification is that which existed in the 70's, however, those restraints were later relaxed and development flourished even though today some of the sustainable needs are achieved by using local transport or car.</p> <p>O - 9241 - 1828 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9474	<p>Louisa Young [8135] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>This sounds like protecting the rich from development.</p> <p>O - 9474 - 8135 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9574	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>The proposed development will leave very little countryside to be considered</p> <p>O - 9574 - 6690 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
9801	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>No. As stated above there is insufficient consideration of the need to disperse homes, services and employment to a broader geographical area within the NPA and beyond. The hierarchy need to be reconsidered.</p>

	O - 9801 - 7513 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -
9984	<p>GF Cole and Son [8226] (represented by ASquared Architects (Mrs Jayne Taylor) [7042]) - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? Objection : see below</p> <p>The hierarchical approach to development has resulted in many small settlements falling out of the designations under policies 8 and 9. A consequence of this is that the restrictions of policy 10 limits the provision of small scale and infill housing development within these small settlements unless a specific local need can be identified, or an exceptions development of affordable housing is proposed. It also appears to severely limit conversions of redundant buildings to residential use within open countryside.</p> <p>Such an approach overlooks the important contribution that small scale infill development and conversions can make to the gradual evolution of smaller settlements and the efficient use of existing buildings - resulting in a stagnation of settlement character and an increase in vacant, underused, and degenerating buildings in the countryside.</p> <p>The policy should be adjusted to enable consideration to be given to infill development within small settlements, and the conversion of existing redundant buildings to residential use</p> <p>O - 9984 - 8226 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10034	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? NO - Countryside locations that are directly adjacent to development boundaries of towns and villages should be considered when they logically present an area for development.</p> <p>Alternatively, the development boundaries from Service Villages upwards should be re-assessed to encompass areas that are partially developed and provide an opportunity for accommodating residential dwellings.</p> <p>It must be recognised that not all of the required residential development can be accommodated on brownfield sites. The</p>

	<p>Council should ensure that when looking for suitable green field sites that they focus on edge of villages as opposed to in the countryside. This will ensure a steady supply of housing and homes are provided in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>Residential development on 'The Street' to the east, but outside of the development boundary of Buxton is established and provides an opportunity for further residential development that is within walking distance of Buxton's services.</p> <p>This area could contribute to the expected accommodation of 10-20 new dwellings within Buxton as stated in Policy 8, without adding pressure to the more well defined boundaries to the north, south and west.</p> <p>O - 10034 - 8230 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>10110</p>	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>There should be very little development in the countryside</p> <p>O - 10110 - 8239 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
<p>10185</p>	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>Countryside locations that are directly adjacent to development boundaries of towns and villages should be considered when they logically present an area for development.</p> <p>Alternatively the development boundaries from Service Villages upwards should be re-assessed to encompass areas that are partially developed and provide an opportunity for accommodating residential dwellings.</p> <p>It must be recognised that not all of the required residential development can be accommodated on brownfield sites. The Council should ensure that when looking for suitable greenfield sites that they focus on edge of villages as opposed to in the countryside. This will ensure a steady supply of housing land and homes are provided in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>Residential development on 'The Street' to the east, but outside of the development boundary of Buxton is established and provides an opportunity for further residential development that is within walking distance of Buxton's services.</p>

	<p>This area could contribute to the expected accommodation of 10-20 new dwellings within Buxton as stated in Policy 8, without adding pressure to the more well defined boundaries to the north, south and west.</p> <p>O - 10185 - 8246 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10465	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>No large scale development.</p> <p>O - 10465 - 8309 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10566	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>The countryside is the most important thing to the quality of life - also for food production and tourism. Leave it as it is.</p> <p>O - 10566 - 8318 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>
10589	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside?</p> <p>We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10589 - 8319 - Policy 10 The Countryside (Q18), (Q18) Do you agree with the approach being proposed for Countryside? -</p>

Response – Q19

The Broads

Policy 11 (page 39) explains the strategy for areas next to the Broads.

Q19 The Broads

Policy 11 (page 39) explains the strategy for the area next to the Broads.

Q18 Do you agree with the approach being proposed for the areas next to the Broads? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q19 Total	90	10	72	8	90

7919	<p>Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 06/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Previous comment about restricting second-home ownership.</p> <p>C - 7919 - 6885 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8008	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 16/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>I don't know anything about the area so do not feel qualified to comment.</p> <p>C - 8008 - 7851 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8334	<p>Mr Brian Cleland [7938] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 16/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>There must be much closer cooperation with the Broads Authority than seems to be allowed for in Policy 11.</p> <p>C - 8334 - 7938 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8818	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? No comment. This should be judged by local residents</p> <p>C - 8818 - 6869 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9364	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Page 39 is on the e company in my copy</p> <p>C - 9364 - 7113 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10324	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? We agree with the aspiration, but this does not fit with the favoured option of large scale development within the adjacent to Broads villages. The setting of these villages (for example, Salhouse) would be irrevocably changed by greenfield development in the North East growth triangle. We are not convinced that building a new town on the edge of a National Park will enhance the environmental quality and setting of the area.</p> <p>C - 10324 - 6826 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10385	<p>GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT Paper - 01/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Policy 11 The Broads: 14. As drafted, the policy for the Broads is consistent with the statutory duty to have regard to its 'National Park' purposes, but adds little in terms of spatially specific content. There is scope for strengthening the Strategy's vision for the Broads, and for managing the area's relationship to growth in the north east of Norwich in particular. For example, there will be increased visitor pressure on protected habitats, but there may also be opportunities to improve appropriately managed access to the Broads.</p>

	C - 10385 - 7463 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -
10466	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? We do not want the Broads exploited. They are best left as they are.</p> <p>C - 10466 - 8309 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10494	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? The Broads and surrounding areas and villages must be protected for the current residents, wildlife and tourism.</p> <p>C - 10494 - 8310 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10567	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? The Broads are a valuable asset which brings in money from tourism. Any further development will ruin the beauty and in turn cause visitors to go elsewhere.</p> <p>C - 10567 - 8318 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
7891	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? definitely right tourism brings a lot of money to the region therefore it is essential that proper investment is made to encourage visitors.</p> <p>S - 7891 - 7787 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>

7970	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - SUPPORT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? the broads will also become sea if global warming continues - the world will have to limit its population</p> <p>S - 7970 - 6862 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8093	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT Web - 26/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Fine</p> <p>S - 8093 - 7880 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8123	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 8123 - 7888 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8163	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 8163 - 7899 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8188	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8188 - 4796 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8212	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes, but do you regard the route of the NDR as next to the Broads? Well then?</p> <p>S - 8212 - 7901 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8277	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8277 - 7912 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8302	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 13/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Full</p> <p>S - 8302 - 7915 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8366	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>-</p> <p>S - 8366 - 6992 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>

<p>8476</p>	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 8476 - 8016 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>8500</p>	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 8500 - 8020 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>8526</p>	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 8526 - 7817 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>8550</p>	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 8550 - 8021 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>8574</p>	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8574 - 1976 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8663	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>S - 8663 - 8036 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8687	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>S - 8687 - 8044 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8741	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8741 - 8053 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8753	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8753 - 8045 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8794	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 8794 - 8061 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8846	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 8846 - 8064 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8903	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? agree</p> <p>S - 8903 - 7620 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8916	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 8916 - 2014 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
8983	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p>

	S - 8983 - 8092 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -
9046	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9046 - 4187 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9120	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9120 - 8111 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9124	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9124 - 7111 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9159	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9159 - 2055 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9174	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9174 - 8112 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9239	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9239 - 4494 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9242	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9242 - 1828 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9302	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9302 - 5445 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9346	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 9346 - 8123 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -
9393	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9393 - 8124 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9404	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Must be looked after, strict watch over infiltration of unlaw expansion, plus being mostly flood plains no building of houses as no insurance will be available against flooding if global warming occurs</p> <p>S - 9404 - 8120 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9419	<p>Mr David Gladwell [8126] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 01/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>The BROADS AREA is of vital importance to retain the unique environment and attraction we have. Under the stewardship of John Packman as Chief Executive this has been maintained and developed, with the new BESL strategies and flood bankworks creating a saviour of the system with roll back reed beds establishing a new panoramic view of the Broads. Around the Chet mouth confluence to the Yare (Hardley Cross) this has been of major importance and an outstanding success where angling has also been taken into consideration sympathetically too.</p> <p>S - 9419 - 8126 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9434	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9434 - 8127 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9459	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>S - 9459 - 8134 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9492	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9492 - 8139 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9525	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>But not enough details given</p> <p>S - 9525 - 8140 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9555	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9555 - 8146 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9608	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 9608 - 8162 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>9628</p>	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? The Broads Authority welcomes the inclusion of a policy recognising the inter-relatedness of the Broads and the Joint Core Strategy area, and particularly the potential impact, positive and negative, upon the Broads of development taking place outside but near to it.</p> <p>The use of the term „adjacent. in the policy might be interpreted so narrowly as to frustrate the intention of the policy. It is therefore suggested that the Policy should preferably read</p> <p>In areas close to the Broads.... It would be useful to include within the policy explicit regard to the visual impact of new development, as this is currently only included within the reasoned justification, not the policy itself. Whilst acknowledging the importance of the economy, environmental quality and setting of the Broads, the Authority would also wish to see the policy considerations expanded to include tranquillity, recreational value and navigational use. There is much potential to be realised by the Broads Authority and its neighbours working together. Taking these points together the following revised wording is proposed: POLICY: In areas in close proximity to the Broads Authority area particular regard will be applied to maintaining and enhancing the economy, environment, tranquillity, setting, visual amenity, recreational value and navigational use of the Broads REASONED JUSTIFICATION: The Broads is an area of acknowledged national importance for landscape, biodiversity, and recreational and navigational value. It is a major contributor to the economy and quality of life of the Joint Core Strategy area</p>

	<p>and wider region. Development within the Joint Core Strategy area has the potential to strengthen, complement and link with Broads assets, but also risks harming or under-valuing them if the inter-relatedness of the two areas is not properly recognised.</p> <p>S - 9628 - 7986 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9682	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes, other than previous comments</p> <p>S - 9682 - 8047 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9707	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 9707 - 5446 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9733	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 9733 - 8174 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9769	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - SUPPORT Web - 15/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? This is crucial - the Broads is one of the areas key attractions.</p>

	S - 9769 - 8184 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -
9802	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9802 - 7513 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9834	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9834 - 8198 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9885	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9885 - 2058 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9939	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9939 - 7015 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10001	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10001 - 8228 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10035	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10035 - 8230 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10134	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10134 - 8234 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10186	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10186 - 8246 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10223	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10223 - 5864 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10403	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 28/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10403 - 8294 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10518	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10518 - 7215 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10622	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes as long as the term 'enhancement' also means 'safeguarding' and has full regard to proper flood risk and water management.</p> <p>S - 10622 - 8325 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10672	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes. It must be noted that any development next to the Broads is likely to be short term due to rising sea levels which will cause the Broads to flood neighbouring areas will become under water.</p> <p>S - 10672 - 8348 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>

<p>10742</p>	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 10742 - 1776 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>10775</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 10775 - 7666 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>10796</p>	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 10796 - 8360 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>10811</p>	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 10811 - 8361 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>10833</p>	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10833 - 8362 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10858	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10858 - 8018 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10896	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10896 - 8366 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10938	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10938 - 8368 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10962	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10962 - 8369 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>

<p>10986</p>	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 10986 - 8176 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>11009</p>	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 11009 - 8370 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>11055</p>	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT Paper - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Yes</p> <p>S - 11055 - 6955 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>8237</p>	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - OBJECT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? I do not think anything should be built anywhere near the Broads as it is such a lovely space for people and wild life</p> <p>O - 8237 - 4558 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>9198</p>	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p>

	<p>The Broads is about more than visual impact see 18.</p> <p>O - 9198 - 8114 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
9575	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>There should be no development next to the Broads</p> <p>O - 9575 - 6690 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10094	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>The Broads, being a National Park and a very sensitive environment should be left alone, as far as possible.</p> <p>O - 10094 - 8235 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10111	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>There should not be development in the countryside</p> <p>O - 10111 - 8239 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
10439	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads?</p> <p>Should we not have sea defences as stated by the present government, then areas of the Broads will be lost.</p> <p>O - 10439 - 8308 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>

<p>10543</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? Sympathetic Development could take place in the Broads area for housing and tourism</p> <p>O - 10543 - 8312 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>
<p>10590</p>	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10590 - 8319 - Policy 11 The Broads (Q19), (Q19) Do you agree with the approach being suggested for the areas next to the Broads? -</p>

Response – Q20

The hierarchy of town and village centres

Policy 12 (page 40) explains the strategy for hierarchy of centres.

Q20 The hierarchy of town and village centres

Policy 12 (page 40) explains the strategy for hierarchy of centres.

Q20 Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q20 Total	109	25	69	20	114

7971	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 12/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>I foresee traditional shops disappearing as more shopping is done on line</p> <p>C - 7971 - 6862 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8009	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 16/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>I support the development of areas such as Hall Road etc which need development. However I query the need for small towns to have any more development that they cannot support.</p> <p>C - 8009 - 7851 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8278	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>No additional retail space in Norwich - too much already.</p> <p>C - 8278 - 7912 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8598	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Brownfield sites only</p> <p>C - 8598 - 8024 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8795	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes to the hierarchy of town and village centres; yes to Magdalen street and Anglia square, no to shopping malls</p> <p>C - 8795 - 8061 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9269	<p>Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? I agree to Norwich city centre being No 1 but am at a bit of a loss to understand the reasons for the other inclusions. What does Aylsham have in common with Anglia square and Magdalene Street for example? As to the protection of commercial premises, the failure to protect small businesses from unfair competition by large supermarkets does not bode well for the future.</p> <p>C - 9269 - 8115 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9405	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Not enough is done for sustainability, variety of shops and services by small companies who have expertise, not multi stores and supermarkets that encroach on every trade without the knowledge or expertise of times gone by</p> <p>C - 9405 - 8120 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9473	<p>Louisa Young [8135] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Anglia square is hardly a supplement to anything. It is ugly, squalid and the shops are expensive masquerading as cheap. The quality of retail establishment there is a disincentive to people to use it for meaningful shopping, resulting in use of out of town supermarkets and surprise surprise more car use.</p> <p>C - 9473 - 8135 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9527	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Partly as Magdalen Street and Anglia Square are in desperate need for development. Norwich City Centre may not be able to sustain more retail outlets for reasons given before</p> <p>C - 9527 - 8140 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9629	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>The hierarchical significance of the four categories presented is not clear. They appear all to be subject to the same test, „development... at a scale appropriate to the form and function.</p> <p>C - 9629 - 7986 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9660	<p>Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Page 40 Policy 13 The hierarchy of centre. If Govt want to promote large village of which Long Stratton - IT should fund the bypass first!</p> <p>As to having bypass provided by development this would deprive the village of some facilities as development could surely not fund bypass and infrastructure and community facilities - if it had to cost of houses would be out of reach?</p>

	C - 9660 - 8165 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -
9734	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Not sure</p> <p>C - 9734 - 8174 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9746	<p>Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Shopping - this is more difficult, but the Castle Mall and Chapelfield are more geared up to help blind and partially sighted people. Shop Mobility works well in the city.</p> <p>C - 9746 - 1155 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9847	<p>Spen Hill Developments Limited [8201] (represented by DPP LLP (Ms Chloe Renner) [8202]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>To assist the clear application of policy, we welcome the identified retail hierarchy which follows the specific typologies identified in PPS6 'Planning for Town Centres'.</p> <p>C - 9847 - 8201 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9968	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>C - 9968 - 6903 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>

<p>10095</p>	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - COMMENT Web - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Since we are suffering from a major recession I'm not sure what this means. More small food stores are needed in the City. I would object to any more large supermarkets anywhere. They are killing off the independent stores.</p> <p>C - 10095 - 8235 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10096</p>	<p>Mrs Elizabeth Fletcher [8235] - COMMENT Web - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? No more supermarkets anywhere please. Resist their pressure to expand. We must protect small businesses.</p> <p>C - 10096 - 8235 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10268</p>	<p>Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Hierarchy of Centres: Longwater Retail Park should be added to this list. There is now considerable housing within close proximity to the Longwater Retail Park and the likelihood is that there will be more allocated - hopefully at Easton! This policy should therefore be extended to the Longwater Retail Park allowing retailers of smaller goods to trade there and for it to become more of a local shopping area for the nearby residents of both Easton and Costessey.</p> <p>C - 10268 - 7068 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10286</p>	<p>Henderson Retail Warehouse Fund [8270] (represented by Savills(Manchester) (The Manager) [8269]) - COMMENT Paper - 06/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Policy 12: The Hierarchy of Centres In relation to Question 20, we support the broad categories of the proposed hierarchy of centres. We note that the Policy envisages that the development of new retailing, services, offices and other town centre uses will be encouraged at a scale</p>

appropriate to the forms and functions of the centres listed within the hierarchy. We also note that Norwich City Centre is designated as the principle centre within the hierarchy and confirm we support this position.

As set out above, we consider the Retail Park is an integral part of the overall attractiveness of Norwich City Centre as a retail destination. The importance of the Retail Park has been recognised by the Council through its allocation as a Primary Retail Area in the adopted Local Plan. In addition to the current allocation, the Council has identified retailing in the Riverside location as an important function to the continue operation and success of the wider City Centres and officers confirmed that there are no objections to additional retail development at the Park.

Given the integral role that the Retail Park plays within the overall attractiveness of Norwich City Centre as a retail destination, we request that the hierarchy designation for Norwich City Centre to be broadened to include specific reference to the Retail Park.

C - 10286 - 8270 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -

10288 ASDA Stores Ltd [8274] (represented by Planning Potential (Ms Katie Benford) [8273]) - COMMENT

Paper - 27/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Whilst we have no objection to the propose hierarchy of centres, the first part of the policy appears to suggest that new retailing (and other town centre uses) can only be located in the hierarchy of defined centres.

This conflicts with PPS6 which states that retail development can be located on edge-of-centre sites where no sequentially preferable sites are available in the identified centres.

We therefore request that the following paragraph is included at the end of the policy:

"New retailing, services, offices and other town centre uses should be located in accordance with the sequential approach outlines in PPS6:

- First, in defined centres
- Secondly, in edge-of-centre locations
- Thirdly, in accessible out-of-centre locations."

	C - 10288 - 8274 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -
10305	<p>mrs LISA ford [8282] - COMMENT Web - 07/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Existing small shops in Hethersett are struggling at the benefit of larger chains in Hethersett (Tesco) and Wymondham. Adding retail space will not automatically be a good thing. If larger chains take these retail spaces they will affect local smaller businesses. If local smaller businesses take the retail space they may not succeed due to people preferring to travel to the larger retail parks - such as on the outskirts of Wymondham or Longwater - people do not want to have derelict shopping areas on their doorstep or areas full of £1 shops - similar to Anglia Square of Bowthorpe.</p> <p>C - 10305 - 8282 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10325	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Primary retailing areas should be concentrated in Norwich City Centre or within high streets of existing settlements, rather than out-of-town retail developments.</p> <p>It is important that high streets in market towns, large villages and district centres, both new and old, retain a sense of local distinctiveness. We would like to see specific policy commitments in this section that supports local shops and local food chains and prevent a homogenisation of high streets by national retail chains.</p> <p>C - 10325 - 6826 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10386	<p>GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT Paper - 01/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres: 15. We question whether this policy provides sufficient guidance as to the function of different levels within the hierarchy and hence the appropriate scale of development in each case. Clarification of the scale of urban edge retail/office locations and the</p>

	<p>role of Norwich city centre would be helpful; support for maintaining and strengthening the city's place in the hierarchy as the primary focus for retail and office development would be consistent with Policy 3. In particular, the scale and location of district centres proposed to the north east of Norwich should be clarified.</p> <p>C - 10386 - 7463 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10495	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Leave the towns, villages and hamlets as they are and give a little help to the small shops so they are not destroyed by Tesco. No large development.</p> <p>C - 10495 - 8310 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10721	<p>Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT Paper - 26/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? p.40 - pt 4 - describes establishing a "new shopping district" at Blue Boar Lane, Sprowston. Does this mean centred around Tesco Extra superstore there? Or will it be built further along Blue Boar Lane? Please refer to answer to Q9 about White House Farm. How would White House Farm fit in re. the "new high street"?</p> <p>C - 10721 - 8354 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
7892	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? It is essential that market towns are allowed to grow and encourage the complete range of commercial investment.</p> <p>S - 7892 - 7787 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
7954	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - SUPPORT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the</p>

	<p>proposed hierarchy? Need to ensure single supermarket chain dominance is prevented</p> <p>S - 7954 - 7809 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8124	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8124 - 7888 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8125	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? The current projections on climate change are based on dubious data and are not convincing.</p> <p>Reduction of pollution is a worthy objective.</p> <p>S - 8125 - 7888 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8126	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8126 - 7888 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8127	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p>

	S - 8127 - 7888 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -
8164	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8164 - 7899 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8189	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8189 - 4796 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8213	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes, but I doubt whether the increasing presence of supermarkets promotes local economic growth or widen consumer choice.</p> <p>S - 8213 - 7901 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8238	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 8238 - 4558 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8303	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Web - 13/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Full</p> <p>S - 8303 - 7915 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8367	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>-</p> <p>S - 8367 - 6992 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8438	<p>J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003] (represented by Robert Doughty Consultancy Limited (Mr Robert Doughty) [8002]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Welcome the recognition of Loddon's significance.</p> <p>S - 8438 - 8003 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8477	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8477 - 8016 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8527	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8527 - 7817 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8551	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8551 - 8021 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8575	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8575 - 1976 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8610	<p>Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8610 - 2059 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8688	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>S - 8688 - 8044 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8742	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8742 - 8053 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8819	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8819 - 6869 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8847	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8847 - 8064 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8917	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Long Stratton should not be elevated to main town status</p> <p>S - 8917 - 2014 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8984	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 8984 - 8092 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -
9121	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9121 - 8111 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9125	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9125 - 7111 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9160	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9160 - 2055 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9175	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? I agree with one condition that access by car is made for blue badge holders.</p> <p>S - 9175 - 8112 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9240	Ms T Wheatley [4494] - SUPPORT

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9240 - 4494 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9244	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9244 - 1828 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9365	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9365 - 7113 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9394	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9394 - 8124 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9435	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p>

	S - 9435 - 8127 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -
9460	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>S - 9460 - 8134 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9493	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9493 - 8139 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9556	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>But limited to the reduced housing need as suggested.</p> <p>S - 9556 - 8146 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9609	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9609 - 8162 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9683	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9683 - 8047 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9708</p>	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9708 - 5446 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>9835</p>	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Please add Taverham under 12 (3) as an existing district centre. This will help promote the local economy, widen consumer choice and make Taverham more accessible as part of a sustainable community.</p> <p>A number of the major UK food store operators have indicated interest in pursuing representation in respect of land fronting Fir Covert Rd and Fakenham Rd (A1067) next to Taverham Nursery Centre.</p> <p>The owner has previously made known to the Council this interest, alongside additional mixed uses, in representations made as part of the "LDF Initial Site Concept".</p> <p>Due regard has been given to the current status of the Joint Core Strategy, together with the key findings and recommendations in the Retail and Town Centre Study (GVA Grimley - Oct 2007). It is noted, however, that the study accepts "that this provides only a broad indication of potential growth and need".</p> <p>Taverham and its satellite settlement Thorpe Marriott, is one of the largest settlements within Broadland (pop 12,488 - 2000 census - twice the size of Aylsham the largest market town in Broadland District) and offers a full range of "district centre" facilities, with the noticeable exception of a food store.</p>

Taverham's recent inclusion within the "Norwich Urban Area" and opportunity for further residential growth, highlights the importance of including within the Council's Core Strategy, a foodstore and mixed uses, as part of an overall mixed use sustainable urban extension.

Taverham already has all of the characteristics of an existing District centre with state schools (secondary and primary), private schools, nursery provision, library, GP and dental surgeries, vets, golf course, hotels and leisure clubs, together with Norfolk's largest garden centre and adjoining craft and country shopping centre. This attracts visitors from afar and is a significant tourist destination.

Conversely, other communities within Broadland District defined in the retail study as "district centres", namely Old Catton, Dussindale and Sprowston (Blue Boar Lane) do not have the range of services and shops available in Taverham. They all however have a foodstore in Somerfield (Old Catton), Sainsburys (Dussindale) and Tesco (Sprowston).

We believe that the Council should support the delivery of new retail foodstore which will encourage sustainable shopping patterns and reduce car trips.

The Greater Norwich Partnership Policy Group's support for the Norwich Northern Distributor Road and recent decision on its route immediately west of the site will emphasise the prominence and suitability of the proposals. It is anticipated that the operator will be capable of contributing towards the capital costs of works improving the Fakenham Rd/Fir Covert Road junction.

As a result, the foodstore use would be a catalyst for other uses to come forward on adjacent land. This is likely to include further capital investment in the adjoining Nursery Centre and Craft and Country Shopping Centre, upgrading facilities and retaining and expanding employment opportunities.

In particular a range of ancillary retail (A1/A2/A3) uses to compliment the "de facto" district centre are anticipated, together with start-up offices, community facilities (e.g. PCT surgery), care home provision and improved car parking.

We would support the places identified for large scale residential growth and to increase employment opportunities as strategic locations. We believe the site is already a strategic location and will benefit further from the stated transport infrastructure aims.

The retail study defined the "Norwich Urban Area" (NUA) to "comprise Norwich City Centre, but also includes Anglia Square, a number of district centres and out of centre shopping locations. Taverham is now included within NUA and the proposed

mixed uses, including retail will provide a catalyst for sustainable growth and additional employment.

Although the quantitative and qualitative assessments are now out of date and are open to different interpretation, (and as indicated above the "need" case is now the subject of Government proposals), recent planning consents have followed in line with recommendations made to prioritise Anglia Square and support Hall Rd as a district centre.

With these consents in place from 2011 onwards, there exists an opportunity to bring forward an unspecified quantum of new comparison and convenience goods use up to 2016. Taverham we believe should be able to justify a foodstore and mixed use development on the same PPS6 grounds as Anglia Square and Hall Rd. The subject site will not adversely impact on the vitality and viability of the city centre as a whole and will provide employment opportunities in line with "Policy 2".

PPS6 defines District Centres as "those centres that usually comprise groups of shops often containing at least one supermarket or superstore and a range of services". The retail study also comments that "these centres need to identify and build upon their unique attractions to draw a greater proportion of tourists and all year round visitors spend to help underpin overall vitality and viability". As indicated above the garden centre and craft and country shopping centre have a major role in attracting inward investment into the area through tourism and visitor attractions and the mixed use and foodstore proposals would compliment and strengthen the overall offer. This would meet the criteria of economic and physical regeneration and creating new employment opportunities of up to 400 new jobs.

There is no other site which is large enough to appropriately accommodate the retail floor space and mixed uses proposed. PPS6 recognises the importance of encouraging sustainable shopping patterns - this activity already occurs on the adjoining sites and it is clear that Taverham needs a foodstore to service the existing community and the new residential areas nearby.

S - 9835 - 8198 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -

9886 Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT

Paper - 21/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?

Yes

S - 9886 - 2058 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -

9940 John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT

Paper - 24/04/09

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 9940 - 7015 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10002	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10002 - 8228 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10017	<p>notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? We agree with the proposed hierarchy but submit that policy must be clear in its recognition that some retail uses may be too extensive to be accommodated in the Central areas and are not therefore appropriate City Centre uses. This includes garden centres where the land take is necessarily high but which nonetheless provide an important retail facility and add to the diversity offered to the local community. It is essential that policy encourages their retention and ongoing improvement / development in order to meet the public's requirements as these evolve over the LDF period.</p> <p>S - 10017 - 6911 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10036	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10036 - 8230 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10054	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10054 - 2373 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10187	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10187 - 8246 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10224	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10224 - 5864 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10349	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? So long as TESCO is not allowed to take over all the new developments. Villages need independent shops and post offices.</p> <p>S - 10349 - 8293 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10372	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p>

	S - 10372 - 2020 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -
10404	<p>Acle Parish Council (Ms Pauline James) [8294] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 28/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10404 - 8294 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10440	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10440 - 8308 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10519	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10519 - 7215 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10623	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes, it seems appropriate to need. Corner shops and Post Offices must be encouraged as well small local convenience stores. We have enough Superstores already.</p> <p>S - 10623 - 8325 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>

<p>10673</p>	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10673 - 8348 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10743</p>	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10743 - 1776 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10755</p>	<p>Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048] (represented by J and J Design (Mr J R Shephard) [8358]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10755 - 7048 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10776</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10776 - 7666 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10797</p>	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p>

	<p>7.36 these need to be accessible by a range of sustainable transport options, prioritised to ensure that the lowest impact option is always chosen.</p> <p>S - 10797 - 8360 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10812	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>7.36 these need to be accessible by a range of sustainable transport options, prioritised to ensure that the lowest impact option is always chosen.</p> <p>S - 10812 - 8361 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10834	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10834 - 8362 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10859	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>We must evaluate how Norwich's status as 'the highest-ranking retail centre in the region' has impacted on smaller retail centres such as Cromer or Great Yarmouth and it also affects the viability of creating new smaller retail centres elsewhere in the Norwich policy area. Making Norwich or market towns/the rural economy the focus for growth is to some extent mutually exclusive, particularly in terms of retail. It would perhaps be better to talk of finding a balance between these objectives.</p> <p>S - 10859 - 8018 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10939	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the</p>

	<p>proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10939 - 8368 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10963	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10963 - 8369 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10987	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 10987 - 8176 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
11010	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 11010 - 8370 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
11056	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 11056 - 6955 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>

<p>11135</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 11135 - 2373 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>11148</p>	<p>JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Yes</p> <p>S - 11148 - 6979 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>7932</p>	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT Web - 08/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? no retail should be spread out and kept local to avoid excessive transport use local village small scale retail only</p> <p>O - 7932 - 7812 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>7940</p>	<p>Mr Peter Boddy [7815] - OBJECT Web - 09/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? I object to this proposal on the grounds that it will mean the building of an eco town at Rackheath. I have already submitted my objections to that under Policy 5</p> <p>O - 7940 - 7815 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>8501</p>	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the</p>

	<p>proposed hierarchy? If you can help local retail to develop fine - not more Tescos everywhere. Norwich does not need more retail space. What will happen to the Co-op store in St Stephens? Needs better quality not more nasty cheap shops</p> <p>O - 8501 - 8020 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8664	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Natural growth will limit expansion without intervention, a need must be established before providing facilities that will not be required or sustained.</p> <p>O - 8664 - 8036 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
8944	<p>Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? this seems to be reinventing the wheel. There are already 'town centres' in the places listed - and they are popular for being what they are now.</p> <p>O - 8944 - 8087 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9047	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? No Strategic development in the satellite towns of Long Stratton and Wymondham is unsustainable</p> <p>O - 9047 - 4187 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9200	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the</p>

	<p>proposed hierarchy? - Hoveton / Wroxham is not included in 2. - There is nothing about corner shops or POs which need support to continue let alone for new ones (or rather reinstated ones)!</p> <p>O - 9200 - 8114 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9304	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? No</p> <p>O - 9304 - 5445 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9332	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Wymondham will be too large. Hall road Norwich does not need to be a district centre as it is so close to Norwich city centre.</p> <p>O - 9332 - 8123 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9576	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? This will lead to over population of Norfolk (our country)</p> <p>O - 9576 - 6690 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
9770	<p>Damien van Carrapiett [8184] - OBJECT Web - 15/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? With respect to Thorpe St Andrew, with the exception of health services, surely we don't need further expansion past the Business Park?</p>

	O - 9770 - 8184 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -
9803	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>No. Further to our comments on the unlikely need for new office space noted above, greater focus on town and district centres is needed rather than centralising in Norwich.</p> <p>O - 9803 - 7513 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10112	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>Development should be retained within Norwich on brownfield sites and at a new town in Long stratton</p> <p>O - 10112 - 8239 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
10135	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>We support the identification of the Old Catton/Rackheath/Thorpe St Andrew/Sprowston growth area as a future location for a new district centre/high street as this will enable the creation of vibrant, self-sustaining communities within the sustainable urban extension. It will ensure that the extension develops as a new, attractive place in its own right, with convenient access to jobs and services, which will contribute to the local economy.</p> <p>However, we consider that a new district centre/high street as part of a sustainable urban extension that will serve over 10,000 dwellings in addition to serving employees at the established Broadland Business Park should be higher up the hierarchy than large villages/district centres as identified in Policy 12. Therefore, we suggest that the new district centres/high streets to be established at major growth locations are placed at number 2 in the hierarchy of town and village centres.</p> <p>O - 10135 - 8234 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>

<p>10467</p>	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Do not build in the countryside. This is best left as it is.</p> <p>O - 10467 - 8309 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10544</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Norwich is where the best shops are and that is where people will want to go.</p> <p>Local shopping areas need good cheap parking and interesting shops to attract people.</p> <p>O - 10544 - 8312 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10568</p>	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? Villages and towns are fine as they are, so do not meddle and change them.</p> <p>O - 10568 - 8318 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10591</p>	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10591 - 8319 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>10897</p>	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>We support the identification of the Old Catton/Rackheath/Thorpe St Andrew/Sprowston growth area as a future location for a new district centre/high street as this will enable the creation of vibrant, self-sustaining communities within the sustainable urban extension. It will ensure that the extension develops as a new, attractive place in its own right, with convenient access to jobs, services and facilities, which will contribute to the local economy.</p> <p>However, we consider that a new district centre/high street as part of a sustainable urban extension that could serve over 10,000 dwellings in addition to serving employees at the established Broadland Business Park should be higher up in the hierarchy than large villages/district centres as identified in policy 12. Therefore, we suggest that the new district centres/high streets to be established at major growth locations are placed at number 2 in the hierarchy of town and village centres.</p> <p>O - 10897 - 8366 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>
<p>11119</p>	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy?</p> <p>For consistency with the spatial vision, Policy 5 and paragraph 7.15, Long Stratton should be listed as item 2 not item 3.</p> <p>O - 11119 - 8390 - Policy 12 The hierarchy of centres (Q20), (Q20) Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy? -</p>

Response – Q21

Reducing environmental impact

Policy 13 (page 43) explains reduction of environmental impact.

Q21 Reducing environmental impact

Policy 13 (page 43) explains reduction of environmental impact.

Q21 Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q21 Total	131	25	67	40	132

7972 Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - COMMENT

Web - 12/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

sorry but I don't believe that you will force developers to build anything other than their typical square boxes without regional character. Housing could be greatly improved if garages were built underground as on the continent instead of the car dominating the development

C - 7972 - 6862 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -

8048 Mr Keith Jones [7536] - COMMENT

Web - 22/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

I have an interest in the following being implemented. ref Broadland DC Local Plan (replacement) 2006

15.5: The District Council proposes to designate a Conservation Area covering those parts of Beeston St Andrews which are of special architectural or historic interest; once designated policy ENV16 will apply to the area.

5.6: Part of Beeston is particularly attractive because of the relationship between the farm buildings, hall and their various parkland settings, as well as the wooded margins and area around Red Hall. The proposed Conservation Area may well extend in to the parishes of Spixworth and Sprowston.

C - 8048 - 7536 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -

<p>8128</p>	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - COMMENT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) The present concern about climate change is based on projections from dubious data and is not convincing.</p> <p>The reduction of pollution is a worthy objective.</p> <p>C - 8128 - 7888 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>8214</p>	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - COMMENT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Serious doubts about this. Development is likely to use up scarce resources and the road proposals are unlikely to minimise the need to travel by car. What is the flood risk? Is it the latest figures predicted? I think a lot of this is just words.</p> <p>C - 8214 - 7901 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>8599</p>	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Brownfield sites only</p> <p>C - 8599 - 8024 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>8715</p>	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - COMMENT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) The proximity of jobs to new housing seems a critical issue not adequately addressed - relying on the development of transport systems to link where people live and where they work is surely short-sighted. For smaller villages the development of new housing without space for associated employment is inappropriate but it may be difficult to make a requirement in planning</p>

	<p>terms?</p> <p>C - 8715 - 8049 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8773	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Sounds great on paper but what is the reality it will happen? The environmental aspects of it are too weak and where is all the money going to come from now cut-backs for these type of projects will be made.</p> <p>C - 8773 - 8045 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8796	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Generally yes and as specified no</p> <p>C - 8796 - 8061 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8920	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) It is not possible to accommodate the large amount of housing projected without creating serious environmental damage. This strategy equals major urbanisation. How for instance will light pollution be controlled from 33,000 extra homes / streets?</p> <p>C - 8920 - 2014 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9079	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Must be ready to improve public transport availability if not so many cars</p>

	C - 9079 - 8109 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -
9308	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Have you correctly and sympathetically identified sites that are important for landscape character? Some are not immediately obvious but are an integral part of Norfolk's singular rural appeal - e.g. common and heath lands between Norwich & Coltishall for instance.</p> <p>C - 9308 - 8117 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9630	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>The Broads Authority believes the reduction of environmental impact should be inherent in the strategy, and the first policy in the strategy document, from which the others, including location of development, flow. That said, the Authority welcomes the recognition that efficient use of land, community needs, resource conservation, environmental protection, landscape protection, energy efficiency, recycling, water management, design, distinctiveness and townscape, historic and cultural features, nature travel reduction, climate change, and flood risk reduction should warrant a mention in one of the Strategy's policies.</p> <p>C - 9630 - 7986 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9646	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>The proposals in this policy have, as indicated in paragraph 8.1, been included in numerous national policy statements and also in the Regional Spatial Strategy. Reference is also made to the Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 - Planning and Climate Change. We can therefore see no need for the CS to reiterate, yet again, such guidance when it can clearly be referenced in these other documents. Any proposed policy need only make reference to these other publications where</p>

	<p>requirements are well documented.</p> <p>C - 9646 - 7503 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9783	<p>Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees with the proposals in policy 13. However, there are concerns about the number of houses squeezed into some new developments and there should be provision for children's play areas, even in small developments.</p> <p>C - 9783 - 1974 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9969	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>C - 9969 - 6903 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10251	<p>Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 09/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Policy 13 Reducing Environmental Impact</p> <p>All development will</p> <p>Bullet point 2 misses out geodiversity protection. (Conserving geodiversity in its own right is not the same as keeping reserves of minerals for later use.) Suggest amendment to:</p> <p>"...sites that are important for biodiversity, geodiversity, landscape character ..."</p> <p>C - 10251 - 8260 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10387	<p>GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 01/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree</p>

	<p>with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact: 16. We welcome the commitment to reducing environmental impact but would encourage you to avoid repetition of national policy and strengthen those elements which provide a spatially specific basis for reducing carbon emissions, for example by identifying opportunities for renewable energy generation; we understand that further evidence to inform energy policy will become available prior to publication of the submission draft. We comment on modal priorities elsewhere (Policy 16), as this relates to strategic access and transportation policy as well as environmental impact.</p> <p>C - 10387 - 7463 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10468	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) No development is the only way to save the environment.</p> <p>C - 10468 - 8309 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10641	<p>Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333] - COMMENT Web - 11/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Cohousing is a particularly effective way of reducing environmental impact. Within the core values of Norwich Cohousing is the intention to build a housing stock with intrinsic energy saving and carbon reducing features. These homes are likely to include (amongst others) passive solar architecture, solar hot water and photovoltaic systems and rain water collection. Furthermore, we will use local and renewable building materials and labour for our development. Cohousing also offers ongoing environmental benefits such as encouraging alternatives to private car use, community cooking, vegetable growing, composting, recycling and the sharing of resources.</p> <p>C - 10641 - 8333 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10649	<p>Ms Lucy Hall [8295] - COMMENT Web - 11/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p>

	<p>Para 8.3: what are 'high quality movement opportunities'? At the moment I can't cross the road near my house because there is a continuous stream of car traffic going round a mini-roundabout, travelling in and out of the city at rush hour. Whose movement will you prioritise? Mine, a pedestrian, or theirs?</p> <p>Roads and highways are limited in size. This Core Strategy and NATS seem unwilling to grasp the principle that encouraging one form of transport means restricting another. You can't just encourage (public transport, cycling) without doing some restricting (cars, lorries).</p> <p>C - 10649 - 8295 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>10683</p>	<p>Ms Natalie Beal [8349] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 10/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Is this repeating national policy or do you intend to go further than national policy - it is unclear what you are intending.</p> <p>The bullet point that starts 'make sustainable use of resources ...' is totally weakened by the inclusion of the wording 'wherever possible' - this gives developers a get-out clause and should be reconsidered.</p> <p>C - 10683 - 8349 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>10707</p>	<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>We suggest that the second bullet point following the statement "all development will" includes the requirement to enhance biodiversity and landscape character as well as protect them. In addition to this we suggest that reference is made in particular to the protection and enhancement of the biodiversity within our river and lake network as required under the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>With reference to the last bullet point (climate change and flood risk), it should be noted that a more detailed development control policy may be required at a later stage to further control development within areas of flood risk and ensure that SUDs are used wherever possible.</p> <p>We note that the policy makes no reference to development on contaminated land. Spatial Planning Objective 8 states that the</p>

use of previously developed land will be prioritised. Furthermore, within paragraph 7.2, it is stated that a significant proportion of development, at least in the short term, will be focused on brownfield sites. It is likely that in some cases this will include sites which may have been contaminated by their previous use, for example, industrial uses. Where this is the case remediation may be required. Therefore, we recommend that policy includes a new bullet point relating to the appropriate remediation of contaminated land.

In addition, for development which may potentially pollute the environment, adequate pollution control measures should be put in place. Where this relates to the road network, we ask to be kept up-to-date in terms of where these structures are, who manages and maintains them and who has access to them. This can be particularly important during road side incidents attended by our Environment Management Field Teams.

C - 10707 - 8352 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -

10722 Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT

Paper - 26/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

Climate change and travel:

I think the N. Distributor Road will increase CO2 emissions because it will increase people's overall mileage to get from A to B on the NDR, compared to before. Also, the high vehicle speeds will also increase CO2 emissions as travelling at 30 or 40 mph, less CO2 is released than when travelling at 60 or 70 - not good for climate change.

C - 10722 - 8354 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -

10917 Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

Policy 13 - Reducing Environmental Impact, sufficiently addresses climate change and promotes sustainability in all development. The policy is in line with central government guidance and all new housing has to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes targets.

Whilst there is no argument that sustainable neighbourhoods are a key element of

the vision, there is some concern with the enforcement of such high standards, particularly those set out in the Codes for sustainable Homes, will result in increased costs and reduced profit margins. Evidence from Knight Frank (2008) suggests that a house built to Code Level 6 at 2007 construction prices will cost in the region of £30,000 to £35,000 extra to construct. Whilst we do not suggest these levels are pushed down, it is clear that once a developer takes into consideration other contributions and possibly a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), a development could be unviable to build. This in turn causes a decrease in house building and housing targets will not be met. The GNDP must take this into consideration when appraising new developments, and in some cases where viability is an issue, other contributions may be reduced. We recommend the GNDP commission viability studies to test the level of benefits that can be expected to be viable in the current climate.

70 Policy 14 - Housing Delivery, states that an absolute net additional 36,000 new homes are to be built and completed between 2006 and 2026 within the NPA. This figure stems from the RSS for the East of England. Proposals for housing will be expected to contribute to the mix of housing required to meet the needs of the area. This is of course dependent on up-to-date and accurate Housing Market Assessments. We have commented separately on JCS Housing Market Assessments and we hope our comments have been taken on board.

71 In negotiating the proportion and tenure of affordable housing, account must be made of site characteristics, market conditions and the overall viability of the scheme. For this reason the provision of affordable housing must be determined on a site by site basis rather than by a predetermined set policy figure. Again, viability assessments need to be prepared to support the targets for affordable housing.

72 Policy 15 - The Economy, states that the local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to facilitate the proposed RSS job growth. ALP are in agreement that achieving the full economic potential of the area is dependent on improved connectivity and implementation of wider sustainable transport proposals.

73 Policy 16 - Strategic Access and Transportation, states that an enhanced transport system will be provided to promote sustainable economic transport and reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices and minimise the need to use the private car. It is this aspect where Wymondham provides a significant advance over other growth locations limited by lack of

strategic roads.

74 ALP wholly support this strategy and feel Wymondham as a location can promote car reduced travel more than any other location. Proximity to existing and proposed transport nodes such as the railway station and high speed bus routes into Norwich will ensure that car reliance is decreased. Sustainable urban design of residential areas will also contribute this. This strategy does, however, cast doubt on the level of sustainability achievable in respect of development in Long Stratton and in North East Norwich.

75 Improvements to the A11 and A47 are fully supported, although further details of work should be made public and contained within this document. At present it is felt the level of information in Policy 16 does not allow for a detailed response. ALP have consulted with CABE on their masterplan proposals in South Wymondham and subsequently they are extremely conscious that any large scale development proposal should not rely on car based movements. Instead, Masterplans should be designed around quality public transport solutions and all new housing must be within a 5 minute walking distance of public transport nodes.

76 Policy 17 - Environmental Assets, states that the environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained and enhanced and the benefits for residents and visitors improved. Development proposal should avoid harming areas of environmental importance. With 21,000 new houses to be found on mainly Greenfield sites, it is clearly going to need responsible planning to ensure existing environmental assets are not harmed. For this reason any growth option within the Favoured Option should demonstrate that development would not harm the environment as a whole, including ecology and landscape.

77 ALP support this view and have demonstrated through their analysis of South Wymondham that the proposed development site together with their site in North East Wymondham would not jeopardise ecology and landscape.

78 Policy 18 - Communities and Culture, states that in order to deliver thriving communities, tackle social deprivation and meet the diverse needs across the JCS, a spatial planning approach will be required to ensure infrastructure requirements are addressed in a holistic way. ALP support social inclusion and believe they can demonstrate that proposals in Wymondham will be built to meet the needs of the whole community. Increased levels of affordable housing and community facilities will ensure that this represents a development for all.

	C - 10917 - 8367 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -
11104	<p>Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Policy 13 - Reducing Environmental Impact, sufficiently addresses climate change and promotes sustainability in all development. The policy is in line with central government guidance and all new housing has to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes targets.</p> <p>Whilst there is no argument that sustainable neighbourhoods are a key element of the vision, there is some concern with the enforcement of such high standards, particularly those set out in the Codes for sustainable Homes, will result in increased costs and reduced profit margins. Evidence from Knight Frank (2008) suggests that a house built to Code Level 6 at 2007 construction prices will cost in the region of £30,000 to £35,000 extra to construct. Whilst we do not suggest these levels are pushed down, it is clear that once a developer takes into consideration other contributions and possibly a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), a development could be unviable to build. This in turn causes a decrease in house building and housing targets will not be met. The GNDP must take this into consideration when appraising new developments, and in some cases where viability is an issue, other contributions may be reduced. We recommend the GNDP commission viability studies to test the level of benefits that can be expected to be viable in the current climate.</p> <p>C - 11104 - 8300 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
7894	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) All houses should be encouraged to save energy and rely less on fossil fuels</p>

	S - 7894 - 7787 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -
7955	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - SUPPORT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Need to ensure a fully comprehensive waste re-cycling system is in place before development.</p> <p>S - 7955 - 7809 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8010	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) yes</p> <p>S - 8010 - 7851 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8165	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Keep in mind that less than 3% of the nation are within walking / cycling distance of their workplace</p> <p>S - 8165 - 7899 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8190	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Therefore do not encourage commercial growth in rural areas, i.e. Hethel engineering.</p> <p>S - 8190 - 4796 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8239	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8239 - 4558 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8279	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8279 - 7912 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8304	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 13/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Full</p> <p>S - 8304 - 7915 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8344	<p>Age Concern Norwich (Phil Wells) [7957] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Providing the housing mix reflects the needs of older people - it is clear that an even spread of older people is not working in terms of delivery of social care, but equally many do not wish to live in older communities. Small affordable homes around a service centre may be a useful compromise allowing community development with potential for effective service delivery.</p> <p>S - 8344 - 7957 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8368	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree</p>

	<p>with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>-</p> <p>S - 8368 - 6992 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8478	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8478 - 8016 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8502	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>If they are actually implemented</p> <p>S - 8502 - 8020 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8528	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8528 - 7817 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8552	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8552 - 8021 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>

<p>8576</p>	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p> <p>S - 8576 - 1976 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>8611</p>	<p>Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p> <p>S - 8611 - 2059 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>8665</p>	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - SUPPORT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>S - 8665 - 8036 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>8689</p>	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>S - 8689 - 8044 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>8743</p>	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p>

	S - 8743 - 8053 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -
8820	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8820 - 6869 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8848	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8848 - 8064 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8905	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>agree</p> <p>S - 8905 - 7620 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8985	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8985 - 8092 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9007	<p>Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>The policy is based on a sound principle to reduce environmental impact. The proposed site would compromise this due to its size.</p> <p>S - 9007 - 8095 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9022	<p>Mr and Mrs Peter Tann [8099] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9022 - 8099 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9123	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9123 - 8111 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9126	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9126 - 7111 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9161	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9161 - 2055 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9176	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>I agree with two provisos</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That access is given to disable blue badge holders 2. That all council housing and housing associations bring their stock up to the current requirements within five years and keep it that way not just new housing <p>S - 9176 - 8112 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9243	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>But priority needs to be given to reducing private transport use by 1. Providing public transport at affordable prices 2. Providing local facilities eg PO, GP's, schools etc as near to homes as possible.</p> <p>S - 9243 - 4494 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9245	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9245 - 1828 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9276	<p>Mrs Gray [5927] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9276 - 5927 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9305	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>But all developments should not be encompassed by the same Governmental density - each new site should be taken into consideration of the surrounding areas</p> <p>S - 9305 - 5445 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9366	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9366 - 7113 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9396	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>However, families will still use cars unless bus fares are significantly reduced and there are shelters from wind & rain.</p> <p>S - 9396 - 8124 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9436	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9436 - 8127 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>

<p>9463</p>	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>S - 9463 - 8134 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>9557</p>	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Subject to the limited number of housing as detailed in other questions.</p> <p>S - 9557 - 8146 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>9610</p>	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p> <p>S - 9610 - 8162 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>9684</p>	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Does not do enough to address local history - character, landscape value, in some cases in relation to Policy Statement 13.</p> <p>S - 9684 - 8047 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>9709</p>	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p>

	S - 9709 - 5446 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -
9735	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9735 - 8174 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9804	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes, we agree with Policy 13, with the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We need to build homes in the right areas, close to employment and services; this means thinking beyond current simple planning practice and looking to bring employment and services to rural areas. This is undoubtedly a challenge. 2. We need to avoid high dwelling densities, provide suitable living areas for families and gardens for children where they can play by themselves; communal green space should add value not be a necessity. <p>S - 9804 - 7513 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9836	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9836 - 8198 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9854	<p>Mr Paul Johnson [8207] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 25/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree</p>

	<p>with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>It is universally recognised that it is vital that impacts on the environment be kept as small as possible. Unfortunately, this hits a major dichotomy as any increase in population will create greater demands for roads, transport, jobs etc. and the more rubbish and disposal needs.</p> <p>S - 9854 - 8207 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9887	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9887 - 2058 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9902	<p>Mr Peter Sutton [8219] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 27/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Minimising the need to travel is important</p> <p>S - 9902 - 8219 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9941	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9941 - 7015 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10003	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 10003 - 8228 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -
10037	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10037 - 8230 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10188	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10188 - 8246 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10225	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10225 - 5864 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10350	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use brownfield sites wherever possible - use infill rather than greenbelt land - build small-scale <p>S - 10350 - 8293 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>

<p>10373</p>	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p> <p>S - 10373 - 2020 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>10441</p>	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p> <p>S - 10441 - 8308 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>10520</p>	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p> <p>S - 10520 - 7215 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>10545</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - SUPPORT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) all sensible</p> <p>S - 10545 - 8312 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>10624</p>	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p>

	<p>Agreed</p> <p>S - 10624 - 8325 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10655	<p>mrs Helene Rinaldo [8345] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Development should also take into account the notion of human footprint and food security, limiting new development to brown field, away from green field is essential and would follow the principle of Sustainable Development as defined by Defra.</p> <p>S - 10655 - 8345 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10744	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10744 - 1776 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10777	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10777 - 7666 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10798	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10798 - 8360 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>

<p>10813</p>	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p> <p>S - 10813 - 8361 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>10940</p>	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p> <p>S - 10940 - 8368 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>10964</p>	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p> <p>S - 10964 - 8369 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>10988</p>	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Yes</p> <p>S - 10988 - 8176 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>11011</p>	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 11011 - 8370 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
7933	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 08/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>all new housing should have its own solar power or chp or heat pumps not just roll of insulation and low wattage lamp</p> <p>O - 7933 - 7812 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8094	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 26/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>All development has a massive environmental impact. Any new houses in this country should meet at least the standards set out for all eco-towns. Energy production should hardly based on fossil fuels. All new settlements should be supported by wind farms, PV cell etc. Waste reduction is essential with as much recycling as possible.</p> <p>The standards set out here are not stringent enough</p> <p>O - 8094 - 7880 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8319	<p>Mr Anthony Knights [7922] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 15/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>It is not possible to consider a policy for reducing environmental impact and STILL wish to build the NNDR; the two oppose each other.</p> <p>O - 8319 - 7922 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8450	<p>Ian Harris [8007] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p>

	<p>Unless you address transportation as the number one priority, building sustainable housing will be meaningless. For instance, the energy saved by switching off a mobile phone charger for a day, is used up by driving a car for one second. Transport is the key, the opportunity, and it's being comprehensively squandered in these proposals.</p> <p>O - 8450 - 8007 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8644	<p>Mr Steve Dowall [8033] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Policy 13 states that all developments will protect sites of landscape character. The site specific proposals S39-032a and S39-02 clearly will not have nor protect that character.</p> <p>O - 8644 - 8033 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8762	<p>Ms Sarah Smith [8059] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) The proposed development of Lingwood will not protect the landscape character of the village.</p> <p>O - 8762 - 8059 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8789	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) It is utter rubbish for you to suggest that the NDR will minimise the need to travel. It will encourage and perpetuate private road traffic and the movement of goods by road.</p> <p>O - 8789 - 8060 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8952	<p>Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p>

	<p>While these aims are all very well and I do agree with them, the proposed growth in homes should be matched to jobs in the same area, within walking distance. This policy should not create or expand "dormitory" areas necessitating long journeys to reach work, shops, healthcare and leisure facilities.</p> <p>O - 8952 - 8088 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
8998	<p>Mr CM Sparrow [8093] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Larger developments within the village would destroy the current landscape.</p> <p>O - 8998 - 8093 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9003	<p>Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) The proposed site S39-02 for development will have an environmental impact on the village of Lingwood. Loss of prime agricultural land Affect historical features - church - school - barns and heater lane Loss of views to church</p> <p>O - 9003 - 8094 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9011	<p>Mr Philip Smith [8096] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) S39-02a and S39-02 do have landscape value and buildings of historical interest, an ancient church, old barns , school, and heater lane and village pond and squaring off the village is unnecessary.</p> <p>O - 9011 - 8096 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9014	<p>Mr KD White [8097] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>The area is the most attractive part of the village. Public footpath views of the church, barns etc</p> <p>O - 9014 - 8097 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9018	<p>Mr Robert Hall [8098] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>S39-02a and S39-02 do have landscape value and buildings of historical interest - ancient church, old barns, a school and a heater lane and pond. Views within the village should be retained. A village does not have to be square.</p> <p>O - 9018 - 8098 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9048	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>No - Not agreed relating to Long Stratton and Wymondham</p> <p>O - 9048 - 4187 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9201	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>The principles are sound but particularly in relation to needing the need to travel, your other policies do not back this up.</p> <p>O - 9201 - 8114 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9333	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Housing will not be energy efficient enough unless guidelines are much more strict for building.</p>

	O - 9333 - 8123 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -
9406	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>All measures must be in place before housing starts and they must be far in advance of what is expected now, otherwise it will never be put into practice, as we already have seen, transport links essential without major road building which only encourages traffic</p> <p>O - 9406 - 8120 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9494	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Very worthy but over optimistic</p> <p>O - 9494 - 8139 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9528	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Because although agree with the sentiment, do not agree with the overall strategy</p> <p>O - 9528 - 8140 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9577	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>How can you build 10,000 homes without damaging the environment? Please explain how you will do this.</p> <p>O - 9577 - 6690 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>

9619	<p>RW Kidner [8163] (represented by Bidwells Cambridge(310) (Michael Hendry) [7492]) - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) The policy needs to refer to a specific code level as well as an energy efficiency figure and sustainability standards in order to make the policy clear offering certainty for developers to ensure the policy is enforceable and deliverable.</p> <p>O - 9619 - 8163 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
9920	<p>stephen eastwood [7962] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) Policy states that all the developments will protect sites of landscape character. The site specific proposal S39-02a and S39-02 is not in accordance within the Broadland District Landscape Assessment as having landscape value</p> <p>Also see Question 28</p> <p>O - 9920 - 7962 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10055	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) It is unreasonable to require all new housing to match current Housing Corporation requirements under the Code for Sustainable Homes. The house building industry is committed to working in stages towards the government's aspiration to achieve zero carbon new dwellings by 2016. However the relevant technologies to achieve this are still developing and also there may be circumstances where achieving specific levels or ratings under the Code may not be feasible or viable for unsubsidised open market housing, particularly whilst achieving other objectives, such as providing affordable housing or meeting infrastructure requirements. A more flexible policy wording is needed that promotes more sustainable construction and carbon reduction measures rather than requiring certain levels or ratings. This would also be more adaptable to changing technologies and any future changes in government policy</p> <p>O - 10055 - 2373 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>

10113	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>The environmental impact of these proposals is huge affecting large areas of countryside therefore development should be retained within Norwich on brownfield sites and at a new town in Long stratton thereby reducing environmental impact</p> <p>O - 10113 - 8239 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10136	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd are committed to delivering development that reduces energy requirements through moving to a sustainable urban footprint. Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd are also committed to reducing the number and length of trips made by residents and workers through the delivery of a full range of amenities and services within walkable/cyclable distance and/or accessible by public transport. This strategic approach will compliment carbon efficiency measures incorporated in other aspects of the development.</p> <p>We broadly support this policy but, with reference to our response to question 1 above, the requirement for developments to comply with the Code for Sustainable Homes need to be considered in the context of the Government's timetable as follows:</p> <p>Code Level: 3 (25% CO2 reduction) Housing associations comply by: 2008 It is proposed private developers comply by: 2010</p> <p>Code Level: 4 (44% CO2 reduction) Housing associations comply by: 2011</p>

	<p>It is proposed private developers comply by: 2013</p> <p>Code Level: 6 (zero-carbon)</p> <p>Housing associations comply by: 2015</p> <p>It is proposed private developers comply by: 2016</p> <p>The reference to the Housing Corporation in the first bullet point should be removed. In addition, it is considered that reference needs to be made to feasibility and viability with regard to the level of energy that can be generated by on-site renewables.</p> <p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd will be interested in the findings of the Energy Strategy being prepared by the GNDP.</p> <p>O - 10136 - 8234 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>10169</p>	<p>Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245] (represented by David L Walker Limited (Head office) [8182]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>Whilst we support the principles of Policy 13 to address environmental impact, we believe that the policy should be strengthened to safeguard and protect mineral and waste resources under the sustainable use heading, and localised environmental resources designated under the adopted planning policy and the emerging MWDF. In addition, mineral railheads have national safeguarding provisions, which should be replicated and covered under travel element of this policy.</p> <p>O - 10169 - 8245 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>10326</p>	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>The impact on the environment will be considerable given the major new road developments and high level of greenfield land that the Strategy proposes. The measures outlined in this policy merely reflect aspirations of very modest damage limitation, in our view.</p>

	<p>We welcome the commitment that all new housing should match Housing Corporation requirements under the Code for Sustainable Homes. A policy commitment to the upgrade of existing buildings would also be welcome. Indeed, 70% of today's homes will still be with us in 2050 the gains to be achieved from improving the environmental performance of existing housing are arguably greater than building new settlements.</p> <p>For comments on the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy, see comments under question 2.</p> <p>O - 10326 - 6826 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10496	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) No development is the only way to save our environment.</p> <p>O - 10496 - 8310 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10569	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) The best way to reduce the environmental impact is to stop development. This way we may be able to reduce global warming and save our planet.</p> <p>O - 10569 - 8318 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10592	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10592 - 8319 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10646	<p>David Morris (Mr David Morris) [8335] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Web - 11/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>The aspiration to deliver renewable energy provision should not be at the expense of site viability, as this will only serve to stifle development. The percentage of renewable energy should therefore have regard to site viability.</p> <p>O - 10646 - 8335 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10674	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>No. To only build homes and businesses to current standards is not enough as energy will become more scarce in the forthcoming years. Buildings regs and the Code for Sustainable homes are only minimum requirements. Buildings need to be energy self-sufficient; this can be easily achieved.</p> <p>O - 10674 - 8348 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10756	<p>Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048] (represented by J and J Design (Mr J R Shephard) [8358]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>The Core Strategy should not seek to impose targets for energy efficiency and reduced carbon emissions. These are matters for national control under The Building Regulations. The Secretary of State has recently proposed changes to the draft South West Plan to omit local or regional targets which exceed national requirements.</p> <p>O - 10756 - 7048 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
10835	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>The Landowners are committed to delivering development that reduces energy requirements through moving to a sustainable urban footprint. The Landowners are also committed to reducing the number and length of trips made by residents and workers through the delivery of a full range of amenities and services within walkable/cyclable distance and/or accessible by public</p>

transport. This strategic approach will compliment carbon efficiency measures incorporated in other aspects of the development.

We broadly support this policy but, with reference to our response to question 1 above, the requirement for developments to comply with the Code for Sustainable Homes needs to be considered in the context of the Government's timetable.

O - 10835 - 8362 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -

10860 Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

Under Policy 13, the strategy requires all new housing to match the 'Housing Corporation requirements under the Code for Sustainable Homes'. This is currently set at Level 3 and yet we have argued that to have any hope of meeting greenhouse gas reduction targets, the standard should be Level 4 or higher.

It is also worth bearing in mind the assertions in the remainder of Policy 13 that, for instance, all development will 'contribute to conserving scarce resources, protecting sites that are important for biodiversity, landscape character and protecting mineral and other natural resources'. We might also mention Policy 17 which states that 'environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained and enhanced'. In practice, as detailed previously and elsewhere in this response, much of what is proposed sits uneasily with these laudable aims and yet it is important that these statements are taken seriously enough for objectors to have the ability, where appropriate, to effectively challenge development on the grounds of detrimental environmental impact.

In Policy 15 the statement that a 'readily available supply of land is maintained throughout the JCS period' seems to signal a clear intention that environmental or other constraints will be overridden by immediate economic imperatives. This is potentially contradictory to the sustainability objectives expressed elsewhere in the strategy. Similar concerns arise from the statement in 8.8 that 'provision will also be made for affordable homes to meet a demonstrated local need on sites that would not otherwise be released for housing'. It is a real concern that the pressure on land because of large scale development could mean this provision being used to justify the building on environmentally sensitive sites.

O - 10860 - 8018 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -

10898 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

The BLT is committed to delivering development that reduces energy requirements through moving to a sustainable urban footprint. The BLT are also committed to reducing the number and length of trips made by residents and workers through the delivery a full range of amenities and services within walkable/cyclable distance and/or accessible by public transport. This strategic approach will compliment carbon efficiency measures incorporated in other aspects of the development.

We broadly support this policy but, with reference to our response to question 1 above, the requirement for developments to comply with the Code for Sustainable Homes needs to be considered in the context of the Government's timetable as follows:

The reference to the Housing Corporation in the first bullet point should be removed. In addition, it is considered that reference needs to be made to feasibility and viability with regard to the level of energy that can be generated by on-site renewables.

The BLT will be interested in the findings of the Energy Strategy being prepared by the GNDP.

The BLT supports the efficient use of land and infrastructure. The PFBE uses the 'urban transect' as an urban design tool to help to take a view on the appropriate characteristics and level of density of sites (refer to appendix 2). A further planning tool employed by the PFBE to help inform decisions around urban character, form and density is the 'Characterisation Study', which undertakes detailed visual and GIS based analyses of well performing comparable locations to help inform urban design decisions. The BLT would encourage all of the partners involved in the strategic growth area n the NPA to consider these approaches to ensure that infrastructure and development respond to the particular context of the location and optimises its development opportunity.

Through the masterplanning and EbD process and relevant landscape and ecology assessments, it is anticipated that areas will be identified for the protection, enhancement and creation of open space, which will be integral to new and existing communities. Such areas will include important existing landscape features such as green edges and delineations of settlements, stands of mature trees, hedgerows, some areas of woodland, open green space and productive land. These will be defined to meet a range of objectives including contribution to landscape quality, environmental objectives, access to sport and recreation, promoting well-being,

social cohesion, education and creating opportunities for local food and fuel production and sustainable urban drainage systems.

O - 10898 - 8366 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -

11057 Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - **OBJECT**

Paper - 09/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

The policy should set its own standards in respect of environmental targets for new housing developments - using HC or HCA standards for private housing could undermine viability and hence deliverability as such standards which are constantly being reviewed, changed and evolving offer limited opportunity to confidently forward plan which is essential in the private housing market.

O - 11057 - 6955 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -

11120 The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - **OBJECT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)

While we support the concept of Policy 13, we have concerns regarding the detail as written, despite an attempt to formulate an adaptable policy to cover this emerging field.

Policy 13 refers to CLG's Code for Sustainable Homes (December 2006) but does not specify which code level will be applied or what criteria will be used to upgrade this over time. Traditionally the market has demanded different standards for homes for sale than the former Housing Corporation required for affordable homes for rent, but Policy 13 may be specifying one standard for everything.

Policy 13 specifies on-site generation but the Government has realised that this is not always practical and in Costs and Benefits of Alternative Definitions of Zero Carbon Homes: Project report (February 2009) has already moved the discussion on to consider off-site solutions. The "Citiworks Ruling" in the European Court of Justice has also cast doubt on the legality of private-wire distribution often used from on-site generators.

We would suggest replacing the first paragraph and its two bullet points with:

	<p>"To address climate change and promote sustainability, all development will make a full contribution to delivering the Government's Climate Change Programme and energy policies by securing the highest viable resource and energy efficiency and reduction in emissions."</p> <p>This approach reflects the content of the Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1: Planning and Climate Change (December 2007) and has the benefit of defining the measure (ie viability) which can be used to ramp up requirements without the danger of being trapped into requiring concepts which have which not been developed or have been overtaken by better ideas.</p> <p>O - 11120 - 8390 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>11136</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - OBJECT Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>It is unreasonable to require all new housing to match current Housing Corporation requirements under the Code for Sustainable Homes. The house building industry is committed to working in stages towards the government's aspiration to achieve zero carbon new dwellings by 2016. However the relevant technologies to achieve this are still developing and also there may be circumstances where achieving specific levels or ratings under the Code may not be feasible or viable for unsubsidised open market housing, particularly whilst achieving other objectives, such as providing affordable housing or meeting infrastructure requirements. A more flexible policy wording is needed that promotes more sustainable construction and carbon reduction measures rather than requiring certain levels or ratings. This would also be more adaptable to changing technologies and any future changes in government policy.</p> <p>O - 11136 - 2373 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>
<p>11149</p>	<p>JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13)</p> <p>OBJECT We support Policy 13. However, we are concerned that the proposed level of development in Long Stratton will be incompatible with this policy's aim to 'Minimise the need to travel and give priority to modes of travel in accordance with the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy hierarchy of different types of transport.' Further details are set out in our responses to questions 1 and 2.</p> <p>O - 11149 - 6979 - (Q21) Policy 13 Reducing environmental impact (Q21), (Q21) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 13) -</p>

Response – Q22

Housing delivery

Policy 14 (page 45) explains the strategy for housing delivery.

Q22 Housing delivery

Policy 14 (page 45) explains the strategy for housing delivery.

Q22 Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q22 Total	122	31	42	50	123

7895	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - COMMENT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? This does not go far enough. There are many more affordable houses required throughout norfolk than planned for. C - 7895 - 7787 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
7973	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - COMMENT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? so we're going to build smaller more affordable housing - no more 5 bedroom houses sorry don't believe it C - 7973 - 6862 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8074	<p>Miss Janet Saunders [7875] - COMMENT Web - 23/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Please refer to my previous comments re 'affordable housing'. C - 8074 - 7875 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8166	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - COMMENT Paper - 02/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Only if you stop permitting the planning of estates like Dussindale. Lots and lots of cul-de-sacs and dead-end roads and roads that meander for miles frustrates everyone</p> <p>C - 8166 - 7899 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8215	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>This should be reviewed in the light of the world depression. U doubt that targets for affordable homes can be met and there will be pressure from builders once the depression is over. Does the government have the resources to fund the support needed for this development? It will all change.</p> <p>C - 8215 - 7901 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8369	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Whilst I support the theory behind this part of the strategy I would strongly query how achievable it all is in the current economic climate. Also the reluctance of developers to actually provide the facilities which this plan promotes will be a big stumbling block.</p> <p>C - 8369 - 6992 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8395	<p>Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>We have concerns about the deliverability in the present economic climate of a strategy that relies on large sites which in turn require substantial up-front capital investment (which is in very short supply) in infrastructure to enable them to be developed.</p> <p>C - 8395 - 7012 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>

<p>8600</p>	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Brownfield sites only</p> <p>C - 8600 - 8024 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>8612</p>	<p>Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Suggestion of possible conflict between "green pastoral areas" and 2,200 new homes in Wymondham area</p> <p>C - 8612 - 2059 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>8864</p>	<p>Mr Stephen Andrews [8066] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? I support the need for affordable housing but the quantity of new homes proposed seem huge. There are obviously many brown field sites that could support some of this development but I am worried that the drive to build more houses will result in existing homes being demolished to build new houses more densely packed. As well as not being a green policy, this would result in the loss of much the character and space that makes Norwich such a lovely place to live.</p> <p>C - 8864 - 8066 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>8908</p>	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? yes but not to the southern part of the A143 corridor for gypsy sites as the local area character is such that there are more suitable sites further north and on the A1066</p> <p>C - 8908 - 7620 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>

<p>9068</p>	<p>Ms Penny Tilley [8108] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? The second point is the number of houses standing empty. I think that there are approx a million in Britain, some of which must be in Norfolk, and I feel that it is time something was done about this. So what I am saying is that there are many houses which could be put to better use.</p> <p>C - 9068 - 8108 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>9080</p>	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Possible need now for some shops to be changed to residential dwellings?</p> <p>C - 9080 - 8109 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>9092</p>	<p>Dr. Ruth Roseveare [6929] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Having in the distant past been a doctor myself, I appreciate all the facilities available for people in need of help, like me. Care Homes like Hill Barn are of enormous benefit for elderly people and I am thankful that a room was available for me when I needed it 5 months ago. The situation is ideal, being in a rural setting as Hill Barn is. More such Care Homes are a must for an ageing population, as well as ordinary housing for able-bodied. But the most needed houses should be small to suit the first-time buyer. About shops - I am not one who frequents supermarkets but am thankful that Reepham has provided most of what I have needed all the 25 years I have lived there. There was hope of have such a Care Home on the edge or Reepham itself which would have been a boon. Such a programme could perhaps be re-initiated in future planning. Expensive though the shops may be, I have managed to save enough to pay for this lovely Care Home. And I have managed to save from my small pension to pay my way here.</p> <p>C - 9092 - 6929 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>9407</p>	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? So many ifs and buts you have not designated anything definite, main query do we need this amount as job figures do not equate with what is actually happening</p> <p>C - 9407 - 8120 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>9647</p>	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? We do not consider that Policy 14 deals with "Housing Delivery". The thrust of this proposed Policy, at present, deals with Housing Mix, Affordable Housing and provision for Gypsies and Travellers. These issues are already dealt with in National policy documents such as PPS3 and The East of England Plan and we see no need for the requirements to be repeated here. The issues listed are at a level that are not required in a CS and can be addressed through DPDs as part of the overall LDF process. "Housing Delivery" should deal with when, where and how dwellings and associated infrastructure and services will be produced and this is absent from the consultation document. Indication needs to be provided of costs and associated timings of development to enable an understanding of the proposed phasing arrangements of developments to be gained. The proposal that requires a contribution towards affordable housing on all sites of 5 or more dwellings not only requires further justification that it is an appropriate level across the housing market areas of the constituent districts making up the GNDP, but also needs to address the consequences for the viability of sites particularly if public subsidy is unavailable.</p> <p>C - 9647 - 7503 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>9661</p>	<p>Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Page 47 8.5 Housing mix Last paragraph - Does this mean we shall see residential care buildings again? The are and will be needed - the care for our elderly is not as it needs to be now - they are left alone much of the time as it is - is this caring for them? It would make more sense to provide community care buildings in every community with over a certain number of houses - especially so where there are retirement communities! 8.6 The findings of the most recent housing needs assessment for the three districts indicate that 43% of overall housing needs</p>

	<p>to be affordable ... are able to afford. Yet it states at Affordable Housing on Page 45 a proportion of affordable housing, including an appropriate tenure - mix ... On sites of 5 or more dwellings (Or 0.2 hectare or more). This is 3% less than it states required taking out smaller development, means that this will be lower on the overall housing provision. It must be kept to 43% at least full stop! In fact 50% would be more appropriate especially so in the dreadful economic climate we find ourselves in!!</p> <p>C - 9661 - 8165 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9747	<p>Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155] - COMMENT Paper - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Housing - New housing should be accessible to disabled people where appropriate.</p> <p>C - 9747 - 1155 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9970	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? No comment</p> <p>C - 9970 - 6903 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10069	<p>The Greatham Trustees [7606] (represented by Strutt and Parker (Mr David Williams) [7605]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Policy 14 of the Core Strategy document states that housing will be distributed in accordance with the Strategic Growth Options and the Settlement Hierarchy. Paragraph 8.8 of the reasoned justification for the policy, goes into more detail of the GNDP policy behind rural exception sites. When this is coupled with the role of other villages as set out in Policy 9 it is considered that strategy could adversely effect the possibility of achieving the total delivery targets set out in Policy 14 and also the necessary housing mix and levels of affordable housing required in the districts.</p> <p>Paragraph 9 of Planning Policy Statement 3 acknowledges the need to create sustainable inclusive mixed communities in all areas including both urban and rural, and to secure a mix of housing both market and affordable particularly in terms of tenure</p>

and price to support a wide range of households again in all areas both urban and rural (paragraph 10 PPS3). With the Core Strategy's current distribution of development directed so heavily away from the rural areas, this may not be achievable. Paragraph 38 of PPS3 goes on to say that the need to provide housing in rural areas, not only in market towns and local service centres but also in villages is important to enhance or maintain their sustainability, and is a key part of any strategy for providing housing across a District.

The Government's Commission for Rural Communities' recent State of the Countryside Report 2008 found that most of those moving into rural England are families with young children and people aged 44 to 64. Taking this evidence into account, there should be sufficient housing allocations of a variety of types and tenures in smaller settlements in order to provide for population growth, which will in turn increase the viability of the settlements. Such allocations would also aid the delivery of affordable housing to smaller settlements, providing a greater level of certainty in housing delivery for the rural districts. It is considered that the three sites proposed as residential allocations in Spooner Row could contribute to achieving the aims set out in Policy 14.

Linking in with the response to questions 4 and 17, a more certain provision of allocations to Other Villages, and Service Villages, particularly those within the NPA will increase the sustainability of the rural areas of both Broadland and South Norfolk and aid the delivery of a mix of housing to those areas.

C - 10069 - 7606 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -

10151 R Smith [8243] (represented by Beacon Planning Ltd (Ms Jenny Page) [7833]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 20/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

If the GNDP Joint Core Strategy is to meet the necessary housing targets by 2026 and especially to deliver the required number of homes on an annual basis then a balance must be made between meeting affordable housing requirements and actual delivery of homes. The requirement that affordable housing be part of all schemes of 5 dwellings or more is too onerous, particularly when combined with the requirement that the amount be 40%. These thresholds would be counterproductive as they would mean that smaller schemes would not be viable and would simply not be built. The RSS sets a target of 35% of all housing completions being affordable and the PPS sets an indicative threshold of 15 units or more where an affordable housing element is required. This is a much more realistic goal.

No consideration has been given to the delivery of wholly affordable housing developments, such as on exception sites, which will make a key contribution to meeting affordable housing targets.

	<p>Further the current economic conditions mean that viability of any housing scheme is in question, irrespective of the affordable housing requirements. An over-restrictive policy will simply prevent both market and affordable housing coming forward.</p> <p>C - 10151 - 8243 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10247	<p>Mrs Angela Garner [8258] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? The bottom line is that Norfolk is already FULL and if house building continues at the proposed rate, there will be no greenfield sites left for future generations. It seems to me that no-one in local Councils is ever prepared to stand up to the stupid directions from Central Government and say NO MORE.</p> <p>C - 10247 - 8258 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10277	<p>Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? I was pleased to read of the aspiration for 40% of housing to be affordable, and particular of the proposal to reduce the threshold for this to developments of 5 units. The churches are keen to contribute to this target by, where possible and appropriate, releasing church-owned land or property for this purpose. A national research project and guide has recently been produced - www.fiah.org.uk - to assist those seeking to undertake such developments.</p> <p>I was also pleased to see the inclusion of provision for gypsies and travellers. Wearing another hat, I am the Community Stakeholder lead on the Regional Assembly's Housing and Sustainable Communities Panel in which capacity I have been part of many discussions on this - it is encouraging to see a positive response from local authorities.</p> <p>C - 10277 - 8266 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10374	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p>

In principle, yes for housing (with the proviso in response to Question 4); but not for the current policy relating to gypsy and traveller sites.

The Parish Council has responded separately to the Gypsy and Traveller Sites Policy and Proposals (DPD) Regulation 25 Consultation. Essentially, the Parish Council believes there is an apparent mis-match between the assessment criteria for the proposed sites, the resulting scores and sites chosen. Typically, it becomes difficult to understand how a site located on a disused oil terminal and close to a railway line can score maximum points for the well being of site occupiers; and how sites close to major road junctions can be safe for children and animals and provide easy access to local facilities.

There is also a contradiction in relation to the proximity of sites. The SNC guidance is that "New sites should not be too close to existing approved sites". The Parish Council believes that if this test is reasonably applied to the site for which planning permission has already been approved at Harford park-and-ride, the A47 corridor, A11 corridor and A11 transit sites would all be rejected on the grounds that they are far too close to the Harford site.

In summary, the Parish Council believes there are more suitable locations to the east of the a140/A 47 intersection (in the direction of Loddon) that are away from railway lines, busy junctions and potential contamination hazards as well as being less visually intrusive for visitors approaching Norwich.

C - 10374 - 2020 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -

10388 GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT

Paper - 01/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Policy 14 Housing delivery:

17. The inclusion of your housing trajectory within supporting text is helpful and provides the basis for including numeric guidance in Policies 3 and 4 (and 6 and 7). Presented alongside key dependencies, it would also inform an indicative phasing. In practice, this policy deals principally with housing mix and you could consider incorporating information relating to delivery elsewhere in the submission draft DPD.

18. In relation to Gypsy and Traveller provision, the submission draft should clarify the requirement for further sites, including a post 2011 allocation, consistent with the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the draft RSS revision.

C - 10388 - 7463 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -

<p>10410</p>	<p>Easton College [3570] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Colin Campbell) [7597]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Policy 14, in relation to housing mix and affordable housing adds little to national/regional policy. In addition, the approach is contrary to PPS3 which requires, amongst other things, that Local Development Documents to set out the level of affordable housing to be sought and targets for social-rented and intermediate housing. PPS3 also requires that such a target reflects an assessment of economic viability. The policy needs to identify the policy approach that will be followed and an assessment of the impact on viability needs to be undertaken. This approach has been upheld by the Courts in relation to the Blyth Valley Core Strategy.</p> <p>C - 10410 - 3570 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10469</p>	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? We do not need more houses when there are over one million already empty.</p> <p>C - 10469 - 8309 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10640</p>	<p>Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333] - COMMENT Web - 11/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Norwich Cohousing Group believe that the Joint Core Strategy should include and promote opportunities for cohousing schemes within its housing policy.</p> <p>C - 10640 - 8333 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10684</p>	<p>Ms Natalie Beal [8349] - COMMENT Paper - 10/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Why is there not a % within the policy? There is in the supporting text.</p>

C - 10684 - 8349 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -

10918 Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) -

COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Policy 13 - Reducing Environmental Impact, sufficiently addresses climate change and promotes sustainability in all development. The policy is in line with central government guidance and all new housing has to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes targets.

Whilst there is no argument that sustainable neighbourhoods are a key element of the vision, there is some concern with the enforcement of such high standards, particularly those set out in the Codes for sustainable Homes, will result in increased costs and reduced profit margins. Evidence from Knight Frank (2008) suggests that a house built to Code Level 6 at 2007 construction prices will cost in the region of £30,000 to £35,000 extra to construct. Whilst we do not suggest these levels are pushed down, it is clear that once a developer takes into consideration other contributions and possibly a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), a development could be unviable to build. This in turn causes a decrease in house building and housing targets will not be met. The GNDP must take this into consideration when appraising new developments, and in some cases where viability is an issue, other contributions may be reduced. We recommend the GNDP commission viability studies to test the level of benefits that can be expected to be viable in the current climate.

70 Policy 14 - Housing Delivery, states that an absolute net additional 36,000 new homes are to be built and completed between 2006 and 2026 within the NPA. This figure stems from the RSS for the East of England. Proposals for housing will be expected to contribute to the mix of housing required to meet the needs of the area. This is of course dependent on up-to-date and accurate Housing Market Assessments. We have commented separately on JCS Housing Market Assessments and we hope our comments have been taken on board.

71 In negotiating the proportion and tenure of affordable housing, account must be made of site characteristics, market conditions and the overall viability of the scheme. For this reason the provision of affordable housing must be determined on a site by site basis rather than by a predetermined set policy figure. Again, viability assessments need to be prepared to support the targets for affordable housing.

72 Policy 15 - The Economy, states that the local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to facilitate the proposed RSS job growth. ALP are in agreement that achieving the full economic potential of the area is dependent on improved connectivity and implementation of wider sustainable transport proposals.

73 Policy 16 - Strategic Access and Transportation, states that an enhanced transport system will be provided to promote sustainable economic transport and reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices and minimise the need to use the private car. It is this aspect where Wymondham provides a significant advance over other growth locations limited by lack of strategic roads.

74 ALP wholly support this strategy and feel Wymondham as a location can promote car reduced travel more than any other location. Proximity to existing and proposed transport nodes such as the railway station and high speed bus routes into Norwich will ensure that car reliance is decreased. Sustainable urban design of residential areas will also contribute this. This strategy does, however, cast doubt on the level of sustainability achievable in respect of development in Long Stratton and in North East Norwich.

75 Improvements to the A11 and A47 are fully supported, although further details of work should be made public and contained within this document. At present it is felt the level of information in Policy 16 does not allow for a detailed response. ALP have consulted with CABE on their masterplan proposals in South Wymondham and subsequently they are extremely conscious that any large scale development proposal should not rely on car based movements. Instead, Masterplans should be designed around quality public transport solutions and all new housing must be within a 5 minute walking distance of public transport nodes.

76 Policy 17 - Environmental Assets, states that the environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained and enhanced and the benefits for residents and visitors improved. Development proposal should avoid harming areas of environmental importance. With 21,000 new houses to be found on mainly

Greenfield sites, it is clearly going to need responsible planning to ensure existing environmental assets are not harmed. For this reason any growth option within the Favoured Option should demonstrate that development would not harm the environment as a whole, including ecology and landscape.

77 ALP support this view and have demonstrated through their analysis of South Wymondham that the proposed development site together with their site in North East Wymondham would not jeopardise ecology and landscape.

78 Policy 18 - Communities and Culture, states that in order to deliver thriving communities, tackle social deprivation and meet the diverse needs across the JCS, a spatial planning approach will be required to ensure infrastructure requirements are addressed in a holistic way. ALP support social inclusion and believe they can demonstrate that proposals in Wymondham will be built to meet the needs of the whole community. Increased levels of affordable housing and community facilities will ensure that this represents a development for all.

C - 10918 - 8367 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -

11153 Friends Family and Travellers (Planning) (Mr S J Staines) [7224] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Policy 14 Housing Delivery Gypsies and Travellers

FFT and TLRP are pleased that the Core Strategy will pay attention to the needs of Gypsies and Travellers.

However we have some concerns about the policy as it stands.

The Core Strategy Plan period is to 2026 yet the policy only makes provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites to 2011, beyond mentioning that provision will be in line with revisions in the East of England Plan. . The SoS Proposed changes to the Draft revision to the RSS (March 2009) indicates that beyond 2011 provision should be made for an annual 3% compound interest in residential provision and that where LDDs look beyond 2011 provision should be made for the same proportion of the regional requirement as in Policy H3 for 2006-11. Hence Policy 14 should be amended to be conformable with this.

In our view more pitches should be allocated than the minima indicated in the draft RSS policy to cater for supply issues. This

follows advice contained in the RTPI Good Practice Note No 4, part C, p 11-12 - which states "... this eventuality can be anticipated by deliberately over-providing for pitches when allocating sites ie by adding, for example, 20% to the figures handed down from the RSS with the added advantage of providing greater choice in the short term. This is comparable with the approach recommended to ensure the future supply of land for mainstream market housing."

Policy 14 restricts sites to no more than 12 pitches. This is not conformable with Circular 1/2006 which states (p 22) that setting a maximum number as a blanket policy is arbitrary.

The locational criteria listed continue the misconception that residential Gypsy and Traveller sites should be located close to arterial routes. Use of this sort of criterion would deny access to large parts of the districts for residential use by Gypsies and Travellers. The council should carry out a Race Impact Assessment in order to assess the impact of the proposed policy on Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers (recognised as distinct ethnic groups covered by the RRA 1976).

Further the policy makes no mention of the diversity of different groups within the Travelling Community and their diverse needs. Para 5.15 of the SoS proposed changes states that 'Policies should recognise the diversity of the Gypsy and Traveller communities, for instance, provision of sites for New Travellers may require different forms of site development'. There are considerable numbers of New Travellers within the districts covered by the core strategy and their needs seem to have been ignored. The next iteration of the policy will need to take this into account in order to be conformable with regional policy.

Transit provision need is indicated in the SoS proposed changes which states that provision should be made through the LDD for an additional 40 pitches across Norfolk, including the Norwich fringe. The policy should reflect this need and indicate how and when provision for transit sites will be made.

The policy does not discuss tenure type or delivery of proposed site provision. We would like to take this opportunity to draw the Council's attention further to the above mentioned Site Grant Guidance (Homes and Community Agency, Jan 2009) which encourages innovative approaches in section 8:

"We are keen to encourage the development of innovative solutions for site accommodation provision that could help:
speed up delivery,
improve standards and value for money, and
give better outcomes.

This could encompass a wide range of schemes, including:

new, improved designs that can be replicated elsewhere, radical approaches to procurement and delivery, and using public funding to facilitate the development of self-build and low cost owneroccupied sites, providing investment was protected or recycled.

Bids can only be submitted by local authorities, ALMOs or RSLs. However, these organisations are encouraged to be proactive, and work with the Gypsy and Traveller community to develop innovative schemes.

Successful schemes to date have included setting up a fund for use in securing appropriate land for site provision. The sites will be made available to appropriately organised Gypsy and Traveller groups on a non-profit making basis for them to develop and manage. Funds from the sale of land will be recycled into purchasing other suitable sites.

They have also included grant for the purchase of sites and provision of basic infrastructure. The families moving onto the site will be self-builders, providing their own amenities and manage their site. They will also be offered the opportunity to buy stakes in the site, the income from which will be recycled to provide further sites.

Such schemes could assist in meeting demand from Gypsies and Travellers to own their own home, where the cost of achieving this aspiration is prohibitive, as well as potentially utilising the building skills of some members of the Gypsy and Traveller community, and providing better value for money than social rented provision."

We feel that the policy should take the above into account and make similar comments and commitments for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation as made in para 7.56 for affordable housing. As Gypsy sites are a form of affordable housing then the same consideration should be given to delivery issues beyond the mere identification of pieces of land.

The policy should also pay attention to monitoring issues and also indicate when the next round of GTAAs will be undertaken.

S J Staines
FFT Planning
PO Box 223
Ely CB7 9BA

Steve@gypsy-traveller.org

	<p>07845 930065</p> <p>C - 11153 - 7224 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8240	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8240 - 4558 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8280	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8280 - 7912 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8305	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 13/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites must be funded by the Gypsy/Traveller communities by appropriate charges being levied against them.</p> <p>S - 8305 - 7915 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8553	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 8553 - 8021 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -
8577	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8577 - 1976 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8744	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8744 - 8053 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8797	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8797 - 8061 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8822	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8822 - 6869 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8849	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 8849 - 8064 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8986	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 8986 - 8092 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9127	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 9127 - 7111 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9163	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes, but no reference is made to space standards in housing, which for the most part, particularly in speculative private housing are woefully inadequate. In the early 1960's Parker Morris established minimum space standards for public housing! Current housing should demand standards greater than this!!</p> <p>S - 9163 - 2055 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9177	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed</p>

	<p>policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 9177 - 8112 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9246	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 9246 - 1828 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9368	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 9368 - 7113 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9398	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? I take it gypsy & traveller sites would have to be kept clean & tidy at the occupants expense.</p> <p>S - 9398 - 8124 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9437	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? A qualified yes only if there really is a proven need for the 35750 new homes</p> <p>S - 9437 - 8127 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>

<p>9464</p>	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? S - 9464 - 8134 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>9495</p>	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? I am not sure what is meant by onsite and offsite, I am glad the gypsies are being considered S - 9495 - 8139 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>9539</p>	<p>Noble Foods Ltd [8149] (represented by Steve Abbott Associates (Mr Richard Percy) [8144]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? On behalf of Noble foods Ltd Yes. However, the policy should be applied flexibly to allow for local circumstances. S - 9539 - 8149 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>9611</p>	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes S - 9611 - 8162 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>9620</p>	<p>RW Kidner [8163] (represented by Bidwells Cambridge(310) (Michael Hendry) [7492]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed</p>

	<p>policy for housing delivery? The proposed delivery of 32,000 dwellings, out of the total Regional Spatial Strategy figure of 35,750 dwellings within the Norwich Policy Area is welcomed. The settlement hierarchy requires revision based on the Favoured Option of allocating additional development in villages within the Norwich Policy Area and I highlight the land to the rear of Stoke Holy Cross Primary School as an area of sustainable residential development and extension to the school playing field.</p> <p>S - 9620 - 8163 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9685	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes, with 2 exceptions as previous</p> <p>S - 9685 - 8047 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9736	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 9736 - 8174 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9837	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 9837 - 8198 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9888	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT Paper - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p>

	<p>We know you are aware of the report by Matthew Taylor MP of the results of the review carried out at the Prime Minister's request, into the provision of housing in the rural countryside.</p> <p>We hope that when the Government and planning community have had the opportunity to digest the findings of the report, schemes will be devised to put its proposals into practice by implementing the philosophy of developing the countryside proportionately within its existing structures.</p> <p>S - 9888 - 2058 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9942	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9942 - 7015 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10004	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10004 - 8228 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10056	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10056 - 2373 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10114	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed</p>

	<p>policy for housing delivery? A mixture of development is appropriate</p> <p>S - 10114 - 8239 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10226	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 10226 - 5864 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10521	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 10521 - 7215 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10625	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Agreed - particularly for affordable housing</p> <p>S - 10625 - 8325 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10745	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 10745 - 1776 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>

<p>10778</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 10778 - 7666 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10876</p>	<p>Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? We endorse the observation at paragraph 8.4 of the Public Consultation that, in order to meet the obligation in PPS3 to establish a 15-year housing land supply at the point of adoption of a DPD, provision will be made in the Joint Core Strategy to provide a framework to accommodate housing in the period 2021-2026. Given the wording of Policy H1 of the East of England Plan, a minimum of 47,500 dwelling completions must be achieved across the GNDP area in the period 2001-2026. Of that figure, a minimum of 41,800 completions should be sought in the Norwich Policy Area in the period to 2026. On that basis, we acknowledge the observation in the table at paragraph 8.4 that there is a need to identify 'new' land to accommodate approximately 20,275 dwellings in the NPA in the period to 2026 (41,800 - 9,673 - 11,851). Paragraph 3.5 of the Public Consultation notes that the East of England Plan is being reviewed and "it will take account of updated household forecasts and look ahead to 2031. It will result in upward pressure on housing targets but at this stage cannot be assessed with certainty." It will be necessary for the Joint Core Strategy to establish a sound and sustainable spatial strategy, capable of accommodating/managing growth in the period to 2031. During that period, the housing provision figure will increase. Paragraph 33 of PPS3 refers to the process of determining an appropriate level of housing. One of the issues to be taken into account is the Government's latest published household projections. The 2006-based household projections were published by CLG in March 2009 and suggest an increase of 114,000 households in Norfolk in the period 2006-2026. By way of comparison, the housing provision established in the East of England Plan for Norfolk</p>

	<p>anticipates the construction of 83,120 dwellings in the period 2006-2026. Thus, the Government's most recent household projections do anticipate a significant increase above the dwelling requirement presently to be found in the East of England Plan.</p> <p>The East of England Plan anticipates the construction of 40,000 dwellings in Broadland/Norwich/South Norfolk in the period 2006-2026. The 2006-based household projections suggest an increase of 48,000 households across the GNDP area in the period 2006-2026. As with Norfolk as a whole, the latest household projections for the GNDP area suggest a housing requirement figure greater than that described in the tabulation at paragraph 8.4 of the Public Consultation. The Joint Core Strategy will need to be sufficiently robust to accommodate an increase in housing provision assigned to the Norwich Key Centre for Development and Change in the review of the EEP.</p> <p>S - 10876 - 8363 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10941</p>	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 10941 - 8368 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10965</p>	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Re. Gypsy and Traveller Sites: But query the need for a van to be left on site, and if a site is for two vans, how will site accommodate more than two vans for family events.</p> <p>S - 10965 - 8369 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10989</p>	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed</p>

	<p>policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 10989 - 8176 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
11012	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Yes</p> <p>S - 11012 - 8370 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
11121	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Partly yes.</p> <p>Housing Requirement</p> <p>We endorse the observation at paragraph 8.4 of the Public Consultation that, in order to meet the obligation in PPS3 to establish a 15-year housing land supply at the point of adoption of a DPD, provision will be made in the Joint Core Strategy to provide a framework to accommodate housing in the period 2021-2026. Given the wording of Policy H1 of the East of England Plan, a minimum of 47,500 dwelling completions must be achieved across the GNDP area in the period 2001-2026. Of that figure, a minimum of 41,800 completions should be sought in the Norwich Policy Area in the period to 2026. On that basis, we acknowledge the observation in the table at paragraph 8.4 that there is a need to identify 'new' land to accommodate approximately 20,275 dwellings in the NPA in the period to 2026 (41,800 - 9,673 - 11,851).</p> <p>Paragraph 3.5 of the Public Consultation notes that the East of England Plan is being reviewed and "it will take account of updated household forecasts and look ahead to 2031. It will result in upward pressure on housing targets but at this stage cannot be assessed with certainty." It will be necessary for the Joint Core Strategy to establish a sound and sustainable spatial strategy, capable of accommodating/managing growth in the period to 2031. During that period, the housing provision figure will increase.</p>

Paragraph 33 of PPS3 refers to the process of determining an appropriate level of housing. One of the issues to be taken into account is the Government's latest published household projections. The 2006-based household projections were published by CLG in March 2009 and suggest an increase of 114,000 households in Norfolk in the period 2006-2026. By way of comparison, the housing provision established in the East of England Plan for Norfolk anticipates the construction of 83,120 dwellings in the period 2006-2026. Thus, the Government's most recent household projections do anticipate a significant increase above the dwelling requirement presently to be found in the East of England Plan.

The East of England Plan anticipates the construction of 40,000 dwellings in Broadland/Norwich/South Norfolk in the period 2006-2026. The 2006-based household projections suggest an increase of 48,000 households across the GNDP area in the period 2006-2026. As with Norfolk as a whole, the latest household projections for the GNDP area suggest a housing requirement figure greater than that described in the tabulation at paragraph 8.4 of the Public Consultation. The Joint Core Strategy will need to be sufficiently robust to accommodate an increase in housing provision assigned to the Norwich Key Centre for Development and Change in the review of the EEP

Affordable Housing

PPS3 requires local planning authorities to estimate housing need and demand in terms of affordable and market housing and to determine how the distribution of need and demand varies across a plan area. The East of England Plan specifies an overall target of 35% affordable housing coming forward through new permissions, and specifies that within this requirement appropriate targets should be set according to local assessments and evidence of affordability. The reasoned justification does not fully explain how Policy 14 achieves these aims.

Paragraph 8.6 quotes an affordable housing need of 43%. It should have included the derivation of that figure otherwise some people might conclude that the most recent dataset predicts an affordable housing need of 43% right through to 2026 when in fact it does not.

Paragraphs 8.6 and 8.8 suggest that GNDP intends to meet the 35% affordable target with a combination of 0%, 40% and 100% affordable housing in different scenarios. The reasoned justification should specify the mechanism to be used to ensure that the average meets the target (for example by controlling allocation of exempt and exception sites so that the underprovision of affordable housing by the former does not exceed the overprovision by the latter). This is particularly important if GNDP intends the 40% sector not only to meet the 35% target for new homes but also "make realistic inroads" into pre-existing backlogs and under-provision by existing allocations.

Paragraph 8.6 suggests that a flat rate of 40% affordable housing will be used across the plan area. Since the June 2006 ORS

survey identified a considerable variation in need across the area the reasoned justification should show why a single figure was chosen. Whereas higher density housing can afford a higher affordable percentage (for example 60% affordable homes on a 70 dph city development would leave a developer with just as many market homes to sell as 30% affordable home would on a 40 dph development elsewhere) particular emphasis should be given to the justification for setting a lower target in Norwich than the need identified by ORS. Allowing for some additional immigration to bridge the gap between ORS extrapolated growth and that now to be provided, the latest dataset actually predicts an affordable housing need of 31.2% of growth. Adding in the 2006 pre-existing backlog gives an overall requirement from 2006 to 2026 of 34.1%. This breaks down to Broadland District Council 19.8%, South Norfolk Council 13.8% and Norwich City Council 47.0%. Actually because of the physical expansion of Norwich outside the City Council area the percentages for Broadland and South Norfolk will be higher in the Norwich fringe.

These figures do not account for any changes in circumstances since the data was prepared but are in remarkable agreement with the RSS target of 35% average for the GNDP area.

It would appear that new growth is being required to deliver an increased proportion of affordable housing over and above the need attributable to that development not only to rectify a pre-existing backlog but also to compensate for underprovision of affordable housing by existing allocations made in accordance with previous policy.

Paragraph 8.7 does not separate the requirement for developers to deliver affordable housing from the requirement to finance it. This approach would be contrary to ODPM Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations, which requires that planning obligations satisfy each of certain tests. The reasoned justification does not show how requiring developers to pay for affordable housing to meet already existing need and planned underprovision on other developments would fulfil, for example, the "directly related to the proposed development" or the "fair and reasonable" tests.

S - 11121 - 8390 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -

11137 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - SUPPORT

Paper - 30/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Yes

S - 11137 - 2373 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -

7934 Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT

Web - 08/03/09

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? too many houses at the moment no new houses needed. lets face it there's too many empty houses at the moment</p> <p>O - 7934 - 7812 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8011	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - OBJECT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? South Norfolk is a rural area and cannot support the proposed developments. Why should also it have twice the traveller sites as Norwich and Broadland? You cannot move the problem out of your area so it does not affect you. No one else is "given" somewhere to live.</p> <p>O - 8011 - 7851 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8129	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - OBJECT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? New housing development should not detract from the current standard and character of existing housing in any area. I have noted that recent high density housing estate developments do not provide a sustainable living environment.</p> <p>I object to level of provision for Gypsies, all such developments will diminish the value of surrounding properties</p> <p>O - 8129 - 7888 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8191	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - OBJECT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Gypsies and travellers. Too many sites in South Norfolk. Propose 19 in each of the 3 areas</p> <p>O - 8191 - 4796 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8254	<p>R Barker [6805] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Web - 05/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Your initial Joint Core Strategy stated</p> <p>'Long Stratton provides a range of local services and some local job opportunities. It is poorly related to strategic employment sites. Even with a bypass, road access and public transport accessibility to Norwich or to the south is poor. This might constrain employment growth in the village. It does not appear to be a suitable location for further investigation for strategic growth at this time!'</p> <p>Long Stratton was not suitable for strategic growth in your opinion THEN for the reasons above yet you NOW wish to build 1800 new homes!!</p> <p>O - 8254 - 6805 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>8479</p>	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? This is a pleasant, rural area and the proposed housing development is much more than the area should sustain, It will surely destroy much "GREEN" land and expand urban areas to the detriment to the local environment</p> <p>O - 8479 - 8016 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>8503</p>	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Far too many new houses indicated. Should one much more creative solutions e.g. suitable infill over shops / workshops- Having had experience of living near a "travellers" camp I wonder if the quality of life of permanent residents courts too much. My experience indicates that their are areas become like little enclaves where normal laws and council tax requirements do not exist and are certainly not enforced.</p> <p>O - 8503 - 8020 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>

8529	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? More mixed development</p> <p>O - 8529 - 7817 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8626	<p>Kay Eke [8025] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? 1. Question validity of housing projections. 2. Question how valid/equitable the proposed social housing and gypsy/traveller site provisions are.</p> <p>O - 8626 - 8025 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8666	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>O - 8666 - 8036 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8690	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>O - 8690 - 8044 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8716	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p>

	<p>See answer to Q4 - is SN NPA to produce 9,000 additional units or 10,800 by 2026?</p> <p>O - 8716 - 8049 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8777	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>There are too many houses proposed and the housing situation has dramatically changed since these calculations were made. There are many empty houses that should be utilised first.</p> <p>Your Policy 14 for Gypsies and Travellers says, "...avoid environmentally sensitive areas and areas at risk from flooding". The site proposed for Spooner Row has a flooding problem and has local environmental status for wildlife e.g. helps rare birds and biodiversity and a historic ruin. South Norfolk Council are acting against your own policy and trying to put it through before your policy can be implemented.</p> <p>O - 8777 - 8045 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8852	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>It seems to me you have not exhausted the possibilities of converting existing un-used offices and commercial buildings, and have not thought about acquiring empty houses for people who need them</p> <p>O - 8852 - 8060 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
8921	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Less houses should be built - brownfield sites should be used more. More houses within the existing urban area of Norwich and many fewer in South Norfolk and Broadland - affordable housing tied to need and not to an increased overall provision where its provided as a planning gain</p> <p>O - 8921 - 2014 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>

9049	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>No - Not agreed relating to Long Stratton and Wymondham</p> <p>O - 9049 - 4187 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9133	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>The proportion of affordable housing should remain as PPS3 (15 units threshold) the proposed sites for the gypsies and travellers should be published as soon as possible for consultation to facilitate cohesion</p> <p>O - 9133 - 8111 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9202	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>There is nothing about house size - developers like to build big semis and detached houses, we need smaller ones! What are you going to do to ensure locals can afford to live in the countryside in the future (goes beyond "affordable" housing development)?</p> <p>O - 9202 - 8114 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9253	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Priority should be given to traveller sites, affordable housing, social housing, energy saving construction</p> <p>O - 9253 - 4494 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9277	<p>Mrs Gray [5927] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>I believe that the Government is imposing too high a number of houses in our area. I agree with the affordable housing in small communities but feel there are too many large houses being built. luxury executive etc which just encourage commuters</p> <p>O - 9277 - 5927 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9307	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Norfolk is a RURAL county and should remain so. Too many houses proposed. The A140 is badly served by the buses. Very few buses</p> <p>O - 9307 - 5445 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9311	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Too much settlement proposed for the North side of Norwich & the Wensum valley. Apart from anything else it will mean congestion along the main routes to North Norfolk coastal areas & diminish the appeal not only to dwellers but visitors and tourists.</p> <p>O - 9311 - 8117 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9334	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Unfeasible in current economic climate. Not enough employment for 32,000+ people.</p> <p>O - 9334 - 8123 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9529	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Although I do believe Norwich needs more affordable housing not on this scale</p> <p>O - 9529 - 8140 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9558	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>We do not require the total number of homes proposed as stated before. There is a current commitment of 13,856 and this should be the limit to 2026.</p> <p>O - 9558 - 8146 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9578	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>We have already stated that facilities and the infrastructure are stretched, medical, education and hospitals</p> <p>O - 9578 - 6690 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9710	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>I have yet to see any justification for the number of houses required by the government or the numbers passed down to the Norwich Policy Area. Many of these homes will be provided for people coming from outside the area - many to retire which places greater pressure on health, hospital and social services without the necessary funding to support it.</p> <p>O - 9710 - 5446 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9805	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>No, the allocation of 9000 homes to the SN (NPA) is too large. These houses need to be distributed over a wider rural area, as noted above. The readjustment in the housing market means that many more homes have or will become affordable. The scale of affordable housing needs to be reassessed in the light of recent economic changes. We believe we should maintain the PPS3 indicative threshold of 15 units above which affordable housing is required; thereafter each case can be considered on relevant circumstances.</p> <p>Gypsy and traveller sites need to be negotiated with local communities. Acceptance of sites is far more likely if you can establish relationships between one or two gypsy and traveller families and a parish/parishioners. Temporary sites could be agreed by all and serviced for specific periods of the year when that gypsy or traveller family(s) is in that area. Building relationships in this way will engender far greater tolerance, commitment and trust for all concerned.</p> <p>O - 9805 - 7513 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>9855</p>	<p>Mr Paul Johnson [8207] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 25/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>I do not agree with this wholesale development strategy as thought up by Westminster. Why should the rest of our "green and pleasant land" be submerged under concrete and brick. There are hundreds of empty homes around which should be first utilised by an "empty homes policy."</p> <p>O - 9855 - 8207 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>9864</p>	<p>Diocese of Norwich [2708] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr William Lusty) [7762]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>Policy 14 proposes that affordable housing will be provided as part of new housing developments at a proportion according with most up to date study of housing need and / or Housing Market Assessment. It is not appropriate to establish required levels of affordable housing provision to be provided as part of new development, without testing these requirements through the consultation and examination processes of Development Plan Document preparation. This requirement to establish affordable housing requirements through Development Plan Documents is set out within Policy H2 Affordable Housing of the East of England Plan. It is noted that a figure of 40% is referred to within supporting text to Policy 14. This figure, or any</p>

	<p>alternative appropriate figure, should ideally be confirmed within Policy 14 or a related policy within a separate Development Plan Document, with the required percentage therefore tested through consultation and independent examination.</p> <p>O - 9864 - 2708 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9903	<p>Mr Peter Sutton [8219] - OBJECT Web - 27/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Affordable housing must be a priority not an after thought.</p> <p>O - 9903 - 8219 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
9985	<p>GF Cole and Son [8226] (represented by ASquared Architects (Mrs Jayne Taylor) [7042]) - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Objection : see below</p> <p>The policy identifies that 40% of all housing developments should be affordable, and applies this proportion to all developments of 5 units and above. 40% represents a relatively high proportion of affordable units that will need to be supported financially by the open market development, and could result in many developments not being viable. We note that where this becomes likely, there is an option for a financial charge as an alternative, but clearly if the level of charge raised is intended to be equivalent to the value of the affordable housing unit, viability will still remain an issue.</p> <p>Where small sites form an important element of the housing provision (as will be inevitable under the proposed policies for housing in the rural areas) the provision of affordable housing representing almost half of the site development could have a significant impact on the form and design of the development. Where the form and design of such developments is also strongly influenced by the need to reflect and compliment the character of the rural settlement, conflict may occur.</p> <p>It is important therefore to take a reasonably flexible approach to the application of policy 14 where small sites concerned</p> <p>O - 9985 - 8226 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10038	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - OBJECT</p>

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

NO - More consideration should be given to the threshold figure for affordable housing, a threshold of 5 or more (or 0.2ha or more) and a requirement of 40% is likely to result in many schemes becoming unviable.

The policy approach for setting the percentage of affordable housing should ensure that new development should remain viable and the approach should also identify viability as a relevant factor in determining appropriate levels of affordable housing. This is to enable the varying costs of development to be taken into account on a site by site basis. This is consistent with PPS3 which acknowledges that economic viability is a relevant consideration in housing delivery. The Council should consider a uniform viability appraisal method such as the GLA toolkit which is used in London Boroughs

O - 10038 - 8230 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -

10137 Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd consider that a statement should be included that emphasises the need to deliver new homes in an efficient and co-ordinated manner, in accordance with the strategic growth options to ensure that strategic housing targets are met in the required timeframes.

As set out in PPS12, Core Strategies must be founded on a robust and credible evidence base. In addition, PPS3 states that Local Development Documents should be informed by a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and highlights the need for Local Planning Authorities to undertake an informed assessment of the economic viability of any thresholds and proportions of affordable housing proposed.

We consider that further strategic research is required to support Policy 14 both in terms of housing mix and affordable housing. These aspects of the policy will need to be supported by a robust evidence base, including a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and economic viability assessment to support both the percentages of different sizes of dwellings required and the percentages of affordable housing required to ensure that such requirements will not have a detrimental impact on housing deliverability.

	<p>O - 10137 - 8234 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10189	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? More consideration should be given to the threshold figure for affordable housing - a threshold of 5 or more (or 0.2ha or more) and a requirement of 40% is likely to result in many schemes becoming unviable.</p> <p>The policy approach for setting the percentage of affordable housing should ensure that new development should remain viable and the approach should also identify viability as a relevant factor in determining appropriate levels of affordable housing. This is to enable the varying costs of development to be taken into account on a site by site basis. This is consistent with PPS3 which acknowledges that economic viability is a relevant consideration in housing delivery. The Council should consider a uniform viability appraisal method, such as the GLA toolkit which is used in London Boroughs.</p> <p>O - 10189 - 8246 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10306	<p>mrs LISA ford [8282] - OBJECT Web - 07/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Develop a new community away from Norwich so developments do not spoil existing villages and suburbs. Stop areas on the A11 corridor becoming commuter towns by not dualling the A11.</p> <p>O - 10306 - 8282 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10327	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - OBJECT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? See comments under question 4 for our overarching view on housing. Given our principal unease with housing numbers, we make the following comments about build rates.</p> <p>The planned housing provision of 33,000 dwellings in the NPA for the period 2001 - 2021 must slip back on timing by at least</p>

	<p>3 to 4 years in the current economic climate. It is therefore necessary to reformulate housing trajectories and then monitor progress against completions through the plan period. A more realistic rate of delivery would improve the proportion of affordable housing in the total provision, and brownfield land usage.</p> <p>Without a reality check on planned rates and levels of housing, the combination of difficult market conditions and large allocations of greenfield land will have inevitable outcomes. Developers will build relatively few houses, cherry pick from the choice of greenfield sites that are available, and avoid brownfield sites. We cannot support this outcome.</p> <p>Affordable housing is reliant on the 'planning gain' method of delivery, which CPRE does not support. In our view, if the Government is committed to the delivery of affordable housing then it should inject large sums of central grant aid and avoid the over-reliance on developer subsidy. The planning gain mechanism simply puts a hidden cost on open market housing, which then pushes more people into the affordable housing category.</p> <p>We question whether the predicted rates of affordable housing will actually be delivered. In the current economic climate, developers will likely plead that 40% affordable housing provision on sites is not a viable financial proposition. This will be exacerbated when major contributions are sought for other infrastructure, such as the NDR or Long Stratton bypass.</p> <p>O - 10327 - 6826 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10351</p>	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>There is not the demand for so many houses. All around we see empty houses/derelict land/houses boarded up. Use these first.</p> <p>O - 10351 - 8293 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10442</p>	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>In principle houses for residents are right, but sites for travellers no (most of these don't travel).</p> <p>O - 10442 - 8308 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>

<p>10497</p>	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? We do not need those houses here. There are plenty of second homes which should be compulsory purchased. No more house building whilst outsiders have second homes.</p> <p>O - 10497 - 8310 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10546</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? Too many gypsies pitches in South Norfolk.</p> <p>Having just moved from a mixed private/social housing scheme I can assure you that it does not work.</p> <p>O - 10546 - 8312 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10570</p>	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? We have plenty of second homes in the region which should be used before building more. There is also no surplus of jobs in this region.</p> <p>O - 10570 - 8318 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
<p>10593</p>	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10593 - 8319 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>

10638	<p>Mr Alan Ives [8299] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 11/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>The fundamental premise of this report is wrong. This County does NOT need more housing for people for whom there is no, and will be no work.</p> <p>Emphasis should be on managing existing housing stock more firmly to ensure it is cared for, and the local environment respected.</p> <p>All new housing should be attractive to live in and to look at. I see little about quality and aesthetics.</p> <p>Gypsy sites should be provided with provisos with regard to looking after the site.</p> <p>O - 10638 - 8299 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10675	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>No. The proposals for gypsies and travellers do not take into account local consultation and in the South Norfolk area it is already apparent that SNDC are not looking at providing gypsies and travellers with good access to health, education and a nice environment in which to live - they wish to site them next to the A11 at Spooner Row and Sutton where there is noise and air pollution and a very limited infrastructure.</p> <p>O - 10675 - 8348 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10836	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>The Landowners consider that a statement should be included that emphasises the need to deliver new homes in an efficient and co-ordinated manner, in accordance with the strategic growth options to ensure that strategic housing targets are met in the required timeframes.</p> <p>As set out in PPS12, Core Strategies must be founded on a robust and credible evidence base.</p> <p>Policy 14 needs to reflect the need to provide at least 33,000 net new dwellings in the period 2001 to 2021 and at least 9,000 net</p>

new dwellings in the period 2021 to 2026 in the NPA.

Housing mix

A range of housing types will be included within the new urban extension to north east Wymondham to ensure that new communities are sustainable in that they provide for a range of income groups and life stages, to promote long term social cohesion.

PPS3 states that Local Development Documents should be informed by a Strategic Housing Market Assessment. This estimates housing need and demand in terms so affordable and market housing and identifies the accommodation requirements of specific groups, such as first time buyers, older people, disabled people and occupational groups, such as key workers, students etc.

It is understood that the GNDP have undertaken a SHMA to inform the Joint Core Strategy. This should inform policy 14 in terms of housing mix.

Affordable housing

In addition to housing mix, the SHMA should also affordable housing policy in term of the level and type of affordable housing required. PPS3 sets an indicative minimum size threshold at which point affordable housing will be required at 15 dwellings. However, it does give local planning authorities the option of setting lower minimum thresholds, where viable and practicable. It is noted that the GNDP's draft joint core strategy sets a minimum threshold of 5 dwellings, which is significantly below the national minimum threshold of 15. In this circumstance, PPS3 requires local planning authorities to undertake an informed assessment of the economic viability of any thresholds and proportions of affordable housing proposed, including their likely impact upon overall levels of housing delivery and creating mixed communities.

The Landowners understand that the GNDP are undertaking a SHMA and this should inform policy 14. In addition, the Landowners consider that further strategic research is required to support the percentages of affordable housing required to ensure that such requirements will not have a detrimental impact on housing deliverability.

Policy 14 should also make reference to the contribution that the strategic growth location will make towards meeting the Government's objective to improving the affordability of housing available in the Norwich area to different households by substantially increasing housing supply.

	O - 10836 - 8362 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -
10861	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>We would like to see the level of affordable housing provision increased to 50% with particular emphasis on addressing the shortage in large family properties, by, for instance, encouraging such housing in Section 106 agreements.</p> <p>Also please see comments in Question 4.</p> <p>O - 10861 - 8018 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>
10899	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>The BLT consider that a statement should be included that emphasises the need to deliver new homes in an efficient and co-ordinated manner, in accordance with the strategic growth options to ensure that strategic housing targets are met in the required timeframes.</p> <p>As set out in PPS12, Core Strategies must be founded on a robust and credible evidence base.</p> <p>Housing mix</p> <p>A range of housing types will be included within the new urban extension to north east Norwich to ensure that new communities are sustainable in that they provide for a range of income groups and life stages, to promote long term social cohesion. PPS3 states that Local Development Documents should be informed by a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). This estimates housing need and demand in terms of affordable and market housing and identifies the accommodation requirements of specific groups, such as first time buyers, older people, disabled people and occupational groups, such as key workers, students etc.</p> <p>It is understood that the GNDP have undertaken a SHMA to inform the Joint Core Strategy. This should inform policy 14 in terms of housing mix.</p> <p>Affordable housing</p>

In addition to housing mix, the SHMA should also inform affordable housing policy in terms of the level and type of affordable housing required. PPS3 sets an indicative minimum size threshold at which point affordable housing will be required at 15 dwellings. However, it does give local planning authorities the option of setting lower minimum thresholds, where viable and practicable. It is noted that the GNDP's draft Joint Core Strategy sets a minimum threshold of 5 dwellings, which is significantly below the national minimum threshold of 15. In this circumstance, PPS3 requires local planning authorities to undertake an informed assessment of the economic viability of any thresholds and proportions of affordable housing proposed, including their likely impact upon overall levels of housing delivery and creating mixed communities.

The BLT understand that the GNDP are undertaking a SHMA and this should inform policy 14. In addition, the BLT consider that further strategic research is required to support the both the percentages affordable housing required to ensure that such requirements will not have a detrimental impact on housing deliverability.

Policy 14 should also make reference to the contribution that the strategic growth location will make towards meeting the Government's objective to improving the affordability of housing available in the Norwich area to different households by substantially increasing housing supply.

It should also be noted in policy 14 that growth in north east Norwich will be delivered as part of a long term strategy, in which time housing needs may change. Therefore, the core strategy should recognise the need to be flexible in this regard.

O - 10899 - 8366 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -

11058 Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - **OBJECT**

Paper - 09/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?

There is a missed opportunity for affordable housing provision here! Often small infill sites are highly profitable without the substantial infrastructure costs of large scale housing schemes. Developments of 5 or less should be subject to a financial contribution to assist the over onerous and often costly requirements for affordable housing provision on larger developments. This approach would ensure all new market housing contributes to affordable housing provision.

	O - 11058 - 6955 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -
11150	<p>JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery?</p> <p>OBJECT</p> <p>We support the recognition in Policy 14 that the ability to deliver affordable housing we be influenced by a development's financial viability. We also support the recognition that the amount and tenure of affordable housing should be determined by the latest Housing Need Study or Housing Market Assessment.</p> <p>However, it should be made clear that the proposal in paragraph 8.6, which seek 40% affordable housing on sites of 5 units or more, will be subject to review throughout the Core Strategy's lifetime by subsequent Housing Market Assessments.</p> <p>O - 11150 - 6979 - Policy 14 Housing delivery (Q22), (Q22) Do you agree with the proposed policy for housing delivery? -</p>

Response – Q23

The Economy

Policy 15 (page 49) explains the strategy for the economy.

Q23 The economy

Policy 15 (page 49) explains the strategy for the economy.

Q23 Do you agree with the proposed policy? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q23 Total	122	35	62	27	124

7974	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - COMMENT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) to achieve employment in higher scale jobs Norfolk needs to improve its education - I returned from Hertfordshire where the best schools achieve 97% 5 A - C Gcse's not the 60% achieved in the county C - 7974 - 6862 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8130	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - COMMENT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Employment opportunities need to focus on value added activities C - 8130 - 7888 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8216	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - COMMENT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Now out of date as a result of the recession. Back to the drawing board. C - 8216 - 7901 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8324	<p>Mr Geoffrey Loades [6873] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Web - 16/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>The objectives are questionable as to quantum. There is a lack of real evidence as to where the jobs will be created and where the demand will exist. Since much of the housing growth is predicated on population growth from inward movement it is essential that jobs forecasts are based upon robust data.</p> <p>C - 8324 - 6873 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8601	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Brownfield sites only</p> <p>C - 8601 - 8024 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8632	<p>University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Whilst agreeing with the proposed policy, the aspiration for an increase in the proportion of higher value knowledge economy jobs is only achievable if the University plays a major part in generating a trained workforce. Accordingly, there should be strong reference in the policy to continuing development of the University.</p> <p>C - 8632 - 8029 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8717	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Need to work out why needs of small businesses are so rarely addressed in development plans for villages. Do planners have necessary powers to require provision along with housing? - less profit perhaps but critical for sustainability</p> <p>C - 8717 - 8049 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>

<p>8937</p>	<p>Mrs Margaret Elbro [8084] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) To much emphasis on road building, not enough emphasis on cycling and walking.</p> <p>C - 8937 - 8084 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>8956</p>	<p>City College Norwich (Mrs Corrienne Peasgood) [8090] - COMMENT Web - 25/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Whilst the College supports the main points in Policy 15 it is felt that more detail is needed on the sectors which will be supported and encouraged in each strategic employment site. We agree that there should be links between training and education provision and relevant business concentrations including co-location but ask for it to be recognised that in order to co-locate provision there needs to be a critical mass of similar sectors in the strategic employment sites.</p> <p>C - 8956 - 8090 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>9081</p>	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Must have provision everywhere where unemployed people can learn new skills (whether or not there will be employment as a result). Surely such centres are more forward looking than centres for unemployed people who are depressed, by / in the recession.</p> <p>C - 9081 - 8109 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>9313</p>	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes to facilitating provision of further and higher education. More help for small farmers and organic growers much more support for local growers in markets & supermarkets.</p>

	C - 9313 - 8117 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -
9408	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) We are continually losing jobs, especially to other cheaper countries in fact profit driven, jobs in tourism seasonal should not be included, what we really need as a country is more manufacturing then we will have something to sell, this in turn creates jobs</p> <p>C - 9408 - 8120 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9631	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) The Broads Authority welcomes the recognition, given in the reasoned justification for this policy, of the dependence of any achievement of the full economic potential of the area upon maintaining and enhancing the environment and quality of life in the area. The Authority strongly supports the policy’s references to the tourism, leisure and cultural industries, and its identification of the importance to these of high quality design, environmental enhancement, green infrastructure, and appropriate development including sustainable tourism. The Authority suggests these could be elaborated by reference to the importance of such measures, and economic development itself, integrated with and complementary to the adjacent Broads area. The recreational and navigational uses of the Broads are of great importance to the local and wider economy and quality of life. There is potential to strengthen the rural areas section of the policy by reference to support to their economies from the conservation of its historic and locally distinctive settlements and buildings, and to the conservation and enhancement of their landscapes and natural environments. A particular issue in the Broads area which may create some future opportunities in the Joint Core Strategy area is the limitation to productive use of some Broads waterside sites as climate change increases flood risk. In particular this can sometimes make it difficult for</p>

	<p>individual sites, and the waterside generally, to adapt and evolve to meet some of the changing or additional tourism and leisure economic opportunities. There may be merit in the Joint Core Strategy recognising the potential in its area for accommodating additional uses related to recreation and navigation in the Broads, but which cannot always be fully met in the Broads area itself.</p> <p>C - 9631 - 7986 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9648	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Proposed Policy 15 - The Economy is largely aspirational and whilst reaffirming support for existing allocated employment sites/locations does not advance any understanding of how these opportunities will be delivered either through management plans, area action plans or through known opportunities for planning application submissions. There is again little indication as to how these opportunities will be achieved.</p> <p>C - 9648 - 7503 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9662	<p>Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Page 49 Policy 15 The Economy How will the employment land be found if farming land is to be protected - reference policy 10 7.32</p> <p>C - 9662 - 8165 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9787	<p>East Carleton Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1997] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council has reviewed the above document and continues to have the same concerns as raised in the previous consultation. There is little clarity as to where the jobs and business opportunities are going to come from. Policy 15 concentrates on this issue. However, there is no substance to the plan for bringing an additional 33,000 jobs to</p>

	<p>the area. There are some general assumptions that allocation of land for business use, the provision of higher educational facilities and the promotion of tourism, leisure and cultural industries will provide long term employment.</p> <p>C - 9787 - 1997 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9971	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) No comment</p> <p>C - 9971 - 6903 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10059	<p>Bidwells Norwich (309) (Alan Presslee) [8160] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Support the general objectives of meeting the needs of both large and small scale businesses by allocating sufficient land to provide a choice and range of sites and that DPDs ensure that a readily available supply of land is maintained throughout the JCS period. However, question any broad brush or uncoordinated approach to protecting existing and allocated employment sites for continued employment uses, where such sites have ceased to be appropriate/acceptable/viable and where better alternative employment locations are or could be made available. In our experience, inevitably over time certain employment premises and locations become out-dated, no longer fit for purpose and unsustainable and lend themselves for redevelopment to different uses. Indeed, re-using no long fit for purpose employment sites is a key strand of Government Policy (PPS3).</p> <p>C - 10059 - 8160 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10152	<p>R Smith [8243] (represented by Beacon Planning Ltd (Ms Jenny Page) [7833]) - COMMENT Paper - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) The provision of small scale employment sites and business opportunities within the smaller scale residential developments is welcomed. Mixed use schemes at key service centres will provide sustainable development opportunities and contribute to meeting demand for accommodation for small businesses.</p> <p>C - 10152 - 8243 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>

<p>10275</p>	<p>Norwich HEART (Mr Michael Loveday) [960] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) In parallel to these points, the current approach to the JCS has failed in a major way to focus on the economic potential of the area and therefore has neglected what has the potential to drive success in the Norwich of 2026. Again, an analytical approach of 'the place' would demonstrate that the 2 world class unique selling points that the area offers are world class knowledge based industries and world class cultural heritage/creative industries. Focusing attention and resources on consolidating and developing these 2 strengths would go a significant way to underpinning the local distinctiveness and therefore the strength of the economy in the future.</p> <p>Finally, and again taking account of the context of place, Norwich prospered for 600 years as England's second City by being well connected to the Low Countries and to London - connections weren't necessarily just physical (sea links mainly) but involved strong commercial and cultural links too. It is similarly vital that the Norwich of the future reconfigures such links through conventional means (Airport, Stansted, Outer Harbour, effective rail services), new media (Internet) and by ensuring that the public, private and third sectors integrate with national and European institutions that can help the area to benefit from the eventual upturn in the global economy. This means that Norwich should aspire to be one of a connected network of global knowledge hubs and part of an international network of cultural heritage cities.</p> <p>C - 10275 - 960 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>10278</p>	<p>Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Interestingly, there is also research on the positive economic impact of churches and faith groups within communities. See, for example, http://www.eefaithscouncil.org.uk/fiee.htm - research undertaken for the East of England Faiths Council.</p> <p>C - 10278 - 8266 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>10282</p>	<p>Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrold) [8267] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) • Policy 15 is inconsistent, very broad in places and very detailed in others, has a piecemeal approach</p>

- The allocation of employment land according to spatial hierarchy needs to have some flexibility to allow for small scale employment use (e.g. farm shops) in rural areas, outside of key settlements
- The 2 biggest areas of opportunity for Greater Norwich are not covered adequately: Knowledge Economy and Creative/Cultural Industries. It is particularly important that they are included in JCS as principal drivers for the local economy as future funding for related projects will not be forthcoming unless these strands run from JCS through to the Integrated Development Plan and the Programme of Delivery. Creative/Cultural industries potential in particular is virtually unexploited and reference to this sector reads like a tokenistic gesture rather than a key economic strength
- Surprisingly, no reference to wider transport issues. In particular, transport infrastructure, which is key to the local economy, rail times/reliability to London is poor and east/west links are worse. Reference to air links from Norwich but also Stansted and the potential offered by the Outer Harbour should also be referenced. Inevitably this will limit business growth and investment in the long term
- It is understood that the JCS is a long term document to 2026 and that it can only cover issues in the broadest terms. Therefore some reference to the GNDP Economic Strategy should be included, as it provides a greater level of detail and picks up the issues related to enterprise, skills and employment, infrastructure for business and profile raising. Without this reference, it looks as though these issues have been given little consideration
- There should be more emphasis given to the important potential of the Norwich Research Park in the context of the Knowledge Economy sector
- Although we are pleased to see the importance of tourism acknowledged but the phrase 'Tourism, leisure and cultural industries will be promoted' is unclear. An alternative wording might be: "As key drivers of growth and distinctiveness, the tourism, leisure and creative/cultural industries will be positively encouraged." (Of course the strength of the tourism offer is largely a result of the intrinsic inter-connections between the cultural assets, the built heritage and the natural environment of the area and the businesses based around them)
- The reference to rural areas does not adequately pick up on the sustainability of rural communities and the need to preserve local businesses and services
- Housing and the need to include proper access for business to deliver and to serve the interests of households and also to ensure that travel to work plans do not restrict the efficient operation of business. Parking provisions to ensure access for

delivery and quality of life for residents. No housing and development without proper infrastructure in place from the start.
Resist government pressure to build without proper resources

C - 10282 - 8267 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10287 Henderson Retail Warehouse Fund [8270] (represented by Savills(Manchester) (The Manager) [8269]) - COMMENT

Paper - 06/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

Policy 15: The Economy

In relation to Question 23, we consider that the Policy should be broadened to reflect emerging national government guidance in respect of development and job creation.

Emerging national policy recognises the importance of employment opportunities created by non-class B land uses.

Consultations have now been completed in respect of PPS 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Development (17 December 2007 - 17 March 2008) and PPS 6: Planning for Town Centres (10 July 2008 - 3 October 2008). Both draft documents give a clear indication of the direction of future national policy in relation to economic development.

The consultation paper for PPS 4 states at Paragraph 6 that the key government objectives of economic development, include development that maximises job opportunities. Paragraph 13 relates to the types of development that are classified as economic development and this includes both retail and leisure in town centre and other locations.

Paragraph 3.19g of proposed changes to PPS 6 recognises the creation of employment opportunities as a consideration for assessing the proposed impacts of retail and leisure developments.

As emerging national planning policy acknowledges the importance of retail and leisure land uses in terms of employment generation, we consider that locations such as Riverside Retail Park should be recognised in Policy 15.

C - 10287 - 8270 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10328 CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT

Paper - 27/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

The strategy shows a welcome commitment to raising the proportion of high skill jobs in the total mix. However, the recession

will have a considerable impact on planned economic growth and expansion for the area, and employment prospects will need to be critically reviewed and revised over the period.

It is important to have a sensible relationship between levels of housing provision growth and job growth (ideally 1:1) and not encourage a high level of in-migration of the retired and economically non-active by excess housing provision. This will distort social balance and health care needs.

We welcome the objective to support the rural economy in the re-use of redundant agricultural buildings for employment and the promotion of farmers markets and farm shops. However, the policy commitment needs to go further, especially at a time when many rural businesses are operations on the margins of viability. Unchecked, large scale growth in the countryside will inevitably attract planning applications for supermarkets, national retail chains and out of town shopping centres. There needs to be a stronger policy commitment to ensure the survival of existing local businesses in the high street.

Large scale suburbanisation of the countryside, much of it on the edge of Broads National Park, will impact on Norfolk's rural identity and, in our view, make it less attractive for tourism.

C - 10328 - 6826 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10375 Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

In principle, yes. However, the Parish Council wonders about the reference to "background work which suggests a target of 33,000 new jobs between 2008 and 2026." No information is provided to support this statement. The focus in this section of the Document is mainly related to knowledge and small businesses economies. Norfolk is traditionally an agricultural county but no mention is made of this important industry at a time when the security of food supplies is becoming a more important part of national planning. The Parish Council suggests this aspect of the proposed policy should be reconsidered to include recognition of agriculture and related industries.

C - 10375 - 2020 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10389 GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT

Paper - 01/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

	<p>Policy 15 The economy:</p> <p>19. Clarification of the scale and distribution of employment land required to provide a choice and range of sites would be helpful. We welcome the reference to sustainable growth but question whether there is sufficient guidance within policy as to what this might mean in sectoral terms, for example could more weight be given to growing those sectors that would support a low carbon economy, and help position Norwich as the leading centre of 'green technology' within the region?</p> <p>20. We comment elsewhere (Policies 2 and 5) on the relationship between proposed employment locations and infrastructure requirements, and we would encourage you to identify opportunities for linking strategic employment locations to sustainable transport provision, including possible rail access. We note the reference at Policy 2 to a proposed rail halt to serve the Broadland Business Park; we also comment further on transport priorities below.</p> <p>C - 10389 - 7463 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>10411</p>	<p>Easton College [3570] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Colin Campbell) [7597]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Policy 15 deals with the economy but significantly underplays the importance and potential of the agriculture and food industries. A new bullet should be added to the opening paragraph "to support the rural economy and to enable the agricultural industry to innovate, remain competitive and exploit synergies with environmental industries." In the fifth paragraph new bullets should be added on "the development of the 'food hub' concept" and "exploiting synergies between Easton College, the University of East Anglia and land-based industries."</p> <p>C - 10411 - 3570 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>10415</p>	<p>Honingham Thorpe Farms Limited [8296] (represented by Savills (Cambridge) (Mr Colin Campbell) [7597]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>The East of England is a distinctive Region. It has no major urban area within it and its urban areas are essentially a collection of small and medium-sized market towns. London heavily influences the Region. Agricultural and rural industries play a significant role in terms of land management, employment and GVA. Over 75% of the land in the East of England is used for farming and the Region possesses a high number of businesses in food processing and the supply chain. The importance of these industries increases to the north and east of the region. It is important that the JCS recognises these important characteristics, the potential of different sectors of the economy and the potential of food and agricultural industries to</p>

contribute to supporting employment in Norfolk's rural area.

Food Hub concept

The concept of a Norfolk Food Hub is supported by Norfolk County Council and EEDA. In 2006 Norfolk County Council commissioned a feasibility study into a Norfolk food Hub. The food hub study sought to outline the market need and opportunity to developing a food enterprise hub in Norfolk. The study identifies the aim of the food hub as to:

- make a step change in the scale of the potential market for local producers; and
- address the potential for public sector procurement by developing a more effective local supply base and logistics infrastructure.

The Regional Economic Strategy seeks to maintain the East of England as the UK's leader in agriculture and food sector, supported by leading research centres of excellence and knowledge exchange in fields such as biofuels, non-food crops and agricultural engineering.

The Greater Norwich Employment Growth and Sites & Premises Study (Arup, May 2008) recognises the importance of the food sector and the opportunities associated with the Food Hub study. It also recognises the potential to broaden the scope of the Food Hub's activities [beyond those identified in 2006 study] to create a food cluster, bringing R&D institutions together with food processors and education institutions. However, our clients land holdings are well-placed to draw on the links with Easton College and the Institute of Food Research and indeed discussions have been ongoing with Easton College to realise the potential of working together.

In addition to food-related industries, there is potential for the hub to draw on other businesses which have close relationship to agriculture and the environment, such as bio-fuel production and agricultural machinery suppliers. Our client has already had a number of expressions of interest in the location from companies requiring a rural location and discussions are on-going with a number of major food processing businesses. Our client is currently in discussion with the Livestock market regarding potential relocation from Norwich.

The Taylor Review recognises the important role that rural business hubs can play and recommends that such hubs should be supported and that a programme of exemplars be developed (Recommendation 29). In its response the Government has accepted this recommendation. The Norfolk Food Hub and the Honingham Thorpe Business Park has the potential to fulfil this role as an exemplar of rural economic development.

Fit with the strategic objectives

The Norfolk Food Hub, and the Honingham Thorpe Business Park, represents a strategic employment opportunity. The Norfolk Food Hub initiative is supported by national, regional and local policy and has potential to provide more than local benefits and perform a strategic function in relation to food industries, become a model for other rural areas in terms of supporting rural employment, providing access to local healthy produce, reducing food miles, developing a local/regional brand and developing relationships with education/research institutions. Links with environmental industries, such as bio-fuels and energy, are also identified as a key sector in the study.

Our proposals fit well with national and regional aspirations:

- it has the potential as a flagship opportunity and to become a model for other rural areas in terms of supporting rural employment, providing access to local healthy produce, reducing food miles, developing a local/regional brand, developing relationships with education/research institutions;
- it supports the policies of the RSS and RES;
- the links with research and academic institutions will help support and further develop the knowledge economy;
- it would build on the Region's existing clusters of knowledge based activity;
- it involves development in a market of significance for the Region, helping the agricultural industry adapt and responding to key issues such as local sourcing and reducing food miles;
- it develops a local asset in which the Region has a competitive advantage;
- it offers a number of synergies with environmental industries/products, for example, bio-fuels or eco-friendly building materials.

Policy 15 deals with the economy but significantly underplays the importance and potential of the agriculture and food industries. An new bullet should be added to the opening paragraph "to support the rural economy and to enable the agricultural industry to innovate, remain competitive and exploit synergies with environmental industries." In the fifth paragraph new bullets should be added on "the development of the 'food hub' concept" and "exploiting synergies between Easton College, the University of East Anglia and land-based industries."

C - 10415 - 8296 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10607 Mr/Mrs Smith [8322] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

We are of the view that the baseline scenario set out in the Arup Study is the appropriate level at which to plan for job growth

and that it can not be the intention of the RSS to limit job growth in the sub-region to below that baseline. Accordingly we agree that the Spatial Vision should be planning to deliver around 33,000 new jobs over the period 2006 - 2026.

Whilst we consider the analysis in the Arup Study of job growth and land requirements to be a robust analysis, we consider that the Arup Study places insufficient emphasis on the availability of sites to drive job creation. The focus of the Arup Study appears to be on non-land use measures to deliver growth. We acknowledge the importance of such softer measures, however, we consider that a major element of the strategy must be to ensure that sufficient land is delivered to facilitate the provision of employment floorspace. Indeed, the Arup Study identifies (at para. 1.14) that there is a shortage of available land for development. Given this conclusion we are concerned that the Core Strategy fails to deliver sufficient sites of the right type in the right location at the right time and that this will be a constraint on development. The strategy is reliant on sites which are constrained and unlikely therefore to deliver, particularly in the short term.

Whilst we support growth of Science Park activity at UEA, this site is constrained by access and land ownership issues and specifically reserved to meet the needs of the high tech' sector. Studies demonstrate the importance of the growth in high tech' sector and we agree that land should continue to be reserved for such uses. However, as a result there is a need to ensure that the strategy provides for opportunities elsewhere for other economic sectors to grow.

We acknowledge the growth of the airport as an important driver of the local economy. However, the Arup Study suggests that this land will be required for uses directly-related to the airport. Such an approach is consistent with the approach previously pursued at Norwich and at other airports. Whilst such an approach supports growth of the economy there is a need to ensure that opportunities exist elsewhere for other non-aviation related businesses to grow. In addition, major growth at the airport will be dependent upon significantly improved access arrangements which are unlikely to be forthcoming in short to medium term.

Based on the recommendations of the Arup Employment Study the policy allocates growth at Longwater. Arup's conclusions appear to be based on comments in the supporting text in the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) regarding the future potential of such land. The comments in the SNLP do not constitute policy. It is necessary therefore to compare Longwater against other potential locations. The Arup Study does not appear to do this and further consideration needs to be given to the alternative locations for strategic employment provision. The Arup report also contends that Longwater is a good location for further business park activity. This is despite the fact that Longwater has proven to be an unattractive location for such activity over recent years. Longwater was allocated by the SNLP for B1/B2/B8 uses, but is dominated by retail and quasi-retail uses which in turn impacts on the perception of Longwater as a strategic location for industrial, office and warehousing development. No evidence is advanced by Arup as to why the image of Longwater will change and become an attractive location for B1/B2/B8 users. Conversely, there is clear evidence that locations south of the City are strongly in demand for industrial, office and warehousing development.

In order to deliver the additional 250 hectares of land required to drive employment growth of the Norwich City Region additional strategic allocations are required. It is also important that sites are made available for development in the short term. Land at Harford Bridge, Ipswich Road should be identified in the Core Strategy as strategic employment location for early delivery. Harford Bridge is strategically located on the southern side of Norwich in an area which business demands as a location. It is well placed to build on the success of the Broadland Business Park as a location and is immediately available for development. Our clients continue to receive firm interest from employers and developers regarding the site, demonstrating that this site is an area of strong market demand as an employment location.

A masterplan framework document has previously been submitted which sets out how the site could be developed sensitively to respect the river corridor, to enhance the gateway to Norwich and to help deliver the objectives for public access and habitat recreation in the Yare Valley.

Land at Harford Bridge should be allocated as a strategic employment allocation.

C - 10607 - 8322 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10645 David Morris (Mr David Morris) [8335] - COMMENT

Web - 11/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

The nature, type and location of uses on existing Employment allocations should be debated further, in order to create a positive policy framework which encourages the swift development of new employment opportunities and stimulates enterprise;

The inclusion of residential on existing employment sites where appropriate should be welcomed, where it assists in creating a thriving and sustainable community;

C - 10645 - 8335 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10723 Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT

Paper - 26/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

1. I think genuine sustainability could be hard to achieve with such artificially rapid growth forced on Norwich. It's easier to make adjustments when plans turn out not to work well in practice, with more gradual, slower change. Big, sweeping changes can lead to big mistakes.
2. Supporting local agriculture I think is important for Norfolk's future.

C - 10723 - 8354 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10919 Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) -

COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

Policy 13 - Reducing Environmental Impact, sufficiently addresses climate change and promotes sustainability in all development. The policy is in line with central government guidance and all new housing has to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes targets.

Whilst there is no argument that sustainable neighbourhoods are a key element of the vision, there is some concern with the enforcement of such high standards, particularly those set out in the Codes for sustainable Homes, will result in increased costs and reduced profit margins. Evidence from Knight Frank (2008) suggests that a house built to Code Level 6 at 2007 construction prices will cost in the region of £30,000 to £35,000 extra to construct. Whilst we do not suggest these levels are pushed down, it is clear that once a developer takes into consideration other contributions and possibly a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), a development could be unviable to build. This in turn causes a decrease in house building and housing targets will not be met. The GNDP must take this into consideration when appraising new developments, and in some cases where viability is an issue, other contributions may be reduced. We recommend the GNDP commission viability studies to test the level of benefits that can be expected to be viable in the current climate.

70 Policy 14 - Housing Delivery, states that an absolute net additional 36,000 new homes are to be built and completed between 2006 and 2026 within the NPA. This figure stems from the RSS for the East of England. Proposals for housing will be

expected to contribute to the mix of housing required to meet the needs of the area. This is of course dependent on up-to-date and accurate Housing Market Assessments. We have commented separately on JCS Housing Market Assessments and we hope our comments have been taken on board.

71 In negotiating the proportion and tenure of affordable housing, account must be made of site characteristics, market conditions and the overall viability of the scheme. For this reason the provision of affordable housing must be determined on a site by site basis rather than by a predetermined set policy figure. Again, viability assessments need to be prepared to support the targets for affordable housing.

72 Policy 15 - The Economy, states that the local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to facilitate the proposed RSS job growth. ALP are in agreement that achieving the full economic potential of the area is dependent on improved connectivity and implementation of wider sustainable transport proposals.

73 Policy 16 - Strategic Access and Transportation, states that an enhanced transport system will be provided to promote sustainable economic transport and reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices and minimise the need to use the private car. It is this aspect where Wymondham provides a significant advance over other growth locations limited by lack of strategic roads.

74 ALP wholly support this strategy and feel Wymondham as a location can promote car reduced travel more than any other location. Proximity to existing and proposed transport nodes such as the railway station and high speed bus routes into Norwich will ensure that car reliance is decreased. Sustainable urban design of residential areas will also contribute this. This strategy does, however, cast doubt on the level of sustainability achievable in respect of development in Long Stratton and in North East Norwich.

75 Improvements to the A11 and A47 are fully supported, although further details of work should be made public and contained within this document. At present it is felt the level of information in Policy 16 does not allow for a detailed response. ALP have consulted with CABE on their masterplan proposals in South Wymondham and subsequently they are extremely conscious that any large scale development proposal should not rely on car based movements. Instead, Masterplans should be designed around quality public transport solutions and all new housing must be within a 5 minute walking distance of public transport nodes.

76 Policy 17 - Environmental Assets, states that the environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained and enhanced and the benefits for residents and visitors improved. Development proposal should avoid harming areas of environmental importance. With 21,000 new houses to be found on mainly Greenfield sites, it is clearly going to need responsible planning to ensure existing environmental assets are not harmed. For this reason any growth option within the Favoured Option should demonstrate that development would not harm the environment as a whole, including ecology and landscape.

77 ALP support this view and have demonstrated through their analysis of South Wymondham that the proposed development site together with their site in North East Wymondham would not jeopardise ecology and landscape.

78 Policy 18 - Communities and Culture, states that in order to deliver thriving communities, tackle social deprivation and meet the diverse needs across the JCS, a spatial planning approach will be required to ensure infrastructure requirements are addressed in a holistic way. ALP support social inclusion and believe they can demonstrate that proposals in Wymondham will be built to meet the needs of the whole community. Increased levels of affordable housing and community facilities will ensure that this represents a development for all.

C - 10919 - 8367 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

11020 Norwich Chamber Council (Mr Don Pearson) [8371] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

It is essential that any initiative focuses on job creation, and not just focus on building homes.

C - 11020 - 8371 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

11063 The Norfolk Food Hub (Mr Ian Alston) [8380] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

A flagship food and farming hub serving the needs of Norfolk through the provision of World class facilities, professional management and support services to equip the County's agri-food sector for the 21st Century.

Background: Agriculture and the food sector has been undergoing a period of significant change in recent years. Throughout this period one trend has, however, remained constant: the continued increase in demand for provenance. Consumers are concerned about where their food comes from and how it has been produced. In addition consumers are conscious of the impact food production can have on the environment, and this has manifested itself in worries over food miles and a growing interest in sourcing local products.

Norfolk remains a predominantly rural county with real strengths in the agricultural and food sectors. Norfolk alone produces 34% of the country's sugar beet, 3% of the potato crop, 11% of the barley, keeps 14% of the pigs and 11% of all poultry. It is though subject to increased competition, and therefore to safeguard the future of the sector it is important that businesses can access modern infrastructure to serve their needs.

The concept of developing a Norfolk Food Hub was first explored in 2006 by a Norfolk County Council led partnership. The feasibility study investigated the case for a hub on the Royal Norfolk Showground. Unfortunately this site was subsequently withdrawn from consideration, although the partners still share the vision of creating a Norfolk Food Hub as set out in Shaping Norfolk's Future Annual Review 2007/08.

Norwich livestock market, in common with others in the UK, has suffered from old facilities which are poorly equipped to handle the demands of the modern supply chain. In other parts of the country new markets have been developed with facilities more suited to the 21st Century, and these have been very successful at increasing turnover and the range of services provided. The nearest competing markets to Norwich are Colchester and Newark, and even markets as far away as Ashford and Taunton report selling Norfolk stock. The transport of animals to these markets increases costs and raises serious animal welfare issues.

The agri-food sector also requires modern support services to underpin its development. Food hubs or livestock markets elsewhere in the UK have featured the co-location of a range of ancillary service businesses to create modern and efficient infrastructure to support the sector's development.

The proposed Food Hub at Honingham Thorpe is designed to meet these multiple challenges by creating a flagship facility through the co-location of a food hub, new livestock market and Norfolk branded retail facility with supporting ancillary businesses to serve the sector.

Project Outline:

The development includes four components:

1. Food hub - the hub would supply local and regional markets as well as supermarkets and major urban areas such as London with Norfolk branded products. This will allow local food producers to access larger markets and assist public and private sector buyers to source more local products. This will be achieved by providing facilities to co-ordinate food and drink supplies to create efficiencies in the transport system, and to enable food companies to access specialist processing, cool chain and support facilities.

2. Livestock market - this would be relocated from its current 50 year old site at Hall Road Norwich. The aim is to create a modern facility of a standard to compete with the best markets in the UK. This would attract new business and reduce the tendency for stock to be transported to remote markets. The market would be designed so that the Auction Hall could be used for horticultural, antique and general sales to maximise its usage and benefits to the local economy. The market would link to enhances abattoir and meat cutting facilities, and potentially a training facility, to increase the value added to meat produced in Norfolk.

3. Food retail - a flagship Norfolk foodstore would be developed to allow suppliers of the hub to promote their food and drink products locally in a first class environment. It would act as a shop window for local products produced by the agricultural, food and drinks sectors situated in an accessible location at the heart of Norfolk. This component of the site would feature a high quality Food Court, plant centre specialising in local plants and a Norfolk themed restaurant to promote a strong Norfolk brand to consumers.

4. Ancillary businesses - these would be co-located with the Food Hub to provide support services to businesses accessing the food hub and livestock market., Similar developments in the UK have co-located Vets, supply companies, logistics businesses, machinery dealerships and advisory services. The site would also provide childcare facilities for those working on the site and other local workers.

Sustainability:

The development is premised on the delivery and demonstration of high standards of sustainability. Green construction will be integral to the development, with all buildings and services being designed to minimise environmental impact. This will include some of the following (subject to final planning and design exercises):

- The use of renewable materials in construction, e.g. wood, hemp lime;
- Modern energy systems, by promoting energy efficiency and the use of CHP and renewable energy;
- High thermal mass buildings to reduce heating and cooling requirements;
- The maximisation of natural light in areas where this does not create problems with food storage;
- Water storage systems to harvest rainwater, recycle grey water and use sustainable drainage;
- The collection, re-use and/or processing of all on site waste.

Aims and Objectives:

The core aim of the development is to create new high quality employment and enhance the vitality of a sector at the heart of Norfolk's economy.

The objectives for the project are to:

1. Respond to a growing demand for food with local or regional provenance by providing facilities to market the products from Norfolk more effectively to local, regional and national markets;
2. Help to develop the Norfolk brand and consumer awareness of the breadth of quality products from Norfolk and surrounding counties through both the Retail and Food Hub;
3. Add value to Norfolk primary production through the provision of modern production, storage and logistics facilities allowing primary producers to move further up the value chain;
4. Improve the efficiency of the regional food chain, through economies of scale and use of shared resources;
5. Reduce the need for Norfolk livestock to be transported to remote markets thus reducing environmental and financial costs whilst improving animal welfare;
6. Improve the economics of livestock production in Norfolk, and therefore help to maintain and potentially increase grazing livestock numbers to sustain the unique landscape which underpins local tourism;
7. Create a central Norfolk hub of support services for the agri-food sector.

Why Honingham Thorpe:

The key features of Honingham Thorpe Farms making it suitable for the development are:

- Scale and room for expansion - the site covers an area of 40 hectares. A further 400ha is owned adjacent to the site allowing for long term growth if this proves necessary;
- Location and accessibility - with direct access onto the A47 junction at the Western end of the Norwich Southern Bypass the site has excellent road links to service Norfolk. The A47 also gives ready access to the A11, A12, A140 and A17 corridors this serving all of the major urban in the region and London;
- Links to the 'Norwich cluster' of agri-food expertise - the site adjoins Easton College, is within 1 mile of the Norfolk Showground, 3 miles of Poultec and 4 miles of the John Innes Centre, Institute of Food Research, UEA and Morley. This will facilitate interaction between businesses and the expertise cluster in Norwich;
- Management team - the management team at Honingham Thorpe are experienced in large scale development of infrastructure and the management of relationships with tenants. The site already hosts Anglia Farmers and Greenvale AP, two of the largest businesses serving the local agri-food sector;
- Water and environmental services - the site includes a 100 million gallon water resource, and has an underground main which can be used for waste water. The site offers the space for extensive landscaping to provide both a pleasant and sustainable

	<p>environment.</p> <p>Timescale and delivery: The development at Honingham Thorpe is a time critical project given the nature of the challenges it is responding to and the need for new facilities to serve the agri-food sector to be developed as soon as possible. Key milestones are as follows:</p> <p>The scale of development envisaged is substantial, with initial estimates suggesting the Food Hub and Livestock Market alone would cost in the region of £5-10m including infrastructure (based on similar developments elsewhere in the UK, but subject to a full costing exercise). Including subsequent development linked to retail and service companies the total investment will be in excess of £15-20m. The funding mix would include a combination of private sector, public sector and grant aid.</p> <p>Partnership: Honingham Thorpe Farms would be the lead partner for the development, providing both the site and a contribution to the development. However, the scale and nature of the proposals requires a broad partnership contribution to the development. However, the scale and nature of the proposals requires a broad partnership of interests to support the vision for the site, both in terms of funding and its subsequent management.</p> <p>Contacts: The project will be managed by Ian Alston.</p> <p>C - 11063 - 8380 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>11105</p>	<p>Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Policy 15 - The Economy, states that the local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to facilitate the proposed RSS job growth. PJH are in agreement that achieving the full economic potential of the area is dependent on improved connectivity and implementation of wider sustainable transport proposals.</p> <p>C - 11105 - 8300 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>7896</p>	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>It is essential that Norfolk is given the same transportation improvements that are afforded to the rest of the country. Our road and rail network is pathetic and the biggest single reason for the lack of industrial and commercial investment in our area.</p> <p>S - 7896 - 7787 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
7900	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>The A 140 should be completely dualled as should the road to norwich to Yarmouth Norwich to King's Lynn and Norwich and the north Norfolk Coast, every other county in the country has a dual carriage way system that is superior to Norfolk's</p> <p>S - 7900 - 7787 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8012	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 16/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>I agree the economy needs improvement but with the current economic climate that may in the short term be impossible.</p> <p>S - 8012 - 7851 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8095	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 26/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>The policy is all very well, but in reality it will be difficult to increase the level of employment opportunities without better links from Norwich to the rest of the UK</p> <p>S - 8095 - 7880 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8167	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy?</p>

	<p>(Policy 15) Good luck</p> <p>S - 8167 - 7899 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8241	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 8241 - 4558 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8281	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 8281 - 7912 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8306	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Full</p> <p>S - 8306 - 7915 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8419	<p>Ed King [7965] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Support</p> <p>S - 8419 - 7965 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>

8439	<p>J Breheny Contractors Ltd [8003] (represented by Robert Doughty Consultancy Limited (Mr Robert Doughty) [8002]) - SUPPORT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Support the need for employment land to be allocated throughout the area, with particular regard to Loddon, where land already allocated in current Development Plan Documents should be the preferred location for new development in emerging Site Specific Allocation Documents.</p> <p>S - 8439 - 8003 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8480	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 8480 - 8016 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8554	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 8554 - 8021 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8578	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 8578 - 1976 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8667	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>S - 8667 - 8036 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8691	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>S - 8691 - 8044 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8745	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8745 - 8053 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8798	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8798 - 8061 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8823	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8823 - 6869 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>

8850	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 8850 - 8064 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8987	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 8987 - 8092 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9050	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 9050 - 4187 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9128	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 9128 - 7111 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9134	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9134 - 8111 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9178	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9178 - 8112 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9199	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9199 - 2055 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9247	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Agree with the policy but you don't say where - much of this has already happened in areas defined as unsustainable - it seems further thought is required to correct the overall plan.</p> <p>S - 9247 - 1828 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9278	<p>Mrs Gray [5927] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes but please discourage large national companies such as Tesco which are wealthy and therefore getting there own way</p> <p>S - 9278 - 5927 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>

<p>9369</p>	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 9369 - 7113 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>9399</p>	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 9399 - 8124 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>9465</p>	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>S - 9465 - 8134 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>9496</p>	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 9496 - 8139 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>9612</p>	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p>

	S - 9612 - 8162 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -
9686	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9686 - 8047 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9737	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9737 - 8174 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9806	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes, broadly we agree with the Policy 15. As stated previously, new employment opportunities need to be substantially dispersed throughout the NPA and beyond.</p> <p>S - 9806 - 7513 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9838	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9838 - 8198 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>

<p>9889</p>	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT Paper - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) We know you are aware of the report by Matthew Taylor MP of the results of the review carried out at the Prime Minister's request, into the provision of housing in the rural countryside.</p> <p>We hope that when the Government and planning community have had the opportunity to digest the findings of the report, schemes will be devised to put its proposals into practice by implementing the philosophy of developing the countryside proportionately within its existing structures.</p> <p>S - 9889 - 2058 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>9943</p>	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 9943 - 7015 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>10005</p>	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 10005 - 8228 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>10018</p>	<p>notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) We agree with the policy however final policy should positively recognise a need to support all existing services and businesses by allowing them to grow and diversify in order to remain viable in light of the community's changing requirements over the</p>

	<p>LDF period.</p> <p>S - 10018 - 6911 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10039	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10039 - 8230 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10064	<p>RG Carter Farms and Drayton Farms Ltd [8232] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Alan Presslee) [8160]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Support objective to meet larger scale employment needs by allocating sufficient land to provide a choice and range of sites and that DPDs ensure that a readily available supply of land is maintained throughout the JCS period.</p> <p>S - 10064 - 8232 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10115	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>These policies are ok when related to Norwich and Long Stratton</p> <p>S - 10115 - 8239 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10138	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd considers that a sustainable urban extension will make a significant contribution to</p>

	<p>achieving the principle of Policy 15; to develop the local economy in a sustainable way. The urban extension will in itself create employment opportunities as well as providing local people with better access to jobs in the wider sub-region and beyond. A sustainable urban extension in this location will also act to support local economic growth by supporting the Broadland Business Park by providing local services and facilities to employees and in creating a local labour supply.</p> <p>We also support the target of creating 33,000 new jobs between 2008 and 2026.</p> <p>S - 10138 - 8234 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10190	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10190 - 8246 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10227	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10227 - 5864 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10260	<p>The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>We support Policy 15 The Economy as it will promote tourism, leisure and cultural industries. Cultural activity brings economic benefits by providing employment and generating revenue. The creative industries are the UK's fastest growth sector, generating significant revenue and employing hundreds and thousands of people. Activities at museums, libraries and archives generate substantial income and investment and support the tourism and employment economy.</p>

	<p>Likewise theatres can be a major tourist attraction, and policies to promote tourist facilities and the growth of the tourist industry can support the inclusion of theatre use. A festival or summer season may be a crucial draw and bring major economic advantage to a town but this will only be possible if suitable venues are available. A policy to promote theatre use as part of a relatively small development may make a strong contribution to the character of a town and enhance the experience of visiting the town as a tourist.</p> <p>S - 10260 - 8263 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10418	<p>Mr Alan Ives [8299] - SUPPORT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) I do not think there is sufficient attention given to the long term unemployed and those generations of families without work experience who tend to live in clusters on certain estates. Work place and support facilities should be planned for those very districts thereby overcoming obstacles to work such as transport etc</p> <p>S - 10418 - 8299 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10443	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 10443 - 8308 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10522	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 10522 - 7215 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10547	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Sensible</p> <p>S - 10547 - 8312 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10626	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Agreed</p> <p>S - 10626 - 8325 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10676	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 10676 - 8348 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10746	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 10746 - 1776 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10779	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p>

S - 10779 - 7666 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10837 North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - **SUPPORT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

The Landowners broadly supports policy 15 and considers that a sustainable urban extension will make a significant contribution to achieving the principle of the policy; to develop the local economy in a sustainable way. Further support is also given to the target of creating 33,000 new jobs between 2008 and 2026.

The local economy will be developed in a sustainable way

- The Landowners consider that a choice of local employment opportunities is a key part of a sustainable community as these acts to limit the pressure placed on the transport network, stimulates economic growth and enterprise and limits leakage of expenditure outside of the area. A range of employment opportunities also makes places more attractive to live and for businesses to locate.
- The land being promoted for the sustainable urban extension has a locational advantage in that it is in close proximity to existing employment areas outlined elsewhere in these representations. In addition, growth in this location is also well placed to benefit from wider employment opportunities in Norwich and the county hinterland and beyond through its current transport links and alternative modes.

Sufficient land will be allocated in locations consistent with the Spatial Hierarchy policy to meet identified need and provide for choice.

- In this regard, the Landowners allocate a sufficient amount of land within the new urban extension to accommodate a range of businesses and services.
- This will create a range of local employment opportunities, complement services and facilities available within the sub-region and contribute towards the economic growth and diversification.
- In addition, to existing employment areas, growth in north east Wymondham would generate the capacity to create opportunities to diversify and improve the range of employment opportunities available in the area. This could include space for business start ups which would complement the GNDP's objective of achieving growth in the local and knowledge economy.

Opportunities for innovation, skills and training will be expanded.

- This 'knowledge transfer' between the Universities and businesses acts to create 'spin-out' companies, which develop business opportunities created through research. Spin out companies are currently worth £3 billion to the national economy.
- The urban extension will have the capacity to incorporate space for business start ups, such as incubator units which are complementary in stimulating innovation and enterprise.

S - 10837 - 8362 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10900 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - **SUPPORT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)

The BLT broadly supports policy 15 and considers that a sustainable urban extension will make a significant contribution to achieving the principle of the policy; to develop the local economy in a sustainable way. The BLT also support the target of creating 33,000 new jobs between 2008 and 2026. In addition the BLT have the following comments to make in respect of this policy:

The local economy will be developed in a sustainable way

* The BLT consider that a choice of local employment opportunities is a key part of a sustainable community as this acts to limit the pressure placed on the transport network, stimulates economic growth and enterprise and limits leakage of expenditure outside of the area. A range of employment opportunities also makes places more attractive to live and for businesses to locate.

* The land being promoted for the sustainable urban extension has a strong locational advantage in that it is in close proximity to existing employment areas at Broadland and St Andrew's Business Parks and Rackheath Industrial Estate as well as those on Salhouse Road and Roundtree Way. In addition employment opportunities are also available at existing district centres at Blue Boar Lane and Pound Lane. Each of these established employment areas have the capacity for improvement and expansion. This location also has the potential capacity to accommodate at least one additional district centre (as well as a number of neighbourhood centres), which would complement and improve the range of employment opportunities

available. In addition, with planned and possible improvements to the transport infrastructure, growth in this location is also well placed to benefit from wider employment opportunities in Rackheath, Norwich and the county hinterland.

Sufficient land will be allocated in locations consistent with the Spatial Hierarchy policy to meet identified need and provide for choice.

* It is firstly assumed that the question is intended to refer to the 'settlement hierarchy policy' as opposed to the 'spatial hierarchy policy'.

* In this regard, the BLT will allocate a sufficient amount of land within the new urban extension to accommodate a range of businesses and services as well as exploiting opportunities to link with existing employment areas and district centres located in the north east sector, including Broadland Business Park.

* This will create a range of local employment opportunities, complement services and facilities available within the sub-region and contribute towards economic growth and diversification.

* In addition, to existing employment areas, growth in north east Norwich would generate the capacity for an additional district centre and create opportunities to diversify and improve the range of employment opportunities available in the area. This could include space for business start-ups, which would complement the GNDP's objective of achieving growth in the local and knowledge economy.

Opportunities for innovation, skills and training will be expanded.

* This 'knowledge transfer' between the Universities and businesses acts to create 'spin-out' companies, which develop business opportunities created through research. Spin out companies are currently worth £3 billion to the national economy.

* The urban extension will have the capacity to incorporate space for business start-ups, such as incubator units, which are complementary in stimulating innovation and enterprise.

* It is considered that the aspiration to expand the knowledge economy as stated in paragraph 8.14 is reflected in policy 15.

S - 10900 - 8366 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10942	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 10942 - 8368 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10966	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 10966 - 8369 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10990	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes</p> <p>S - 10990 - 8176 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
11013	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Yes, but I think you are living on dreams.</p> <p>S - 11013 - 8370 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
11074	<p>Chaplin Farrant (Julie Carpenter) [7535] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>Subject to strategic locations including the new business park adjacent to the airport.</p> <p>Strongly supportive of new business park associated with the airport, provided that this is widened to include put forward the site known as Manor Farm Horsford (see attached plan) as the strategic site for the above stated new business park given its proximity to the airport, major transport links, park and ride and its location within the proposed NDR preventing any further coalescence of settlements. non-airport related uses which would benefit from close proximity to the airport, sustainable transport and connectivity to new and existing residential communities</p> <p>S - 11074 - 7535 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
7879	<p>Mr Paul Mallett [7783] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Whole of A11 corridor MUST be dualled</p> <p>Northern Bypass must be dualled and connected at both ends with Southern bypass.</p> <p>O - 7879 - 7783 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
7935	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 08/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>we wont need new premises. there an abundance of empty office buildings as it is</p> <p>O - 7935 - 7812 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8192	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Do not support any further development (or financial support) at Hethel.</p>

	O - 8192 - 4796 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -
8370	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - OBJECT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Too much needs to be in place before the meaningful development of small businesses/employment opportunities can occur. The current economic climate makes this even more difficult to achieve.</p> <p>O - 8370 - 6992 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8504	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) The tourist industry in England and Norfolk needs to raise its quality - training must be available and mandatory</p> <p>O - 8504 - 8020 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8530	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) No</p> <p>O - 8530 - 7817 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8778	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) The economy and employment is no longer growing in the way your document suggests. The whole exercise needs to be readjusted for the present and fast changing economic situation.</p> <p>O - 8778 - 8045 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>

8857	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Material development in existing patterns will prevent any limitation of climate change, yet you blithely propose to carry on as usual, while the planet burns. The UK is already overdeveloped materially.</p> <p>O - 8857 - 8060 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
8922	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) We need less new housing and therefore fewer new jobs. The large scale economic growth of this strategy will urbanise our countryside</p> <p>O - 8922 - 2014 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9203	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) "The local economy will be developed in a sustainable way". Really? The rest of the policy is business as usual!</p> <p>O - 9203 - 8114 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9254	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Investment in education/training a priority. Don't aim for growth in economy - sustainability is most important factor</p> <p>O - 9254 - 4494 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9309	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Sound too good to be true</p> <p>O - 9309 - 5445 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9335	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Not enough for 33,000 permanent jobs. Large employers are making people redundant.</p> <p>O - 9335 - 8123 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9438	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) See q28</p> <p>O - 9438 - 8127 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9530	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) Need to look seriously at aspiration particularly in some wards of Norwich. Cannot see 33,000 jobs coming into the area</p> <p>O - 9530 - 8140 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9579	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) As already stated</p>

	O - 9579 - 6690 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -
9588	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>We required only enough extra jobs to satisfy local needs; we do not need to import extra residents from outside Norfolk to make further jobs necessary. We need to raise the standard of education for our own local industry i.e. farming, agricultural research, tourism and financial employment, local craft, experimental invention development and health service, offshore industry, oil and windpower, local fishing industry - these are part of Norfolk strength.</p> <p>Use of redundant agricultural buildings should be supported, listed buildings protected but used.</p> <p>O - 9588 - 8146 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
9711	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Due to the economic downturn, jobs are being lost now and will continue for the next 12 months at least, which makes the target of 33000 jobs even higher. Need for specific employment areas in Long Stratton on some side (east) of bypass. With internet sales increasing, retail jobs will diminish with financial and other sectors using overseas call centres, fewer opportunities will exist in these areas.</p> <p>O - 9711 - 5446 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10170	<p>Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245] (represented by David L Walker Limited (Head office) [8182]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>6.1 Under the provisions of Policy 15, there is no identification for safeguarding requirements of existing intermodal transshipment sites within the emerging Core Strategy DPD. It is considered that a generic policy could be generated under the economic policies of the Core Strategy to ensure that sensitive land uses (such as the residential and light industrial elements of the proposals for the Deal Utilities site) do not encroach on these important activities. Such an approach would be consistent with adopted regional policy and emerging local policy.</p>

	<p>6.2 In addition there are no overriding provisions on the future allocation of minerals and waste sites that are already acknowledged on a County level. Whilst it is accepted that these matters are addressed via county policy documents, it is considered that the economic strategy for an area needs to take account of, and support, the County's views (where appropriate) on these matters.</p> <p>O - 10170 - 8245 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>10352</p>	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Why concentrate so much on retail and service industries? Norwich needs a more diverse economy with manufacturing/processing industries.</p> <p>O - 10352 - 8293 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>10416</p>	<p>Honeyview Investments Limited [8298] (represented by Emery Planning Partnership (Mr Rawdon Gascoigne) [8297]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Leisure & Tourism Policies:</p> <p>The East of England Plan identifies Norwich as a 'key centre for development and change'. Policy NR1 states that Norwich should be a regional focus for housing, employment, retail, leisure, cultural and educational development and should be promoted as a destination for tourists and visitors and a gateway to the wider rural and coastal areas of the County and the Broads.</p> <p>There is a clear requirement for the council to provide additional leisure and tourism facilities, This is identified by regional policy and research, and is also accepted within the consultation document at paragraph 8.15. However, we consider that Policy 15 does not go far enough in setting a policy framework to meet this need.</p> <p>There is a need for additional hotel accommodation within Norwich, in particular on the western side of the city. The EGSPS forecasts a growth of 1,200 jobs in hotels and catering in the period 2007-2026. This identified need was accepted by a Planning Inspector at a recent appeal (Ref: APP/G2625/A/07/2049067).</p>

As well as a need for overnight accommodation for tourism, specifically set out in Policy E6 of the East of England Plan, there is a requirement to provide hotel accommodation for business travellers in Norwich. This need should be met in locations where the need to travel is reduced, for example in close proximity to business destinations. It is important to note that this does not necessarily require such development to be located in the town centre, as acknowledged by the Good Practice Guide on Tourism prepared by DCLG. It is important that the Core Strategy provides for this need. We are concerned that Policy 15 of the Core Strategy makes no reference to hotels and overnight accommodation.

Employment Policies:

The East of England Plan identifies a target of 35,000 for net growth in jobs for the period 2001-2021 in Greater Norwich. Policy 15 states that background work suggests a target of 33,000 new jobs between 2008-2026. Policy 15 sets out the general approach to meeting the targets, and Policy 2 presents a preferred spatial option for meeting the targets for the Norwich Policy Area (NPA).

Whilst the Core Strategy and subsequent DPDs have to take this target into account, we consider that there is a strong need for evidence, including economic evidence, for the production of the Core Strategy and LDF.

Taking this into account, there is strong evidence that Greater Norwich already has an adequate supply of employment land to meet future requirements. On the employment land supply information itself there are the following documents available from which conclusions can be drawn:

- i) Norfolk County Employment Land AMR 2006/7
- ii) Norwich LDF AMR 2007/8
- iii) GNPD Greater Norwich Employment Growth and Sites & Premises Study

There are some question marks over the approach of the Greater Norwich Employment Growth and Sites & Premises Study, in particular the recommendation in the document for an additional 229 Ha to be identified to meet the needs of the GNPA to 2026. However, the Norfolk AMR identifies that at 1st April 2007 within the GNPA there is around 249 Ha of land which is undeveloped but which has planning permission.

If the total land required to accommodate the growth to 2026 is taken on the basis of RSS household projections, then the total land area required is 1069 Ha (of which 229 Ha is in addition to that in active use now). However on the basis of the Greater Norwich Employment Growth and Sites & Premises Study there is presently 1104.5 Ha of land which is either in active use now or available for development.

On the basis of the above evidence, the policy presumption to safeguard land not currently in employment use for B1, B2 or B8 use is not required. Therefore in response to question 23 we disagree with the proposed policy. We consider that the Core Strategy should be more specific in its employment policies, taking full account of the available evidence base. The validity of the evidence base also needs to come under close scrutiny in order to ensure DPD meets the test of soundness.

Allocation of employment land:

The Draft PPS4: Consultation Paper on a New PPS4: Planning for sustainable economic development went out for consultation in December 2007. Although the future of the PPS is now in doubt - depending on the results of a forthcoming public consultation, a new PPS on prosperity could combine parts of four previous documents: PPG4, PPG5, PPS6, PPS7 and paragraphs 53, 54 and annex D of PPG13 - the document makes a number of important points in relation to employment sites and development plans. The consultation will still form part of the evidence base for any future PPS dealing with these issues.

The Draft PPS4 requires the needs of businesses to be recognised. Local planning authorities should facilitate a supply of land which would be able to cater for the differing needs to businesses and the expected employment needs of the whole community, but which is flexible enough to be responsive to a changing economy or new business requirements. It clarifies that local authorities should avoid designating sites for single or restricted use classes wherever possible and avoid carrying forward existing allocations where this cannot be justified.

The Draft PPS4 identifies at Paragraph 24 that in recognising the needs of businesses, local planning authorities should ensure that site allocations for economic development do not simply carry forward existing allocations, particularly if they are for single or restrictive uses. If there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for economic development during the plan period, the employment allocation should not be proposed or retained, and wider employment uses or alternative uses, such as housing, should be actively considered.

The Draft PPS4: Summary of key issues and analysis of consultation responses document showed that 70% of respondents agreed that employment sites should not be retained as such if there is no reasonable prospect of them coming forward for development during the plan period. The Draft PPS4 is a material planning consideration, and there is clear evidence therefore that there is agreement with this logical approach.

O - 10416 - 8298 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -

10470 **Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT**
Paper - 03/06/09

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>We do not want our quality of life ruined for the sake of people from outside to make money.</p> <p>O - 10470 - 8309 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10498	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>The economy is OK at present. Further growth will cause problems and reduce the quality of life. Money is not everything except to the greedy.</p> <p>O - 10498 - 8310 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10548	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>Good words but rail/buses expensive.Norwich airport is declining with fewer flights which causes more road use to other airports.</p> <p>O - 10548 - 8312 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10571	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>No development is acceptable.</p> <p>O - 10571 - 8318 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
10594	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p>

	<p>We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10594 - 8319 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>
<p>10862</p>	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15)</p> <p>The emphasis on promoting the heart of Norwich as a retail centre threatens the viability of creating new 'town centres' in the proposed settlements.</p> <p>The economic importance and potential for growth in small scale manufacturing should be acknowledged in the strategy.</p> <p>Using house building as an economic stimulus, as well as being environmentally questionable, will tend to create jobs in low/skill service sectors.</p> <p>Existing areas of deprivation should ideally receive the greatest economic benefit from any development and the growth agenda should not divert resources away from tackling existing problems.</p> <p>Greater economic diversity and local ownership of businesses should be encouraged with particular support for those adding environmental value.</p> <p>Grouping housing and employment together, while of course desirable, would necessitate a more stable and localised economy to be part of an effective strategy. The environmental constraints of some of the proposed development areas would seem to preclude the delivery of adjacent 'new employment sites'.</p> <p>O - 10862 - 8018 - Policy 15 The economy (Q23), (Q23) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 15) -</p>

Response – Q24

Strategic access and transportation

Policy 16 (page 51) explains the priorities for transportation.

Q24 Strategic access and transportation

Policy 16 (page 51) explains the priorities for transportation.

Q24 Do you agree with the proposed policy? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q24 Total	146	30	58	61	149

7880	<p>Mr Paul Mallett [7783] - COMMENT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) My objection under Q23 should be under Q24.</p> <p>C - 7880 - 7783 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
7920	<p>Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - COMMENT Web - 06/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Buses and trains are too expensive, and until you can influence the prices, they won't be adequately used.</p> <p>C - 7920 - 6885 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8131	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - COMMENT Web - 29/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Improvement to the A47 should be given a higher priority</p> <p>C - 8131 - 7888 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8456	<p>Mr Peter Sergeant [7993] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>The failure to provide a west/north link from the A47 to A1067 as part of the NATS NDR plan will result in increased traffic pressure on local and service roads in the immediate area, and work against the policy aim of 'providing transport infrastructure to unlock growth and improving surface access to Norwich Airport'.</p> <p>C - 8456 - 7993 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8602	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Brownfield sites only</p> <p>C - 8602 - 8024 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8634	<p>University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Please note previous references to the essential role of the Colney Lane Bus Link.</p> <p>C - 8634 - 8029 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8780	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>I think you are trying to turn Norfolk into a mini London.</p> <p>C - 8780 - 8045 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8912	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with</p>

	<p>the proposed policy? (Policy 16) agree but there also needs to be junction improvements along the A140 eg at the junction with A47 and some speed restrictions where it passes service villages which offer good and sustainable opportunities for new homes.</p> <p>C - 8912 - 7620 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9065	<p>Mr Alex Kuhn [8106] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) The GNDP would be wiser investing into worthwhile investments such as the reintroduction of an orbital town, suburb and country tram rail link network that would actually benefit the community by taking traffic and pollution off the roads. Simply visit Holland; they have cracked it (Rotterdam etc) why can't we? Presumably their priorities are in the right place... Instead of building a northern bypass build an efficient clean tramline rail link around Norwich connecting with places like Wymondham, Acle, Dereham etc. Pedestrianise inner Norwich city centre with good tram and bus access, THEN consider building houses on a sustainable scale however. The infrastructure has to be in place first not the other way around, by simply letting the poor motorists fighting it out during peak rush hours! Please remember , we do NOT want to turn Norwich into another Milton Keynes, that would be horrendous for such a fine city and its future. Perhaps you would consider the above points when you have your technical consultation. Food for thought indeed!</p> <p>C - 9065 - 8106 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9069	<p>Ms Penny Tilley [8108] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) I do hope that resources are put into public transport. Having travelled on some very empty buses, it would seem a good idea to gradually invest in some smaller and more economical ones.</p> <p>C - 9069 - 8108 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9082	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Work on roads to provide employment through the recession but will the NNDR be necessary? All park and ride buses in Norwich to run from a site one side of the city to a site on another side, i.e. not all just terminating at the bus station.</p> <p>Park and ride transport running from a site one side of the city to the other instead of just going to the bus station.</p> <p>Maintenance of the present roads and pavements</p> <p>C - 9082 - 8109 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9409	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>As time is the major factor, how are you going to force people to use public transport if it means many hours of travel, especially as successive governments have promoted car usage by their actions and interests school run for working mums and dads not enough local schools will be built</p> <p>C - 9409 - 8120 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9466	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>The use of the private car for people in rural areas is essential. Everyday commuting should be done by efficient public transport from village to city and vv. Cars could be banned from city areas making use of public transport and a return to transporting goods by train should be revived, one train equals forty lorries or more.</p> <p>C - 9466 - 8134 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9649	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Proposed Policy 16 is largely aspirational with little evidence to show how or what improvements are actually proposed. This is</p>

little more than a blunt instrument as it is unable to show the deliverability of enhancements to the Strategic transport systems. The proposed improvements to the A11 and A47 remain unspecified and it is therefore impossible to glean what these are, why they are necessary and what purpose they serve. According to the consultation, the proposed A140 Long Stratton bypass is not prioritised in Regional Funding and there is no indication therefore as to how or when this is likely to be delivered.

With further reference to the LDF Advisory Visit, Inspector's notes, the CS needs to indicate what will be delivered, when it will be delivered and how it will be delivered.

The proposed policy recognises that in rural areas the private car will remain an important means of transport but remains wedded to promoting improvements in public transport even though future population levels are unlikely to warrant the levels of investment required to attain such improvements. Continued reliance on the private car will only add to pressures experienced on urban roads in line with the demands expressed in proposed Policy 9 where rural settlements are judged to rely on the services of larger centres for their everyday needs.

C - 9649 - 7503 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

9663

Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Page 51 Policy 16

Strategic access and transportation, last sentence of first paragraph.

Will do this by promoting ... needs to say by definitely by seeing that a Long Stratton A140 bypass is provided and in place as the first stage to any development.

8.18 identified strategic improvements area: A140 Long Stratton bypass is identified in the local transport plan however not prioritised in the regional funding allocation.

As stated previously - this needs to be prioritised it is need now - longest? awaited bypass!!

C - 9663 - 8165 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

9748

Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155] - COMMENT

Paper - 20/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

The critical point I would suggest for anything in the north of the city is the development of the NDR. Obviously further south the dualling of the A11 and A47 are equally important.

	<p>Buses - Buses should have level access, better numbering, larger signs at bus stops, positioned lower so that they can be seen, arrival announcements for passengers waiting to board buses and similar information to alert passengers when to get off. Timetables should be in large print. Information is readily available as well as practical experience elsewhere in the country. The advent of "sat navs" makes this an exciting possibility.</p> <p>Trains - I understand that assistance for passengers at Thorpe Station is good and blind and partially sighted people are encouraged to ask for help in advance especially when travelling across country and down to London. Large print timetables are required, it is not good enough to tell people to ring up or go on-line.</p> <p>Pedestrian crossings - These need to be carefully sited to reflect the needs of blind and partially sighted people.</p> <p>Shared surfaces - These are not popular and are dangerous for blind and partially sighted people. There needs to be a physical divide between areas used by vehicles and pedestrians.</p> <p>Taxi Card - These have been trialled in Great Yarmouth and need to be introduced.</p> <p>C - 9748 - 1155 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>9813</p>	<p>Long Stratton Parish Council (Mrs E Riches) [2029] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>It is considered that funding for the Long Stratton A140 Bypass - which should be the dual carriageway bypass for which Planning Permission has been granted - should be forthcoming from the Government and should not be dependant upon a large number of homes being built, especially as it must be the longest awaited bypass.</p> <p>C - 9813 - 2029 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>9818</p>	<p>East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 29/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>The implementation of Policy 5 is dependent upon the delivery of significant infrastructure improvements. This includes the construction of the Norwich Northern Distributor Route (NNDR) and the dualling of the A47 to the east of Norwich. NNDR is included in the region's RFA2 submission for completion in 2015. However, the A47 has not been put forward. In addition,</p>

	<p>Policy 5 is also dependent on the construction of the Long Stratton Bypass on the A140. This scheme has not been prioritised in the region's recent RFA2 submission to Government, so consideration may need to be given to innovative funding mechanisms based on development contributions.</p> <p>C - 9818 - 1509 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>10153</p>	<p>R Smith [8243] (represented by Beacon Planning Ltd (Ms Jenny Page) [7833]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>The importance of locating development in the most sustainable locations such as Key Service Centres includes maximising transport accessibility. Blofield is within the NPA and adjacent to the A47 a primary distributor route. The proximity to Norwich is considered a benefit. Whilst Blofield provides the key day to day services and facilities, Norwich is only a short bus ride away for all other needs.</p> <p>The recognition that in most rural areas the private car will remain an important means of travel is welcomed.</p> <p>C - 10153 - 8243 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>10269</p>	<p>Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Rachel Jackson) [7068] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Strategic Access and Transportation. THIS PART OF THE DOCUMENT IS INCORRECT AND IGNORES THE INTERESTS OF A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PEOPLE THE GREATER NORWICH DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP IS SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT. It states the 'Norwich Northern Distributor Road will aid strategic access, significantly improve quality of life and environmental conditions'. Not for those communities stuck between the end of the NDR and the Southern Bypass it will not!! In fact it will do just the opposite. If the GNDP truly represents the 'Greater Norwich Area' then it will include a policy which clearly states it will not support the three-quarter option but will continue to fight for the development of the complete NDR. How does the NDR improve 'environmental conditions' if traffic from the A11 or A47 or indeed the A140 - the main feeder roads to Norwich - is expected to circumnavigate three-quarters or more of Norwich to get to the north of the City or the roads leading to the north of the County? How does the NDR improve the quality of life or indeed the environment of Costessey, Drayton, Taverham, Ringland, etc whose small roads and country lanes will be used as rat runs by all and sundry? It is perfectly possible to build and environmentally sensitive bridge across the Wensum as has been shown by bridges built in other parts of the country and Europe. All that is need is the will on behalf of the County Council to pursue</p>

this and it is up to the GNDP to show that what is being put forward is not meeting the needs for the future of Greater Norwich.

C - 10269 - 7068 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

10390 GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT

Paper - 01/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation:

21. We welcome the commitment in this policy to enhanced and innovative use of the local rail network, and to walking and cycling. We note the reference to BRT at para 8.19 and question whether a commitment to improved bus (and rail?) services should also appear in policy.

22. The Norwich Northern Distributor is identified as necessary to serve a range of objectives, together with the Long Stratton bypass, improvements to the A11 and A47, and enhanced rail, bus and cycle provision. A clear statement of the priority given to the range of transport proposals identified, and their significance - either to the delivery of specific growth locations, and /or wider strategic access - would be helpful. We have already indicated that it will also be helpful if, where funding is uncertain for a specific scheme, alternative infrastructure options can be identified which would support growth.

23. We are aware that two relevant studies have been published recently on the GNDP website which look at A47 junction capacity and public transport requirements to support growth. The latter in particular identifies a number of measures aimed at enabling a step change in public transport service quality, such as bus priority measures at all major junctions, and planning the internal layout of development within the growth areas with a view to creating Public Transport Oriented Developments (PTODS). We would encourage you to consider including a commitment to developing a package of such measures, and to clarify where and when enhanced junction capacity would be required.

24. Elsewhere in the consultation document, NATS is identified as underpinning transport investment priorities. NATS was agreed in 2006 and hence pre-dates the growth strategy and it would be helpful to know whether there is an intention to review those elements of the strategy that may no longer reflect national and regional policy. For example, Policy 16 of NATS states that, where core bus network is on main roads, new bus priority measures will not introduce delays for other major traffic; in our view this may not be appropriate. We understand that some work is already underway aimed at updating NATS, which we welcome.

C - 10390 - 7463 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

10642 Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333] - COMMENT

Web - 11/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Cohousing schemes encourage a reduction in car use by parking cars away from housing and/or running car clubs. Shared childcare, shopping and other tasks and activities can also reduce the number of journeys made.

C - 10642 - 8333 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

10685 Ms Natalie Beal [8349] - COMMENT

Paper - 10/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

I believe that it (NDR) is not needed and the large amount of money that is to be spent on building the NDR should instead be met on reducing demand for single occupancy car use as per all the local, regional and national policies.

By building the NDR you would be meeting car use and enabling an increase in car use which is unsustainable from a health, air pollution and climate change view point.

Enough greenfield land is to be lost when building houses - even more would be needed for this road.

The money should be spent on:

- improving train services
- improving train facilities
- improving all public transport reliability
- work, school and residential travel plans
- improving the walking and cycling network
- educating the population about the health and monetary benefits of cycling and walking

For the amount of money that is to be spent on the NDR, a lot can be done to get modal shift.

Furthermore, where would the money to pay for the road come from? I doubt it is of national or regional importance, so a limited amount, if any, would come from those sources. Will it use up my council tax, rather than it being spent on services that are needed?

	<p>If the NDR were to go ahead, I assume that pedestrians and cyclists will be accounted for in terms of crossing and severage of routes?</p> <p>To summarise, building the NDR will waste money on meeting car use rather than promoting modal shift and is unsustainable in terms of land usage, health, localised air pollution and climate change.</p> <p>C - 10685 - 8349 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10708	<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>It should noted that any new road infrastructure proposed within a flood zone should be considered carefully. Roads are often used in periods of flooding as evacuation routes and therefore any new road infrastructure should be raised above the flood zone where possible.</p> <p>C - 10708 - 8352 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10724	<p>Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 26/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>With a N. Distributor Road, bridges would have to be built to allow cycles, pedestrians and local vehicle traffic to not be cut off from areas the other side of the dual carriageway and to enable people to cycle safely (but not along an isolated route) into Norwich. Make routes suitable for inline skaters too - very fast, relaxing, healthy mode of transport.</p> <p>C - 10724 - 8354 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10920	<p>Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Policy 13 - Reducing Environmental Impact, sufficiently addresses climate</p>

change and promotes sustainability in all development. The policy is in line with central government guidance and all new housing has to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes targets.

Whilst there is no argument that sustainable neighbourhoods are a key element of the vision, there is some concern with the enforcement of such high standards, particularly those set out in the Codes for sustainable Homes, will result in increased costs and reduced profit margins. Evidence from Knight Frank (2008) suggests that a house built to Code Level 6 at 2007 construction prices will cost in the region of £30,000 to £35,000 extra to construct. Whilst we do not suggest these levels are pushed down, it is clear that once a developer takes into consideration other contributions and possibly a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), a development could be unviable to build. This in turn causes a decrease in house building and housing targets will not be met. The GNDP must take this into consideration when appraising new developments, and in some cases where viability is an issue, other contributions may be reduced. We recommend the GNDP commission viability studies to test the level of benefits that can be expected to be viable in the current climate.

70 Policy 14 - Housing Delivery, states that an absolute net additional 36,000 new homes are to be built and completed between 2006 and 2026 within the NPA. This figure stems from the RSS for the East of England. Proposals for housing will be expected to contribute to the mix of housing required to meet the needs of the area. This is of course dependent on up-to-date and accurate Housing Market Assessments. We have commented separately on JCS Housing Market Assessments and we hope our comments have been taken on board.

71 In negotiating the proportion and tenure of affordable housing, account must be made of site characteristics, market conditions and the overall viability of the scheme. For this reason the provision of affordable housing must be determined on a site by site basis rather than by a predetermined set policy figure. Again, viability assessments need to be prepared to support the targets for affordable housing.

72 Policy 15 - The Economy, states that the local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to facilitate the proposed RSS job growth. ALP are in agreement that achieving the full economic potential of the area is dependent on improved connectivity and implementation of wider sustainable transport proposals.

73 Policy 16 - Strategic Access and Transportation, states that an enhanced transport system will be provided to promote sustainable economic transport and reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices and minimise the need to use the private car. It is this aspect where Wymondham provides a significant advance over other growth locations limited by lack of strategic roads.

74 ALP wholly support this strategy and feel Wymondham as a location can promote car reduced travel more than any other location. Proximity to existing and proposed transport nodes such as the railway station and high speed bus routes into Norwich will ensure that car reliance is decreased. Sustainable urban design of residential areas will also contribute this. This strategy does, however, cast doubt on the level of sustainability achievable in respect of development in Long Stratton and in North East Norwich.

75 Improvements to the A11 and A47 are fully supported, although further details of work should be made public and contained within this document. At present it is felt the level of information in Policy 16 does not allow for a detailed response. ALP have consulted with CABE on their masterplan proposals in South Wymondham and subsequently they are extremely conscious that any large scale development proposal should not rely on car based movements. Instead, Masterplans should be designed around quality public transport solutions and all new housing must be within a 5 minute walking distance of public transport nodes.

76 Policy 17 - Environmental Assets, states that the environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained and enhanced and the benefits for residents and visitors improved. Development proposal should avoid harming areas of environmental importance. With 21,000 new houses to be found on mainly Greenfield sites, it is clearly going to need responsible planning to ensure existing environmental assets are not harmed. For this reason any growth option within the Favoured Option should demonstrate that development would not harm the environment as a whole, including ecology and landscape.

77 ALP support this view and have demonstrated through their analysis of South Wymondham that the proposed development site together with their site in North East Wymondham would not jeopardise ecology and landscape.

78 Policy 18 - Communities and Culture, states that in order to deliver thriving communities, tackle social deprivation and meet the diverse needs across the JCS, a

	<p>spatial planning approach will be required to ensure infrastructure requirements are addressed in a holistic way. ALP support social inclusion and believe they can demonstrate that proposals in Wymondham will be built to meet the needs of the whole community. Increased levels of affordable housing and community facilities will ensure that this represents a development for all.</p> <p>C - 10920 - 8367 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>11021</p>	<p>Norwich Chamber Council (Mr Don Pearson) [8371] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Existing businesses and the transport in the Norwich area is key. In this respect growth will be severely and negatively impacted if the NDR is not constructed, including the Postwick hub, and we wholeheartedly support the plans presented by NCC.</p> <p>Transport is a big issue for business in Norwich and is and has been a significant limiting factor to our cost base and attracting new inward investment. Therefore, the north Norwich congestion will be greatly relieved with the NDR, but is an essential element for development of new jobs to support the rural areas of north Norfolk as well.</p> <p>In respect of transport the dualling of the A11 is absolutely crucial part of the infrastructure required to enable the area to generate growth on more equal terms with our colleagues in Cambs, and Suffolk.</p> <p>C - 11021 - 8371 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>11035</p>	<p>Mr Stan Sabberton [8373] - COMMENT Paper - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Just heard of your consultation one day before deadline.</p> <p>Couldn't find the document. Found the answer sheet, but couldn't find a way of sending it.</p> <p>It is desperately urgent that Norwich leads the way in reducing oil dependency and hence, in the context of transport planning, reducing car use drastically.</p>

Enhanced public transport is one vital component, maximising use of flexible minibus routes, rural rail links (using the inherited and sometimes disused rail links into the city by tram/train systems, interlinking market towns such as Dereham, Fakenham by light rail, reinstating longer distance links such as Norwich-Oxford), aggressively promoting cycling in car-free streets.

In the fast developing situation it is folly to pursue more road building and accompanying out-of-town sprawl.

C - 11035 - 8373 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

11080 Residents of Gibbs Close, Little Melton [8385] (represented by Mr Alex Graham [8384]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

I note the

addendum transport report (ref 233902AS02/02/A) but this is lacking in any comprehensive analysis and seems only to reference predicted trip generation data for buses. It is clear from the evidence studies that only 8% of trips will be by bus from the key growth points. Although this is said to rise to 16% by 2021, it is not clear how this is meant to occur and even if it were the case, a significant proportion of all travel would still be made by car contrary to the sustainability aims of the core strategy and central government planning policy.

C - 11080 - 8385 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

11106 Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Policy 16 - Strategic Access and Transportation, states that an enhanced transport system will be provided to promote sustainable economic transport and reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices and minimise the need to use the private car.

30 PJH wholly support this strategy and feel Loddon as a location can promote car reduced travel more than any other location. Proximity to existing and proposed transport nodes such as bus routes into Norwich will ensure that car reliance is

	<p>decreased. Sustainable urban design of residential areas will also contribute this.</p> <p>C - 11106 - 8300 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
7901	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) A better road system will enhance country areas not spoil them.</p> <p>S - 7901 - 7787 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
7956	<p>Colin Mould [7809] - SUPPORT Web - 10/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) This should be the priority not "a long way down the list" The provision of these factors is essential to prosperity, growth, the environment etc. It must be recognised the rural nature of Norfolk and that transport (the car/lorry) is the key element.</p> <p>S - 7956 - 7809 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8013	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Improvements are needed fast.</p> <p>S - 8013 - 7851 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8168	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) These have all been predicted, required, demanded and promised for the last 30 years. No change there then!</p>

	S - 8168 - 7899 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -
8193	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8193 - 4796 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8242	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8242 - 4558 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8282	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8282 - 7912 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8307	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 13/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Full</p> <p>S - 8307 - 7915 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8420	Ed King [7965] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - SUPPORT

	<p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Support</p> <p>S - 8420 - 7965 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8432	<p>Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Fully agree</p> <p>S - 8432 - 7771 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8481	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8481 - 8016 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8555	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8555 - 8021 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8579	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 8579 - 1976 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -
8613	<p>Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Suggested view - consider reopening railway stations serving A140 corridor - Swainsthorpe, Flordon, Forcett and Tivetshall with parking</p> <p>S - 8613 - 2059 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8668	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>S - 8668 - 8036 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8692	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>S - 8692 - 8044 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8746	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8746 - 8053 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8799	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8799 - 8061 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8824	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8824 - 6869 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8851	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8851 - 8064 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8988	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8988 - 8092 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9051	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>But greater attention should be paid to 'enhancement and innovative use of the local rail network' such as building more stations and using light rolling-stock at frequent intervals for short journeys.</p>

	S - 9051 - 4187 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -
9129	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9129 - 7111 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9135	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>yes</p> <p>S - 9135 - 8111 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9248	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9248 - 1828 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9370	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9370 - 7113 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9439	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9439 - 8127 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9498	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Worthy but optimistic</p> <p>S - 9498 - 8139 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9531	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>These need to be addressed independently of growth in population as they are real needs for people and businesses now</p> <p>S - 9531 - 8140 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9589	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Except that the NNDR is not required.</p> <p>S - 9589 - 8146 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9613	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 9613 - 8162 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -
9687	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9687 - 8047 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9738	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9738 - 8174 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9807	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes, we broadly agree with Policy 16. The only issue we would take is with the last 2 bullet points. Enhancing rural communities and employment will require improved and alternative approaches to public transport in rural areas. This is in any event essential if we are going to encourage young people who live in rural areas to continue in education and training.</p> <p>S - 9807 - 7513 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9839	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>The NNDR should be a priority - meaningful growth points (e.g. Rackheath) cannot be promoted unless/until the infrastructure is in place. Sustainable developments can reduce traffic - see attached and should be supported.</p>

	S - 9839 - 8198 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -
9890	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9890 - 2058 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9904	<p>Mr Peter Sutton [8219] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 27/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>How can a rapid bus service be achieved in the City when the traffic is so bad and can only get worse with the increase in housing and population? What local rail network?</p> <p>S - 9904 - 8219 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10006	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10006 - 8228 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10019	<p>notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>We agree with the policies but in particular endorse the recognition that use of Park and Ride facilities should be encouraged to minimise congestion in the main urban area.</p> <p>S - 10019 - 6911 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>

<p>10040</p>	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Yes</p> <p>S - 10040 - 8230 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>10057</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Yes</p> <p>S - 10057 - 2373 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>10191</p>	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Yes</p> <p>S - 10191 - 8246 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>10228</p>	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Yes</p> <p>S - 10228 - 5864 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>10353</p>	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p>

	<p>Priorities: - dual the NDR and link up to A47 - improve rail links to London - need to be faster</p> <p>S - 10353 - 8293 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10376	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) In principle, yes. The Reasoned Justification points to the fact that outside agencies (i.e. Network Rail and the Highways Agency) will be key in providing some crucial elements of the strategy but no information is provided as to how accommodating these agencies will be. That knowledge is both crucial and critical. Moreover, the references to Norwich International Airport are entirely dependent on KLM continuing to provide the link to Schiphol but no information is provided about the ongoing surety of that link.</p> <p>S - 10376 - 2020 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10419	<p>Mr Alan Ives [8299] - SUPPORT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Agree with general thrust of report, but feel there needs to be more emphasis on links to North and West, thereby improving access to Peterborough/Corby, Midlands and North. Cycleway strategy seems a bit half hearted, and progress to date in Norwich and the County is slow and poor.</p> <p>S - 10419 - 8299 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10444	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Yes</p> <p>S - 10444 - 8308 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10523	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10523 - 7215 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10627	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes - but - we would like a Norwich city centre fixed rail tram route through from east to west. It should improve traffic flow [see results in Croydon city centre]. Also we have some doubts about parts of the proposed route for the NNDR which should not be allowed to define the proposed areas for housing and other infrastructure.</p> <p>S - 10627 - 8325 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10677	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10677 - 8348 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10747	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10747 - 1776 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10780	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with</p>

	<p>the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Yes</p> <p>S - 10780 - 7666 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10943	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Yes</p> <p>S - 10943 - 8368 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10967	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Yes</p> <p>S - 10967 - 8369 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10991	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Yes</p> <p>S - 10991 - 8176 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
11014	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Yes</p> <p>S - 11014 - 8370 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>

<p>11122</p>	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) The A140 is one of the strategic corridors in Norfolk and recognised as such within the accompanying text of the Public Consultation. It provides for key regional connectivity as well as for movement within Norfolk. In so doing, other improvements in the A140 corridor might also be considered in the future as supportive to the identified growth within the NPA and Norfolk. Accordingly, we support the approach outlined in Policy 16 which identifies the promotion of a bypass for Long Stratton as part of the enhancement of the transportation system in the Core Strategy area to promote sustainable economic development and minimise the need to use the private car. We agree with paragraph 8.17 that good strategic access reduces the perceived isolation of Norfolk. However, paragraph 8.18 notes that the Long Stratton Bypass is not prioritised in the Regional Funding Allocation.</p> <p>Appendix 0 states that the spatial strategy promotes development at Long Stratton to achieve local benefits through the provision of a bypass (page 65). We support the policy position advocated by the GNDP. The implementation of the favoured spatial strategy will necessitate a number of significant highway improvements across the Norwich Policy area, including a bypass for Long Stratton.</p> <p>S - 11122 - 8390 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>11138</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Yes</p> <p>S - 11138 - 2373 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>7897</p>	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - OBJECT Web - 05/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) better road and rail networks improves the local environmental and does not harm the medium to long term environment.</p> <p>O - 7897 - 7787 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>

<p>7936</p>	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT Web - 08/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) there best way of keeping norfolk a pleasant place to live is to keep transport route poor or we become a london over spill slum town like luton</p> <p>O - 7936 - 7812 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>7975</p>	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - OBJECT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Norfolk's isolation is what is attractive about it to the tourists!! Norwich via Schipol is a joke at journey times 4 X flying from Stansted to anywhere else in Europe - great for the North Sea Oil platforms though</p> <p>O - 7975 - 6862 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>8096</p>	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - OBJECT Web - 26/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) The focus is still too much on road transport. We need to change our focus mainly to public transport and cycling to reduce road traffic.</p> <p>O - 8096 - 7880 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>8217</p>	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - OBJECT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) No, no, no. The NDR and Norwich airport will be detrimental to the environment and you are giving up too easily on the use of the private care use. What about peak oil production? Try harder, much harder.</p> <p>O - 8217 - 7901 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>

8255	<p>R Barker [6805] - OBJECT Web - 05/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) The initial Joint Core Strategy opinion concerning the A140 and proposed Long Stratton By Pass stated.....'Long Stratton provides a range of local services and some local job opportunities. It is poorly related to strategic employment sites. Even with a bypass, road access and public transport accessibility to Norwich or to the south is poor. This might constrain employment growth in the village. It does not appear to be a suitable location for further investigation for strategic growth at this time'. If it was not suitable then it still is unsuitable now..!! O - 8255 - 6805 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8320	<p>Mr Anthony Knights [7922] - OBJECT Web - 15/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) How can the NNDR possibly improve the quality of life for anyone except vehicle drivers? O - 8320 - 7922 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8341	<p>e buitenhuis [7951] - OBJECT Web - 19/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) The current proposals ignore the observed reality of climate change, and should be redesigned to stimulate walking, cycling, public transport and working close to home. O - 8341 - 7951 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8371	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - OBJECT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) The strategy talks about promoting access and transportation. There is little if anything definite about steps that have actually</p>

	<p>been taken or will actually be taken to provide improved public transport. Not everyone has access to a car. Good Public transport should be regarded as being more important than private transport.</p> <p>O - 8371 - 6992 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8408	<p>paul eldridge [7987] - OBJECT Web - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) how if your stated aim is to reduce the contribution to climate change can this plan support road improvements and improvements to the airport with aviation and road transport both significant emitters of greenhouse gases, it has been shown that when a road is improved it generates more traffic thus leading to higher emissions</p> <p>O - 8408 - 7987 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8435	<p>Helen Baczkowska [8000] - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) It appears that insufficient thought has been given to developing integrated public transport and low carbon transport over developing more road networks. Building the NDR will exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>O - 8435 - 8000 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8443	<p>Dr Tim Rayner [8006] - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) A Norwich Northern Distributor Road will re-enforce car-dependent lifestyles. Priority should be given to improved public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>O - 8443 - 8006 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8451	<p>Ian Harris [8007] - OBJECT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with</p>

	<p>the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Quote: 'Enhance the transportation system to promote sustainable economic development, reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices and minimise the need to use the private car. We will do this by promoting:'</p> <p>..followed by a list dominated by road schemes and improvements. You're having a laugh, aren't you? Just read it again, please. Exactly HOW will A be achieved by B? In particular, how will climate change be addressed by building roads?</p> <p>O - 8451 - 8007 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8505	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>It looks good but all areas should have good transport links not just some. It had better be more effective than now. You try to get a bus out of Norwich after 6.30 to anywhere!</p> <p>O - 8505 - 8020 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8531	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>The NNDR is a waste of money and a environmental disaster. The public transport proposals are weak as the document does not mention frequency of services (the primary factor in modal choice)</p> <p>O - 8531 - 7817 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8635	<p>Dr Rebecca Taylor [8030] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Emphasis on road building, particularly in tandem with the airport runs completely in contradiction to stated aims of sustainability. The NNDR will encourage car use: funding for safe cycle and walk ways in combination with reliable and affordable public transport should be the main priority</p> <p>O - 8635 - 8030 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>

<p>8646</p>	<p>Mr Pat Gowen [8034] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) I object to the Norwich Northern Bypass development on grounds of: (1) Cost at a time of critical financial stringency and escalating Council Tax. (2) The encouragement given for more traffic and escalating CO2 emissions. (3) The additional traffic resulting in the already frequently gridlocked Hellesdon area due to the use of the Cromer and Reepham Roads as access to the NDR now that the access at Costessey has been refused. (4) That at far lower cost improvements could be made to public transport, Park and Ride, links between the Airport, Rail Station and 'Bus station to facilitate further use of these.</p> <p>O - 8646 - 8034 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>8702</p>	<p>mrs jane fischl [8031] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) No - climate change will be exacerbated by these proposals and all the evidence is that you cannot build your way out of congestion. Plans such as the NNDR will only encourage vehicle use and will do nothing to promote efficient and green public transport and other alternatives.</p> <p>O - 8702 - 8031 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>8858</p>	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) The NDR will make things worse, as described above. Your public transport plans are afterthoughts and inadequate, as well as contravening government requirements for them to be considered at the outset of planning.</p> <p>O - 8858 - 8060 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>8923</p>	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Most of these proposals are incompatible with CO2 reduction targets. The net result of such large scale development will be increase traffic levels and congestion and a Norwich area akin to the home counties</p> <p>O - 8923 - 2014 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8946	<p>Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>I object to the building of an NDR. It is not needed, will only increase the number of cars on the road generally (while there is still any fuel for them! Then what ?). This will be of no help to the environment - or to the mindset of the car-cultured generation. We need to encourage people to believe that they can travel safely on public transport, or walk in safety, or cycle in safety. Putting guards back on the trains would give people jobs as well as reassuring the public. Spend the money on that.</p> <p>O - 8946 - 8087 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8953	<p>Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>I object to the NDR.</p> <p>O - 8953 - 8088 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
8955	<p>Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Pollution and climate change cannot be reduced by building more roads. This area needs much better public transport, that responds to the needs of people who need to travel. In particular bus services need huge investment Current levels of bus services restrict the ability of people to access work and leisure, healthcare and other facilities. This needs to be addressed.</p> <p>O - 8955 - 8088 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>

<p>8960</p>	<p>MR Richard Edwards [7925] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) No. You cant reduce climate change by building more roads. We don't want more money spent on major road building such as a Norwich Northern Distributor Road which will only encourage people to drive. We want priority given to first class public transport system, walking and cycling links. The council's report says nothing about funding buses first</p> <p>O - 8960 - 7925 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>9179</p>	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Because it does not include access for blue badge holders in the transport system see comment on Q9. But I think that all houses and flats should be covered by a WIFI link to promote home working and home working should be allowed from council and housing agency properties as well as private.</p> <p>O - 9179 - 8112 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>9204</p>	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -All A47 & NDR will not help -The rail proposals are woefully insufficient - The airport is not sustainable - Nothing about buses and strategic cycle routes</p> <p>O - 9204 - 8114 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>9209</p>	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p>

	<p>There is only a reference to encouraging cycling and walking. In order to achieve this, a comprehensive dedicated cycle network needs to be established particularly in the Norwich area if we are serious about climate change and reducing CO2 emissions</p> <p>O - 9209 - 2055 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9255	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Road building especially NDR, unnecessary if sufficient resources put into public transport FIRST</p> <p>O - 9255 - 4494 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9270	<p>Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) The NNDR seems to me unnecessary and will not improve access to Norwich. A high quality bus service is fine in theory but given the fact of congestion during the morning and evening rush hour and the single carriageway on most roads, the buses would be unable to make any improvement.</p> <p>O - 9270 - 8115 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9279	<p>Mrs Gray [5927] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) This section is contradictory. I do not see how you can reduce the contribution to climate change at the same time as encouraging more travel by road improvements. I do not see how you are promoting healthy travel choices and minimising the need to use the private car in what you are planning</p> <p>O - 9279 - 5927 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9310	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Even if a bypass comes to Long Stratton there will be even more traffic on the road (A140) as buses are poor and there is no rail links to alternative to the car</p> <p>O - 9310 - 5445 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9315	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Yes please expand & improve local rail network. No to NNDR for reasons already outlined in previous answers. More efficient and reliable bus services please. If Long Stratton residents in favour of bypass then fine.</p> <p>O - 9315 - 8117 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9336	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Long Stratton cannot sustain new housing levels without a bypass. This needs to be more of a priority.</p> <p>O - 9336 - 8123 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9401	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>No NNDR - it would just encourage more cars, etc. Do something about airport development charge. It is a turn off!</p> <p>O - 9401 - 8124 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9510	<p>South Norfolk Council (Stoke Holy Cross Ward) (Mr Trevor Lewis) [8142] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p>

	<p>No. There is no stated policy as concerns the expansion of domestic flights from Norwich, which once had an extensive east-coast flights network. I am not advocating any particular policy, only saying that some sort of policy is needed. What is stated is imprecise. Norwich Airport does have a service to the south west (Exeter), but, I think, summer only and only three days a week. There is also a seasonal limited service to Jersey.</p> <p>The policy should identify an extension of the Norwich - Cambridge rail service to Stansted Airport as a regular direct service as a major objective. Also, it is disappointing that Elveden is mis-spelt in 8.18, considering its importance to the Norwich area.</p> <p>O - 9510 - 8142 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9580	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>As already stated</p> <p>O - 9580 - 6690 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9621	<p>RW Kidner [8163] (represented by Bidwells Cambridge(310) (Michael Hendry) [7492]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>The policy must recognise that in order to truly address "rural deprivation and isolation and enhance accessibility to jobs and services" it is necessary to provide jobs and housing in rural areas and not to look at development within or adjacent to rural settlements as automatically resulting in car trips in or out but rather in balance to result in a net reduction of traffic movements enabling people to work where they live. A new bullet point should be added to read "Promoting balanced development of housing and employment to create live work settlements".</p> <p>O - 9621 - 8163 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9632	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>The Broads Authority agrees with the objectives of promoting sustainable economic</p>

development, reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices, and minimise the need to use the private car mentioned in the policy. However, as currently written the strategy could be interpreted as giving disproportionate weight to road development which would appear to conflict with some of the sustainability objectives. The Authority believes that the starting point of the policy should be to improve access, not, as set out here, to enhance the „transportation system.. If that were the case then the measures listed in the first and second halves of the policy could be combined and prioritised against a single set of criteria. „Improved access. should also be interpreted in a qualitative, rather than purely quantitative way. Recognition should be given to the importance of the transport network in shaping an area’s character and layout. Each transport link affects not only the character and value (economic and otherwise) of the locations it connects, but also those either side of it - every „link. is also a barrier of some description. The transport network should be carefully developed to help shape the area towards the type of place the Joint Authorities are seeking to achieve. The inter-relationship of the transport network and the pattern of land use, movement and lifestyles is such an important and complex matter that it deserves more careful articulation than is currently presented in the document.

O - 9632 - 7986 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

9712

Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Long Stratton bypass is essential, but other improvements needed on A140 to take increased traffic caused by proposed development. Better public transport is only answer to reducing car usage. Mothers will still take their children to school by car. Long Stratton has no access to rail service.

O - 9712 - 5446 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

9856

Mr Paul Johnson [8207] - OBJECT

Web - 25/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

Compared to the rest of the England, Norfolk is very poorly accessed by road or rail. For instance, to drive from London to Leeds, say, could be done in 2 hours, from anywhere in South or East Norfolk you could add another one and a half, or two

	<p>hours to that.</p> <p>O - 9856 - 8207 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9917	<p>Miss Lynda Edwards [6780] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>The proposed NDR will NOT be the answer to our traffic problems - it will make them worse. Who on earth, if they want to access the city from North Norfolk, will bother to go out of their way along the NDR route?</p> <p>As many of the narrow streets to the north of the city are medieval or Victorian, surely it would make sense to spend the proposed money for the NDR on public transport to and from the north of the city? Many people drive into the city as there is no usable bus or train service in. Public transport would create jobs - more people in employment - more people will be able to return to paying Council Tax!</p> <p>O - 9917 - 6780 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9944	<p>John Heaser [7015] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>NO - not enough commitment to build the sort of cycle paths that will get people out of their cars. Cycle routes have to be both direct and safe.</p> <p>O - 9944 - 7015 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
9972	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>The list of road schemes is incompatible with the vision and with the opening sentence of the policy. Improvements to the A11, A47, the Northern Norwich Distributor Road and Long Stratton bypass should all be omitted. There is far too great an emphasis within this policy on long distance travel, whereas the vast majority of travel within Greater Norwich starts and finishes in Greater Norwich. Whilst recognising that Norwich Airport may be seen as a benefit for Greater Norwich the environmental</p>

	<p>impact of air travel is extremely negative and has to be discouraged and economically the airport is likely to be a massive drain on the region with the amount of money being taken overseas vastly exceeding money coming into the region. Any reference to the airport in terms of sustainability therefore needs deleting.</p> <p>The reference to rural transport also needs challenging. Whilst the private car undoubtedly plays an important role for many in rural areas at present it is also not an option that is available for many. For many on lower incomes reliance on the private car to access jobs is a major burden and is unsustainable in the longer term as the impact of peak oil bites. Reducing reliance on the private car must therefore be an aim of the policy.</p> <p>O - 9972 - 6903 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>10116</p>	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>NDR needs reconsidering</p> <p>O - 10116 - 8239 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>10139</p>	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>We broadly support this policy, but consider that, for the sake of consistency, the third bullet of Policy 16 be amended to state that the Core Strategy will promote the enhanced and innovative use of the local rail network, including the utilisation of the existing capacity on the under-used Bittern Line (the Norwich-Sheringham railway line).</p> <p>Consideration for the extant highway improvements incorporated in the Local Plans are also omitted at present. One highway improvement particularly relevant to the development of North West Norwich and the expansion of Broadland Business Park, is the Link Road between Plumstead Road East and the A47 Postwick Junction. This unlocks considerable potential to the North East of Norwich, and will enhance connectivity to the proposed Distributor Road. Any such proposals also need to be explicitly referenced.</p> <p>O - 10139 - 8234 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>

<p>10171</p>	<p>Lafarge Aggregates Ltd [8245] (represented by David L Walker Limited (Head office) [8182]) - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) 7.1 With regard to Policy 16 (Strategic Access and Transportation), it is noted that the policy seeks to promote sustainable economic development; however it doesn't make reference to the strategic nature of the freight assets in respect of rail and water. Our client's site at Trowse is a fully operational railhead, with strategic importance for the importation of resources not indigenous to the County. 7.2 In response to Question 24 therefore, it is considered that a freight movement (or freight site protection policy) needs to be integrated within this policy to achieve long-term sustainable economic growth. Such an approach would be consistent with existing adopted policy, namely:- - Policy EMP 9.1 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Nov 2004); - Policy TRA 7 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (Mar 2003); - Policy MIN22 and MIN23 of the adopted Norfolk Mineral Local Plan (Jan 2004); and - Policy T10 of the East of England RSS (Mar 2008). O - 10171 - 8245 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>10329</p>	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - OBJECT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) See comments under question 2 for our overarching views on transport. The contradictions inherent in the Joint Core Strategy are represented in their fullest here. How will Policy 16 'reduce the contribution to climate change' by 'enhancing the regional significance of Norwich International Airport for both leisure and business travel to destinations across the UK and beyond'? How will Policy 16 'minimise the need to use the private car' by the £150m investment in the NDR? We welcome the policy commitment to enhance local and regional rail links and improve public transport between Main Towns and Key Service Centres. However, the stated reliance on the private car for more rural areas could be eased with more extensive improvements to the rural bus service.</p>

	O - 10329 - 6826 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -
10471	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>We do not want new roads. We want the old ones repaired and properly maintained.</p> <p>O - 10471 - 8309 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10499	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>The roads are satisfactory at present. ore roads will only bring an increase in crime. No large development or eco-towns.</p> <p>O - 10499 - 8310 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10572	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>A tram system for Norwich would be an asset.</p> <p>O - 10572 - 8318 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10595	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10595 - 8319 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10650	<p>Ms Lucy Hall [8295] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Web - 11/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Policy 16 looks like it would have been a good proposal if it was written in 1980. Now we need a vision for how we want to live in 2050 - avoiding climate disaster, gridlock, children killed on the roads and the misery of congestion. You can't have both 'lessen environmental impact' AND 'improve surface access to Norwich Airport'. It has to be one or the other. Lets go for the former.</p> <p>O - 10650 - 8295 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10656	<p>mrs Helene Rinaldo [8345] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Contribution to climate change:</p> <p>reliance on cars is still prevalent here , with improvement on road and construction of the NDR. Very little is planned for non pollutant mean of transport, no tramways for example, no real consideration for bike lane that would allow village to village ride. As for public transport, increasing the number of route, the frequency would make public transport viable.</p> <p>O - 10656 - 8345 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10687	<p>Mr P Baker [8350] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>I agree with the improvements, but would add priority for more cycle lanes on main roads between towns and Norwich - e.g. A140 Aylsham-Norwich.</p> <p>O - 10687 - 8350 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
10799	<p>Liftshare (Ms Ali Clabburn) [8360] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)</p> <p>Once again the proposed options need to reflect all the options to reduce the need to travel first, followed by ensuring there is</p>

	<p>infrastructure to support and encourage sustainable modes as detailed in answer 2.</p> <p>In terms of social exclusion and accessibility, as you mention in many rural locations the private car will remain important. However, this does not mean this should be ignored. Promoting car-sharing would enable transport from rural areas to be more sustainable while increasing accessibility. A properly marketed car-sharing scheme and strategically placed HOV lanes are necessary.</p> <p>8.19 A new and innovative way of providing public transport that has been omitted is providing a countrywide car-sharing scheme and supporting HOV lanes to help people share their journeys.</p> <p>O - 10799 - 8360 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>10814</p>	<p>Ms Kerry Lane [8361] - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) Once again the proposed options need to reflect all the options to reduce the need to travel first, followed by ensuring there is infrastructure to support and encourage sustainable modes as detailed in answer 2.</p> <p>In terms of social exclusion and accessibility, as you mention in many rural locations the private car will remain important. However, this does not mean this should be ignored. Promoting car-sharing would enable transport from rural areas to be more sustainable while increasing accessibility. A properly marketed car-sharing scheme and strategically placed HOV lanes are necessary.</p> <p>8.19 A new and innovative way of providing public transport that has been omitted is providing a countrywide car-sharing scheme and supporting HOV lanes to help people share their journeys.</p> <p>O - 10814 - 8361 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -</p>
<p>10838</p>	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - OBJECT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) The Landowners support the objectives of this policy, to enhance the transportation system to promote sustainable economic development, reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices and minimise the need to use the</p>

private car. However, it is considered that these objectives should be expanded to state that that the enhancements to the transport system will also support new and existing communities.

The Landowners support the policy of enhancing rail services to London and Cambridge as this will strengthen regional and national linkages, which will in turn attract inward investment and make Norwich and its sub-region a more attractive place for businesses to relocate.

The Landowners also support the policy to enhance and use the local rail network in an innovative way. Wymondham offers the best opportunity to utilise the existing capacity on its line to Norwich and Cambridge and beyond via the wider national rail network. This would act to increase transport choice and promote more sustainable modes of transport. It would also increase connectivity to and from existing communities and support future communities, giving people better access to jobs and improving the viability of commercial activity in this location. These measures together with initiatives to improve pedestrian and cycling routes will significantly improve transport and travel in the NPA

A key concept of developing a sustainable urban extension to north east Wymondham is that of the walkable/cyclable neighbourhood. This involves designing places to encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport, such as walking and cycling rather than the private car. This involves co-locating services in appropriate locations to ensure easy and convenient access to employment, services and facilities.

The urban extension will integrate a number of permeable route options that encourage people to move around, where the private car is considered at the bottom of the transport hierarchy, followed by public transport, cyclists and at the top, pedestrians. It is recognised that such routes should form part of a wider objective to relieve pressure on the roads, promote healthier lifestyles, and encourage people to enjoy the area outside of their cars and to create efficient modal shifts towards more sustainable modes of transport. The aspiration is to link a number of walking and cycling routes to a wider network. As such, it is considered that routes along which cycling and walking are prioritised should be provided locally and within the sub-region. However, this is not to say that cars will not be accommodated for within the new urban extension but it is expected that the need and desire to use the private car will be significantly reduced.

Growth will be master planned to ensure that the urban form is robust and adaptable changing occupational requirements over time, to accommodate technological advancements and/or movement towards the live/work lifestyle, which can act to reduce the need for people to commute.

O - 10838 - 8362 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

10863 Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

As detailed in Question 4, instead of the Rackheath eco-town concept, a continuous line of development is envisaged from the proposed Postwick hub to the NIA. It is stated that 'Delivery is dependent on the implementation of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road'. Yet this road is completely unsuitable in its form for a semi-urban environment. Exits and entrances will be limited by its dual carriageway status and it will merely result in communities being cut-off from each other with visual and noise impact degrading their environment. The cynic might view this expanded pattern of development as justification for the NDR, but it would undoubtedly be a poor one.

Improved railway provision and bus services should be prioritised over major road building with options left open for more imaginative solutions such as trams. For example, serious consideration should be given to opening a station at Dussindale that would serve housing developments in that area and also Broadland Business Park.

The appropriate level of investment will not be possible with such large sums devoted to the NDR. The strategy does not demonstrate the required measures or commitment to achieve a modal shift away from car use. The NDR itself is an inappropriate, expensive and environmentally destructive scheme completely at odds with the need for carbon reduction. This is demonstrated by the carbon emission figures from the business case recently made to Government for the NDR: Norwich's transport emissions go up from somewhere around 370,000 tonnes/year at present to 582,000 in 2071 ie a 57% increase whilst NDR (scheme related) emissions go up from 24,631 tonnes/year to 69,286 ie a near tripling. This is unacceptable when the Government is already committed to a 60% greenhouse gas reduction target by 2050 and may soon be setting a stronger target of 80% reduction by 2050 under the Climate Change Bill.

The proposed Postwick Hub gyratory is much larger, and over-engineered, than required for the expansion of the proposed business park (Broadland Gate) and for serving new housing to the north. This is because it has been designed to create the first stage of a controversial Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NNDR) in the guise of a business park access road. The Department of Transport, in a letter to the Director of Planning and Transportation at Norfolk County Council expressed the following on the topic:

'The CIF business case submitted to DfT/CLG for Postwick Junction did not show analysis of Postwick on its own. However, using the analysis available, it was evident that the proposed Postwick scheme, as designed around the NNDR, was unlikely to offer significant transport benefits on its own as it offered no appreciable distance or delay reductions for major flows of traffic. Indeed it appeared that, in isolation, it could produce net transport disbenefits as some vehicles would need to travel a more circuitous route through the junction'.

...and later went on to state:

'It would also be open to Norfolk County Council to review the Postwick Junction design and prepare an alternative option that is less dependent on the NNDR. The Departments would be willing to review any alternative proposal and, subject to proving

its economic and sustainability benefits, would offer CIF funding for that scheme instead'.
See also Question 10

O - 10863 - 8018 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

10901 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - **OBJECT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

The BLT supports the objectives of this policy, to enhance the transportation system to promote sustainable economic development, reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices and minimise the need to use the private car. However, it is considered that these objectives should be expanded to state that the enhancements to the transport system will also support new and existing communities.

The BLT supports the policy of enhancing rail services to London and Cambridge as this will strengthen regional and national linkages, which will in turn attract inward investment and make Norwich and its sub-region a more attractive place for businesses to relocate.

The BLT supports the policy to enhance and use the local rail network in an innovative way. The north east sector of Norwich also offers the best opportunity to utilise the existing capacity on the underused Bittern Line (the Norwich-Sheringham railway line). Land is currently set aside for a rail halt within Broadland Business Park. The relocation of this or the creation of an additional rail halt within a new urban extension in north east Norwich, linking with the proposed Eco settlement at Rackheath, would create a new rail transit and public transport interchange, linked to the centre of Norwich and the wider national rail network. This would act to increase transport choice and promote more sustainable modes of transport. It would also increase connectivity to and from existing communities and support future communities, giving people better access to jobs and improving the viability of commercial activity in this location.

These measures together with initiatives to improve pedestrian and cycling routes will significantly improve transport and travel in the Norwich area and enable the north east sector of Norwich to accommodate a significant amount of growth. This

is anticipated to be over the 7,000 dwellings as identified in the Core Strategy and it is considered that the Core Strategy should state that this area has the capacity to accommodate at least 10,000 dwellings. The BLT proposes that the potential for tram/train transit opportunities are fully explored.

The BLT acknowledges the need for new transport infrastructure to support the growth of the city. Within the area proposed for sustainable urban extension by the BLT, a route for an inner link road has been safeguarded in part within Broadland District Council's existing Local Plan. This link road is safeguarded in two parts, one of which has an extant planning permission. However, it should be noted that the road as currently safeguarded, does not link. The 'missing section' is located centrally within the area of land being promoted by the BLT. The provision of a complete link road in this location will enable the delivery of the urban extension in advance of the Northern Distributor Road. It will act to support north/south traffic, cycle and pedestrian movements around the periphery of Norwich and within the fabric of the new extension and encourage orbital movements between the Broadland Business to the south, Wroxham Road to the north, thus relieving pressure on existing arterial routes. It would also create easier access to the park and ride facility on the Wroxham Road, potentially encouraging more people to use this facility and in turn, reducing commuter traffic into the city.

It is suggested that policy 16 of the draft Joint Core Strategy is amended to include bullet points that refer to new rail halts that utilise the existing capacity of the Bittern Line and to the inner link road.

A key concept of developing a sustainable urban extension to north east Norwich is that of the walkable neighbourhood. This involves designing places to encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport, such as walking and cycling rather than the private car by co-locating services in appropriate locations to ensure easy and convenient access to employment, services and facilities.

The urban extension will integrate a number of permeable route options that encourage people to move around, where the private car is considered at the bottom of the transport hierarchy, followed by public transport, cyclists and at the top, pedestrians. It is recognised that such routes should form part of a wider objective to relieve pressure on the roads, promote healthier lifestyles, and encourage people to enjoy the area outside of their cars and to create efficient modal shifts towards more sustainable modes of transport. The aspiration is to link

a number of walking and cycling routes to a wider network. As such, it is considered that routes along which cycling and walking are prioritised should be provided locally and within the sub-region. However, this is not to say that cars will not be accommodated for within the new urban extension but it is expected that the need and desire to use the private car will be significantly reduced.

Growth will be master planned to ensure that the urban form is robust and adaptable changing occupational requirements over time, to accommodate technological advancements and/or movement towards the live/work lifestyle, which can act to reduce the need for people to commute.

O - 10901 - 8366 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

11090 Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

No.

We support some elements of the proposed policy package - enhanced rail services to London and Cambridge and use of local rail network, provision of IT links, improved public transport accessibility and location of development close to essential services - but they sit within an overall unsustainable transport policy package.

The emphasis on upgrading road infrastructure and promoting Norwich Airport would undermine the Government's legal targets to reduce CO2 emissions by 34% by 2020 and 80% by 2050 on 1990 baseline levels.

Over-emphasis on long distance travel, whereas a significant amount of travel generated within, to and from NPA is local. NNTAG opposes dualling of the A11 and A47 as they would generate traffic, increase CO2 and damage internationally important habitats .

Policy relegates the problem of transport and social exclusion to areas outside Norwich urban area (rural areas, main towns, KSC), whereas it also affects Norwich and will increase with the JCS emphasis on location of strategic employment.in the urban fringe. Quality of life is not addressed.

Conflict with several of the Spatial Vision Objectives - to protect, manage and enhance the environment (Obj 8), to minimise

the contributors to climate change (Obj 9), to reduce the need to travel (Obj 11).

Does not accord with RSS Policy T1. Policy 16 is entirely dominated by infrastructure measures and fails to mention any other types of measure such as behavioural change which is high in the Regional Transport Strategy hierarchy under Policy T2. The supporting text at 8.19 recognises the need to manage travel in view of the levels of growth in the core strategy. However, apart from wanting to encourage people living in new development to walk or cycle and promoting public transport for longer journeys and in rural areas, no other measures are proposed! Managing travel demand would help to reduce existing traffic levels and free up road capacity for growth and green travel modes. The benefits of traffic reduction should be locked in using demand management measures to include extensive use of smart choices and parking restraint..

Furthermore, since the JCS plan period runs to 2026, Policy 16 should expand upon the limited travel demand measures identified in the RSS to 2021 in support of carbon reduction targets.

Policy 16 does not reflect RSS Policy NR1 which seeks to " achieve a major modal shift in emphasis across the Norwich Policy Area towards travel by public transport, cycling and walking."

Investment must be refocused on a sustainable transport package in accord with NR1.

The supporting text at 8.19 lists a number of new ways of providing public transport such as "High Quality rapid bus services in and around the city", but these are not given any policy weight. Although the supporting text also says that public transport will be promoted ahead of car based improvements, this is not the case since the NDR has been prioritised over the Major Public Transport Scheme in EERA's submitted list of Regional Funding Allocation Round 2 priorities.

Policy weight is given to improving public transport accessibility to and between Main Towns and Key Service Centres but not to the Norwich urban area.

There is also strong scope for improving public transport accessibility within main towns and key service centres as well as to and between.

The local policy framework identifying a NDR is outdated. The supporting text 8.17 refers to the Local Transport Plan and NATS as providing the framework for a NDR. NATS which sets out a transportation strategy for the Norwich Area until 2021 was agreed by NCC in 2004 and published in April 2006, pre-dating the RSS approved in 2008. The Local Transport Plan covers the period 2002 to 2021. There is a strong need for a reassessment of NATS and for rolling it forward to 2026.

Soundness

We consider Policy 16 to be unsound. It is not a strategy for serving the NPA to 2026 but a collation of infrastructure proposals. Policy 16 is:

- not consistent with national and regional policy;
- not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives since no alternatives have been considered eg NDR is treated as fixed.
- not founded on a robust evidence base.
- not deliverable in terms of funding.

Recommended changes

Delete policy 16 in its entirety and re-write to reflect national regional transport policies.

O - 11090 - 8387 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

11151 **JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - OBJECT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16)

OBJECT

Improvements to the A11 / A47 and Local Rail Network

We believe that the proposed improvements to the A11 and A47 are important to allow good access between Wymondham, Hethersett, Cringleford and Norwich. These improvements should, however, be delivered alongside improvements to the public transport network on the A11 corridor.

We support the recognition of the need to promote 'enhanced and innovative use of the local rail network'. We believe that this is consistent with Policy NR1 of the Regional Plan, which encourages the use of the railway in the Wymondham / A11 corridor to promote local employment.

Long Stratton Bypass

The proposed allocation of 1,800 dwellings at Long Stratton in order to fund a bypass is entirely inconsistent with Policy 16 and its supporting text. The bypass itself is likely to reduce congestion in and around Long Stratton, but one of the net

effects of this will be to make car journeys more attractive, and increase total car journeys.

At the same time, the new housing will form the basis of an unsustainable commuting pattern, placing new residents in a settlement without the local facilities or jobs of a main town, thus necessitating out-commuting. The town is also unlikely to benefit from a high quality public transport system, and so drivers are unlikely to be encouraged to leave their cars at home. For the above reasons, this policy conflicts both with other policies in the Core Strategy and Policy NR1 of the Regional Plan.

O - 11151 - 6979 - Policy 16 Strategic access and transportation (Q24), (Q24) Do you agree with the proposed policy? (Policy 16) -

Response – Q25

Environmental assets

Policy 17 (page 53) explains the policy for protecting and maintaining environmental assets.

Q25 Environmental assets

Policy 17 (page 53) explains the policy for protecting and maintaining environmental assets.

Q25 Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q25 Total	101	20	67	15	102

8218	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>This really does not stack up with the proposed scale of development proposed overall. You will spoil what the area is now and there is great uncertainty you achieve the proposals in the time scale now in any case.</p> <p>C - 8218 - 7901 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8603	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Brownfield sites only</p> <p>C - 8603 - 8024 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8636	<p>University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Given the direct access the Colney Lane Bus Link will provide between Norwich Research Park West (John Innes Centre, Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital NHS Trust) and Norwich Research Park East (UEA) it has the potential to contribute to environmental well-being as a consequence of carbon reductions in public transport.</p> <p>C - 8636 - 8029 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>

<p>8914</p>	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) agree but assets could be protected by clearly stating in policy as per PPS3 that brownfield land MUST be developed before greenfield. C - 8914 - 7620 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>8924</p>	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Of course we want to see environmental assets protected and enhanced but this is not possible with such large scale development. Huge economic and population growth locally, nationally or internationally will destroy the environment C - 8924 - 2014 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>9073</p>	<p>Wymondham Heritage Society (Ms Irene Woodward) [1003] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) WHS welcomes the reduction in overall housing numbers for Wymondham and the undertaking to preserve the breaks between the town and neighbouring settlements. The document does seem to be silent on the question of how the necessary infrastructure improvements for Wymondham will be achieved; this is a matter of concern to us. However, the statement on page 67"expansion of the town centre of a quality that will retain and enhance the distinctive character of the historic centre" seems to be an introduction out of nowhere. We cannot see how any expansion of the town centre could be achieved because of its enclosed nature. It may also be said to conflict with Policy 17, Environmental Assets. C - 9073 - 1003 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>9083</p>	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p>

	<p>At present Norwich often green spaces are cared for by people who do not know anything about horticulture not their fault if they make mistakes. Leaves left lying about can harbour "sharps" and of course need clearing completely from the whole of an area at the same time as they blow everywhere otherwise if left storm drains and then main sewers are blocked by them Green spaces and their proper care at the present time</p> <p>C - 9083 - 8109 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9410	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) With the amount of land you are proposing to fill with housing and all the infrastructure needed the face of the area will change dramatically and irreversibly to the detriment of the area. As a native of the area who considers city and surround already spoilt why spoil it further</p> <p>C - 9410 - 8120 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9650	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) The aims behind Policy 17 need to be justified after having considered why it remains important for areas of environmental importance to be retained and protected. Having not considered all reasonable alternatives to possible areas for growth the proposed policy has not been justified. This is a critical area for the CS and its credibility.</p> <p>C - 9650 - 7503 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9688	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes, but has tourism been fully addressed as a local industry? The effect of inappropriate siting of housing could alter the character and quality of life of certain areas, therefore cease to be attractive to tourists, thus having a detrimental effect on the local economy.</p> <p>C - 9688 - 8047 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>

<p>9973</p>	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) No comment</p> <p>C - 9973 - 6903 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>10020</p>	<p>notcutts Limited (Mrs Erica McDonald) [6911] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) The principle of a multi-functional network of green spaces and green links within the urban area and particularly within new developments is a good one where such designation can be done in a meaningful way. However in identifying Green Space and Green Links a common sense approach is required to ensure that these do in practise provide a strategic and relevant function. Designation must represent a positive move towards meeting the objectives. There are some existing designations where it is difficult to see any real benefit from the Green Link designations. Thus while the principle behind this policy is to be supported, it is important that the individual authorities take a fresh look at existing designations</p> <p>C - 10020 - 6911 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>10252</p>	<p>Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260] - COMMENT Paper - 09/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) I welcome the environmental policies now written into this Core Strategy, although there is still a tendency for the document to focus on development areas to the detriment of policies needed for the vast areas outside these spots. South Norfolk and Broadland will still be largely rural communities and be responsible for large tracts of countryside. The policies developed for geodiversity are mainly expressed in terms of where not to develop, rather than positive ones of protection and mitigation and enhancement of geodiversity everywhere. Other Core Strategies that I have read do contain these positive policies for biodiversity and geodiversity.</p> <p>Policy 17 Environmental Assets I welcome this policy and its inclusion of geology as an asset. I think that as worded this section does provide the policy needed to protect the geodiversity of the region, but it does read rather in the negative terms of where not to develop, rather than in</p>

	<p>positive protection and enhancement terms.</p> <p>8.23 Suggest amend geo-diversity to geodiversity</p> <p>C - 10252 - 8260 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10279	<p>Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Church buildings are of course part of the built cultural heritage and Norwich and Norfolk have a rich heritage in that respect, especially in relation to church buildings which are within the Church of England's care. We are keen to continue to develop the use of our buildings for cultural and tourism purposes alongside their prime purpose as places of prayer and worship. The Norfolk and Waveney Churches Discovery Project is of particular relevance here - www.norwich.anglican.org/visiting/discovery. The Archdeacon of Norfolk leads this and would be pleased to give you further details.</p> <p>C - 10279 - 8266 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10573	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Every open space, green field or park should be saved for our future generations.</p> <p>C - 10573 - 8318 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10709	<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>We support the proposals to "avoid harming areas of environmental importance" and "assets of acknowledged regional or local importance". However, the Water Framework Directive also requires us to ensure that there is no deterioration within our Water Bodies and indeed that their condition, in terms of biology, chemistry and hydromorphology, improves. We recommend that this is reflected in the policy.</p>

	C - 10709 - 8352 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -
10725	<p>Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT Paper - 26/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please look at the asset that is White House Farm in Sprowston. 2. Instead of demolishing estates where some of the gardens are very large, if the tenant isn't a keen gardener, why not instead fence off a section at the end of these gardens? As with communal residential gardens in Bowthorpe (see photos), residents could plant them with flowers and fruit and veg. Anyone who spends time helping could be entitled to take some fruit or veg or herbs home for free. Educational, attractive and diet improving and community building. It's not just the countryside that needs their open spaces, Norwich council tenants are entitled to it too! <p>C - 10725 - 8354 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10921	<p>Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Policy 13 - Reducing Environmental Impact, sufficiently addresses climate change and promotes sustainability in all development. The policy is in line with central government guidance and all new housing has to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes targets.</p> <p>Whilst there is no argument that sustainable neighbourhoods are a key element of the vision, there is some concern with the enforcement of such high standards, particularly those set out in the Codes for sustainable Homes, will result in increased costs and reduced profit margins. Evidence from Knight Frank (2008) suggests that a house built to Code Level 6 at 2007 construction prices will cost in the region of £30,000 to £35,000 extra to construct. Whilst we do not suggest these levels are pushed down, it is clear that once a developer takes into consideration other contributions and possibly a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), a development could be unviable to build. This in turn causes a decrease in house building and</p>

housing targets will not be met. The GNDP must take this into consideration when appraising new developments, and in some cases where viability is an issue, other contributions may be reduced. We recommend the GNDP commission viability studies to test the level of benefits that can be expected to be viable in the current climate.

70 Policy 14 - Housing Delivery, states that an absolute net additional 36,000 new homes are to be built and completed between 2006 and 2026 within the NPA. This figure stems from the RSS for the East of England. Proposals for housing will be expected to contribute to the mix of housing required to meet the needs of the area. This is of course dependent on up-to-date and accurate Housing Market Assessments. We have commented separately on JCS Housing Market Assessments and we hope our comments have been taken on board.

71 In negotiating the proportion and tenure of affordable housing, account must be made of site characteristics, market conditions and the overall viability of the scheme. For this reason the provision of affordable housing must be determined on a site by site basis rather than by a predetermined set policy figure. Again, viability assessments need to be prepared to support the targets for affordable housing.

72 Policy 15 - The Economy, states that the local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to facilitate the proposed RSS job growth. ALP are in agreement that achieving the full economic potential of the area is dependent on improved connectivity and implementation of wider sustainable transport proposals.

73 Policy 16 - Strategic Access and Transportation, states that an enhanced transport system will be provided to promote sustainable economic transport and reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices and minimise the need to use the private car. It is this aspect where Wymondham provides a significant advance over other growth locations limited by lack of strategic roads.

74 ALP wholly support this strategy and feel Wymondham as a location can promote car reduced travel more than any other location. Proximity to existing and proposed transport nodes such as the railway station and high speed bus routes into Norwich will ensure that car reliance is decreased. Sustainable urban design of residential areas will also contribute this. This strategy does, however, cast doubt on the level of sustainability achievable in respect of development in Long Stratton and in North East Norwich.

75 Improvements to the A11 and A47 are fully supported, although further details of work should be made public and contained within this document. At present it is felt the level of information in Policy 16 does not allow for a detailed response. ALP have consulted with CABE on their masterplan proposals in South Wymondham and subsequently they are extremely conscious that any large scale development proposal should not rely on car based movements. Instead, Masterplans should be designed around quality public transport solutions and all new housing must be within a 5 minute walking distance of public transport nodes.

76 Policy 17 - Environmental Assets, states that the environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained and enhanced and the benefits for residents and visitors improved. Development proposal should avoid harming areas of environmental importance. With 21,000 new houses to be found on mainly Greenfield sites, it is clearly going to need responsible planning to ensure existing environmental assets are not harmed. For this reason any growth option within the Favoured Option should demonstrate that development would not harm the environment as a whole, including ecology and landscape.

77 ALP support this view and have demonstrated through their analysis of South Wymondham that the proposed development site together with their site in North East Wymondham would not jeopardise ecology and landscape.

78 Policy 18 - Communities and Culture, states that in order to deliver thriving communities, tackle social deprivation and meet the diverse needs across the JCS, a spatial planning approach will be required to ensure infrastructure requirements are addressed in a holistic way. ALP support social inclusion and believe they can demonstrate that proposals in Wymondham will be built to meet the needs of the whole community. Increased levels of affordable housing and community facilities will ensure that this represents a development for all.

C - 10921 - 8367 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -

11022 Norwich Chamber Council (Mr Don Pearson) [8371] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

As business people we are sensitive to the environmental impact of any development and are confident our NCC

	<p>representatives have taken full consideration of such matters to minimise any such impact. However, we believe growth and the development of infrastructure to enable growth, must be the priority and that this can be managed to minimise any adverse impact.</p> <p>C - 11022 - 8371 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
11107	<p>Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Policy 17 - Environmental Assets, states that the environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained and enhanced and the benefits for residents and visitors improved. Development proposal should avoid harming areas of environmental importance. With new houses to be found on mainly Greenfield sites, it is clearly going to need responsible planning to ensure existing environmental assets are not harmed. For this reason any growth option within the Favoured Option should demonstrate that development would not harm the environment as a whole, including ecology and landscape.</p> <p>PJH supports this view and has demonstrated through their analysis of George Lane, Loddon that the proposed development site would not jeopardise ecology and landscape.</p> <p>C - 11107 - 8300 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
7898	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>fully agree with the proposal</p> <p>S - 7898 - 7787 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
7902	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>But this can be done better if the road and rail infrastructure was improve by concentrating vehicles down fast moving arteries.</p> <p>S - 7902 - 7787 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
7976	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 12/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>We have to be very careful not to destroy the attractive rural nature of much of the county</p> <p>S - 7976 - 6862 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8014	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 16/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>But I do not think environmental policies go far enough - homes should be more built more environmentally "friendly" if they are to be built.</p> <p>S - 8014 - 7851 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8132	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 29/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8132 - 7888 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8169	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 8169 - 7899 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -
8194	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8194 - 4796 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8243	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8243 - 4558 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8283	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8283 - 7912 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8308	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 13/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Full</p> <p>S - 8308 - 7915 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8372	Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT

	<p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>-</p> <p>S - 8372 - 6992 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8482	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8482 - 8016 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8506	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8506 - 8020 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8556	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8556 - 8021 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8581	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 8581 - 1976 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -
8669	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - SUPPORT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>S - 8669 - 8036 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8693	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>S - 8693 - 8044 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8747	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 8747 - 8053 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8800	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 8800 - 8061 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8807	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals</p>

	<p>set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 8807 - 8045 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8825	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 8825 - 6869 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8853	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 8853 - 8064 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8935	<p>Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (Dr Ken Hamilton) [8081] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) NLA strongly support this policy.</p> <p>S - 8935 - 8081 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8989	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 8989 - 8092 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>

<p>9052</p>	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 9052 - 4187 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>9130</p>	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 9130 - 7111 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>9136</p>	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 9136 - 8111 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>9180</p>	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 9180 - 8112 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>9210</p>	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9210 - 2055 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9249	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Most important</p> <p>S - 9249 - 1828 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9256	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9256 - 4494 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9280	<p>Mrs Gray [5927] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9280 - 5927 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9338	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9338 - 8123 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>

<p>9371</p>	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 9371 - 7113 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>9403</p>	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) New Whittlingham Broad at Thorpe St Andrew would be much more attractive without the 3 Rottweilers on one of the boats tied up there!</p> <p>S - 9403 - 8124 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>9440</p>	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) A qualified yes if there has to be increased development then the proposals outlined are fine</p> <p>S - 9440 - 8127 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>9467</p>	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>S - 9467 - 8134 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>9499</p>	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9499 - 8139 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9532	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9532 - 8140 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9590	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Except that any proposals which harm present assets should not be developed.</p> <p>S - 9590 - 8146 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9614	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9614 - 8162 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9633	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>The Broads Authority strongly supports this policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.21 should be re-worded to clarify that the Broads lie outside of the Joint Core Strategy area.</p>

	S - 9633 - 7986 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -
9713	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9713 - 5446 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9739	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9739 - 8174 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9808	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9808 - 7513 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9840	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9840 - 8198 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9891	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 9891 - 2058 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9945	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 9945 - 7015 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10007	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 10007 - 8228 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10041	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 10041 - 8230 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10140	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10140 - 8234 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10192	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10192 - 8246 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10229	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10229 - 5864 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10354	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10354 - 8293 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10377	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10377 - 2020 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>

<p>10420</p>	<p>Mr Alan Ives [8299] - SUPPORT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) This section is not as determined as it should be. The commitment should be to avoid all but the absolute minimum detraction of greenfield by use of brown field. There should be precise plans for protecting more landscapes as with the national parks, such as Broadland. Linked and continuous green routes for wildlife is a proven MUST. Everywhere the country and town meet, our people seem to despoil by dumping and litter. Clear plans to manage tidiness in the countryside should be included.</p> <p>S - 10420 - 8299 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>10445</p>	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 10445 - 8308 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>10524</p>	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes</p> <p>S - 10524 - 7215 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>10549</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - SUPPORT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) All ok</p> <p>S - 10549 - 8312 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>

<p>10628</p>	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Agreed S - 10628 - 8325 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>10678</p>	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes S - 10678 - 8348 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>10748</p>	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes S - 10748 - 1776 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>10781</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Yes S - 10781 - 7666 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
<p>10944</p>	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10944 - 8368 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10968	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10968 - 8369 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10992	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10992 - 8176 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
11015	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 11015 - 8370 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
7937	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 08/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>all towns and cities should have defined greenbelt not to be built on in any circumstances</p> <p>O - 7937 - 7812 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>

8532	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Because of the NNDR</p> <p>O - 8532 - 7817 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
8859	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Based as it is on a NDR that will open up the villages and rural areas for development, your environmental policy is bogus.</p> <p>O - 8859 - 8060 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9205	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) Too weak. In any case all your other policies will be allowed to over-ride this one, clearly.</p> <p>O - 9205 - 8114 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9312	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) The existing landscape will be blighted by thousands of new homes eating into greenfield sites which provide habitat for birds, animals and insects etc and are enjoyed by residents of Norfolk</p> <p>O - 9312 - 5445 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
9581	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals</p>

	<p>set out in this policy? (Policy 17) As already stated</p> <p>O - 9581 - 6690 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10117	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>There cannot be development without significant environmental damage limiting that damage is what matters</p> <p>O - 10117 - 8239 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10330	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>In our view, the 'ordinary' countryside is of equal value to designated sites, and one of Norfolk's most important 'Environmental Assets'. Norfolk is primarily a rural county and the scale of greenfield development that the strategy proposes will impact heavily on the 'largely rural character and high environmental quality' that the Policy recognises (8.21). This Policy is a message of damage limitation that we do not accept.</p> <p>CPRE Norfolk has grave concern that the landscape character of areas will be greatly impacted by the suburbanising effects of development, and the historic character of towns such as Wymondham will be homogenised by housing extensions.</p> <p>In our view, protection of the countryside is fundamentally more essential than the provision of pseudo green infrastructure. The loss of countryside is not compensated by the 'development' of urban parks and green 'spaces'.</p> <p>O - 10330 - 6826 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10472	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>We, as Norfolk people, do not want all this pushed on us. We do not need it. People come to Norfolk for what is already here.</p>

	O - 10472 - 8309 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -
10500	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>Residents of Norfolk as well as visitors like Norfolk as it is. Development will destroy tourism and ruin the lives of the residents.</p> <p>O - 10500 - 8310 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10596	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10596 - 8319 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10688	<p>Mr P Baker [8350] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>More cycle lanes - e.g. A140 Aylsham-Norwich.</p> <p>O - 10688 - 8350 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -</p>
10839	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)</p> <p>The Landowners consider that the conservation, management and enhancement of the natural and built environment, which is of intrinsic value to the local area and beyond is an important consideration in planning for growth. Ecological, landscape and heritage assessments will have to be carried out during the masterplanning process to ensure that important features are maintained and, where possible, enhanced. Such evidence should also inform policy 17.</p>

It is the intention that such features are integrated into the new urban extension in order to create a sense of place and a quality environment in which to live, work and visit. This allows new and existing communities to benefit from its amenity value and access it as a recreational resource. This will result in more sustainable growth whereby communities have appreciation and respect for the natural landscape as it contributes towards the creating a sense of place. The natural landscape is also crucial to creating high a quality environment, which in turn attracts people to the area.

In masterplanning a sustainable urban extension to north east Wymondham, the Landowners will prioritise the creation of a high quality landscape as a setting for the development, which will enhance the landscape character of the north east fringe of the town generally. Areas of landscape/ecological interest will be retained and enhanced as part of the development masterplan, while new landscape features may be created.

The Landowners also acknowledges the need to create a viable, long-term management regime for elements of the 'green infrastructure'. It is critical that proposals for the green infrastructure are fully tested both from a capital and revenue perspective. This is to make sure that a long term management regime can be put in place to ensure the continued maintenance and quality of the green infrastructure provided in the growth area.

It will be important in developing a landscape character for the new growth areas to recognise a fundamental shift in the character of the area, from urban fringe towards becoming an integral neighbourhood(s) within the fabric of the town. While the preservation and enhancement of natural features will be essential in establishing a high quality environment, such features must respond to a changing role in landscape, environmental, recreation and leisure conditions within the geography of Wymondham.

O - 10839 - 8362 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -

10864 Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - OBJECT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

While we do agree with the sentiments expressed in Policy 17, we fail to see how the current emphasis on dispersed settlements served by an expanded road network will do anything other than fragment the natural environment. Many of the green links, or green 'stepping stones', that are proposed are simply not continuous enough for effective species interchange. For instance, the Public Consultation envisages 'stepping stones' of reclaimed heathland linking 'Mousehold Heath to the surrounding countryside'. For stepping stones to be effective, the distance between them has to be kept to an absolute minimum. There is

also the point that for heathland to be self sustaining and of true biodiversity value, it needs to cover a relatively large uninterrupted area. There is already an extensive built up area between Mousehold Heath and the countryside with no such large unused open spaces. Further, recent revisions to the Strategy show a more complete joining up of development between Rackheath and the main Norwich urban area which throws into question whether the stepping stone concept, at least as a link with Mousehold Heath, is realisable.

It must also be borne in mind that many brownfield sites where nature has been able to, in varying degrees, reclaim itself are also important in terms of wildlife. Indeed, from a biodiversity point of view, they can often be an improvement on intensive agricultural land. Blanket encouragement to develop on brownfield should therefore be tempered with detailed environmental assessments and protection of key sites. Also, we must look into ways to use local policy in improving the cultivated landscape, for instance in the encouragement of hedgerow restoration and favourable terms for retail outlets selling local organic produce. As regards the effects of climate change, these could be very rapid and are particularly hard to predict. Nature is also not an easy entity to proactively adapt, even in a stable climate. Of course some measures, such as the planting of trees more suitable to a warmer climate, are relatively achievable. However, this must be done in conjunction with making every effort to preserve current species of flora and fauna which may include extensive research and cooperation on a national or, even, international level to assist in possible solutions.

O - 10864 - 8018 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -

10902 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - **OBJECT**
Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17)

The BLT consider that the conservation, management and enhancement of the natural and built environment, which is of intrinsic value to the local area and beyond is an important consideration in planning for growth. Ecological, landscape and heritage assessments will have to be carried out during the masterplanning process to ensure that important features are maintained and, where possible, enhanced. Such evidence should also inform policy 17.

It is the intention that such features are integrated into the new urban extension in order to create a sense of place and a quality environment in which to live, work and visit. This allows new and existing communities to benefit from its amenity value and access it as a recreational resource. This will result in more sustainable growth whereby communities have appreciation and respect for the natural landscape as it contributes towards the creating a sense of place. The natural landscape is also

crucial to creating high a quality environment, which in turn attracts people to the area.

In masterplanning a sustainable urban extension to North East Norwich, the BLT will prioritise the creation of a high quality landscape as a setting for the development, which will enhance the landscape character of the north east fringe of the city generally. Areas of landscape/ecological interest will be retained and enhanced as part of the development masterplan, while new landscape features may be created. The BLT also acknowledges the need to create a viable, long-term management regime for elements of the 'green infrastructure'. It is critical that proposals for the green infrastructure are fully tested both from a capital and revenue perspective. This is to make sure that a long-term management regime can be put in place to ensure the continued maintenance and quality of the green infrastructure provided in the growth area.

It will be important in developing a landscape character for the new growth areas to recognise a fundamental shift in the character of the area, from urban fringe towards becoming an integral set of neighbourhoods within the fabric of the city. While the preservation and enhancement of natural features will be essential in establishing a high quality environment, such features must respond to a changing role in landscape, environmental, recreation and leisure conditions within the geography of the city.

O - 10902 - 8366 - Policy 17 Environmental assets (Q25), (Q25) Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? (Policy 17) -

Response – Q26

Communities and Culture

Policy 18 (page 55) applies across the whole Joint Core Strategy area and includes health, education, culture and leisure.

Q26 Communities and Culture

Policy 18 (page 55) applies across the whole Joint Core Strategy area and includes health, education, culture and leisure.

Q26 Do you agree with the proposals set out in this policy? YES / NO

If no, please explain why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q26 Total	112	24	75	16	115

8219	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - COMMENT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) I think you will be hard pushed to get the required backing from developers and government in the present circumstances.</p> <p>C - 8219 - 7901 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8345	<p>Age Concern Norwich (Phil Wells) [7957] - COMMENT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Community cohesion is only discussed in the context of new arrivals to the area. Cohesion between generations is essential and currently declining and effort needs to be made here too. Equally community functioning is as depending on facilities such as pubs, shops and community buildings as on GPs, schools and libraries. These have been harder to access in residential areas over the years and present additional problems for older people.</p> <p>C - 8345 - 7957 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8433	<p>Norfolk County Football Association Ltd (Mr Gavin Lemmon) [7771] - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Leisure facilities both new and current need to be strategically developed ensuring the sporting governing bodies are consulted from the outset.</p>

	C - 8433 - 7771 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -
8861	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) I think I have answered this question already</p> <p>C - 8861 - 8060 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8925	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Again these aspirations are fine but high levels of growth will produce the opposite effects to those desired. Please do not equate "well designed safe and accessible spaces" with the provision of lighting. Norfolk is gorgeously dark in places and its dark night skies and landscapes are a very special feature of the landscape, they deserve more protection</p> <p>C - 8925 - 2014 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9072	<p>Wymondham Heritage Society (Ms Irene Woodward) [1003] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) WHS welcomes the reduction in overall housing numbers for Wymondham and the undertaking to preserve the breaks between the town and neighbouring settlements. The document does seem to be silent on the question of how the necessary infrastructure improvements for Wymondham will be achieved; this is a matter of concern to us. However, the statement on page 67 "expansion of the town centre of a quality that will retain and enhance the distinctive character of the historic centre" seems to be an introduction out of nowhere. We cannot see how any expansion of the town centre could be achieved because of its enclosed nature. It may also be said to conflict with Policy 17, Environmental Assets.</p> <p>C - 9072 - 1003 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9281	<p>Mrs Gray [5927] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Footpaths to town centres please! Plonking down large areas of housing on the edge of town with no footpaths (and I don't mean pavements - actual footpaths) means the people use their cars to go out of town</p> <p>C - 9281 - 5927 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9412	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>The theoretical is no good, it is fact and now with maximum numbers of houses per acre, less space for gardens and very little green space, there is not enough allotments for people now, allotments provide exercise, healthy produce therefore healthier life styles, every garden used to have its veggie plot, developers are only interested in profit. Council houses used to provide first step on housing ladder</p> <p>C - 9412 - 8120 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9651	<p>Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Proposed Policy 18 dealing with Communities and Culture is again principally aspirational with no substance. There is no indication that the proposed strategy is capable of being delivered by whom, or when.</p> <p>C - 9651 - 7503 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9664	<p>Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Page 55 Policy 18 Communities Culture</p> <p>How are all the infrastructure requirements for Long Stratton going to be funded - look carefully at this - if developers fund bypass and infrastructure costs how are they going to be able to fund for these unless the cost of houses goes up out of reach.</p> <p>C - 9664 - 8165 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>

<p>9784</p>	<p>Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) The Parish Council agrees with the proposals in this policy. However, there are conflicts with other policies in the consultation.</p> <p>C - 9784 - 1974 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>9974</p>	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) No comment</p> <p>C - 9974 - 6903 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>10162</p>	<p>Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [7674]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Similarly for contributions for communities and culture, the viability of developments is critical and again the necessary flexibility should be built into these policies to enable negotiation and revision dependent on the market conditions at that time.</p> <p>C - 10162 - 8244 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>10257</p>	<p>South Norfolk Rural Deans consultation group (The Venerable Archdeacon David Hayden) [2801] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Thank you for the copy of the document about the planning strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. Broadland and South Norfolk fall within my archdeaconry and I am concerned, unless I have missed it, that there is no mention under 'quality of life' about the role of our many churches. We have an amazing heritage in Norfolk of more historic churches per person per acre than anywhere in the world. We also have many Christians giving freely of their time and energy to support the different age groups. I am already meeting with the leaders of the Methodist church to work together on making sure that there is</p>

	<p>adequate provision for Christian worship and service in the proposed eco town at Rackheath. We all need to work together to make sure that the quality of life, culture and heritage is adequately provided for in these major changes that are being proposed in Norfolk.</p> <p>Many thanks for all you do.</p> <p>C - 10257 - 2801 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>10280</p>	<p>Diocese of Norwich (Bishop James Langstaff (Bishop of Lynn)) [8266] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Despite the inclusion of pictures of church buildings in the strategy brochure, churches then receive hardly a mention - indeed I couldn't find one at all, but forgive me if I have missed one.</p> <p>Our churches are, however, much more than buildings and are often at the heart of community provision, both providing and hosting many different activities for the benefit of the wider community. Examples would include youth work, care of the elderly and vulnerable, toddler groups, IT access, post offices, bereavement care, holiday clubs and much more. These are of course in addition to the key functions of providing place and space for worship, prayer, rites of passage and pastoral care for the whole community. I was, therefore, disappointed not to find churches (and wider faith groups) mentioned in, for example, paragraph 7.17 as well as elsewhere in the consultation document. We would assert that our communities would be the poorer without the presence of their churches. It may be that people do not mention the church when asked about what they want as community facilities - I rather suspect that that is because they simply assume that the church is there.</p> <p>C - 10280 - 8266 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>10307</p>	<p>mrs LISA ford [8282] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 07/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Purpose built open spaces are often overrun with dog walkers who use the area as a dog's toilet. I do not see why I should have to travel to a designated open space when I already have plenty of open space surrounding my village - until it is developed! Hethersett already has the facilities listed for the communities and culture.</p> <p>C - 10307 - 8282 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>

<p>10331</p>	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT Paper - 27/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) It is noted that the planning system can only have a limited influence in meeting many of the 'softer' aspirations expressed here.</p> <p>C - 10331 - 6826 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>10391</p>	<p>GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT Paper - 01/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Policy 18 Communities and culture: 25. Whilst welcoming the recognition given to community and health infrastructure we would encourage you to develop more spatially specific proposals for inclusion in the submission draft DPD, and to inform the implementation framework.</p> <p>C - 10391 - 7463 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>10550</p>	<p>Mr Adrian Vernon [8312] - COMMENT Web - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) fine words but won't happen as there are too may separate agencies involved</p> <p>C - 10550 - 8312 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>10643</p>	<p>Norwich Cohousing Group (Ms Lucy Hall) [8333] - COMMENT Web - 11/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Cohousing schemes promote well-being through knowing one's immediate neighbours and having opportunities to stop and chat. They are particularly beneficial for the needs of young and old people, those with physical and mental disabilities or those with mental health issues, because they provide a safe and supportive community.</p> <p>Cohousing encourages healthier lifestyles through shared cooking, gardening, walking and physical activities.</p>

There is a greater sense of safety because neighbours know one another and can look out for each other.

Leisure opportunities are improved through, for example, having shared play areas for children and space for cultural celebrations.

C - 10643 - 8333 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -

10922 Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

Policy 13 - Reducing Environmental Impact, sufficiently addresses climate change and promotes sustainability in all development. The policy is in line with central government guidance and all new housing has to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes targets.

Whilst there is no argument that sustainable neighbourhoods are a key element of the vision, there is some concern with the enforcement of such high standards, particularly those set out in the Codes for sustainable Homes, will result in increased costs and reduced profit margins. Evidence from Knight Frank (2008) suggests that a house built to Code Level 6 at 2007 construction prices will cost in the region of £30,000 to £35,000 extra to construct. Whilst we do not suggest these levels are pushed down, it is clear that once a developer takes into consideration other contributions and possibly a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), a development could be unviable to build. This in turn causes a decrease in house building and housing targets will not be met. The GNDP must take this into consideration when appraising new developments, and in some cases where viability is an issue, other contributions may be reduced. We recommend the GNDP commission viability studies to test the level of benefits that can be expected to be viable in the current climate.

70 Policy 14 - Housing Delivery, states that an absolute net additional 36,000 new homes are to be built and completed between 2006 and 2026 within the NPA. This

figure stems from the RSS for the East of England. Proposals for housing will be expected to contribute to the mix of housing required to meet the needs of the area. This is of course dependent on up-to-date and accurate Housing Market Assessments. We have commented separately on JCS Housing Market Assessments and we hope our comments have been taken on board.

71 In negotiating the proportion and tenure of affordable housing, account must be made of site characteristics, market conditions and the overall viability of the scheme. For this reason the provision of affordable housing must be determined on a site by site basis rather than by a predetermined set policy figure. Again, viability assessments need to be prepared to support the targets for affordable housing.

72 Policy 15 - The Economy, states that the local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to facilitate the proposed RSS job growth. ALP are in agreement that achieving the full economic potential of the area is dependent on improved connectivity and implementation of wider sustainable transport proposals.

73 Policy 16 - Strategic Access and Transportation, states that an enhanced transport system will be provided to promote sustainable economic transport and reduce the contribution to climate change, promote healthy travel choices and minimise the need to use the private car. It is this aspect where Wymondham provides a significant advance over other growth locations limited by lack of strategic roads.

74 ALP wholly support this strategy and feel Wymondham as a location can promote car reduced travel more than any other location. Proximity to existing and proposed transport nodes such as the railway station and high speed bus routes into Norwich will ensure that car reliance is decreased. Sustainable urban design of residential areas will also contribute this. This strategy does, however, cast doubt on the level of sustainability achievable in respect of development in Long Stratton and in North East Norwich.

75 Improvements to the A11 and A47 are fully supported, although further details of work should be made public and contained within this document. At present it is felt the level of information in Policy 16 does not allow for a detailed response. ALP have consulted with CABE on their masterplan proposals in South Wymondham and subsequently they are extremely conscious that any large scale development proposal should not rely on car based movements. Instead, Masterplans should be designed around quality public transport solutions and all new housing must be within a 5 minute walking distance of public transport nodes.

76 Policy 17 - Environmental Assets, states that the environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained and enhanced and the benefits for residents and visitors improved. Development proposal should avoid harming areas of environmental importance. With 21,000 new houses to be found on mainly Greenfield sites, it is clearly going to need responsible planning to ensure existing environmental assets are not harmed. For this reason any growth option within the Favoured Option should demonstrate that development would not harm the environment as a whole, including ecology and landscape.

77 ALP support this view and have demonstrated through their analysis of South Wymondham that the proposed development site together with their site in North East Wymondham would not jeopardise ecology and landscape.

78 Policy 18 - Communities and Culture, states that in order to deliver thriving communities, tackle social deprivation and meet the diverse needs across the JCS, a spatial planning approach will be required to ensure infrastructure requirements are addressed in a holistic way. ALP support social inclusion and believe they can demonstrate that proposals in Wymondham will be built to meet the needs of the whole community. Increased levels of affordable housing and community facilities will ensure that this represents a development for all.

C - 10922 - 8367 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -

11030 Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] - COMMENT

Paper - 15/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

Similarly for contributions for communities and culture, the viability of developments is critical and again the necessary flexibility should be built into these policies to enable negotiation and revision dependant on the market conditions at that time.

C - 11030 - 7175 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -

11033 Mr Bernard Godding [8372] - COMMENT

Paper - 14/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

There are currently too few non-commercial locations for groups to meet - thus the needs of teenagers for club & society

	<p>venues seems to be an increasing issue. There appears to be competition for available space in some communities, where early years childcare is in contention with groups of older people.</p> <p>C - 11033 - 8372 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
11108	<p>Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd [8300] (represented by Barton Willmore (The Manager) [8389]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Policy 18 - Communities and Culture, states that in order to deliver thriving communities, tackle social deprivation and meet the diverse needs across the JCS, a spatial planning approach will be required to ensure infrastructure requirements are addressed in a holistic way. PJH support social inclusion and believe they can demonstrate that proposals in Loddon will be built to meet the needs of the whole community. Increased levels of affordable housing and community facilities will ensure that this represents a development for all.</p> <p>C - 11108 - 8300 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
7899	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>S - 7899 - 7787 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
7903	<p>Mr. Rod Tuck [7787] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 05/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>It is essential the villages are not cut off to health centres better education and culture therefore it is essential to have a good transportation system, better roads are the key for better bus services rail services and mobility of labour in cars.</p> <p>S - 7903 - 7787 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>

7938	<p>Mr Paul Newson [7812] - SUPPORT Web - 08/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) m</p> <p>S - 7938 - 7812 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
7977	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - SUPPORT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) additional infrastructure needs to be of a very high quality</p> <p>S - 7977 - 6862 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8015	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT Web - 16/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) You need to give serious thought to this issue as all of the facilities, particularly in rural villages, are over stretched, when developers pay money under s.106 agreements to build it is not enough to compensate for the added burden and people (landowners developers etc) are getting rich out of house building without enough money being taken from them to compensate the developed area for the burden they create.</p> <p>S - 8015 - 7851 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8097	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - SUPPORT Web - 26/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) These seem to be sensible objectives</p> <p>S - 8097 - 7880 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8134	<p>Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Web - 29/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8134 - 7888 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8170	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Preserve and develop our culture and pander less to newcomers.</p> <p>S - 8170 - 7899 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8195	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Education facilities should be kept local. This would enable children to cycle / walk to school.</p> <p>At present approximately 15 - 20 vehicles (many 4 X 4) travel past this address to Bressingham school, 4 times per day. (Driver + 1 child)</p> <p>S - 8195 - 4796 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8244	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8244 - 4558 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8284	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the</p>

	<p>proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 8284 - 7912 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8309	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Proposals should be included to police and prosecute littering offenders and powers given to Environmental Teams to issue fixed penalty notices to "Take Away2 establishments whose packaging is found to be littering the environment.</p> <p>S - 8309 - 7915 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8373	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p> <p>S - 8373 - 6992 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8374	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - SUPPORT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) yes</p> <p>S - 8374 - 6992 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8483	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p>

	S - 8483 - 8016 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -
8507	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 8507 - 8020 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8533	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 8533 - 7817 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8557	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 8557 - 8021 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8582	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 8582 - 1976 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8637	University of East Anglia (Mr Joseph Saunders) [8029] - SUPPORT

	<p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Full</p> <p>S - 8637 - 8029 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8670	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>S - 8670 - 8036 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8695	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>S - 8695 - 8044 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8748	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8748 - 8053 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8801	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>I have explained where I have doubts, don't understand or disagree</p> <p>S - 8801 - 8061 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>

8821	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - SUPPORT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) So long as councils do engage with existing communities about any developments proposed.</p> <p>S - 8821 - 8045 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8826	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 8826 - 6869 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8854	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 8854 - 8064 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8990	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes. Health in the communities is the main objective and will reflect on all the aspirations covered in the policy 18.</p> <p>S - 8990 - 8092 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9053	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9053 - 4187 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9131	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9131 - 7111 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9137	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9137 - 8111 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9181	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>I partly agree but I think that CCTV should be in use on all public building i.e. community centres to stop crime and anti-social behaviour</p> <p>S - 9181 - 8112 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9250	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9250 - 1828 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>

<p>9314</p>	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) If all these targets can be in place BEFORE any large scale development takes place, any chance of another hospital? in addition to NNUH</p> <p>S - 9314 - 5445 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>9318</p>	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) There is a growing population of dependent elderly in Norwich & Norfolk. Would like to see more funding for the care services both in institutions and private homes. Much more funding and encouragement for the arts. Purpose built accommodation where necessary - look at the success of the Sainsbury centre and the forum. Many wonderful ancient buildings in Norwich are still empty & allowed to fall into disrepair or not realising their full potential.</p> <p>S - 9318 - 8117 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>9337</p>	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 9337 - 8123 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>9372</p>	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p>

	S - 9372 - 7113 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -
9441	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9441 - 8127 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9468	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 02/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>S - 9468 - 8134 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9500	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9500 - 8139 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9533	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Again these are required regardless of growth</p> <p>S - 9533 - 8140 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9540	<p>Noble Foods Ltd [8149] (represented by Steve Abbott Associates (Mr Richard Percy) [8144]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) On behalf of Noble foods Ltd</p> <p>Yes. However, the policy should also seek to identify and make good any shortfalls of community facilities</p> <p>S - 9540 - 8149 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>9591</p>	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Developers are only interested in making the maximum profit insofar as planning permission allows them. With all the good intentions as stated in Policy No. 18 there is a design weakness in the past of new developments which should not be allowed in the future.</p> <p>Example A</p> <p>The present Rackheath estate which has been developed and extended on the crossroads Green Lane West / Salhouse Road and the proposed development on the other side of the crossroads and across the route of the NNDR, which I do not agree with anyway. It would be better to have no further development in this area than what is built at present. In order to provide a village as proposed (which I do not think is required due to limit of housing), it should be planned in the area to the coal yard and station cottages. The centre of the village should contain the school, medical and community centres and small individual shops, also open parkland space. The housing should surround the centre in an oblong shape bounded by green belt land and farms. It is not possible for me to describe this in detail without a plan for which there is no time or space to produce at this stage.</p> <p>Example B - We do not require another home farm example as at Sprowston what must be the ugliest supermarkets surrounded by car parks at the centre of a yet-to-be-completed developed estate. A far better plan of this could have been compiled but has been blighted by the supermarket being there in the first place.</p> <p>Example C - Dussindale. We do not require a development of this type - a mass of maze-like roads with roundabouts. I have heard this area being called "Dustbin Vale".</p> <p>S - 9591 - 8146 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>9615</p>	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the</p>

	<p>proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 9615 - 8162 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9634	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 9634 - 7986 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9689	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 9689 - 8047 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9740	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 9740 - 8174 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9809	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 9809 - 7513 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>

<p>9841</p>	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - SUPPORT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Development opportunities which can come forward now and fit easily into existing communities whose health, crime, education, culture, leisure and community cohesion benchmarks are already established, should be encouraged. The key issues over the next 5 years will be employment opportunities - a lack of jobs will have a corrosive effect on communities.</p> <p>S - 9841 - 8198 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>9857</p>	<p>Mr Paul Johnson [8207] - SUPPORT Web - 25/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Any increase in populations/ additions to communities must be carried out with understanding as to current nature of that community. Perhaps a questionnaire of current residents may assist in this.</p> <p>S - 9857 - 8207 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>9892</p>	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT Paper - 21/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 9892 - 2058 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>9946</p>	<p>John Heaser [7015] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) Yes</p> <p>S - 9946 - 7015 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>10008</p>	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10008 - 8228 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10042	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10042 - 8230 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10141	<p>Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234] (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>We broadly support this policy and consider that social infrastructure requirements should be identified through the master planning process promoted by Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd. Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd aims to work closely with the team responsible for facilitating the Rackheath Eco-Community development with regard to the social and physical infrastructure required to ensure the development of sustainable communities in North East Norwich.</p> <p>We consider that there is an error under the heading 'crime' and the sentence stating 'underlying factors that can lead to crime and anti-social behaviour tackle' should be deleted.</p> <p>S - 10141 - 8234 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10193	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 10193 - 8246 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -
10230	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10230 - 5864 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10261	<p>The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>We support Policy 18 Communities and culture as it provides for existing leisure facilities to be protected and enhanced. The protection of theatres is essential if future generations are to have the opportunity to experience the joys of drama, dance, music and opera.</p> <p>S - 10261 - 8263 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10270	<p>Sport England (East Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Policy 18 (Question 26)</p> <p>Yes - Sport England supports this policy to protect and enhance cultural/leisure facilities within the policy area.</p> <p>S - 10270 - 2986 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10355	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 10355 - 8293 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -
10378	<p>Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10378 - 2020 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10446	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 28/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10446 - 8308 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10525	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10525 - 7215 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10629	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 10/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>S - 10629 - 8325 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10639	<p>Mr Alan Ives [8299] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Web - 11/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Most of this is motherhood and apple pie, and will be impossible to deliver in our country with the existing culture. At least start by saying MORE about responsibility of all citizens and sanctions for ASB & criminal behaviour.</p> <p>S - 10639 - 8299 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10679	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10679 - 8348 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10749	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10749 - 1776 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10782	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10782 - 7666 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10840	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p>

	<p>The Landowners broadly support this policy acknowledge the need for new infrastructure to support the growth of the city and surrounding areas, which relates to the need for new social infrastructure.</p> <p>The delivery of such infrastructure requires the coordination of a range of public sector organisations and the private sector.</p> <p>S - 10840 - 8362 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>10865</p>	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>NOTES: We think it is important that the needs of children and, perhaps more particularly, teenagers are prioritised in the provision of community based sporting and cultural facilities - obvious reasons being that they are the least able to provide for themselves or to travel out of the area and that the provision of such facilities tends to have the benign effect of reducing anti social behaviour.</p> <p>We think there is sense in decentralisation of funding for the arts. Arts provision and its attendant financing tends to be concentrated in the city centre. While there are obvious reasons for this, there is a real accessibility issue for the young in outlying areas of the city which could be replicated in any new developments. It contributes to a widespread perception of the arts as irrelevant or elitist. To counter this, what of diverting some existing funding, or seeking new funding streams to provide such facilities as small scale sound proofed venues or subsidised shared studio space for the visual arts.</p> <p>The city council generally has a policy of funding events (either free or low cost to participants) as opposed to large leisure centres, which I think has proved very successful in improving the culture of the city and engaging many people who may otherwise have been relatively excluded and we would like to see this applied over the Greater Norwich area.</p> <p>There may also be lessons to learn (for instance, from the closure of Lakenham Sports and Leisure Centre), in terms of a constructive and mutually supportive relationship between the public and private sectors. It has to be recognised that much community based sporting activity, for instance, is often going to be a loss making enterprise, and that a certain amount of practical or financial assistance from the public sector is an essential part of the funding mix. Again, adequate infrastructure funding is of primary importance here as it would be to 'bridge the gap' in making community based facilities viable while settlements are early in their stages of growth.</p> <p>S - 10865 - 8018 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
<p>10903</p>	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the</p>

proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)

The BLT broadly support this policy acknowledge the need for new infrastructure to support the growth of the city, which relates to the need for new social infrastructure. The delivery of such infrastructure requires the coordination of a range of public sector organisations and the private sector. As part of the EbD for the master planning of the North East sector, we anticipate the full range of public and private agencies concerned with the supply of social infrastructure to be involved in the process. It is expected that the result of this exercise will be a detailed infrastructure requirement strategy.

The BLT supports the need to promote the integration and cohesion within and between existing communities in major growth locations. To this end, the BLT has initiated an EbD process, championed by the PFBE. The purpose of the EbD process is the creation of a masterplan as the culmination of a collaborative approach with relevant stakeholders and the range of professional disciplines. Through a series of workshops, representatives of existing communities and other stakeholders are not only consulted on development proposals but are proactively engaged in the creation of the vision for the place as well as planning for the development itself. This ensures that existing communities and stakeholders can communicate their concerns and specific requirements as well as being able to articulate how they envisage that they will integrate with the new communities. In addition it is anticipated that the following principles be incorporated within the design for the new urban extension:

- * Ensuring that existing and new communities are linked by a network of permeable walking and cycling routes to encourage social interaction;
- * Locating services and facilities in appropriate locations so that they are easily accessible by both existing and new communities and become a focus for social activity and interaction;
- * Providing places and buildings where people can meet and interact, which are to be appropriately distributed through a walkable land use plan;
- * Designing development to respect and enhance local context and character;
- * Through design, creating a sense of place to ensure that both new and existing communities are able to connect and have a strong identity with the place in which they live.

	S - 10903 - 8366 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -
10945	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10945 - 8368 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10969	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10969 - 8369 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10993	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10993 - 8176 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
11016	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 11016 - 8370 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8860	<p>Mr Peter Lanyon [8060] - OBJECT</p>

	<p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>By suburbanising villages and rural areas, you will be subjecting them inevitably to crime, anonymity and ennui, exactly the opposite of what you pretend.</p> <p>O - 8860 - 8060 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8936	<p>Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust (Mr Lewis Dunham) [8083] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>The Policy is not sufficiently explicit as there is no reference to Places of Public Religious Worship.</p> <p>We are concerned to ensure that our earlier responses to the JCS Issues & Options Consultation are taken into account. Definite provision should be made for faith groups to operate in locations where a need is established.</p> <p>O - 8936 - 8083 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
8954	<p>Mrs Hazel Davidson [8088] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>While these proposals are all very well they omit the need to provide jobs close at hand for the people who will live in these places, to avoid the need for commuting.</p> <p>O - 8954 - 8088 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9206	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Health - no mention of access to complimentary alternative healthcare - promotion of healthier lifestyles required a serious change in travel behaviour more than this strategy messages. - Some - designs should not work against e.g. foot or cycle - no cul-de-sacs is without cut through for walkers or cyclists

	<p>- Culture - remember that most cultural diversity is small scale and does not sit well with big projects and red tape</p> <p>- Leisure - access to green space needs enhancement; night clubs we have too many of</p> <p>- Cohesion - I'll believe this when I see it - little evidence of this approach so far!</p> <p>O - 9206 - 8114 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9211	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>There is only a reference to encouraging cycling and walking. In order to achieve this, a comprehensive dedicated cycle network needs to be established particularly in the Norwich area if we are serious about climate change and reducing CO2 emissions</p> <p>O - 9211 - 2055 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9257	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>No</p> <p>O - 9257 - 4494 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9415	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>With so many new houses in the triangle integration between new & existing will be difficult. There is a lot of emphasis on walking & cycling but each should have its own path. It is also dangerous to have cars parked over cycle paths especially on narrow roads.</p> <p>O - 9415 - 8124 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9582	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>We cannot see how this policy can be achieved please enlighten us</p> <p>O - 9582 - 6690 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
9714	<p>Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Good aspirations, but is funding available to deliver them given the likelihood that there will be less money available in the planned period. The current Norwich University Hospital has insufficient beds to cope now. There is no mention of any plans to expand this or provide cottage hospitals to cope with the further 32000 houses giving at least 70-100,000 more people to cater for.</p> <p>O - 9714 - 5446 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10118	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Another reason for development within Norwich on brownfield sites and at a new town in Long Stratton - to do the current option would be hugely expensive. Concentrating the development in 2 areas means less investment</p> <p>O - 10118 - 8239 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10417	<p>Honeyview Investments Limited [8298] (represented by Emery Planning Partnership (Mr Rawdon Gascoigne) [8297]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Number Ten, Barnards Road, Norwich:</p> <p>The site is situated on the Bowthorpe Industrial Estate on the western side of Norwich. The northern part of the site adjoins the A1074 but access is obtained from Barnard Road, the access road serving the adjacent industrial estate. The site is adjacent to The Quality Hotel to the east and employment uses including light industrial, commercial and manufacturing premises to the</p>

west and on the opposite side of Barnard Road. A public house is also located to the east.

Bowthorpe Centre is approximately 800m to 900m walking distance to the south of the site and accommodates a range of retail and service type facilities including police station, health centre, building society, Roy's stores (food, clothing and home goods), coffee shop/cafe, takeaway, public house, newsagent/post office, Boots, electrical shop, hairdressers, letting agents, Blockbuster Videos, bakery, charity shop and bookmaker.

The current use of the site is a bowling alley comprising 30 lanes together with ancillary bars, restaurant, conference facilities and function room. The initial planning consent was granted for the development in February 1992 (Ref: 4910701). There are no conditions restricting the use of the building solely to a bowling alley. There would therefore be potential for altering the site to any other use falling within Class D2 of the use classes order provided that this did not involve material changes to the physical appearance of the building. This would include a number of leisure uses.

The site is allocated within the prime employment area of Bowthorpe within the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (November 2004). The adjacent hotel is not, however, covered by the employment allocation. The planning permission for the bowling alley was granted when the site remained allocated for employment purposes. This lawful change in the use of the site does not appear to have been considered when the Local Plan was reviewed.

The site is unsuitable for B2 use. It is of utmost relevance that the owner has no intention to ever develop the site for any other employment purposes, such as B1 or B8, and our own investigations into the market requirements for this site have indicated that the use of the site for employment purposes is not likely.

The adjacent hotel is not covered by the employment allocation, and the site is currently in a leisure use. It is logical that the site is also excluded from the employment allocation zone. We propose that the site should be allocated for leisure use, including its potential use for a hotel, in the Core Strategy and Local Development Framework.

Conclusions:

Norwich relies upon its leisure and tourism facilities to deliver growth in the City, and these industries should be central in developing a spatial strategy for the Joint Core Strategy. The spatial planning objectives should be expanded upon to further emphasise the need for additional leisure and tourism provision within Norwich. We consider that Policy 15 does not go far enough in setting a policy framework to protect, enhance and deliver leisure and tourism sites and facilities.

We consider that the evidence base upon which employment policies and land allocations are made is scrutinised closely. The evidence reveals that Greater Norwich has a yearly supply of employment land in excess of the plan period. Therefore the

	<p>protection of employment sites, and the allocation of sites, needs to be reviewed with this in mind.</p> <p>The Draft PPS4 is clear in its emphasis that employment sites should not be retained as such if there is no reasonable prospect of them coming forward for development during the plan period. In terms of the site Number Ten, Barnard Road, Norwich, the owner has no interest whatsoever in the site coming forward for employment use in the short, medium or long term.</p> <p>Considering this together with the fact the site has an existing leisure use (D2), we object to the site being allocated as employment land within the Core Strategy, or any subsequent document within the LDF.</p> <p>O - 10417 - 8298 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10473	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>We do not want to trade our countryside for some silly artificial dream. We want everything left as it is. For years people have put up with low wages for the quality of life. We must think of the environment.</p> <p>O - 10473 - 8309 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10501	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Development and destruction of the countryside will not maintain or enhance our quality of life. It will ruin all our lives because we choose to live here in rural Norfolk, otherwise we would move to London or Birmingham.</p> <p>O - 10501 - 8310 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10574	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>People are individually responsible for all the above and have enough of these facilities, excepting shortage of hospital places, quick access to doctors ad NHS dentist.</p>

	O - 10574 - 8318 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -
10597	<p>Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 08/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.</p> <p>O - 10597 - 8319 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>
10757	<p>Althorpe Gospel Hall Trust [7048] (represented by J and J Design (Mr J R Shephard) [8358]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18)</p> <p>Whilst the Trust supports the inclusion of Places of Worship within the definition of Community Facilities in the glossary in Appendix 7, they are concerned that specific reference should be made to the provision of "Places of Worship" in Policy 18. In support of our concerns we would draw attention to the following references:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PPS1 paragraphs 4, 5, 7, 14, 16, & 42 - 'Diversity & Equality in Planning' (ODPM: January 2005): Box 5, Key 10, and page 158 - East of England Plan 2008 paragraph 6.1 and Policy C1 - Faith and Community: a good practice guide for local authorities LGA: 2006 - Face to Face and Side by Side: DCLG: 2008 <p>Recent research in the Cambridge sub-region has highlighted the need for Places of Worship. (http://www.cambridgeshirehorizons.co.uk/documents/publications/research/faith_facilities_study.pdf)</p> <p>The policy should acknowledge that truly Sustainable Communities require a wide range of facilities including Places of Worship and other Meeting Places to meet existing deficiencies as well as new growth requirements.</p> <p>O - 10757 - 7048 - Policy 18 Communities and culture (Q26), (Q26) Do you agree with the proposals in this policy? (Policy 18) -</p>

Response – Q27

Implementation and monitoring

Policy 19 (page 57) sets out the main infrastructure that will be needed to support the overall strategy. It addresses funding and delivery and describes how the strategy will be monitored.

Q27 Implementation and Monitoring

Policy 19 (page 57) sets out the main infrastructure that will be needed to support the overall strategy. It addresses funding and delivery and describes how the strategy will be monitored.

Q27 Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? YES / NO

If no, please tell us why.

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q27 Total	106	28	55	25	108

7883

Mr Paul Mallett [7783] - COMMENT

Web - 05/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

NNUH, hospital, needs to be expanded to take into account all these extra residents, what provision has been made for that. The existing site needs to be expanded by as much as 33% or a new much larger one built to replace it.

C - 7883 - 7783 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

7921

Mrs Alexi Balmuth [6885] - COMMENT

Web - 06/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

This section a bit too long to read. My concern is with follow-through. Many new estates are dull, cookie-cutter style, and offer no real incentive to live there despite convenience to travel for work. This hopefully is what your text sets out to avoid.

C - 7921 - 6885 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

8135

Mr Charles Thomas [7888] - COMMENT

Web - 29/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

This section indicates that the level of proposed development is not sustainable without increased cost to the community.

Getting developers to pay is not a free lunch the cost will ultimately be borne by the community.

	C - 8135 - 7888 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -
8396	<p>Mr Ben Du Brow [7012] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? The proposed funding arrangements will almost certainly not be deliverable in the current financial climate.</p> <p>C - 8396 - 7012 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8671	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - COMMENT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Basically yes but the Development Partnership must retain control and not be compromised by commercial developers offering inducements to acquire additional sites or increased housing density.</p> <p>C - 8671 - 8036 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8926	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Linking infrastructure funding to new build provision ie the developer pays is a favoured principle. Affordable housing needs to be provided to meet local needs and not as a response to inward migration. The infrastructure attendant upon this is huge levels of development will itself further urbanise the area. Since we do not support the growth we do not support the related infrastructure</p> <p>C - 8926 - 2014 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9084	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? With the care of roads, storm drains and main sewers (getting blocked by fallen leaves) at present not "working". It is more</p>

	<p>important to see the proper care of these before thinking of creating new ones! Strom drains and main sewers and their ongoing overseeing regarding blockages - especially with more building proposed and much more flash flooding predicted generally in the country</p> <p>C - 9084 - 8109 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9316	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Is the Campaign for Rural England to be involved?</p> <p>C - 9316 - 5445 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9319	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Like the suggested pedestrian & cycle links. More interesting and healthful walkways could be created along the catton to Spixworth path & cycleway.</p> <p>C - 9319 - 8117 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9413	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? There will need to be very stringent methods and overseeing that the very latest (even experimental) controls that must be adhered to, to come even close to best results. Not the notch potch way various things can be done now with the relaxation of planning controls. For faster conclusions, speed is not essential but getting it right and attractive with everything in place is</p> <p>C - 9413 - 8120 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9469	<p>Mr Barry Dowe [8134] - COMMENT Web - 02/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our</p>

approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?
So long as compulsory purchase means the removal to a similar location then that would be acceptable.

C - 9469 - 8134 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

9652 Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

It is unrealistic to expect any one developer to guarantee a development in full. Such a policy needs to have sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances. To expect guarantees to the implementation of a whole scheme is an unrealistic expectation especially when development of large schemes are more often phased and may be implemented by more than one developer.

The reasoned justification to proposed Policy 19 acknowledges that the costs of the infrastructure identified in the Growth Infrastructure Study relating to the two proposed development scenarios in the NPA is likely to exceed probable revenue from a community Infrastructure levy and it therefore remains to be seen whether these two options are viable. No cheaper alternatives appear to have been evaluated.

We consider that Proposed Policy 19 has not been thought through; there is no guarantee of delivery and no contingencies have been identified in the event of failure to deliver or achieve the stated aims. There is no indication of what is required and the proposed policy is principally aspirational.

With regard to Table 2, it is unclear whether the proposed growth locations deliver the items listed in terms of critical mass.

C - 9652 - 7503 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

9665 Ms E Riches [8165] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Page 57 Policy 19 Implementation and Monitoring

Taking all into account - has the Government guaranteed funding - innovative approaches to capital investment ..How can this be achieved? Especially so in the present economic climate - things are likely to get worse!!

In the case of community and social development - reduced contribution? If this happens the communities will be less able to have the requirements - more funding will be required not less!!

Page 58 First paragraph - sentence "The developers of major strategic growth locations ..

How can they be expected to support - the cost of houses to go up even more if so!!

	<p>Page 62 Table 1 How can all this be achieved with new house costs being such tat they are affordable or at a price that will mean they are likely to be sold?</p> <p>C - 9665 - 8165 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9785	<p>Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council (Mrs C Jowett) [1974] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Whilst the cost of the infrastructure necessary to deliver the Joint Core Strategy would seem to be enormous, there are no real costings available and therefore it is not clear if the funds will be available to deliver these developments and the potential cost to Council Tax payers is of great concern to this Parish Council. It is also felt that the success of these plans depends largely on the development of the major road network, including the provision of the Northern Distributor Road.</p> <p>C - 9785 - 1974 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9975	<p>Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>C - 9975 - 6903 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9986	<p>GF Cole and Son [8226] (represented by ASquared Architects (Mrs Jayne Taylor) [7042]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Partial Objection: see below</p> <p>We note with some concern the commitment to a Community Infrastructure Levy, yet to be fully supported by government, and involving contributions to an extensive range of facilities and services. The raising of finances to support development which is necessary to meet the needs of the population for housing and economic activity requires significant debate, and must be applied in a reasonable and fair manner, assuming that the principle itself becomes supported by government. At certain times</p>

	<p>and in certain locations it can also act as a deterrent to development.</p> <p>We would suggest that until the principle is approved and clear government guidance given on the content and application of such a Levy, the Core Strategy Document should simply refer broadly to the intention of the three Councils to investigate the application of such a Levy and its content, once it has support of Government. A subsequent policy document could be provided either as part of the individual LDFs of the Partner districts, or as a further Joint document for the GNP area, once the future of the community levy principle is resolved nationally. This would allow further debate specifically on the nature of the Levy, and the need for it to be applied in the individual districts.</p> <p>C - 9986 - 8226 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10163	<p>Mr Martin Green and Norwich Consolidated Charities [8244] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [7674]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>As above, with regard to the provision of infrastructure and potential introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), the viability of developments is critical and therefore sufficient flexibility should be built into these policies to ensure they can be negotiated and revised to reflect the market position at that time and therefore not preclude otherwise viable developments.</p> <p>C - 10163 - 8244 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10283	<p>Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrold) [8267] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to plan infrastructure at the same time as the designation of areas for development within Local Development Frameworks and other strategic plans that impact on transport and infrastructure. This needs to be resolved in advance of new development, with a clear plan for delivery that is costed, transparent and deliverable and which is not going to result in development proceeding without the ability to deal with its consequences <p>C - 10283 - 8267 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10308	<p>mrs LISA ford [8282] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 07/06/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>The recently built poppyfields estate in Hethersett is an eyesore and not a village development what so ever - it includes three story blocks of flats which would be better suited on Norwich Riverside. The social housing on the estate is obvious and lets the estate down even further.</p> <p>The council should ensure that new housing is of an appearance suitable to the surrounding environment and of a high quality.</p> <p>C - 10308 - 8282 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>10392</p>	<p>GO East (Ms Mary Marston) [7463] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 01/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring:</p> <p>26. We welcome recognition of the need for a delivery and monitoring framework setting out how, when and by whom the Core Strategy's vision, objectives, spatial strategy and policies will be delivered. The consultation document indicates that further work is currently underway to identify key infrastructure requirements, and to inform your implementation framework. This should identify specific utilities, transport, social and community infrastructure requirements, and clarify the timing and 'criticality' of schemes to the delivery of the strategy, together with the anticipated funding availability.</p> <p>C - 10392 - 7463 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>10474</p>	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 03/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>We do not want the NDR. We do not want an eco-town. We do not want any large scale developments.</p> <p>C - 10474 - 8309 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>10551</p>	<p>MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Having just moved from Norwich City Council area I have seen how badly the existing infrastructure is maintained I am</p>

	<p>concerned how a bigger area will be looked after long term</p> <p>C - 10551 - 8312 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10710	<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Area Office) (Miss Jessica Bowden) [8352] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 15/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>We note bullet point 2 which states that infrastructure will be provided through "coordination with the investment programs of other public bodies and utility providers." This is particularly important with regard to water infrastructure. Early consideration is required to give the water company time to program the infrastructure into its investment cycles. Your WSC should help do this.</p> <p>C - 10710 - 8352 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10726	<p>Ms S Layton [8354] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 26/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>I am concerned about the quality of many housing developments over the last 10 years. In particular, with regard to the way many of the streets on these estates have been built without pavements, which I regard as crucial to developing a pedestrian-friendly lifestyle (also crucial for the climate and to combat obesity). Therefore I've enclosed photos which I have taken at 4 newbuild sites in Norwich (built within the last 10 years approx.) to illustrate what I am concerned about. The four areas are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fifers Lane 2. Bowthorpe 3. Former N&N 4. Stan Petersen Close, Thorpe Hamlet <p>C - 10726 - 8354 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10923	<p>Allied London Properties [8367] (represented by Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Mr Edward Hanson) [7091]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our</p>

approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?
Generally we do not support this approach and would prefer to continue negotiations on the opportunities and constraints of the scheme and the legal parameters of the Section 106. Implementation of the policies in this plan will depend on the coordinated activities of a number of agencies. Not only is it essential that development timetables outlined in this report are kept to, it is also essential that necessary infrastructure is provided in tandem with new development and at appropriate times in the development process.

80 It is clear that a CIL will be subject to further work and we hope to see evidence of this in the near future including details on the method of calculation needed to consider different forms of development.

81 It is worrying that the Growth Infrastructure Study identified the key infrastructure required to accommodate the two proposed development scenarios is likely to exceed the probable revenue from CIL and current mainstream funding. The GNDP cannot rely on growth point status funding, as up until now, the grants have been well below that requested. In light of this ALP support full stakeholder engagement when reviewing the level of CIL. This will ensure that the CIL achieves an appropriate contribution, but does not threaten the overall viability of PGO's.

82 Funding of infrastructure through development proposals is essential if all of the infrastructure requirements are to be met. However, the level of funding must vary depending on infrastructure requirements of particular areas. For instance, and using the example of the Favoured Option, it is clear that development of 7000 new homes in the Sprowston and Rackheath area will create a population that is likely to use the NNDR far more than the residents of 2200 new houses in Wymondham and 1800 new houses in Long Stratton. The same scenario applies to development of a Bypass around Long Stratton.

C - 10923 - 8367 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

11031 Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175] - COMMENT

Paper - 15/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

As above, with regard to the provision of infrastructure and potential introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), the

	<p>viability of developments is critical and therefore sufficient flexibility should be built into these policies to ensure they can be negotiated and revised to reflect the market position at that time and therefore not preclude otherwise viable developments.</p> <p>C - 11031 - 7175 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
11038	<p>Norwich Design Quality Panel (The Manager) [8375] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 09/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>There is no clear mechanism to ensure that quality from the macro scale to the micro (masterplanning to design of buildings) is enshrined and implemented in any of the proposals.</p> <p>The argument that aspiration to quality is already a government policy and therefore should not be embedded in this document is contradictory since a good 50% or more of the document is also government policy and on this measure should not be there as well.</p> <p>C - 11038 - 8375 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
11123	<p>The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>We have several reservations about the concepts and details in Policy 19, however we acknowledge that this is effectively work in progress pending a possible implementation of a Community Infrastructure Levy.</p> <p>We expect there will be further consultation as this policy evolved and would request the opportunity to defer comment until then.</p> <p>C - 11123 - 8390 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8016	<p>Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 16/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>But a lot should be funded by the developer and landowner who make money out of the development.</p>

	S - 8016 - 7851 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -
8171	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? We'll see what the politicians can do to screw this up.</p> <p>S - 8171 - 7899 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8196	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - SUPPORT Paper - 02/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 8196 - 4796 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8220	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes, but I think you will struggle to get funding from Government and developers. Really this whole exercise is now dead in the water until you can have any idea of the effect of the current depression.</p> <p>S - 8220 - 7901 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8245	<p>Mrs Joyce Deaning [4558] - SUPPORT Paper - 03/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 8245 - 4558 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>

<p>8285</p>	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - SUPPORT Web - 10/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 8285 - 7912 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>8310</p>	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - SUPPORT Web - 13/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Full</p> <p>S - 8310 - 7915 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>8484</p>	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 8484 - 8016 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>8508</p>	<p>Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 8508 - 8020 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>8558</p>	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - SUPPORT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p>

	<p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8558 - 8021 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8583	<p>Bressingham & Fersfield Parish Council (Mr M Mortimer) [1976] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8583 - 1976 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8641	<p>The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569] (represented by The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>On behalf of Norfolk Environmental Waste Services:</p> <p>NEWS support the inclusion of 'waste management/recycling/composting facilities (with maintenance payments, adoption by a public body or a local infrastructure management body)' in any proposed funding system as detailed in draft Policy 19. As a critical infrastructural requirement the provision of waste management facilities is crucial to balanced development.</p> <p>S - 8641 - 7569 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8696	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>S - 8696 - 8044 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8749	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p>

	S - 8749 - 8053 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -
8802	<p>Mrs Cynthia Wade [8061] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8802 - 8061 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8827	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8827 - 6869 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8855	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8855 - 8064 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8991	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 8991 - 8092 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9132	<p>Mr John Osborne [7111] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9132 - 7111 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9182	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>I agree with all except the green infrastructure part as I think cycle links should be paid for by people that use them not out of local or central government funds and water conservation measures should be not made compulsory and the householder / tenant should pay for it only if they want it and if they move to a property and it is already installed they must have the right to have it removed or be compensated yearly for having it.</p> <p>S - 9182 - 8112 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9207	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>As long as this is not spent on new roads and car parking.</p> <p>S - 9207 - 8114 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9212	<p>Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council (Mrs L Read) [2055] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9212 - 2055 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9251	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? But community infrastructure levy to be for that community and not moved sideways.</p> <p>S - 9251 - 1828 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9258	<p>Ms T Wheatley [4494] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 9258 - 4494 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9373	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 9373 - 7113 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9442	<p>Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 9442 - 8127 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9501	<p>Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - SUPPORT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p>

	S - 9501 - 8139 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -
9592	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Only if we need the expansion. But as a general principle in all development this should be followed.</p> <p>S - 9592 - 8146 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9616	<p>Mrs Sandra Osborne [8162] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9616 - 8162 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9690	<p>Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9690 - 8047 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9741	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>More utopia!</p> <p>S - 9741 - 8174 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9810	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - SUPPORT</p>

	<p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes, providing this is done efficiently at sensible cost.</p> <p>S - 9810 - 7513 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9893	<p>Swardeston Parish Council (Carole Jowett) [2058] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 21/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 9893 - 2058 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10009	<p>The Bunwell Partnership (Mr Nigel Crouch) [8228] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10009 - 8228 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10043	<p>The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10043 - 8230 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10119	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>As long as development is retained within Norwich on brownfield sites and at a new town in Long stratton</p>

	S - 10119 - 8239 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -
10194	<p>Commercial Land [8246] (represented by The London Planning Practice LLP (Ms Erin Murphy) [8230]) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10194 - 8246 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10231	<p>Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>S - 10231 - 5864 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10271	<p>Sport England (East Region) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [2986] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Policy 19 (Question 27)</p> <p>Yes, Sport England supports this policy and we note that Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities are included within the Appendix (Table 2) of types of facilities that will benefit from Community Infrastructure Levy of Planning obligations contributions. It would be preferable in the submission document to be clear as to which types of facility will fall within the 'Community and Recreation Facilities' definition, rather than the approach taken (to list a few examples), as this will eliminate any possibility of ambiguity. Alternatively, the direct reference in the policy to the Appendix giving the fuller list should be added.</p> <p>S - 10271 - 2986 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10356	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 10356 - 8293 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10447	<p>Mr J E Youngs [8308] - SUPPORT Paper - 28/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 10447 - 8308 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10526	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - SUPPORT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 10526 - 7215 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10630	<p>Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - SUPPORT Web - 10/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 10630 - 8325 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10653	<p>Jim Smith (Mr Jim Smith) [8342] - SUPPORT Web - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? The Forestry Commission is fully supportive of the development of Supplementary Planning Document to deliver Green Infrastructure in the Greater Norwich Development Partnership area.</p>

	<p>The Forestry Commission within the East of England is working closely with local planning authorities to support this approach especially where there large land holdings of Public Forest Estate or land in private ownership which can support the delivery of specifically ENV5 from the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>S - 10653 - 8342 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10654	<p>Jim Smith (Mr Jim Smith) [8342] - SUPPORT Web - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? The Forestry Commission is fully supportive of the development of a Supplementary Planning Document to deliver Green Infrastructure in the Greater Norwich Development Partnership area.</p> <p>The Forestry Commission within the East of England is working closely with local planning authorities to support this approach especially where there large land holdings of Public Forest Estate or woodland in private ownership which can support the delivery of ENV5 from the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>S - 10654 - 8342 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10680	<p>Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - SUPPORT Paper - 15/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 10680 - 8348 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10750	<p>Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 10750 - 1776 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>

<p>10783</p>	<p>NHS Norfolk (Deborah Elliott) [7666] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 10783 - 7666 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>10866</p>	<p>Norwich Green Party (Mr Stephen Little) [8018] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? We have no major objections to the proposed mechanism of funding via a Community Infrastructure Levy but would need more information on the level of democratic accountability of the proposed local infrastructure management bodies. It is not clear how these bodies would functionally relate to the Economic Development Boards (as envisaged in the current unitary proposals) which have been a source of objection from us due to their unrepresentative nature. The uniform rate of the CIL is a concern as this may discourage development on brownfield sites where, for instance, additional expense to deal with contamination may be required.</p> <p>S - 10866 - 8018 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>10946</p>	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 10946 - 8368 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>10970</p>	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 10970 - 8369 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>

<p>10994</p>	<p>Howard Birch Associates (Mr Howard Birch) [8176] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 10994 - 8176 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>11017</p>	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Yes</p> <p>S - 11017 - 8370 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>11059</p>	<p>Norfolk Homes Ltd [6955] (represented by Les Brown Associates (Mr Les Brown) [4203]) - SUPPORT Paper - 09/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? However developer contributions must be structured to ensure viability which is the only means by which the housing numbers envisaged within the Plan period will be delivered and the resultant social facilities, infrastructure and AH provision will be achieved.</p> <p>S - 11059 - 6955 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
<p>11152</p>	<p>JB Planning Associates (Mr John Boyd) [6979] - SUPPORT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? COMMENT The Fairfield Partnership support the principles of developments funding infrastructure commensurate with the scale of development proposed and also in the promotion of high quality developments. The recognition in paragraph 9.4 that any CIL will need to be determined by</p>

	<p>financial viability, rather than infrastructure cost is supported. Similarly, the recognition at paragraph 9.6 of the need to review the CIL periodically, and tie it to the BERR output price index for public works is supported.</p> <p>S - 11152 - 6979 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
7978	<p>Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - OBJECT Web - 12/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? The infrastructure needs to be built before the housing</p> <p>O - 7978 - 6862 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8375	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - OBJECT Web - 20/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? In the current economic climate I do not see how all of this will be achievable. Also it is far too dependent upon income from other agencies, the government and developers. All of these are uncertain sources. Indeed the policy has been based upon the assumption that the government will introduce a requirement for a community infrastructure levy. What if it does not?</p> <p>O - 8375 - 6992 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8534	<p>Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - OBJECT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Not enough detail</p> <p>O - 8534 - 7817 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8647	<p>Mr Steve Dowall [8033] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p>

	<p>The site specific S39-02a falls outside the stated hierarchy. There is a lack of road upgrades within this proposal to improve links to the A47 of Blofield.</p> <p>O - 8647 - 8033 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8718	<p>Mr Nick Miller [8049] - OBJECT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? CIL as currently proposed is potentially seriously open to abuse of power by remote politicians and planners leaving new development seriously under-resourced for infrastructure. Should be preumtion in favour of local gain accruing locally unless explicitly gifted by the community to other purposes Errors in the document - see above.</p> <p>O - 8718 - 8049 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
8830	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - OBJECT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? This whole project is now totally out-of-date and should be shelved. Where is the money coming from in this present climate to reach these high aspirations? Developers, the Government and the country are all short of cash.</p> <p>What is really worrying is the lack of any plans to expand the N&N hospital. Just with the present population the hospital can't cope - there are not enough beds, and from my own recent experience there were not even enough trolleys in the corridors! The lack of investment in these crucial services is pathetic and should be immediately addressed.</p> <p>O - 8830 - 8045 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9054	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? There is widespread concern among developers that 'wish lists' to be funded by CIL will render many strategic developments uneconomic, thus stalling delivery.</p>

	O - 9054 - 4187 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -
9138	<p>Mrs S M Curtis [8111] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>I realise that the area will need to develop in the future but completing this form on the day of the announcement of a dire budget and massive borrowing requirement for future years, I question the source of funding that will be required and am apprehensive of the amount of further debt that will be undertaken</p> <p>O - 9138 - 8111 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9340	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>Needs to be fully regulated and fully adequate. Targets for sustainability green infrastructure, enough efficient housing etc are not high or strict enough.</p> <p>O - 9340 - 8123 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9417	<p>Ms Irene Burrows [8124] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>That strikes me as a an awful lot to expect the developer to pay for and at the end of the day the house purchaser will be paying!</p> <p>O - 9417 - 8124 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9534	<p>Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>There is likely to be cuts in public spending. The councils are changing with unitary status. We already spend far too much</p>

	<p>public money on bureaucracies, need these services delivered without the cumbersome public sector infrastructure that accompanies them</p> <p>O - 9534 - 8140 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9583	<p>Drayton Parish Council (Mrs Patricia Kirby) [6690] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>How can the finances be achieved. Please could you tell us</p> <p>O - 9583 - 6690 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9622	<p>RW Kidner [8163] (represented by Bidwells Cambridge(310) (Michael Hendry) [7492]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>While the need to provide health, education, culture and leisure is acknowledged it must be recognised that any planning obligations resulting from development should be fairly and reasonably related to the development and meet the tests in Circular 05/05.</p> <p>O - 9622 - 8163 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9635	<p>Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>There is some confusion here because the question refers to „infrastructure funding and promoting quality in developments., whereas the policy is titled „implementation and monitoring. Despite this title, however, the policy does not actually mention monitoring.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>With regard to infrastructure funding, the generality of what is set out in the policy is acceptable. It may be preferable to refer to a local development document for the community infrastructure levy charges, as this will leave open the potential for a development plan document, rather than plump definitely for a supplementary planning</p>

document, with its lesser status, at this early stage in the development of the levy and its local application.

QUALITY

The policy states that "the quality of new developments will be assured...", but nowhere does it explain which quality is referred to, or even whether it should be high or low, which gives little assurance of what will, in practice, be delivered.

There are mentions of scrutiny of Design and Access statements and of accredited design processes, which leads one to suppose that design quality is perhaps what is meant. High quality design is something more easily written into a policy than actually achieved, especially, perhaps, in respect of large scale housing, domestic extensions, and roads and other transport infrastructure. Given the importance of design to the feel of a place, and to the survival of the historic textures and spaces of settlements - hence quality of life and the economy - it is surprising that reliance is seemingly placed wholly on processes to provide the desired outcome. Whether there is any evidence that either of these, or the combination of them, is any guarantor of design quality is unclear.

The same paragraph then refers to community development. The supporting text refers to an ongoing commitment to growing community organisations. By contrast the policy text has this ceasing when a development is first occupied.

IMPLEMENTATION

Given the complexity of the area, the scale of housing development proposed, and the four councils involved in the Strategy, it is surprising that more is not said about implementation. Presumably there will be further local development documents? Will the Integrated Development Programme be one? To what extent will the Strategy be taken forward by the four councils jointly, and how much individually?

MONITORING

The supporting text states "the Joint Core Strategy includes a monitoring framework", but none is present in the consultation document.

O - 9635 - 7986 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

9715

Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Due to economic downturn less funding will be available. It is therefore important to ensure that infrastructure is provided for

	<p>before development takes place or at the very least in conjunction with the pace of development.</p> <p>O - 9715 - 5446 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9842	<p>Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - OBJECT Paper - 30/03/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? A "community infrastructure levy" is yet another cost.tax which will deter parties from bringing development forward. The planning system is overcomplicated and costly - why add to it with further 'hurdles' given the current economic uncertainties.</p> <p>O - 9842 - 8198 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
9905	<p>Mr Peter Suton [8219] - OBJECT Web - 27/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? Any new development must be carefully done and due regard paid to the effects on current residents and environment.</p> <p>O - 9905 - 8219 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10058	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by R. P. S. (Ms. Helen Phillips) [4269]) - OBJECT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? We support in principle the use of CIL as this provides more certainty for developers and should spread some of the cost of growth related infrastructure between different types and sizes of development. However, it is essential that, in developing this approach, there is a direct relationship maintained between the process for establishing the charging schedule, the infrastructure planning process and the development plan strategy. The setting of CIL at a realistic level in the charging schedule is something that must be both fully consulted upon and examined independently as part of the LDF process. The setting of CIL at a realistic level is particularly important given current economic conditions. If it is set too high or at a level higher than current normal Section 106 costs, there is a real danger of schemes being unviable and undeliverable. It is also essential that the relationship between CIL and planning obligations is such that there is no confusion or double payment We remain very concerned about the intention to require developers of major strategic growth areas to guarantee development in full and for all developers to guarantee the long term maintenance of physical and social infrastructure provided. Given the</p>

current state of the market and the history of peaks and troughs in the housing market and the economy, this is an unreasonable imposition that could well be counter-productive and not assist in bringing development forward.

O - 10058 - 2373 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

10142 **Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]** (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) -

OBJECT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd. recognises that there is a major challenge in delivering the level of growth required in the sub-region. However, Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd is committed to working together in partnership with the GNDP and other relevant stakeholders to bring forward vital and viable development that delivers sustainable growth in the North East sector.

We broadly agree with this approach but consider that, as with other issues, scheme viability needs to be included in the consideration and requirement of development contributions.

O - 10142 - 8234 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

10262 **The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) [8263]** - **OBJECT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

We do not support Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring as it does not deal with the substance of this policy. The policy on implementation and monitoring should give information on the monitoring and implementation of the Core Strategy policies. In order to assess whether the Core Strategy has helped achieve its objectives it is important that the Council monitors the impact of the policies. This policy should describe the wider social, environmental and economic background against which the Core Strategy policies operate.

There should be a separate policy for planning obligations (and CIL) to show an overall approach to developer contributions with appropriate references to strategic sites and clear links to the details set out in an accompanying supplementary planning document.

The content of Policy 19 includes community and recreational facilities and the use of 'etc' at the end of this bullet point does not give a clear indication as to whether facilities for the cultural and creative industries are included. Neither does the description of community facilities in the Glossary provide enlightenment. For clarity and greater certainty of intended outcomes, so that the advice is clear and consistent, we recommend the description community facilities provide for the health, welfare, social, educational, spiritual, leisure and cultural needs of the community. In this way arts activities and theatre will be incorporated in any policy that mentions the enhancement and development of community facilities.

The Trust recognises the importance of planning obligations to assist existing theatre owners in becoming more self-reliant and to obtain better buildings by using the planning system and working with the private sector. We are concerned that theatre buildings do not benefit appropriately under the terms of S106 and other agreements and that it will increasingly be necessary to unlock new sources of funding to help pay for significant improvements to them.

O - 10262 - 8263 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

10502 Mr I T Smith [8310] - OBJECT

Paper - 03/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

No to NDR. No to eco-towns or major developments.

O - 10502 - 8310 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

10598 Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - OBJECT

Paper - 08/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?

We have answered no to all questions. Please go to Question 28 for our reasons.

O - 10598 - 8319 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

10841	<p>North East Wymondham Landowners [8362] (represented by Valepark (Mr Graham Tuddenham) [4361]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>The landowners broadly agree with this approach but consider that, as with other issues, scheme viability needs to be included in the consideration and requirement of development contributions.</p> <p>O - 10841 - 8362 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
10904	<p>Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>The BLT recognises that there is a major challenge in delivering the level of growth required in the sub-region. However, the BLT is committed to working together in partnership with the GNDP and other relevant stakeholders to bring forward vital and viable development that delivers sustainable growth in the north east sector.</p> <p>We broadly agree with this approach but consider that, as with other issues, scheme viability needs to be included in the consideration and requirement of development contributions.</p> <p>O - 10904 - 8366 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -</p>
11139	<p>Persimmon Homes (Anglia) [2373] (represented by RPS (Ms Helen Phillips) [4285]) - OBJECT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments?</p> <p>We support in principle the use of CIL as this provides more certainty for developers and should spread some of the cost of growth related infrastructure between different types and sizes of development. However, it is essential that, in developing this approach, there is a direct relationship maintained between the process for establishing the charging schedule, the infrastructure planning process and the development plan strategy. The setting of CIL at a realistic level in the charging schedule is something that must be both fully consulted upon and examined independently as part of the LDF process.</p> <p>The setting of CIL at a realistic level is particularly important given current economic conditions. If it is set too high or at a level higher than current normal Section 106 costs, there is a real danger of schemes being unviable and undeliverable. It is also essential that the relationship between CIL and planning obligations is such that there is no confusion or double payment</p> <p>We remain very concerned about the intention to require developers of major strategic growth areas to guarantee development</p>

in full and for all developers to guarantee the long term maintenance of physical and social infrastructure provided. Given the current state of the market and the history of peaks and troughs in the housing market and the economy, this is an unreasonable imposition that could well be counter-productive and not assist in bringing development forward.

O - 11139 - 2373 - Policy 19 Implementation and monitoring (Q27), (Q27) Do you support our approach to funding infrastructure and promoting quality in new developments? -

Response – Q28

Anything else you would like to tell us?

This question covers anything else you would like to say about the Joint Core Strategy.

Q28 Anything else you would like to tell us?

Q28 Is there anything else you would like to say about the content of this Joint Core Strategy which has not already been covered in the previous questions?

	Total no. respondents	Comments	Yes / Support	No/ Object	Total no. representations
Q28 Total	129	123	2	6	131

7979 Mrs Rosemary Bennett [6862] - COMMENT

Web - 12/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

While I agree that Long Stratton needs a bypass it's possible the environmental cost is too high additional journeys into Norwich will be generated by doubling the size of the village - if I'd wanted to live in a town I would have moved to one when i returned to Norfolk two years ago. 35,000 houses won't be needed when the government changes immigration will be severely restricted. We should encourage people to live above High Street shops the added advantage being crime reduction and reduce the numbers of both empty and second homes in the country

C - 7979 - 6862 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

8017 Miss Lynne Morris [7851] - COMMENT

Web - 16/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

I think there needs to be a balance between meeting the criteria for houses and consolidating what is already in a village and serious consideration given to the impact the development will create both on the current village/town and what will be created.

C - 8017 - 7851 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

8059 Mr Andrew Burtenshaw [7870] - COMMENT

Web - 19/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Infrastructure (including public transport) needs to be in place BEFORE the housing and employment development is

	<p>completed.</p> <p>C - 8059 - 7870 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8172	<p>Mr A.J. Pring [7899] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>I congratulate you on producing this comprehensive document and I commiserate with you for the conditions under which you have had to complete it.</p> <p>I used to be sceptical about all this happening but you know what they say about sceptics, "they are only a cynic without any experience of life".</p> <p>When I see a politician stay with a plan and keep a promise?</p> <p>Good luck</p> <p>C - 8172 - 7899 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8197	<p>Mr Roger F. Weeks MRICS [4796] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 02/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Ensure: Houses are not build on flood planes.</p> <p>Ensure: Health education, emergency, and services can cope before housing is built.</p> <p>Ensure: Adequate parking provision of housing developments to remove all the on street parking blighting our landscape.</p> <p>Remember few people now use a garage for garaging and that many households now have 2 / 3 cars</p> <p>C - 8197 - 4796 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8221	<p>Mr P Anderson [7901] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 03/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p>

	<p>Circumstances have overtaken this strategy and the proposals not worth the paper written on. Nor should you succeed. The proposals are written so as to take in all possible angles but you have not looked at the hard facts facing us:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Adaptation and mitigation of global warming / climate change. I realise you think you have but I don't think you have. You are much too easy on vehicle use and air traffic. 2 The point of peak oil production and the need for transition to local sustainability. 3 The need to reconsider flood risk in the light of new information and hence to take into account that these strategies will be using land that will be needed in future. 4 The length and difficulty of replying to this consultation. 5 You're unlikely to listen to replies in any case <p>C - 8221 - 7901 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>8259</p>	<p>pulham market parish council (mr laurence taylor) [7907] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 06/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>We consider that any further development in our village in particular & in Norfolk in general should be dependant on the prior provision of new infrastructure such as water supply & sewerage services.</p> <p>C - 8259 - 7907 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>8286</p>	<p>Rockland St Mary and Hellington Parish Council (Mr Dennis Passingham) [7912] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 10/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>More public transport in rural areas, including services running into the late evening.</p> <p>Establish 'mini-interchange points' where bus routes can cross (probably around the southern by-pass). This may avoid travelling into and out of the city when travelling from one rural location to another.</p> <p>C - 8286 - 7912 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>8287</p>	<p>Diane Flynn [7914] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 12/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p>

	<p>Ref representation 6837 SHLAA Doc.</p> <p>Section 3a- there is very limited public transport in Blofield. There is no Sunday or evening service and it takes about 40 mins to walk to the nearest station along an unlit road with an incomplete footpath. Of the bus services mentioned - 1 doesn't exist and the other is 1 bus per day. How does this qualify as 'services'? Garden Farm gives the residents local produce within walking distance and provides a gradual introduction into the surrounding farming land from the present building line. Any change will need more visible support for public transport</p> <p>C - 8287 - 7914 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>8311</p>	<p>Mr Robert Mapes [7915] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 13/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Nothing to add except - I would have preferred to have submitted the questions booklet rather than go all through this palaver !</p> <p>C - 8311 - 7915 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>8376</p>	<p>Alyson Lowe [6992] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>achievability in current economic climate. Therefore need to prioritise aims. I would put public transport then affordable housing first.</p> <p>Whilst I support the theory laid out in questions 3,8,9,15,16,17,18,19,20 & 21 this is conditional upon basic services e.g. sewage/water and good regular public transport being available.</p> <p>loopholes for developers?</p> <p>Too dependent on other agencies.</p> <p>Question 27 - This policy is far too dependent upon obtaining money from other public bodies, government funds and developers. These sources are not secure jeopardising the success of the strategy. Also the policy depends upon the Community Infrastructure levy being introduced. What will happen if it is not?</p>

C - 8376 - 6992 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

8386 **Mr M Buckingham [7968]** (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - **COMMENT**
Web - 22/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

We do have concerns that there is an over-reliance on large sites for the delivery of the new housing. We believe that more smaller sites with lower infrastructure requirements will be required if the new housing is to be delivered in the plan period having particular regard to the current recession and the shortage of both public and private sector finance that exists at present.

Please note that all the representations submitted on behalf of Mr Harrold are also submitted on behalf of Mr Buckingham and Mr Holman

C - 8386 - 7968 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

8403 **COLNEY PARISH MEETING (MRS HAZEL MARTIN) [7978]** - **COMMENT**

Web - 21/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Colney Parish Meeting

The JCS was discussed at the Committee Meeting for Colney Parish on 14th April 2009. There are many good ideas in the document especially those relating to the environment and village communities. However, concerns were expressed that the massive scale development envisaged was based on a Regional Spatial Strategy that was out of date and unsustainable. We therefore cannot support any of the large scale developments proposed and believe that building on this scale would have an adverse impact upon quality of life in the County.

Yours sincerely,
Hazel Martin
Clerk
4 Church Farm
Colney
NR4 7TX

C - 8403 - 7978 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

<p>8424</p>	<p>M Harrold [7966] (represented by Michael Haslam Associates Ltd. (Mr Michael Haslam) [6716]) - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? We do have concerns that there is an over-reliance on large sites for the delivery of the new housing. We believe that more smaller sites with lower infrastructure requirements will be required if the new housing is to be delivered in the plan period having particular regard to the current recession and the shortage of both public and private sector finance that exists at present.</p> <p>Please note that these representations are also submitted on behalf of Mr Buckingham and Mr Holman.</p> <p>C - 8424 - 7966 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>8452</p>	<p>Ian Harris [8007] - COMMENT Web - 22/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? I am desperately sorry. This policy fills me with a great pessimism. You are only paying lip service to the key issues - climate change, boom-and-bust growth-led economics, community cohesion. The few concessions you've made to sustainability and sanity will be easily dwarfed (if not eliminated) by the bulk of the proposals, which are business as usual: big developments, big roads, and shop 'til you drop. You had an opportunity to make people sit up and take notice, to think about change for the better - and you threw it away.</p> <p>C - 8452 - 8007 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>8485</p>	<p>Mr C Skeels [8016] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Business should be attracted to the area which inevitably means extra housing. However, we should as far as possible try to provide this within existing town boundaries and ensure that expansion of these boundaries are kept to a minimum to preserve town and village identities. This propose housing requirements seem to be too much for the area in general and South Norfolk in particular.</p> <p>C - 8485 - 8016 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>

8509

Mrs Helen Hutson [8020] - COMMENT

Paper - 23/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Far too many new houses indicated. Should one much more creative solutions e.g. suitable infill over shops / workshops- Having had experience of living near a "travellers" camp I wonder if the quality of life of permanent residents courts too much. My experience indicates that their are areas become like little enclaves where normal laws and council tax requirements do not exist and are certainly not enforced.

If this could all be implemented wouldn't things be good?

- Will local people actually be listened to and their views acted on or ignored
- Very little detail about impact on medical facilities - what about polyclinics- the N & N cannot cope now - how will it co-e with thousands of extra households
- If areas are to be developed there needs to be a wait for it "cottage hospital" to cope
- Where will the funds come from for new medical and educational facilities
- Very little said about reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. Will there be more and visible police type persons?
- Every effort must be made to use land other than green belt
- Unhappily little has been said about integrating the many travellers sites in to the locality and how these areas will be monitored
- Much more thought must be given to the development of Norwich. God forbid we get anther Anglia square
- How many "local" "ordinary" people will be on relevant bands / committees / working parties?

C - 8509 - 8020 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

8535

Mr Daniel Douglas [7817] - COMMENT

Paper - 23/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Public transport

Housing should be built at a density as to justify commercial bus operation. Estate design should allow preferential and efficient bus operation.

Housing design

Terraced houses are popular in Norwich. Lets bring them back! New developments should include non-car developments of flats / terrace houses.

	<p>Rail services Gain should allow the building of a new stations at Thorpe St Andrew and Long Stratton parkway Affordable Housing There should be only affordable housing in Harleston for local people. Their should be a definition of affordable housing which pegs itself against the average wage of a single Norfolk person</p> <p>C - 8535 - 7817 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8559	<p>Mrs Patricia Robertson [8021] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? The strategy appears to be extremely well thought out with all aspects of a reasonable lifestyle being considered i.e. education, health, employment etc and above all the means to finance such a venture. As a householder outside the proposed development area, this plan does not affect me as greatly as those within the area wishing to invest in any such development. I do, however, care greatly about the preservation of our heritage, historically and environmentally, and feel that due consideration has been given to all such aspects in the proposed plans</p> <p>C - 8559 - 8021 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8604	<p>Mr M Read [8024] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? High density building should be avoided which would produce the slums of the future Agriculture should be encouraged on the basis of self sufficiency on a county / country scale Encourage the reduction of the carbon footprint in the county Build only on brownfield sites Encourage the use of public transport where possible</p> <p>C - 8604 - 8024 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8614	<p>Tacolneston Parish Council (Mr P Jeffery) [2059] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Support appendix O - the preferred option followed by 3,2,1 in order of preference</p> <p>C - 8614 - 2059 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8642	<p>The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569] (represented by The Landscape Partnership Ltd (Mr Steven Bainbridge) [7569]) - COMMENT Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? On behalf of Norfolk Environmental Waste Services: Contrary to the position taken in Policy 19 waste management facilities are not listed in either Table 1 or Table 2 as development likely to be funded through contributions or CIL. It's of critical importance that a strategically important waste management facility such as that operated by NEWS at Longwater, Costessey is properly protected from nearby incompatible development. It wouldn't be an overstatement to say that if the site were adversely affected by incompatible nearby development, the waste infrastructure critical for Norwich and serving much of Norfolk would be put at significant risk.</p> <p>C - 8642 - 7569 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8672	<p>Mr Kevin Fincham [8036] - COMMENT Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>C - 8672 - 8036 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8701	<p>Mrs Jo Fincham [8044] - COMMENT Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Please take on board the comments that basically say no to any development in Tasburgh except for individual homes on infill sites. I would like this village to retain it's character and not have swathes of new housing taking up greenfield sites behind my home. I moved here from the city to have open fields. The school, sewerage system, junctions and road layouts could not cope</p>

	<p>with further development.</p> <p>C - 8701 - 8044 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8703	<p>mrs jane fischl [8031] - COMMENT Web - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? The NNDR seems to be having undesirable results already. Before the route has been decided and funding secured there are proposals for an over engineered Postwick Hub predicated on the NNDR proceeding which it may not. What a waste of public money and wanton disregard for the environment! The NNDR project needs radical review. The current recession highlights the decline in the requirement for roads and also in the demand for business facilities and new homes. You appear to be stuck in a 2002 time warp - get up to date and smell the recession and scrap this project.</p> <p>C - 8703 - 8031 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8757	<p>Mrs Anita Turpin [8058] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Residents of the Greater Norwich Development Area have the National Park area of the Broads on their doorstep with huge potential for outdoor leisure and education for Norwich, recognised in the Broads Authority and Broads Tourism Forum's approach to raise visitor numbers. Sustainable transport is essential to link the Broads to the GNDA and the proposed cycling and walking route (The Three Rivers Way) linking the public transport hub at Wroxham/ Hoveton to Broads villages provides an essential green route for visitors , with the potential to eventually link to Rackheath and Sprowston.</p> <p>C - 8757 - 8058 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8828	<p>Marlingford & Colton Parish Council (Mr Max Bergin) [6869] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? We are very unhappy that we were not consulted about which policy area we have been allocated. As a rural parish we believe we should be in the South Norfolk Rural Policy Area rather than the Norwich Policy Area - South Norfolk.</p>

	<p>We also question whether plans that were created before the extent and impact of the global recession were fully appreciated can be considered relevant and realistic?</p> <p>C - 8828 - 6869 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8829	<p>Trowse Primary School (Mr James Macdonald) [7608] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>The previous document described Trowse as a Service Village suitable for 10-20 new houses which would be appropriate. Trowse has the facilities described for a service village. The current document describes Trowse as an urban fringe parish and is unclear as there is no indication of the housing allocation for Trowse. There would be great concern if Trowse were intended to grow such that character and atmosphere change from a village to a major suburb of Norwich. Residents choose to live in Trowse because it is a village and has a village school and is not part of Norwich.</p> <p>C - 8829 - 7608 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8844	<p>Ms K Dunn [8045] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Your Policy No 14 - housing needs - at the end of this exercise you will have a clearer picture of what specific housing is needed and where it should go. In the light of this I think it is ludicrous that South Norfolk Council are trying to rush through permanent gypsy and traveller sites before your Joint Core Strategy has been fully developed. South Norfolk Council should wait until the results of this exercise are formulated and published before crucial decisions which affect small rural communities are made.</p> <p>C - 8844 - 8045 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8856	<p>Mr John Nelson [8064] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>The proposed major growth of Hethersett is too great when compared to the very moderate growth of the other key service centres</p>

	C - 8856 - 8064 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -
8904	<p>Mrs Dorothy Allen [8071] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>flooding vehicle access amenity value Tiffey Valley transport</p> <p>C - 8904 - 8071 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8919	<p>ie homes & property ltd (Mr Ed Palmieri) [7620] - COMMENT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>current settlement hierarchy is too rigid and prescriptive and needs to be reviewed so that more sustainable service villages can take more housing. Eg there are some really sustainable service village locations like Tasburgh and Newton Flotman along the A140 close to Long Stratton that could take more than 10-20 homes (as per the current settlement hierarchy) and up to 200 new homes.</p> <p>C - 8919 - 7620 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8927	<p>Hempnall Parish Council (Mr I J Nelson) [2014] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Hempnall Parish Council is highly critical of the process whereby high levels of growth are imposed by central government acting through an in elected regional authority. The original consultation document on core strategy did not offer local people / organisations the change to give an opinion as to whether the high level of growth envisaged was desirable or not. Therefore the level of opposition to such a huge amount of development has not been measured. however, most of these extra houses have yet to be built and before this happens hopefully our national government will re-examine its commitment to judge housing growth particularly in relatively underdeveloped parts of lowland Britain. All people,</p>

	<p>wherever they live need truly rural places to visit and explore. If this core strategy actually happens we will lose our special rural atmosphere.</p> <p>Next time please provide paper that can actually be written on. I've tried 5 pens on this glossy surface already</p> <p>C - 8927 - 2014 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8948	<p>Miss Marguerite Finn [8087] - COMMENT Web - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Some of the proposals are acceptable - but they are mixed in with others which are not. It seems that someone somewhere is determined to go ahead with a massive and unsustainable development in Norwich and the North East of Norwich - even though it is not needed or wanted. Reconsider the scale of your proposals. Preserve and sustain the special nature of Broadland and the fine city of Norwich. Put back what Beecham took away. Fund small railways to link up North Norfolk with Norwich. Don't close community hospitals. Make more land available for allotments. Don't destroy the countryside.</p> <p>C - 8948 - 8087 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8961	<p>MR Richard Edwards [7925] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Start thinking of bringing trams back to Norwich it is possible or at least light rail</p> <p>C - 8961 - 7925 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8968	<p>Ms Rosemary Mann [7706] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Wicklewood is a village that needs to be a service village and be allowed to keep growing. Many people have retired here when we had a shop and regular bus service to Wymondham, now we are leasing all this. There is a good school, several businesses, still a shop premises and a local pub all which need a certain amount of increase in population for them to survive.</p>

	<p>C - 8968 - 7706 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8992	<p>Mr Norman Sewell [8092] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Matter of interest. Is has been stated in the local press that Norwich will lose out in cash on the project: "New bridge connecting Whitlingham to Norwich" within the time set out because of failure to secure "technical support". In particular with some confusion as to whom was responsible for delay - City Council, County Council, Greater Norwich Partnership</p> <p>C - 8992 - 8092 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9000	<p>Mr CM Sparrow [8093] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? I object strongly to the proposed development to the north of post office road in Lingwood. As the present infrastructure is only just adequate. The character of the village would be completely changed with views to the church being lost.</p> <p>C - 9000 - 8093 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9004	<p>Mr and Mrs A W Bowyer [8094] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? No traffic assessment regarding impact of development has been made. Access to site: A47 via church road - dangerous junction. A47 at white horse junction accident black spot and route in village passes school. Route to Blofield Heater Lane single track - Blofield Rd lane with passing places. Has any assessment been carried out regarding water / sewage services capability of coping with large scale development. Lingwood should remain a service village and any growth should on be commensurate with the existing hierarchy of a service village.</p>

	C - 9004 - 8094 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -
9008	<p>Mr and Mrs P Sabberton [8095] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>There is no local employment in the Lingwood area leading to two main issues:</p> <p>1 People will have to travel and prefer to do this by car. The existing road structure is not sufficient even for the existing levels of traffic. Access to the A47 (the only route to either Norwich or Great Yarmouth) is limited and at times hazardous!</p> <p>Development of the roads around the village would have an environmental impact, detrimental to the area.</p> <p>2 In the current economic climate of unemployment how are people going to afford new houses, either via a mortgage or rental. Jobs are scarce in the area and continued building of new housing is not the answer to what is a more fundamental issue affecting the country.</p> <p>3 The existing rail link is too limited a form of travel for people to get to the areas of work!</p> <p>C - 9008 - 8095 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9015	<p>Mr KD White [8097] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>There has been no forward knowledge given to the villagers most affected. The proposal to build so many houses brings to mind the following problems:</p> <p>Transport to and from places of employment</p> <p>Existing road structure could not carry the increased traffic</p> <p>Schooling for the village</p> <p>Sewerage is, I believe, now up to full usage</p> <p>The parish council is appointed to serve the village, but this proposal has not been put forward to the village even at its earliest conception.</p> <p>C - 9015 - 8097 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9019	<p>Mr Robert Hall [8098] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>There is no plan to improve road linkage and connections to the A47 are already dangerous. Roads to Blofield and Brundall are also dangerous. The road to Blofield is far too narrow, undulating with several bends and is totally inadequate for current traffic flow.</p> <p>Has anyone considered schooling and the sewage system?</p> <p>C - 9019 - 8098 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9023	<p>Mr and Mrs Peter Tann [8099] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>We are keen to conserve the visual character of the area, especially the open views towards the church over farmland. Any large development would be to the detriment of the village and the traffic impact on our village roads would be devastating. We are totally opposed to a large-scale development taking place and would prefer Lingwood to remain the rural village that we have enjoyed living in the last 11 years.</p> <p>C - 9023 - 8099 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9055	<p>Keymer Cavendish (Mr E. J. Keymer) [4187] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>The JCS is a comprehensive and well-presented document. It is sound in most respects.</p> <p>The three factors we wish to question are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The sustainability of strategic development at Long Stratton and Wymondham 2 The lack of detail in utilising local rail 3 The impact of the economic climate on the viability of strategic housing development <p>C - 9055 - 4187 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9066	<p>Mr David Wrigley [8107] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered</p>

	<p>previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Is the almost total ABSENCE of publicity within Mulbarton about this meeting: a)Deliberate? (to avoid having to cope with people and their comments) b)Accidental e.g. is someone not doing the work of putting in adverts etc? (who?) c)Because you're so remote from local people that you don't ever realise that you need to put up adverts? No wonder you get few people attending! Is it a pseudo-consultation?</p> <p>C - 9066 - 8107 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>9070</p>	<p>Ms Penny Tilley [8108] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? I have skimmed through the plans for housing and transport, though there wasn't much re the latter. On the whole I do feel that the public have been listened to concerning plans for housing. However, I do have a couple of points re housing, which would of course involve central government, but if it was taken on board, fewer homes would need to be built. The first point is with regard to holiday homes. I do not have any numbers to back my argument, but there are a great many second homes in this county, as indeed there are in other areas of the country. Many of these stand empty for long periods. Some communities, especially those near the coast are virtually dead during the winter, which must be awful for the few locals who live there all the year round, and will affect public services generally in those areas. In my opinion, very few people require a second home. It is time that they became too expensive to own!</p> <p>C - 9070 - 8108 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>9085</p>	<p>Ms R Pickering [8109] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Need again to stress the advisability of NOT implementing any new plans without VERY careful consideration during the recession and possibility of a depression developing. Important to see that there are jobs created for unemployed people which are sensible at an uncertain time - not just in the hope of "better times soon". When planning permission has been granted with the full knowledge of the local community, for it NOT to be altered afterwards without the local community's knowledge</p>

	<p>C - 9085 - 8109 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9183	<p>Mrs S Capps-Jenner [8112] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? I would be willing to discuss any of my comments with you. If you want more information. I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>C - 9183 - 8112 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9208	<p>Widen the Choice Rural Transport Partnership (Mr Chris Wood) [8114] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? The strategy is a numbers game that tries to carry on with business as usual, ignoring climate change, peak oil, the health agenda etc in the hope that this will not be noticed with a bit of sustainability added like a garnish. Your "sustainable" policies are either too weak or contradicted by other policies. This does not bode well for a sustainable future for the Norwich area.</p> <p>C - 9208 - 8114 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9252	<p>Stratton Strawless Parish Council (Mr T Dann) [1828] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? There is no allowance within the various justifications for entrepreneurial acts within area defined as unsustainable and in consequence this will have a negative effect.</p> <p>C - 9252 - 1828 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9275	<p>Ms Rosemary O'Donoghue [8115] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? In general I found the ideas set out in the Joint Core Strategy depressing. I appreciate that the intention is good in that it attempts to ensure that the planned expansion is part of a coherent whole and that there will be no ribbon development such as</p>

	<p>happened in the past especially in some parts of the country when small and large towns become linked with become a large conurbation.</p> <p>However, the scale of the proposals for this part of Norfolk seems far too large and may very well transform the county. Also the most optimistic assumptions are made in each case and there can never be any certainty about what will be important in the future (fifty years ago, who would have believed the shoe industry would be dead).</p> <p>The best thing about the strategy is the importance given to Norwich as a historic and as a commercial centre. Norwich city centre is a vibrant and happy place and every effort should be made to ensure it remains that way.</p> <p>C - 9275 - 8115 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>9317</p>	<p>Mrs Brenda Ruddock [5445] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>How is the delivery of the Long Stratton bypass to be scheduled? Bypass first then houses? or no bypass-no houses?</p> <p>C - 9317 - 5445 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>9320</p>	<p>Ms Jill Loan [8117] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Are measures being considered to reduce the amount of traffic pollution in central Norwich? It is a veritable smog bowl, just stand outside Britannia barracks on the hilltop on a calm sunny day & look at the level of smog. Lots of suggestions in this J.C.S are most welcome, namely those pertaining to increased education opportunities, better health care provision, particularly for the elderly and most importantly more funding & encouragement for all existing & future cultural events & opportunities.</p> <p>C - 9320 - 8117 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>9341</p>	<p>Ms Celia Viner [8123] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Needs to be monitored and accountable to the public at regular review meetings. Very high level need actual detail of how it</p>

	<p>will be achieved and the impact and financial and environmental cost</p> <p>C - 9341 - 8123 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9374	<p>Mr Peter Rope [7113] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Could not go beyond Q19 as joint core strategy nov 2007 was out of sequence with questions. There seems to be considerable funding in city from the GNDP i.e. Barrack Street improvements, St Georges Street etc. Hopefully in the future the suburbs will get some benefit (i.e. cycle ways). Thank you I am sorry if any sounding negative after 40 years, plus the expansion to east of Thorpe is not something I am proud of . At least I took the time to fill in the questionnaire. Thank you</p> <p>C - 9374 - 7113 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9418	<p>Mr E Newberry [8120] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? There are too many properties proposed in the area nearest to Thorpe St Andrew and Rackheath. The infrastructure such as schools took more than ten years to get the new school at Thorpe St Andrew, although it was in the plan for Dussindale at the outset. The roads will become worse than they are now if all developments take place and if Rackheath eco town is built it will bring roads near Sprowston and Thorpe to complete grid lock. There will not be the infrastructure such as schools and local shops to stop people travelling a long way or especially the school run as long as people choose to which school they send their children. The whole thing is likely to end up the slums of the future not the nice area it is at the moment. Services such as water, sewers, electricity and gas will be a problem ,as the non co2 alternatives just could not provide enough power especially in these days of electrical goods of every type being pushed, even the digital equipment uses more power then the existing equivalent</p> <p>C - 9418 - 8120 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9443	<p>Ms Valerie Chipperfield [8128] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered</p>

previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?
 I totally dislike these questionnaires, they never ask the right questions as far as I'm concerned.
 The proposed NNDR is going to be dual not single and that is good.
 Its not too far out of the city and that is also good.
 It does not have an access point on the Spixworth Rd that is not good.
 It does not go the whole way to join the A47 and as such becomes useless to us to drive going through the city to get sensibly to on-go to lots of places, east, west and south of the City of Norwich.
 The inner ring road was never completed properly and is a bottle neck into the city over Carrow Bridge and now the proposed NDR is also going to be incomplete.
 The other thing that is incredibly not good is that it is not proposed to be a bypass and will not have a contravene route along it, with slip road access to each joining road not constant roundabouts.
 Those constant roundabouts will mean that it use is greatly inhibited and maybe even avoided because that sort of road is such a pain to use.

C - 9443 - 8128 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9444 Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council (Mr Steve Griggs) [8127] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

This covers questions 1.3.4.5.6.9.22.23.and 25

The responses in this questionnaire are the consensus view of the Parish Council which has grave reservations about the direction in which this strategy is taking us. We outlined these concerns in our letter of 16th Jan 2009 to the GNDR c/o City Hall, which covered our response to the Issues and Options Questionnaire. Despite asking for the views of the Joint Core Strategy team on the issues we raised in our letter of January, we received no reply. The Parish Councils questions the rationale underpinning the assumptions that are driving the Joint Core Strategy. What evidence is there, for example, that there will be a requirement for 40,000 new homes and 35,000 new jobs in this region by 2020? Do we envisage the current population, and numbers of unemployed rising by the year 2020 to fuel the demand, or are we planning large scale migration into the region to create demand? We are currently not convinced that such, as described in the questionnaire 'unprecedented high level of growth and change' will be beneficial to the region. It is hard to see how this level of growth can be absorbed and sustained in the longer term. We have ample evidence in Britain over the years where headlong growth has faltered and left a legacy of decline. Indeed we are currently facing an economic downturn that is impacting on the key industries in the region with growing numbers of residents being made redundant at for example Bernard Matthews and Zenith Windows not to forget the policy of

off shore placing of jobs by Norwich Union etc. In addition we are not convinced that there will be a requirement for the scale of expansion envisaged for retail outlets. It is obvious that large scale development of retail in one part of the city (Chapelfield for example) results in the decline in other areas (units vacant in Castle Mall and shops closing or moving to Chapelfield) The possible consequences of any decision to expand late night leisure areas should be carefully thought through, to avoid adding to the already not inconsiderable problems of policing and controlling the large number of youngsters who come in to Norwich for its night life. Again this is a chicken and egg situation. Are we providing the night life facilities because there is a demand for them or is the demand fuelled by the fact that the facilities are there? We do acknowledge that there needs to be some continuing growth to sustain services and facilities but it needs to be well managed and sustainable to avoid over reaching ourselves and damaging the character of the region. Surely the strategy should be to preserve the current levels of employment (with modest natural growth) rather than seeking to create an unprecedented high level of jobs, which cannot be satisfied from within the region without importing workers from outside the region? If the strategy is to be seen through, we would make a plea that the infrastructure to support it is put in place early and not as seems the norm cobbled together in an ad hoc fashion late on. These views of the Parish Council are probably unwelcome, but are the considered opinions of its members not having received a response to our letter of January we would welcome some response to this questionnaire

C - 9444 - 8127 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9502 Mrs C H Bryant [8139] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

I hope there will be updates

C - 9502 - 8139 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9535 Ms Cathy Armor [8140] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

I am completing this survey travelling home from work in London as my sector contracting hence moved to London, am on a train that takes 2 hours when I could get to Leeds quicker. In my 20 years of living in Norwich, it has changed beyond recognition and has enjoyed growth and prosperity BUT there are still pockets of severe deprivation, aspiration is low. The promised infrastructure improvements haven't happened and these plans are far too much growth

C - 9535 - 8140 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

<p>9541</p>	<p>Noble Foods Ltd [8149] (represented by Steve Abbott Associates (Mr Richard Percy) [8144]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? On behalf of Noble foods Ltd</p> <p>Please find attached a location plan which shows the Noble Food Limited site in Marsham. The site is potentially available for residential development and could incorporate recreational open space facilities to serve the local community, thus addressing a local deficiency of such facilities which is identified in the adopted broadlands district local plan (replacement).</p> <p>C - 9541 - 8149 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>9584</p>	<p>South Norfolk Council (Cllr Robert Savage) [8151] - COMMENT Web - 06/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? On behalf of the residents in my Ward and the residents of Wymondham, I request that the Greater Norwich Development Partnership include measures in the Joint Core Strategy to preserve the special character of Wymondham and to protect the landscape of the Tiffey Valley, adjacent to Chapel Lane, from development. In particular, the disposition of any proposed housing developments for Wymondham must be integrated sensitively with the existing dwellings in small numbers and not be added onto the town in big blocks.</p> <p>C - 9584 - 8151 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>9593</p>	<p>Mr R Harris [8146] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? General - I appreciate that a great deal of thought has been given to development and much time spent working out the proposals, but as I have explained in principle I do not agree that this is required or in the best interests of Norfolk and Norwich. Minor matters of concern for the present population and future housing already agreed; the following should be considered; 1. The proposed extension for Sprowston Cemetery should be put in hand and not altered, in fact further extension should be made to that proposed. 2. There is a shortage of allotment space in Sprowston and the present allotment space should be extended. This may also apply</p>

in other areas and certainly if new villages are planned.

3. If further plans for small or medium-sized supermarkets are required, they should be designed to fit into the general architectural scene and not as the Tesco supermarket at Sprowston which is the ugliest I have ever seen.
4. Car parking areas need much more screening by well-designed walls, trees (mature) and by plants, creepers etc to the walls. Properly maintained walls should not be in long lengths but in interesting formats.
5. Supermarkets should not be allowed to buy up small convenience stores and create a monopoly in the area, such as happened at Sprowston on the Wroxham Road. There is no choice of a considerable distance around and advantage is taken by charging high prices at the convenience store.
6. All existing open spaces and sports parks now existing should be maintained and not changed in planning for development. Pinebanks should be used as previously for social activities only - no development allowed.

C - 9593 - 8146 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9623

RW Kidner [8163] (represented by Bidwells Cambridge(310) (Michael Hendry) [7492]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

It should be noted that in addition to the comments made above the comment previously submitted in relation to the Joint Core Strategy still stand as does the technical supporting information submitted therewith.

C - 9623 - 8163 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9636

Broads Authority (Mr. John Clements) [7986] - **COMMENT**

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

CONSULTATION DOCUMENTATION - It is unfortunate that the Core Strategy has been presented for consultation in a somewhat disjointed state. The absence of changes to reflect the advice received in earlier consultation and, especially, the introduction of a "favoured option" without consequent adjustments of other parts of the text, renders the document rather confusing and the status of any particular part of it unclear. Responses to this consultation will therefore need to be analysed with some caution, and the potential need for further consultation carefully considered.

INTRODUCTION (Paragraph 1.2) - This important introduction states the Core Strategy is "a plan... that will guide future housing growth in Norwich and the surrounding area". This

is an excessively narrow interpretation of what the Core Strategy should be trying to achieve. The Broads Authority hopes that the challenging task of addressing the housing growth agenda will not result in the Partnership losing sight of the wider agenda that could and should be addressed in any Core Strategy for this area. The introduction should be changed to reflect a more comprehensive and integrated approach to the area.

PLANNED OUTCOMES? - The draft Joint Core Strategy proposes major development , especially housing development, in various parts of the area, yet no information is provided on the changes in resulting size, distribution and structure of the population expected to arise from the proposed housing developments, or the changes in patterns of movement, recreation and employment resulting.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL - No sustainability appraisal is included with the download draft Joint Core Strategy. The GNDP website says under "Sustainability Appraisal and Regulation 25" that "The draft sustainability appraisal will be more fully developed when the GNDP has proposed a favoured option". There are two concerns associated with this. Firstly the sustainability appraisal is supposed to be informing the choice of favoured options, not following them. Secondly, a favoured option is already referred to in the current consultation draft of the Core Strategy, so it is not clear why (or perhaps whether) the sustainability appraisal awaits further development.

APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT - Very little mention can be found of an Appropriate Assessment. Earlier consultation on this Core Strategy indicated that "An Appropriate Assessment will be needed under the Habitats Regulations legislation to look at the potential impact of the strategy on internationally important wildlife. This will become clearer closer to the 'preferred options' stage". The regulations governing consultation have changed, however it is difficult to see how the Joint Authorities will be able to settle on the favoured option mentioned in the document and assure themselves that the option can be implemented without harm to designated sites, and that any necessary mitigation can be incorporated at the required location and stage without an AA being substantially more advanced. The Government has stated that best practice will be to undertake the Appropriate Assessment alongside the development of options prior to formal consultation.

Paragraph 1.1 - It would be useful to clarify the role of the Broads in the Partnership, and in relation to this Joint Core Strategy at this point.

Paragraphs 1.2, 1.3, 2.4, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1 and 8.21 - These should all be amended to clarify that the Broads area falls outside the Joint Core strategy area.

Appendix 4 - The map and the list of wards and parishes should be modified to indicate that the Broads Authority area does not form part of the Norwich Policy Area.

Appendix 5 - The City Centre Diagram at Appendix 5 should indicate (albeit diagrammatically) the boundary between the Core Strategy area and that of the Broads Authority (i.e. the river edges)

C - 9636 - 7986 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9653

Gable Developments (Mr Chris Leeming) [7503] (represented by Lanpro (Mr C Marsden) [8164]) - **COMMENT**
Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

The consultation document needs to be revised in the context of the PINS report. However, from the pre-determined stance taken by the GNDP it will be impossible to produce an evidenced based strategy without risk of accusation that the evidence has been designed to fit the proposed outcome.

Appendix 0 - the favoured option

It is noted that the favoured option for growth includes what is described as an "urban extension" consisting of Old Catton/Sprowston/Rackheath/Thorpe St. Andrew in order to provide a concentration of growth to support local services. We cannot see that Rackheath fits the description of an "urban extension" given that its development is predicated upon the expansion of an existing village divorced from the present urban area. In addition, it is noted that historic parkland is to be conserved. This currently separates Rackheath from the urban area.

It is proposed that the level of development will be retained at Rackheath irrespective of whether or not its proposed eco-town status remains. The proposed eco-town therefore appears irrelevant in this instance.

With regard to proposed growth options in South Norfolk, under the "favoured option" it has been decided that the Yare valley renders any similar large-scale urban extension inappropriate. The consultation document offers no explanation for this in that it does not discuss the reasons in any detail anywhere within the consultation document to justify this stance.

The proposed growth in South Norfolk is spread more thinly and it is therefore difficult to see how this can result in the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services where clearly there will not be the concentration of growth considered necessary in north-east Norwich in order to achieve this. Clearly the lessons appear to have been learnt in Broadland which in the past has produced developments such as Thorpe Marriott, Dussindale and Queens Hills, all examples of stand-alone housing developments. Broadland District Council's website now offers the following recognition: "...The best way of financing these new facilities is by concentrating development in two or three larger, new communities rather than spreading the development in smaller amounts around existing communities..." - precisely what is being proposed in South Norfolk.

No explanation is offered as to why some public transport provision appears to be prioritised for improvement in advance of

the choice of the favoured strategic growth option.

It is noted that in virtually all of the locations chosen within the "favoured option" it remains to be determined how the requirements for secondary education, to support the levels of proposed housing, are to be met. In view of this it is difficult to see how the document can conclude that the Joint Core Strategy shapes the delivery of education, and transport, as suggested on page 66 of the consultation document, whilst it is also suggested that it does not need to "shape" the delivery of utility services.

There is no indication in the present document about whether any of the land within the favoured option has been secured for development, i.e. land ownership issues.

The approach taken in this consultation document appears to run counter to the advice set out in paragraphs 14 and 15 of the Inspector's notes (Norwich LDF Advisory Visit). This states that given the scale of growth programmed for the NPA, and the levels of infrastructure necessary to accommodate it, the need for infrastructure, and its funding, is key to ensuring that the Core Strategy can meet the 'effectiveness' test of soundness. It appears that the GNDP has deliberately side-stepped this issue in this consultation document.

Description of major growth locations

Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St. Andrew growth triangle

Delivery of this growth option is dependent upon the implementation of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road. No indication is given in the document as to the timing of the provision of this road or when this, in turn, will permit the delivery of housing from the proposed growth locations. No indication is provided of the phasing of delivery from the these proposals.

The consultation document states that the structure of the local geography suggests that this new community will take the form of a series of inter-related new villages or quarters. This description does not appear to fit with the earlier description of it as an urban extension.

The report sets out a list of items of to be included in the development amongst which is:

- Permeability and community integration across the Norwich Northern Distributor Road and with existing communities.

This description illustrates the "bisected" nature of the proposals and suggests that the proposed growth locations do not represent cohesive communities. They appear as isolated locations and no suggestions are offered as to how such issues are to be addressed.

Wymondham

- No discussion or reasoning is given why it remains necessary to retain the strategic gap to the north and north-east;
- No indication is provided as to how the town centre is to be expanded, where and what it is to consist of;
- Secondary education provision remains unresolved;
- No discussion as to whether the proposed level of development is capable of supporting necessary infrastructure costs.

Hethersett

- No idea given as to whether the provision of 1,000 additional houses is sufficient to support additional levels of services and the extent of what these will need to be;
- Where are employment opportunities to be created to serve the additional development in this 'extended community';
- What measures are to be taken to avoid Hethersett becoming even more of a dormitory settlement than at present;
- No reference as to whether the improvement works necessary to the Thickthorn junction to accommodate the levels of development proposed at Wymondham/Hethersett or indeed Attleborough are viable; what form these may need to take; their potential costs and timing necessary in order to facilitate the proposed growth areas.

Cringleford

Similar comments apply to this proposed growth location. In addition the impacts of additional development upon the Yare Valley appear to be glossed over in the effort to have this location as part of the growth agenda.

Long Stratton

The consultation document (page 65) indicates that the completion of a bypass is a pre-requisite for the scale of growth identified in Long Stratton. This means the road must be provided before development can take place. It is not understood how this is possible if the proposed level of growth is to fund the road, given that on page 68 of the document it states that growth is planned to deliver the road.

Irrespective of this, it is unclear whether the level of growth envisaged is sufficient to pay for the road.

The extended community is to include various facilities including an enhanced town centre. It is unclear how the centre of Long Stratton will be enhanced or expanded given the lack of available sites. With the exception of the redevelopment of the former petrol station site for a Co-op supermarket a few years ago, the present centre tends to consist mainly of hot food takeaways and hair salons.

Conclusion

We remain unclear as to why the GNDP considered it necessary to undertake this consultation when it does not appear to advance the purposes of the Joint Core Strategy, other than to put forward the "favoured option" for growth. However, we view the way in which this has been presented for consultation as "case not proven"

There are clear deficiencies in the way in which the JCS has been approached and despite the Inspector's report offering advice on the way in which the exercise should be conducted, little attention appears to have been paid to that advice.

In our view, the Joint Core Strategy represents a pre-determined outcome to the choices for future major growth locations within the Greater Norwich Policy Area; no reasonable alternatives have been assessed and there is a lack of an evidence base

to justify the favoured option put forward in this consultation.

C - 9653 - 7503 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9691 Wroxham Parish Council (Mrs Daphne Wyatt) [8047] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Please note: Re. definition of Norwich Policy Area Appendix 4. Wroxham addressed and referred to in this document as a key service area is not included within the designated boundaries of the map as shown, dated 14th July 2008. Therefore, cannot be designated as a settlement area at this moment within the context of this consultation. The plans as exhibited were a complete copy of plans submitted for the "Local Plan" in 2006 which were subsequently rejected by the Planning Inspectorate on the grounds that the area designated was considered to be an "Area of Landscape Value". We consider that the Village of Wroxham, as stated a Fringe area, should be subject to a separate consultation process and as such, should not be part of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership currently under Public Consultation.

C - 9691 - 8047 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9716 Mr Paul Ruddock [5446] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

I consider the proposals in this document to be excessive and ambitious in the planned period, given the economic downturn. I think the figures should be revisited and scaled down within the planned period. There is a need to address issues that affect existing people living here now, such as an expansion of hospital facilities which are continually under pressure and will increase with new development. I am particularly concerned with the proposals for Long Stratton. We definitely need a bypass, but the imposition of excessive numbers of houses without a more strategic plan for the village (especially as it is doubling in size) seems to be a knee jerk reaction. We need more information on this to ensure that the scale of such development is required to fund a bypass and its consequences. We also need assurances that a dual carriageway is still on the agenda and not a cheaper short term single carriageway which is inadequate as has been proved in other areas. I am also concerned at the lack of specific provisions of employment in Long Stratton to serve such increased numbers. I also think that a demographic survey should be undertaken to forecast the number of people likely to occupy the proposed 32000 houses divided between; a) people already in the Norwich Policy Area; b) people coming from outside the area taking up employment; c) people coming from outside the area to retire and then assess the impact that survey results will have on existing services.

	C - 9716 - 5446 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -
9742	<p>Mrs Rosemary Watkinson [8174] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Speaking as a Mangreen landowner. Mangreen Project: The footpaths and bridlepaths here are already enjoyed by a lot of people. If all this area becomes urbanised, those people will be forced to go much further afield to find real peace and countryside. So will the new house-holders. A lot more traffic and congestion on other foot and bridlepaths will result. A definite 'yes' or 'no' to many of the questions is impossible without far more knowledge/experience than the 'man in the street' can be expected to possess. Therefore the replies should be regarded as guesses. Not clear who is funding all this consultation; general tax payer? Council tax payer? Developers? How much is driven by "Empire Building"?; actual government orders? And what is result of a change of government?</p> <p>C - 9742 - 8174 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9749	<p>Norfolk & Norwich Association for the Blind (Mr P. J. S. Childs) [1155] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 20/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Consultation - It is important that organisations like us are consulted in advance to avoid incidents like the recent fiasco in Magdalen Street with the re-routing of buses which blind and partially sighted people did not know about.</p> <p>(Miscellaneous) Tourism - Many museums and such public places have moved a long way forward with Braille, tactile material, better lighting, but there is more to do such as large print leaflets and more material available to use.</p> <p>Visual Awareness Training - There is a feeling that taxi and bus drivers would benefit from visual awareness training as well as all Council staff who meet face to face with partially sighted people and those involved in planning and transportation decisions. We run half-day and one day training courses.</p> <p>C - 9749 - 1155 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
9751	<p>Mr David Holliday [8178] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 20/04/09</p>

	<p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>We recently visited a public exhibition at Hellesdon Community Centre. The exhibition had been very poorly attended. Although we have sympathy for those Council officers who were there and very helpful in explaining the plans, we do not believe enough has been done to make the public aware of the plans and the importance of their comments. For example, we noticed the exhibition advertised in Broadland News. If we had not, we would not have known, and had we not been able to attend on that day, we may not have been able to find out more. There should be a lot more done to promote the consultation, with a clearer message, such as: We need to build 22,000 new homes - some on land in your community - tell us what you think.</p> <p>In addition, something displayed at each of the potential development sites; posters in local community shops and temporary A-boards on main routes around the area; may easily have attracted passing residents to the exhibition - just three simple actions.</p> <p>C - 9751 - 8178 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>9776</p>	<p>Blofield Parish Council (Mrs D Wyatt) [1781] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Just confirming that Blofield Parish Council do not wish to make any additions to their previous submission.</p> <p>C - 9776 - 1781 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>9777</p>	<p>Salhouse Parish Council (Mrs D Wyatt) [1823] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Just confirming that Salhouse Parish Council do not wish to make any additions to their previous submission.</p> <p>C - 9777 - 1823 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>9811</p>	<p>Cringleford Parish Council (Mrs Anne Barnes) [7513] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 22/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p>

Yes. Realistic amounts of monies must be agreed for community facilities that remain realistic within the timescale from negotiating the 106 Agreement to final construction.

C - 9811 - 7513 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9819 East of England Development Agency (Ms Natalie Blaken) [1509] - COMMENT

Paper - 29/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Finally, the Councils should be clear that the core strategy is consistent with the findings of the Greater Norwich Integrated Development Programme and the Community Infrastructure Fund for the growth point.

C - 9819 - 1509 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9843 Ms Karen Drane [8198] (represented by Waterfront (Mr Robert Delafield) [7828]) - COMMENT

Paper - 30/03/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Following the publication of Preferred Options, the Government published a consultation document on Proposed Changes to PPS6 in July 2008. This document represents the Government's latest view on retail planning policy. Although only in consultation form, this document and its key recommendations are heavily evidence based, therefore significant weight should be attached to the document. The draft PPS6 and in particular the Ministerial Statement seeks to revisit the technical difficulties planners can be caught up in when addressing "need" and what this will mean to the town centre. Rather planners should be encouraged to plan for consumer choice and to promote competition, and to consider wider impacts of new retail development when preparing development plans, such as economic and physical regeneration, creation of jobs and the claw back of trade outside the catchment area.

We would ask that the policies and objectives of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD should have regard to the Government's new framework for town centres and retail development. The 2007 study should be updated accordingly.

Regional Planning Policy identifies Norwich as a "New Growth Point" which means that the area provides the opportunity for sustainable growth. Broadland District recognises the importance the influence of Norwich has on the sub-region - a city centre first policy - and the need to ensure that development elsewhere is consistent with the scale, size and function of the centre.

We believe it is appropriate to include within the Joint Core Strategy, and ultimately the Local Development Framework,

guidance on how future development on the above site can come forward (Fir Covert Road, Taverham). The site specific proposals meet the following key objectives:

- Objective 1 - full and detail public consultation will take place, including Taverham Parish Council.
- Objective 2 - better and safer community facilities.
- Objective 3 - healthy travel choices.
- Objective 4 - alternatives to using cars, grouping employment and services together complimenting facilities within a large and thriving residential suburb.
- Objective 5 - economic growth, 300 - 400 new local jobs, mixed uses etc.
- Objective 6 - existing residents have access to services they need.
- Objective 7 - an existing environment, including schools which can support adequately improved existing facilities and new uses proposed.
- Objective 8 - defining the edge of the built environment between the existing residential areas of Taverham and Thorpe Marriott and Norwich Northern Distributor Road and open countryside beyond.
- Objective 9 - all buildings will make the best use of proven technology to minimise impact on climate change with high BREEAM ratings.
- Objective 10 - new and improved infrastructure.
- Objective 11 - a sustainable development which will have an immediate impact on reducing travel time and cost by providing retail facilities closer to where shoppers live.
- Objective 12 - adding to what is already a substantial visitor attraction without having any negative impact on the strength and uniqueness of Norwich city centre.

C - 9843 - 8198 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9844 **Mr John Martin Shaw [7544] - COMMENT**

Paper - 14/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

I have been approached by landowners with land at Honingham which is of course the next village along the A47 after Easton. The land, amounting to some 90 acres, adjoins the existing built-up area of Honingham and would be available for development.

I appreciate that whereas Easton lies within the present Norwich Policy Area (NPA), Honingham is just outside that boundary. However the construction of the new junction with the Mattishall road on the A47 means that Honingham now has good access

to the trunk road. In view of this and the fact that Honingham is only two miles along the A47 from Easton and four miles from the Longwater/Showground complex it may well be worth reviewing the boundary of the Policy Area with a view to including Honingham.

While any development would have to avoid the Tud Valley, since I understand that there may be infrastructure problems with many of the NPA proposals, I wonder whether it is worth looking at the scope for further development in Honingham. I should be most grateful for your comments.

C - 9844 - 7544 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9906 Mr Anthony Springall [8220] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

1) In the related NATS document there is a proposal for a rapid bus route from Wymondham to Norwich with a spur to the Hospital and the UEA. I object to the rapid (or any other) bus route to the UEA if it means crossing the river between Colney Lane/Research buildings and the UEA main campus (near the Sainsburys Arts Centre). The appropriate route between the hospital and the UEA main campus should be via the B1108 Watton Rd.

2) Please ensure that Hethersett doesn't expand too far outwards so that it merges with Lt. Melton. Otherwise the plan to expand along the A11 corridor makes sense.

C - 9906 - 8220 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9921 stephen eastwood [7962] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

The site specific S39-02a and its potential for development falls outside the stated hierarchy. There is no planned connectivity with the eventual dualling of the A47 or existing road upgrades linking Lingwood to Blofield.

No Travel Assessment has been made with regards to the impact of such a size of development. Any growth must be specific to the site specific proposals commensurate with the existing hierarchy of a Service Village. This includes any development which must be sustainable including being effective in protecting the environment.

With regards to the Site specific proposal S39-02 & 02a this is not in accordance with regards to the Broadland District Council policy with regards to ENV 8 - Landscape value / character.

"The inherent visual qualities and distinctive character of areas shall be protected. Development will only be permitted where it is not detrimental to the character, scenic quality or visual benefit of the area."

The Site specific proposal S39-02a and S39-02 are located within the 'Freethorpe Plateau Landscape Character Type'. Namely:-

- i) Seek to conserve the open visual character of the area
- ii) Seek to conserve the landscape setting of Manor House, Halls and Churches
- iii) Seek to maintain key views towards churches, which are often key landscape features
- iv) Specifically to conserve the landscape setting of Lingwood
- v) To ensure new development does not disrupt the smooth, predominately uninterrupted skyline within the area.

All the aforementioned points are relative to the proposed land site specific S39-02 and S39-02a and are reasons to object to this development proposal as this area, to the north of Post Office Rd has been assessed as having Landscape Value. S39-01 is a more realistic location being adjacent to a main exit/entry route to Lingwood, the proposed roundabout size is not constrained by existing properties to the west of the existing junction.

The existing hierarchical settlement placement of Lingwood (Service Village) is appropriate to the current / future scaling of amenities and services now and in the future within the boundary limitations of Lingwood.

The Parish Council aims to expand Lingwood are predicated upon, quote " to bring a better shape to the village" and " this has always been planned for". Within the site specific documentation pertaining to S39-02a / S39-02 it states that the proposed land use / scale of development "accords with the Parish Council aims to match the Core Strategy". The proposed developments, particularly S39-02/S39-02a falls outside this specification. (See Q 21)

The Lingwood Parish Council (instigators of the requested sites), have not demonstrated any planning acumen nor wish to discuss in detail what the plans are for the S39-02a site in particular. When raised at a recent Parish meeting my attempt for a discussion with regards to Travel Plan / Impact assessment / Environmental assessment / Resources assessment was not entertained on the basis that it was a " concept / construct / vision" until a planning application is made. The allocation of such a large area of land S39-02 & 02a and its consideration for future development is at odds with the scale of acceptable limits of

development Lingwood can cope with.

Furthermore, no one directly affected by these proposals and many other villagers indirectly affected were not informed nor invited to comment prior to the site specific proposals being submitted. This is a serious point and is worthy of seeking clarification with regards to communication / responsibilities from the Parish Council towards its own parishioners / residents outside the remit of this Policy document.

Its worthy of note that many elderly residents have fallen completely out of the consultation process with regards to the GNDP and the follow on Broadland LDF due to lack of online access. Why has this not been addressed?

In summary, keep Lingwood as a Service Village and do not increase the size of the village beyond the planned 10 - 20 house scaling. I strongly object to these proposals to potentially re-classify Lingwoods position above its existing settlement placement. I also wish to mention the lack of 'best practice' with regards to the Parish Councils aims, when measured against the Policy values stated within the LCS, associated policies in the LDF and existing planning policies implemented by Broadland District Council.

The Parish Councils aims to increase the size of the village is almost certainly at odds with the aims of the majority of residents of Lingwood it purports to represent.

C - 9921 - 7962 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

9976 Sustrans (Mr Nigel Brigham) [6903] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

We are concerned that there is a general failure to recognise the need for modal shift and the tools that are needed to do this. There is clear evidence that walking and cycling need to be increased for health reasons alone and growing recognition of this. Likewise there is growing recognition of the need for local production and reducing distances travelled, but we are concerned that this document places a big overemphasis on long distance travel. Sustrans with Social data have undertaken detailed analysis of travel patterns across the UK and further afield and although this has not been done in Norwich we anticipate similar results, showing that most trips are local and there is already a great deal of potential for switching many car trips to walking and cycling.

People's travel choices are complex and changes can rarely be made by just provision of one piece of infrastructure.

Comprehensive walking and cycling networks are needed, but they also need to be attractive and people need to know about them, because travel choice is based on perceptions rather than reality. Personalised Travel Planning, work -based and school travel plans are therefore important and need mentioning. The balance between the private car and other modes can also be strongly influenced by parking policies and pricing mechanisms, which again does not seem to have been mentioned.

C - 9976 - 6903 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10143 **Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd [8234]** (represented by Landmark Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Wilkinson) [6976]) -

COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd, as part of a consortium, have been promoting a sustainable urban extension to North East Norwich for a number of years and have made representations throughout the process of the development of the Joint Core Strategy. It is still very much our view that the option of a sustainable urban extension in North East Norwich is ultimately the most sustainable option for major growth in Norwich and we welcome the recognition of this through the draft Joint Core Strategy. It is an ideal location to meet future housing needs with good (and the potential for much improved) access to Norwich City Centre.

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd is committed to the area and to developing comprehensive and long term solutions that result in the best use of their land-holdings to ensure that they are contributing towards meeting the needs of existing and future communities. This is exemplified through their commitment delivering a sustainable urban extension to the city.

It is recognised that there is a major challenge in delivering the level of growth required in the sub-region. However, the Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd is committed to working in partnership with the GNDP and other relevant stakeholders to bring forward vital and viable development that delivers sustainable growth in North East Norwich.

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd aim to pursue an Enquiry by Design (EbD) process, which will be used as a planning and design tool to obtain an optimal master plan for development that takes place within the area. It is anticipated that the full range of public and private agencies concerned with the supply of infrastructure will be involved in the master planning process. It is expected that the result of this exercise will be a detailed infrastructure requirement strategy.

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd is also looking to work closely with the team responsible for facilitating the Rackheath Eco-Community development with regard to the social and physical infrastructure required to ensure the development of

	<p>sustainable communities in North East Norwich.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with the member authorities of the GNDP to ensure that they are kept informed of progress, not in terms of working up proposals for the sustainable urban extension and with regard to the development of the appropriate delivery mechanisms to make it happen.</p> <p>C - 10143 - 8234 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>10200</p>	<p>Hopkins Homes Limited [8247] (represented by Entec UK (Mr Simon Warner (Wymondham)) [7036]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>This response along with our Settlement Assessment represents our formal response to the questions posed by the GNDP. Our submission has attempted to adopt a robust approach to identifying Wymondham as a location that can accommodate significant growth. We have made the case that Wymondham should be allocated a greater amount of housing than is out forward in the favoured option of the GNDP Core Strategy Regulation 25 Submission. This is particularly the case as lower order settlements, such as Hethersett, Cringleford and Long Stratton, clearly cannot accommodate the housing levels proposed.</p> <p>The subject site, located to the south west of Wymondham, can be found to be inherently sustainable. Hopkins Homes site at Wymondham would therefore be able to support the delivery of the RSS dwelling numbers.</p> <p>The Favoured Option is not compliant with National Planning Guidance in PPS3 and PPS12, or guidance in the RSS and as a result the Favoured Option is unsound.</p> <p>Therefore Hopkins Homes propose that the Core Strategy should be allocated between 4,000 and 8,000 new homes in Wymondham to maximise its sustainable credentials and to ensure the requirements of the RSS are delivered within the Plan period.</p> <p>C - 10200 - 8247 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>10208</p>	<p>Kier Land Ltd [8254] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Adam Nicholls) [7168]) - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>What is particularly troubling and disappointing to Kier Land Ltd is that the Technical Consultation documents is not supported</p>

by a revised Sustainability Appraisal. There have been some significant changes to the Core Strategy since the original Issues & Options report of November 2007 (which was supported by SA): For instance, there are now three main options for major development, and choices made in relations to the distribution and number of dwellings for smaller-scale development. It is proposed that Aylsham not be allocated any additional housing, with only infill growth permitted, yet there are no SA results to support this decision (i.e. it has not been compared with "Aylsham - 300 homes" or even "Acle - 100-200 dwellings", for example).

Kier Land Ltd has been informed that the revised SA to support the Technical Consultation will not be available until early October (i.e. after the end of the consultation period for the Technical Consultation). This is wholly unsatisfactory: Paragraph 4.43 of PPS12 states that SA "... should form an integrated part of the plan preparation process. SA should inform the evaluation of alternatives. SA should provide a powerful means of proving to decision makers, and the public, that the plan is the most appropriate given reasonable alternatives". The overall soundness of the Joint Core Strategy is, even at this early stage, clearly questionable.

Water Cycle Study: The results of the Water Cycle appear to be the key determinant in the decision not to allocate any dwellings to Aylsham. In turn, this seems to be based on policy WAT2 of the East of England Plan, which urges LDDs to site new development where it can take up 'spare' water supply/wastewater infrastructure and thereby minimise the need for new/improved infrastructure. Whilst the general point is accepted, water supply and wastewater capacity are only one element in determining the strengths and weaknesses of potential new development locations. Irrespective of this, water supply and wastewater treatment works tend to need to be upgraded on a fairly regular basis (e.g. to cope with increased environmental standards), so their situation needs to be assessed over the whole Plan period.

A more general criticism of the Water Cycle Study is that it appears to be a stage 'behind' the Joint Core Strategy. For example, Kier Land Ltd would have expected to see the costs and timeframe for accommodating/providing water/wastewater infrastructure for proposed allocations in Main Towns and Key Service Centres included in Stage 2a of the Water Cycle Study. It is difficult to know what the exact cost of providing upgraded sewage treatment infrastructure for 300 dwellings in Aylsham would be, but extrapolating from the costs for upgrading for 100 and 500 dwellings, it would appear to be in the region of £2.3m. Although this figure is unsurprisingly higher than for most Main Towns, it would not be payable by any developers - instead it would be gradually recharged through water bills.

A quick perusal of the figures for water supply costs for other Main Towns and Key Service Centres is illuminating. For instance, using an indicative figure of 100 new dwellings, the cost of providing wastewater and water supply infrastructure for Aylsham is roughly £7.4m; for Harleston the figure is £9.8m; for Diss the figure is £10.2m; and for Loddon the figure is an astronomical £14.4m! In calculating the likely costs of upgrading wastewater infrastructure, water supply and water resources,

and 'scoring' flood risk, groundwater pollution potential and surface water quality, the Water Cycle Study (revised Stage 2a) finds that Aylsham scores 'better' (i.e. cheaper and less risk of environmental harm) than fellow Main Towns Harleston and Diss. It is interesting to note that Acle - a Key Service Centre - is proposed for an allocation of 100-200 dwellings "because no allocations can be made at Aylsham", yet in table 5.5 of the Water Cycle Study Stage 2a (September 2008), Acle is ranked 7th of the 8 Rural Policy Areas, with higher costs and greater environmental constraints than Aylsham. Kier Land Ltd therefore finds the decision to not allocate any dwellings to Aylsham, purely on the basis of lack of wastewater treatment capacity, very difficult to understand.

C - 10208 - 8254 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10232 Mr D Mawson OBE [5864] - COMMENT

Paper - 30/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

There is little mention of the need to protect the environment of historic buildings. In my view it is not enough to merely retain such buildings and conserve them where necessary: The setting that has existing since the construction of them must be retained unaltered, particularly in the open countryside. Therefore an exclusion zone of 400 metres on all sides of these buildings should be insisted upon.

Appendices 1, 2 and 3:

I cannot see how the town centre of Wymondham can be expanded without drastic alterations to the existing buildings, many of which are listed. If the demolition of some of these buildings is needed to achieve this expansion, it will ruin the high environmental and historical quality of the town. About 40 years ago there was an example of the loss I am referring to with the building of a most unsuitable block on Market Street of which Summerfield's is part.

C - 10232 - 5864 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10233 Mrs T P S Cane [7147] - COMMENT

Paper - 01/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

(SEWAGE WORKS ACCESS DIRECT OFF A47) A huge waste of the taxpayer's money. I was sent two letters in the early Spring, the second one apologising for the first, which was intended for Parish Councils and so no consultation docs arrived. I queried this at the time and was told they would be sent out or I could go to Poringland or The Hollies to collect one. As I wished to spend time reading and assessing the plan, I asked for them to be sent - this was agreed. They didn't arrive, so I

	<p>telephoned on 15th April to request my copy as promised and was told it would be sent. Bearing in mind the closing date of 24th April when it arrived that morning I didn't stand a chance to get it read, checked or filled in by the end of the day. Now post arrives at lunchtime and I had an appointment to keep, I was more than a little upset. I am so worried than when a sustains cycle route and bridleway - the main one in a large group of parishes is being used for huge 40 tonne lorries constantly in the day and night. What is going to happen at Whitlingham sewage works with all this extra housing? Highways have closed a perfectly routed lane to traffic, maintaining a tarmac road for just a few residents and yet our village has motorway status and constant traffic up a bridleway when the Norwich Southern bypass lies adjacent to the works with no access for lorries. How can those lucky people in Beeston St Andrew manage to sleep at night? They should try this side of the Yare. It has to be sorted before the houses are built. One on and one off for sewage lorries, composting trucks and all the Anglian Sewage Office and Works traffic to access the Works directly from the A47. I hate the media laughing at what goes on in Norfolk. We had a hospital with no direct route, a sewage works served by 1 1/4 miles of concrete byway, trees cut down in case little dears knocked conkers down - it goes on and on and I had hoped this consultation would address SEWAGE WORKS ACCESS DIRECT FROM A47.</p> <p>C - 10233 - 7147 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>10240</p>	<p>Hethersett Parish Council (Ian Weetman) [8023] - COMMENT Paper - 24/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? The next consultation stage should be extended beyond September to allow for disruption caused by the holiday season?</p> <p>C - 10240 - 8023 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>10243</p>	<p>Mr Duncan Smith [8257] - COMMENT Paper - 23/04/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? If the Government or Councils insist on building houses, please ensure they have reasonably sized gardens. This is to give separation and privacy regardless of how people use the space. Once built, if social and working patterns change, you cannot make the gardens bigger.</p> <p>C - 10243 - 8257 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>10248</p>	<p>Mrs Angela Garner [8258] - COMMENT</p>

	<p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>I am not prepared to wade through your glossy brochure, which must have cost thousands to produce, just to answer loaded questions. What audacity to include a glossary of everyday words - please afford the electorate some common sense and basic knowledge.</p> <p>C - 10248 - 8258 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
10253	<p>Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8260] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 09/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Glossary is missing: Geodiversity Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphologic Site (RIGS) (On a par with county wildlife sites. They should also be referred to within the document itself.)</p> <p>But it is good to see that the geological content of Sissies is included in the definition given.</p> <p>C - 10253 - 8260 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
10332	<p>CPRE Norfolk (Mr James Frost) [6826] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 27/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>The public is being asked to consult on a document which is inconsistent and out of date. The document includes a favoured option for growth but the implications to key policies 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9 have not been incorporated. This seems very irregular considering the importance of the implications and the fact that the public will not get a further chance to be consulted. It is no surprise that people feel divorced from the process given the confusion inherent in the document.</p> <p>C - 10332 - 6826 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
10357	<p>Arthritis Care (Ms Carole Williams) [8293] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 30/04/09</p>

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?
Please could Norwich take this opportunity to have a proper pedestrian zone without vehicles at all - i.e. none after 9 a.m. and before 7 p.m. Currently anyone with mobility problems, visual impairment etc. can be put at risk by vehicles driving up/down Bedford Street, London Street etc. Lorries are too large to be allowed in these areas - one is frequently squashed against the walls of shops. Smaller vans can be quite threatening. Other cities have a no vehicle zone - why not Norwich?

C - 10357 - 8293 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10379 Keswick Parish Council (Mr P Brooks) [2020] - COMMENT

Paper - 24/04/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

The Parish Council is of the opinion that:

- the Joint Core Strategy is complete and comprehensive but the parts are inextricably linked in a manner that creates interdependencies crucial to the success of the whole strategy
- the Document is starkly silent on all matters in relation to cost but does identify some agencies which will be crucial (particularly with regard to the transport infrastructure) without whose support the Strategy will fail in some key respects
- the Strategy does not recognise the fundamental fragility of the current economic situation and the possible long term impacts which may be pivotal to its success.

The Parish Council therefore believes it would be prudent to factor these considerations into the Strategy and for their relevance to be recognized and appreciated in the Document. One suggestion would be for the GNDDP to undertake a risk assessment of the different interdependencies and identify their possible long and short term impacts against predictions for the economic recovery. That would enable a tiered Strategy to be produced which would provide:

- surety about a first tier of development leading to
- further development forecast against a background of realistic and sensible economic recovery; and setting
- a foundation for the total Strategy outlined in the Document to be achieved in a measured and assured manner instead of the much higher risk option presented.

C - 10379 - 2020 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10423 Ms Barbara Lockwood [8306] - COMMENT

	<p>Paper - 11/05/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? I am wary in this current climate of the Government's wasted time and funds for going ahead with partnership and development. Having said that, I well understand the help for the unemployed to gain work.</p> <p>I also feel although the NDR will probably be needed in future, it is not needed at this point in time due to loss of business on the roads and we know not how long this will continue.</p> <p>The whole issue of Increased Taxes must be taken into consideration too.</p> <p>The public must also be given greater awareness of the Joint Committee Consultations within the partnership.</p> <p>These are future needs for a growing population that must be addressed as soon as possible in the near future; first of all repelling and dismissing those prone to greed and fraud by fixing their own rules.</p> <p>C - 10423 - 8306 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>10424</p>	<p>Morningthorpe Parish Council (Mr P Rodger) [8307] - COMMENT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Under the current economic climate we do not consider any of the suggested objectives are achievable.</p> <p>C - 10424 - 8307 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>10475</p>	<p>Mr David Smith [8309] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? I was born in Norfolk, my roots are here. I do not want to see it all built up like other parts of the country and spoilt by outsiders - their only interest is just to make money, then move on. I do not want to see all this mass building which will destroy fields, hedgerows and trees that have been here for hundreds of years. These all give us oxygen which we all need. To replace this with houses and silly bushes stuck here and there with grass verges neatly cut is absolutely crazy. This is all going against the environment. Everyone that I have met is against this. If this goes ahead this will not be a democracy as I have</p>

	<p>always voted labour, conservative or liberal all my life, but I am fed up with all the crookedness, lies and deceitfulness of government and councils. If this goes ahead I will vote for the British Nationalist Party as they want to look after the countryside, not destroy it.</p> <p>C - 10475 - 8309 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
10503	<p>Mr I T Smith [8310] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? The local people living in the villages and hamlets should have the right to stop any development which would affect their lives. Too often people's lives are destroyed by people from outside who come in to dictate what will happen. The GNDP is wasting huge amounts of money which would be better spent on helping towns and villages in this region. The GNDP should be scrapped as it will cause immeasurable harm to the region.</p> <p>C - 10503 - 8310 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
10527	<p>Postwick with Witton Parish Council (A R Woods) [7215] - COMMENT Paper - 08/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? The major growth for north east of Norwich is dependent on improvements to the Postwick interchange and building the NDR. Without these, the growth should not proceed.</p> <p>C - 10527 - 7215 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
10575	<p>Mr G P Collings [8318] - COMMENT Paper - 03/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? We must stop building roads and development. We must retain all green fields and open spaces. We must retain all farmland for production of food as we will be faced with a food shortage in a few years time as global warming will result in crop failures. Development is unnecessary and it is proposed just for greed.</p> <p>C - 10575 - 8318 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>

10599 Mr/Mrs Shingfield [8319] - COMMENT

Paper - 08/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Having lived in Norfolk all our lives, as did our parents, we have seen Norfolk ruined totally by so called "improvements", opening up of Norfolk and progress. Our quality of life has decreased. There are too many people coming to live in Norfolk - to house these people, an urban sprawl has been taking over our beautiful countryside. Everywhere is crowded, roads congested, schools full, doctors and dentists full, hospitals working way beyond capacity, special schools turning away scores of children due to lack of spaces.

Whatever infrastructure is put into place to accommodate the occupants of new housing will not be sufficient. We need more infrastructure to cope with all the people that are here now.

Jobs, homes, prosperity for local people? You slogan is unbelievable. The jobs described are unsustainable. In shops and leisure, if the economy has a downturn, these jobs go. They are not real jobs such as production industries for our country and export. More homes are only needed because people keep coming here and Norfolk is full, Britain is full. Prosperity for local people?

Our heritage, our culture is being lost along with our beautiful Norfolk to become a mish mash of urban sprawl. Even our own Norfolk accent ridiculed in our own county because of the relentless population input. Please leave Norfolk to be enjoyed by the present maximum residents.

Government targets on growth must be questioned, not just accepted. It is only 17 years until 2026. What will be asked of us after this?

Vast areas of agriculture land are being lost to development. Combined with rising sea levels this will prove disastrous. Jobs, homes, prosperity for local people, but for how long? Let's re-think for the sake of future generations.

C - 10599 - 8319 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10631 Central Norwich Citizens Forum (Ms Patricia Daniel) [8325] - COMMENT

Web - 10/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Difficult to assess in difficult economic recession times - the whole plan will depend upon sufficient capital investment. If we can get that then it does look to be a sustainable plan.

C - 10631 - 8325 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10651 Ms Lucy Hall [8295] - COMMENT

Web - 11/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

If it hasn't already been done, I hope that GNDP will consider involving schools in the strategy consultation. Children also live in houses and neighbourhoods and have opinions about how they want to live. When they grow up they will have to deal with the results of this building programme, good or bad. Their comments are just as valid as adults'. The exhibition timetable doesn't seem to have included any schools.

C - 10651 - 8295 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10681 Mrs Lyn Robertson [8348] - COMMENT

Paper - 15/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

I suppose my main concern is that the identity of Norfolk will gradually disappear through further development. The dualling of the Elvedon stretch of the A11, whilst improving transport links, will open the way for future development along this corridor in an area of outstanding beauty. Where else do you get such large blue skies? Norfolk is rich in culture and history with a strong rural link, this should not be overshadowed, we do not want the county to end up like Essex. Development of the airport should be limited. Stansted is easily accessible.

Additional growth in population will also inevitably mean an increase in crime unless communities are able to work, be educated and have access to services. The GNDP must ensure that the houses are not all built first, that the development is simultaneous.

The energy requirement of the development must be accurately assessed to ensure that green energy is used at every opportunity. Maybe this should be a pre-requisite for developers and businesses. The use of wind farms must be encouraged and community CHP. There are many communities worldwide which have been developed with this in mind.

C - 10681 - 8348 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10686 Ms Natalie Beal [8349] - COMMENT

Paper - 10/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

There is no mention throughout the document of the Manual for Streets, BREEAM or Building for Life. This would help ensure that developments are as sustainable as possible.

Whenever environment, economic and social are mentioned, environment is always mentioned last. The Stern review clearly states that climate change is the biggest market failure that exists. I would like this wording re-ordered in order to emphasise that when you mean sustainable, you really mean strong sustainability rather than weak sustainability. It feels that you use the word sustainable a lot, but the order you put things in implies that you are only really using it because it is a buzz word at the moment and not something you believe in.

Other examples are where road improvements are mentioned first in lists with walking and cycling last.

C - 10686 - 8349 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10699 Kier Land Ltd [8254] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mrs Isabel Lockwood) [7175]) - COMMENT

Paper - 08/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

However, Kier Land Ltd is extremely disappointed at the contents of the latest iteration of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Essentially it appears that the SA is still the same document as it was when it accompanied the July 2008 Issues & Options consultation document, but with updates only to cover the new favoured growth option. Yet in Kier Land Ltd's opinion there could not be a clearer example of where SA should be a valuable part of the decision-making process than the housing allocation at Aylsham. Statutory consultees such as Norfolk County Council, Anglian Water, NHS Norfolk and Aylsham Town Council believe that there are no significant constraints to growth at Aylsham (apart from the current lack of sewerage capacity), and therefore a proper SA of the housing options for Aylsham should have been carried out.

Acle (a Key Service Centre) is proposed to receive an allocation of 100-200 dwellings because no allocation is proposed for Aylsham. Kier Land Ltd is astonished to see that this important decision has apparently been reached without reference to a sustainability appraisal of the options. The 'environmental' reason (lack of current sewerage capacity) appears to outweigh the 'social' (adequate school capacity, healthcare services, shops) and 'economic' (Aylsham has a much larger employment base than Acle) but without any apparent balancing of the factors. This would be understandable if the lack of sewerage capacity

was an absolute constraint, but Anglian Water has made clear that upgrades to the sewerage system is merely a matter of timing (they will need sufficient time to build in investment decisions into their future Asset Management Plans).

Paragraph 3.37 of Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents makes clear that "broad strategic options" should be considered at the early stages of SA and policy options production (Task B2). Kier Land Ltd finds it difficult to understand how the re-distribution of 100-200 dwellings from Aylsham to Acle does not count as a "broad strategic option" which should have been subject to a detailed sustainability appraisal. The note on the front cover of the Joint Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Framework that "this appraisal will be developed further to take account of consultation responses from the technical consultation (summer 2008) and the public consultation (spring 2009)" appears to give the impression that, contrary to the requirements of the SA process, decisions are being made by the GNDDP and then SA assessments are undertaken later, rather than be considered contemporaneously. This is a serious flaw in the production of the Joint Core Strategy. Kier Land Ltd asserts that there should be a further round of Issues & Options consultation, accompanied by an up-to-date SA and Stage 2B Water Cycle Study, before the Pre-Submission Consultation document is published.

C - 10699 - 8254 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10711 Hethersett Consortium [8353] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Ms Becky Rejzek) [4034]) - **COMMENT**
Paper - 13/05/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

The draft Sustainability Appraisal (SA), incorporating appraisals of original Options 1, 2 and 3 (August 2008); Option 2a (December 2008) and the Favoured Option (December 2009) was published at the end of April 2009. It is a useful document to assess the performance of the Favoured Option in meeting sustainability objectives, compared to the previous options for identifying strategic growth locations.

We note that the SA conclusion for the JCS Vision (page 9) acknowledges the Vision's attempts to promote sustainable locations for new development. However, later on in the SA, questions are raised over the sustainability performance of the Favoured Option for growth distribution compared to other previous options. Given this, it is unclear whether the Favoured Option can deliver the Vision's aspirations for sustainable growth, especially as the latest distribution of growth would not appear to result in the most sustainable outcomes.

We have reviewed the Sustainability Appraisal and considered its conclusions on the various growth distribution options. We note and support the SA conclusion of the previous Option 1 (i.e. including 4000 homes in Hethersett) (page 160) that this approach performs well against the sustainability criteria. We agree that it would deliver sustainable transport infrastructure and

services, which is a key requirement for growth in the RSS. We do not accept that growth at Hethersett would have any impacts on European sites, and the Ecology report that we have submitted previously to the GNDP would confirm this. We agree that Green Infrastructure would be significantly enhanced.

We also note the SA's conclusion of the previous Option 2, (i.e. 4000 homes at Hethersett and redistributed growth to other locations in South Norfolk) (page 173), and agree that it performs generally well in sustainability terms. We also accept that there are serious doubts about the sustainability credentials of strategic levels of growth at Long Stratton and the ability to fund a by-pass and other necessary infrastructure.

The SA conclusion of the previous Option 3 (i.e. no growth at Hethersett and redistributed to other locations in South Norfolk) (page 185) was the least best performing of the 3 options, particularly in relation to delivering high quality public transport and infrastructure, which are key requirements for growth set out in the RSS. We can agree with the SA's conclusion.

The SA of Option 2a (December 2008) (i.e. limited growth in Hethersett of 1000 homes and further redistributed growth in South Norfolk) (page 201) concluded that the sustainability benefits were reduced because of the weakening in the ability to provide high quality public transport and uncertainty over the delivery of the Long Stratton by-pass due to the dispersal of growth. We agree with this conclusion. However, it did conclude that growth at Hethersett could be accommodated within sustainability limits.

The SA of the Favoured Option (February 2009) (i.e. reduced overall levels of new housing growth from 24,000 to 21,000, limited growth in Hethersett of 1,000 dwellings and redistributed growth to settlements in South Norfolk) (page 218), results in similar sustainability conclusions to Option 2a. Again, we agree that pursuing such an option would result in less sustainable outcomes than pursuing previous Options 1 and 2.

We contend that it is very clear that the sustainability benefits of the Favoured Option are held back because of the approach to redistributing growth to a number of settlements in South Norfolk and the resultant weakening in the ability to provide high quality public transport, jobs and services. We agree with the SA's acknowledgement that these factors are essential in the delivery of sustainable communities, and in particular sustainable transport and services, and helping to combat CO2 and the negative impacts of growth.

We have also considered the SA of the different growth locations, including the South West (pages 294-302). We agree with the SA's conclusion that to deliver a wide range of services, including improved public transport requires a large scale of development. We agree that the location provides good public transport and cycling access to major employment locations. Our own evidence confirms the SA's conclusion that the area contains few areas of existing environmental constraint, and providing

the scale of growth is sufficient can also deliver a country park. However, importantly we disagree with the statement that the development would result in the coalescence of 2 villages. Our Vision and Delivery statement demonstrates that 4,000 homes can be accommodated on land north of Hethersett without coalescing with Little Melton. It is important that the SA is amended to reflect this, and remove it as an impact. Our Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment demonstrates how the land could be developed within existing landscape capacity limits.

Conclusions:

We broadly support the Sustainability Appraisal's conclusions. It clearly demonstrates that Options 1 and 2 (July 2008), including 4,000 homes at Hethersett are the most sustainable options for accommodating strategic growth, compared with Options 3 (July 2008), 2a (December 2008) and the Favoured Option (February 2009).

It also clearly demonstrates that the current Favoured Option of dispersing growth to South Norfolk settlements results in a less sustainable outcome than focussing growth on key locations in South Norfolk, including Hethersett. The SA confirms that the South West area, including Hethersett is capable of accommodating strategic levels of growth beyond the 1,000 provided in the Favoured Option. Indeed such an approach provides the greatest opportunity to deliver the public transport services, infrastructure and other facilities required as pre-requisites of sustainable growth, as set out in the RSS. We support the overall conclusion that for larger scale development, the South West area is one of the best performers in sustainability terms.

We do not accept the SA's conclusion that growth in the South West would result in the Coalescence of villages. We have demonstrated how strategic levels of growth can be accommodated without coalescence. We therefore suggest that the SA is changed to reflect this. We do not accept that growth at Hethersett would have a 'dramatic negative' impact on the local landscape and townscape. We have demonstrated how strategic levels of growth can be accommodated within landscape capacity limits.

We consider that Hethersett is one of the best locations for accommodating higher levels of strategic growth; and provides the best opportunity to deliver high quality public transport, infrastructure, services and facilities needed to support a sustainable community.

C - 10711 - 8353 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10751 Aylsham Town Council (Mrs M E Anderson-Dungar) [1776] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Thank you for the opportunity, but the Town Council has no further comments to make.

Members did feel that the document was user-friendly and easy to understand from the public's perspective.

C - 10751 - 1776 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10877 Taylor Wimpey Developments & Hopkins Homes [8363] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Paragraph 3.10 of the East of England Plan states that the main strategy is to concentrate development at the region's cities and other significant urban areas, including selected market towns. Policy SS3 of the EEP defines Key Centres for Development and Change. Norwich is identified therein as a KCDC. Policy 1 of the Public Consultation describes the settlement hierarchy for Broadland/Norwich/South Norfolk, noting that the scale of development will decrease at each level of that hierarchy. New development will be focused on the urban area of Norwich, including urban fringe parishes such as Costessey. Costessey is physically part of the built-up area of Norwich and its identification as a location for further growth implements not only Policies 1 and 5 of the Public Consultation but also Policies SS3, H1 and NR1 of the East of England Plan. Costessey is appropriately identified in the Public Consultation as an element of the favoured growth option. Our clients particularly support the identification of a strategic growth location at Costessey between the A47 and the built-up area of Norwich.

Paragraph 13.67 of the EEP acknowledges the economic strengths of the Norwich area and states that there are opportunities to build upon those existing prospects. Policy NR1 of the EEP requires that the strategy for employment growth should focus on specific locations, including Longwater (business park uses). When these strategic spatial planning objectives are considered, it is clear that Norwich is the primary focus for the accommodation of new housing and employment opportunities. That being the case, Costessey is an apposite and sustainable location for further housing, being well related to the urban area of Norwich and situated in close proximity to important existing employment areas. Costessey has a higher rating in the settlement hierarchy than Easton and, in the circumstances, Appendix 0 of the Public Consultation should make a distinction between Easton and Costessey, noting that

the latter represents a more sustainable focus for further housing.

Further housing at the proposed Lodge Farm extension can assist in a positive manner in the provision of facilities such as enhanced public transport and improved bus/cycle links. Lodge Farm is better related to Longwater and the Bowthorpe employment area than Easton.

A careful consideration of the strategic planning merits of Costessey leads to the conclusion that it is a more appropriate location for growth than Easton which is physically separated from Norwich by the A47 and the Royal Norfolk Showground. The implementation of a sound spatial strategy, reflecting the policy base provided by the EEP, would recognise the advantages of Costessey. Given that clear strategic spatial planning policy framework, our clients have noted with some concern the observation at page 49 of the Regulation 25 Consultation: Evidence Report which describes potential disbenefits should the proposed Longwater junction improvements not arise. The Evidence Report specifically identifies the loss of "some of the benefits to Easton College of nearby development." Our clients would respectfully suggest that the Core Strategy should be promulgated on the basis of sound spatial planning considerations, not the perceived benefits to a particular organisation. Paragraph 38 of PPS3 refers to the criteria to be used by local planning authorities when identifying locations to accommodate new housing. One of the matters to be weighed in the balance is the accessibility of a proposed development area to existing local community facilities, infrastructure and services, including public transport. The location of housing should facilitate the creation of communities of sufficient size and mix to justify the development of, and sustain, community facilities, infrastructure and services. The desired outcome can be achieved by extending the existing Lodge Farm development area. The plan at page 69 of the Public Consultation illustrates the favoured growth option and our clients welcome the identification of land between the A47 and the existing urban edge of Norwich as a strategic growth location.

Appendix 0 suggests that the Costessey area is expected to accommodate 1,000 dwellings. We would observe that such a figure represents the minimum to be constructed, following the advice given at Policy H1 of the EEP. As Costessey plainly occupies a more sustainable strategic location than Easton, the Joint Core Strategy should make clear the fact that any housing to be provided at Easton will be a residual figure once the capacity of land at the western edge of Norwich has been maximised.

The Spatial Vision established in the Public Consultation states that where greenfield development is unavoidable, "it will be guided to areas with good access to Norwich, to a

range of strategic employment locations, and services, and where good public transport links exist or can be provided." There are substantial/important existing strategic employment locations at Longwater and Bowthorpe, close to the proposed Lodge Farm extension. The Costessey area is an appropriate location for growth given the relationship between the proposed new housing and the existing strategic employment locations. Easton does not exhibit the same physical or spatial relationship to the urban area of Norwich and the strategic employment locations.

C - 10877 - 8363 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10905 Broadland Land Trust [8366] (represented by Savills (London) (Mr Michael Derbyshire) [8365]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

The Broadland Land Trust (BLT) comprises a number of landowners who have been working together to promote a sustainable urban extension to North East Norwich (please refer to the map in appendix 1). The BLT has been involved throughout the development of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership's (GNDP's) Joint Core Strategy.

The land owners brought together through the BLT have a shared interest in the long term future of this area and now intend to create a single, legal delivery vehicle to bring forward circa 320 ha of land for a sustainable urban extension to north east Norwich. The extent of this land is included within the area delineated in red on the map on page 8 of Broadland District Council's growth questionnaire.

It is recognised that that the delivery of such a large-scale and complex programme will have major challenges. However, the BLT is committed to working with the GNDP and other relevant stakeholders to bring forward vital and viable development in the growth location. .

The BLT has initiated an EbD process, championed by the PFBE, which has begun to identify the key and detailed issues associated with growth in this location. The outcome of the full EbD process will be a masterplan for the urban extension, planned and designed with active involvement from the GNDP, its constituent local authorities, local residents and other relevant stakeholders.

It is the BLT's intention that the EbD process will inform BLT's response to the Joint

	<p>Core Strategy process. However, as the EbD process has not been concluded, it will be necessary for the BLT to supplement these representations with information and outcomes that arise from this masterplanning process.</p> <p>C - 10905 - 8366 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
10947	<p>Ms Jean Cooper [8368] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? 1. Traffic control improvement needed within city (St. Stephens!) 2. Improved bus service needed in Thorpe St Andrew (North side). An extra bus - 124 - although much appreciated, was cancelled a few weeks ago. We 'oldies' have no means of getting back up the hills from River Green (the main street of Thorpe St Andrew)! 3. Is the second van left on site (see 8.9) not a permanent base and therefore not a travellers ...?</p> <p>C - 10947 - 8368 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
10971	<p>Mr William E Cooper [8369] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? High quality bus services in and around city: One hopes St Stephen's will be "sorted" as at moment this is a complete "foul up". Castle Meadow not much better.</p> <p>Improved bus services for North Thorpe. There is no service for elderly between "Upper Thorpe" and "Lower Thorpe" i.e. River Green area.</p> <p>Also no service to Thorpe Road via Harvey Lane. 124 that covered this area until recently, has been withdrawn.</p> <p>C - 10971 - 8369 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
11018	<p>Mrs S Plaw [8370] - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered</p>

	<p>previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Please try to use brownfield sites wherever feasible. Please don't destroy the countryside and our rural villages in the rush for more houses.</p> <p>C - 11018 - 8370 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>11024</p>	<p>Wrenbridge (Harts farm Ltd) [2425] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr John Long) [8211]) - COMMENT Paper - 12/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd supports the Sustainability Appraisal's (SA) general conclusions that Wymondham is a good location for growth; is a well established employment location in its own right; has already demonstrated the ability to attract investment; and is a readily accessible established strategic employment location.</p> <p>C - 11024 - 2425 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>11034</p>	<p>Mr Bernard Godding [8372] - COMMENT Paper - 14/06/09 Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? Secondly, while it is stated at 8.3, Sustainable neighbourhoods - that the transport system enables sustainable use of resources minimising the emission of carbon dioxide and thus the impact on climate change.</p> <p>And in the response at ENV 6 to the questions regarding adaptation and mitigation of the impacts of climate change:-</p> <p>Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing energy consumption? Will it lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources? Will it increase the capacity of the area to withstand the effects of climate change? Will it ensure that the risks to lives, land and property are minimised?</p> <p>While it is suggested that the 'Vision has a specific section responding to the challenges of climate change', this is not clearly defined.</p> <p>Indeed there seems to be virtually nothing that suggests that the strategy takes a meaningful and effective view of wither Peak Oil or Climate Change. Thus there are no suggestions regarding energy security, a heavy emphasis on (diesel?) buses for</p>

transport, no mention of micro generation, on-land wind farms.

C - 11034 - 8372 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

11039 Norwich Design Quality Panel (The Manager) [8375] - COMMENT

Paper - 09/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Overall there is no clear, articulated, explicit and comprehensive aspiration for Quality of Design (in all senses, not just what things look like) in any proposals forthcoming; wherever quality is mentioned it is subsidiary to other issues. In the context of the broad meaning of quality, the Panel wished to particularly stress the importance of quality encompassing low carbon development considerations. Additional to obvious elements such as how we build buildings, this must include how we live - walkable/cyclable rather than car based environments, the positive use of water in developments and surface/run-off/flooding issues, relationship of activities and the need to reduce travel, plants, planting and carbon sinks.

Equally there is little consideration of the carbon impact of each development decision or the policies that will allow them to happen.

C - 11039 - 8375 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

11060 Mr Mark Champion [8376] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

The document is clearly thorough and represents a great deal of hard work on the part of many people. However, I am concerned that this document denies a great deal of people the opportunity to comment purposefully upon the proposals.

First, the opportunity for public comment has not been effectively advertised. I know very few people who are aware that this opportunity exists - clearly the message is not getting through. The consultation requires far more media exposure, and a simple message i.e. We're going to construct loads of new houses and roads in Norwich - where do you want them?; this should be splashed over the front of the Evening News for a week.

In addition, the language used in the document is far too complex. Take for example: ...In negotiating the proportion and tenure of affordable housing account will be taken of site characteristics and the economic viability of provision...

The purpose of the strategy is to ask the people who live in Norwich what they think of the plans - the wording in the document will prevent most people - myself included - from making clear judgements about exactly what the proposals entail. This clearly undermines the purpose and validity of a public consultation, as only a minority of the public will be able to access and respond to the document.

Finally, the Joint Core Strategy Exhibition Timetable interests me as it seems, with the exception of the opening exhibition at the Forum, all exhibition dates occurred on weekdays when, of course, a large number of people are at work. If the consultation was actively seeking full public representation, these events would be held on weekends AND weekdays to ensure that ALL those who wished to comment on the major plans for their city were able to.

Representation Summary: The public consultation is ineffective and prevents many people from commenting on large scale plans that are certain to impact on them. I believe this because: 1. The language used in the document is too complex for people not familiar with planning; 2. The consultation document, and the opportunity for consultation, have been poorly advertised; 3. The timings of the public exhibitions are likely to have denied many people the opportunity to be introduced to the proposals.

C - 11060 - 8376 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

11065 Wymondham Consortium of Landowners [8218] (represented by Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Rob Snowling) [8381]) -

COMMENT

Paper - 15/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Environmental Impact:

- ENV1 (To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment): We note and support the GNDP's assessment of public transport facilities in Wymondham and the excellent connection that Wymondham Railway Station provides with Norwich, Thetford and Cambridge. The Wymondham South site is located within close proximity of the town centre and the Railway Station. It is therefore considered that development of the Wymondham South site will contribute towards the GNDP's assessment that Wymondham compared favourably with other proposed growth locations within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA). Furthermore, we consider that growth at Wymondham South will help to achieve the objectives of ENV1 through the implementation of an access strategy that is based on existing public transport facilities and a reduction in sole occupancy car journeys (i.e. modal shift).

- ENV2 (To improve the quality of the water environment): The Wymondham South site provides the opportunity to improve biodiversity and create wetland habitats, possibly as part of a surface water attenuation strategy. We consider that the potential to create new wetland habitats should be considered as a positive effect (rather than a neutral effect).

- ENV3 (To improve environmental amenity, including air quality): We note that the GNDP consider that growth at Wymondham represents a negative effects in terms of improving air quality. However, we consider that growth at Wymondham South provides the opportunity for modal shift (see comments at ENV1), which is likely to result in reduced levels of emissions, when compared with other growth locations. We therefore consider that the impact of growth at Wymondham, and moreover Wymondham South, in respect of emerging Policy ENV3, should be considered as neutral/positive, rather than negative.
- ENV4 (To maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity): The Wymondham South sites, including land to the northeast of Rightup Lane, provides the opportunity to maintain and enhance biodiversity through the creation of strategic and public open space. We therefore consider that Wymondham should receive a positive score under ENV4.
- ENV5 (To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment): We note the GNDP's comment that growth to the south of Wymondham would not affect areas of particular landscape value, and would therefore be preferable to growth elsewhere at Wymondham. The larger part of the Wymondham south site (between Silfield Road and Rightup Lane) is comprised of a former sand and gravel working and a redundant animal feed mill (Barker's Mill). We therefore consider that growth in this location presents an opportunity to enhance the quality of the natural landscape, and the urban townscape/historic environment, through high quality design and place making.
- ENV7 (To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk): The Wymondham South site is located in an area where the risk of flooding is less than 1 in 1,000. A drainage assessment is currently being undertaken by the Consortium that will assess the suitability of SUDS to accommodate surface water run-off and assess the capacity of foul water infrastructure. As stated above, we consider that the opportunity to create or enhance wetland habitat as part of the proposed development, possibly as part pf a surface water attenuation strategy, is a positive effect.
- ENV9 (To make the best use of resources, including land and energy, and to minimise waste production): The Wymondham South site is classed as low grade arable farmland. However, as stated above, the majority of the site is comprised of a former sand and gravel workings and a redundant animal feed mill (Barker's Mill), which constitutes previously developed land, It is therefore considered that growth at Wymondham, and more specifically the Wymondham South site, will have a positive impact.

Social Impacts:

- The vision for the development of Wymondham South will be to form an attractive and sustainable community which integrates seamlessly with the existing settlement, creating strong connective links with the town centre. The design concept will be to create a place that has its own distinct qualities whilst also responding to the surrounding local character, features and landscape. It will provide a range of dwelling sizes and configurations to suit a variety of markets and needs. It is considered that growth at Wymondham South will have a significant positive effect in terms of social sustainability.
- SOC8 (To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs): As stated above (under ENV1), the Wymondham South site is located within close proximity to the town centre and the Railway Station. Growth at Wymondham South will,

therefore provide excellent access to a wide range of existing local facilities in Wymondham and help to reduce dependency on the private motor vehicle (i.e. through improved access to public transport facilities).

Economic Impacts:

We note the GNDP's comments that Wymondham is a successful employment location in its own right and new development will help to support the local services and economic activity that is already established in Wymondham, and nearby (e.g. Lotus and Hethel Engineering Centre). Due to this and the excellent public transport facilities at Wymondham we consider that growth at Wymondham South will have a significant positive effect on the economy.

C - 11065 - 8218 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

11066 Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [8382] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

My main comment is that there is a very good policy as stated in ENV4 on p67, which has the welcome phrasing 'To maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity'. However there are no Decision Making Criteria nor Indicators and Targets for geodiversity in Appendix 4: The SA Framework matrix on p112. Without means of applying ENV4 for geodiversity, the policy is inadequate.

Geo-Suffolk, Natural England and the Suffolk County LA group which co-operated on the wording for Suffolk SAs agreed on the following wording which we think is adequate for geodiversity:

Comments in detail on areas of the report where geodiversity is currently included:

p.8 Welcome identification of PPS9 to include geological conservation.

Section 6 Environment.

This section is missing any description of the geology of the area. Except for p26 6.27 where South Norfolk does refer to '... the glacial deposit geology...'

p67 Welcome wording to policy ENV4

p76 Appendix 1. Welcome identification of PPS9 and its geology contents

p88 & 94 Welcome inclusion of geodiversity in the South Norfolk Agenda 21 document and the South Norfolk Corporate Environment Strategy

p112 Appendix 4: The SA Framework. (See comments above). ENV4 requires strengthening for geodiversity

There may be other areas of the report where geodiversity ought to be included but currently is not., As the Scoping Report itself is only partially satisfactory for geodiversity, the Sustainability Assessment Framework which is based on this Scoping Report is also inadequate to test the geodiversity sustainability of future LDF documents. Many of the above geodiversity omissions are perpetuated into the SA Framework document itself.

Comments on the GNDP Joint Core Strategy Sustainability Framework:

As stated above, the main deficiencies for geodiversity are carried over from the Scoping Report into the SA Framework, However most of the 'tests' of policies are fairly neutral for geodiversity, but do miss many geodiversity enhancement opportunities. I have tried outline some of the places where such opportunities are missed.

Comments in detail:

p4 Vision matrix ENV4 Although this policy has geodiversity in its title, there are no Decision Making Criteria and no Comments/justification that refer to geodiversity. Without these, this policy is inadequate for geodiversity.

p81 ENV4 Comments box should flag up that there are positive opportunities for increasing geological exposures in cuttings etc.

p91 ENV4 Testing Environmental Assets Policy. Since there are no questions asked about geodiversity, there are no conclusions as to how this policy will affect geodiversity, thus an opportunity to test the policy for geodiversity sustainability is lost.

p93 SOC3 - good comment

p96 The conclusion reached on the Environmental Assets Policy is that it will "...contribute significantly to...biodiversity and geodiversity..." But nothing at all has been shown about geodiversity since no questions have been asked. The SA is deficient for geodiversity.

p67 This false conclusion is stated again.

	<p>p100 ENV4 testing Community and Culture policy again misses geodiversity an a great opportunity to enhance geological exposures.</p> <p>The same geodiversity deficiency continues every time that a policy is tested against ENV4 and time and time again the opportunity to ask how geodiversity could be destroyed or enhanced is lost. See pages 161, 176, 189, 204, 222, 230, 238, (There are geodiversity effects both inside and outside the NDR), 246, 254, 262, 270, 278, 287, 295, 304, 313, 323, (need to add geodiversity improvement options), 344, 355, (developer contributions could be very important for geodiversity) etc.</p> <p>Until this deficiency is made good and each policy is again tested against ENV4 with the question asked 'Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of geological value in both urban and rural areas? I consider that this SA Framework will be deficient for geodiversity.</p> <p>I also attach the draft UKRIGS Supplementary Planning Guidance for Nature Conservation - Geodiversity and Development in the UK. This is a 4 page document which describes the requirements for geodiversity within the whole planning process.</p> <p>C - 11066 - 8382 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>11067</p>	<p>RSPB (East of England Regional Office) (Dr Philip Pearson) [8268] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>We do not consider the construction of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road a sustainable solution and alternative options must be considered in the SA. We would expect alternatives to include measures such as reducing the scale of development within this area, improved public transport, improved routes for walking and cycling, and upgrading existing roads rather than constructing new ones.</p> <p>C - 11067 - 8268 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
<p>11069</p>	<p>Norwich Economy Round Table (Ms Caroline Jarrold) [8267] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>General comments:</p> <p>* JCS has been developed with an emphasis on "roads and drains infrastructure" rather than from a place shaping/design focus. This will lead to problems in the long term. We should approach it from the point of "what sort of place do we want Norwich to</p>

be in the future?"

* JCS lacks "local distinctiveness" needs a greater emphasis on local businesses

Response Policy 15 - The economy

* Policy 15 is inconsistent, very broad in places and very detailed in others, has a piecemeal approach

* The allocation of employment land according to spatial hierarchy needs to have some flexibility to allow for small scale employment use (e.g. farm shops) in rural areas, outside of key settlements

* The 2 biggest areas of opportunity for Greater Norwich are not covered: Knowledge Economy and Creative/Cultural Industries. It is particularly important that they are included in JCS as future funding for related projects will not be forthcoming unless these strands run from JCS through to the Integrated Delivery Programme and the Programme of Delivery.

* Surprisingly, no reference to transport. In particular, transport infrastructure, which is key to the local economy, rail times to London are poor and east/west links are non-existent. Inevitably this will limit business growth and investment in the long term.

It is understood that the JCS is a long term document to 2026 and that it can only cover issues in the broadest terms. Therefore some reference to the GNDP Economic Strategy should be included, as it provides a greater level of detail and picks up the issues related to enterprise, skills and employment, infrastructure for business and profile raising. Without this reference, it looks as though these issues have been given little consideration.

C - 11069 - 8267 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

11076 Redenhall with Harleston Town Council (Ms Margot Harbour) [8383] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Background:

Notably, the Strategy identified that up to 300 new homes should be built in Harleston, in addition to those already identified to be built through earlier Local Plans and yet to be completed. The consequential significant increase in population both from

present allocations of housing and the new proposals has significant implications. If these are not addressed at this stage they could undermine the character of the town, its cohesive community and its physical capacity.

Context:

Harleston is renowned for its inclusive atmosphere and special character. These are defined to a great extent by its historic structure, strong sense of affinity from those who live, use and visit the town and small size, relative to a diverse and largely independent retail provision. This gives rise to the opportunity to achieve a sustainable community, rare in rural England and in line with the aims stated in the consultation document. The town's essential character requires respect and understanding if it is not to be compromised and the goal of a fully sustainable and integrated community not achieved.

Consideration of proposed increase in housing and its location needs to be seen in relation to the impacts, as yet unquantified, of the houses recently completed and those planned to be built and the effects of this and future increases in population on the existing capacities and physical limits of the town.

With the town depending on a large proportion of users coming from the satellite villages and surrounding areas and many town residents still likely to use their cars to access the centre and schools, car parking capacity and traffic flow at key locations are determining factors in the town's ability to function. Without an increase in parking capacity of a demonstrable lessening of the demand on the car parks and school environs from those who could choose alternative transport, any further increase in population will push the demand beyond manageable levels.

RwHTC suggests that it would be unwise to embark on significant further increases before having assessed and assimilated the impact of the existing proposed housing. A number of matters need to be addressed to ensure that new and potential residents can be integrated and absorbed and the 'ground prepared' before agreeing to extend the housing levels.

Of especial concern are:

- a. car parking capacity
- b. town centre traffic flow issues
- c. school run parking issues
- d. drainage and flash flood issues
- e. health and dental care capacity
- f. limited number and range of local jobs
- g. impact on schools

- h. impact on health and dental facilities
- i. limited public transport
- j. risk of sinking into an unsustainable dormitory commuter settlement

It is appreciated that some of these matters can readily be addressed if further resources are made available as the population grows, e.g. health care and school capacity. However provision of adequate car parking and improved surface water drainage need much more careful pre-planning and thought. Until these are addressed in detail RwHTC requests that no decision be made at this stage to increase the housing allotment to the town.

The RwHTC appreciates the difficult decisions which the GNDP will need to make and that these are driven by Government targets beyond their control. It supports the work that the GNDP is doing and which has been carried out in an endeavour to address these major issues. The stated long-term aim of sustainable communities cannot be achieved unless the impacts of specific developments and their effects can be identified and ameliorated. The GNDP risks unwelcome outcomes from additional housing, which could severely undermine the common strategic objectives of a sustainable community.

In seeking to ensure that the community can thrive, RwHTC believes that there is a need, in the short term at least, to recognise and work within established limits. If the scale of housing exceeds that which can be coped with, the car parking problems and traffic flow issues which will arise could well prevent the town remaining a hub for local surrounding communities and be harmful to its future prosperity and social well-being.

The RHTC request therefore that any decision to increase the housing levels in Harleston, be postponed, and that representatives of the GNDP meet with representatives of the town council to discuss the complexities and potential knock-on effects deriving from the proposals, so that GNDP might be more fully informed from local knowledge on the detailed implications.

If the GNDP does not feel able to do this, the RHTC requests that any allocation of housing be made in principle only, conditional upon:

- a. ensuring that further expansion will contribute to the town's environmental, economic and social integrity;
- b. solving existing, serious drainage and flash flood problems which will be exacerbated by more housing;
- c. undertaking a major campaign to encourage much higher levels of walk to town/school to relieve car pressure and to absorb the significant increase in housing already in the pipe-line (there has already been a sustained walk to school campaign which

has probably reached its potential);

d. undertaking a study to assess parking capacity and patterns and identifying where extra capacity can be found or provided which is not detrimental to the character or amenities of the town.

The Town Council urges the GNDP to do the above 'up front' so that the lessons of history can be learned.

The Town Council would welcome the opportunity to work with the GNDP to ensure that future needs can be met through positive action, making the most of opportunities as a model for sustainable development.

C - 11076 - 8383 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

11091 Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group (Ms Denise Carlo) [8387] - COMMENT

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

i) Lack of transparency governing GNDP

It is a matter of democratic concern that the GNDP excludes the public from its meetings so that people are unable to hear exchanges between their elected representatives or understand the justification for decisions. The GNDP also refuses to publish minutes of meeting. A decision to exclude the public undermines JCS Objective 1: to involve as many people as possible in new planning policy.

ii) Incomplete Evidence Base published on GNDP website

Documentation posted on the GNDP website is incomplete. For example, in relation to housing, the only reports posted are:
- Greater Norwich Housing Market Assessment Report, Sept 2007. This examines future housing markets to 2016, ten years short of the JCS timeframe.

- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, April 2008. The methodology has been posted, but not the final report.

The Norwich Growth Area, Infrastructure Need and Funding Study, (Dec 2007) does not correspond with JCS plan period and housing figures. The study assesses the infrastructure and delivery requirements for supporting planned growth to 2021 on the basis of current RSS growth rates for the NPA (33,000 dwellings). The JCS on the other hand plans for 37,750 dwellings to 2026.

Important transport assessment information is not yet available. NNTAG inquired at the end of 2007 whether GNDP had examined different strategic transport options for serving the NPA. GNDP replied that as part of the work to prepare the Preferred Option, transport modelling and strategy development would be carried out for the various growth options to develop the transport elements of the JCS. In an email sent 8 April 2009, NNTAG inquired about the availability of this work. The GNDP replied that modelling work had been commissioned and would be published. As of 9 June, there is no sign and the findings cannot be commented on as part of the consultation.

The GNDP website is an important repository for public information. Either the website has not been kept up-to-date, or else the reports are outdated or do not match the extended plan period and housing figures or have not been published. This state of affairs makes it difficult to assess the evidence base for the JCS.

iii) Sustainability Appraisal

NNTAG has concerns over the SA preparation and content:

- very limited consultation on the Scoping Study;
- adoption of objectives which do not necessarily support sustainability eg "EC 3 - To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth";
- treatment of unsustainable elements as part of the baseline case, notably a NDR. Alternatives to a NDR have not been assessed, even where adverse impacts are identified (eg North-East Sector outside the NNDR, "likely use of NNDR could increase the use of the car".) which would avoid or reduce such impacts as required by the SEA Directive;
- the GNDP does not appear to have considered alternative locations for an eco-community to Rackheath, when there may be more sustainable locations.
- Options have been tested selectively eg Long Stratton Bypass, transport in rural areas, but not others eg NDR.

The SA Documents posted on the GNDP web are difficult to read, with numerous tables and a contents page, introduction and summary omitted.

- It is unclear how the GNDP has taken the SA assessments into account.

iv) Appropriate Assessment

Is an Appropriate Assessment required in relation to:

- demand for water and scale of growth and any potential impact on European designated sites such as River Wensum SAC and those found in The Broads?

- improvements to A47 referred to in Policy 16 (dualling of Acle Straight)?

C - 11091 - 8387 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

11124 The Leeder Family [8390] (represented by Pegasus Planning Group (Mr John Holden) [4250]) - **COMMENT**

Paper - 12/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Appendix 0

We support the definition of the major growth locations at Appendix 0 and their identification on the favoured growth option diagram that forms part of that Appendix.

We endorse the observation in Appendix 0 that growth at Long Stratton will deliver a bypass and, as a consequence, achieve local environmental improvements by removing through traffic. We note that further work is being undertaken separately to establish the scale of development required to fund a bypass without adversely affecting funding for other infrastructure required by the strategy. We hope to be afforded the opportunity to continue to inform that work as it evolves.

Whilst Appendix 0 refers to the accommodation of around 1,800 dwellings at Long Stratton in the period covered by the JCS, we would observe that the settlement has the capacity, in association with the delivery of a bypass and the regeneration of the settlement as a whole, to accommodate further housing in response to potential growth scenarios arising in the NPA in the period to 2031. We have noted that the report considered by the GNDP Policy Group on 18th December 2008 regarding the review of the East of England Plan concluded that the emerging Joint Core Strategy is capable of providing for a continuation of EEP residual housing development rates within the JCS area. The report considered by the Policy Group on this matter observed that none of the further growth will be possible without significant investment in supporting infrastructure. The report

noted that existing growth is dependent on large scale infrastructure investment, including the delivery of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road, and significantly enhanced public transport.

The strategy described within Appendix 0 will provide and support necessary social/physical infrastructure and deliver sustainable new communities. Further housing and employment opportunities at Long Stratton, in addition to the delivery of a bypass, can be undertaken in a manner which will enhance the sustainability of the settlement and enable significant environmental improvements to be achieved within the existing urban fabric. The favoured option has a number of significant spatial advantages, including the delivery of a bypass at Long Stratton which will bring important amenity benefits to existing residents and improve this key link between Ipswich and Norwich.

Sustainability Appraisal Framework

We recognise that the SAF is a work in progress but we would disagree with a number of erroneous and unsubstantiated references

Pages 201, 213, 219 and 220 suggest that a Long Stratton bypass will draw public funding away from other infrastructure. We would observe that this depends on the scale of a bypass. For example a new alignment optimised for development could minimise the requirement for public funding whereas an alignment like the presently approved bypass optimised for strategic benefits would maximise that need. The merit of the additional funding depends on the value which GNDP places on the strategic benefits and is not directly related to the sustainability of development at Long Stratton.

Page 229 clearly states that a bypass will reduce congestion locally in Long Stratton and benefit the environment in the centre of the settlement. This does not warrant a "very negative" score in the medium and long term given against the SA objective to reduce the effect of traffic on the environment. The comments would suggest a very positive score for both the medium and long term.

The ability of Long Stratton to contribute to sustainable travel is questioned on pages 161, 197, 202, 215, 216, 218, 229 and 236.

Page 202 suggests that Long Stratton may affect the achievement of critical mass to support the aim of Bus Rapid Transit in the A11 corridor. We would suggest that the deliverability of such a proposal as has been outlined within the JCS is not certain in either case. We also assume that the more modest growth allocated outside A47 in the South West has been calculated to avoid the need for major works at the Thickthorn junction. That being the case, the value of extra demand for BRT could be significantly outweighed by the need to spend nearly £40 million on junction improvements.

Pages 197 and 215 state that Long Stratton has a poor bus link which is a challenge to improve. However, the current service to Norwich actually requires a double deck bus to cope with existing demand in the peak hours and operates without public subsidy on weekdays.

The consultants to GNDP highlight in their Appraisal of the Emerging Option (December 2008), that "Long Stratton growth locations have the potential to support turn up and go service frequency in 2031". However in reaching that conclusion they considered a service serving only the new growth at Long Stratton. We would contend that if they had instead considered combining the new service with that already serving the existing settlement they would have discovered that a more frequent service could have been achieved much earlier which would maximise the opportunity to capture mode share from new development from the beginning and provide an opportunity for the more frequent service to attract an even greater proportion of existing residents onto public transport.

The Operator has confirmed that the service frequency can be doubled for development in Long Stratton and the selection of a route north of the A47 into Norwich can be varied to best suit the bus facilities that exist and workplace destinations

In relation to out commuting the 2001 Census Travel to Work statistics, when examined in detail as to where Long Stratton residents work currently and how they travel to those destinations, show that public transport use for travel to work is operating a mode share of up to 25% for the key workplace destination in the centre of Norwich, and 16% overall for out commuting. This is twice the mode share identified in the EDAW study. Later GNDP studies into public transport suggest target mode shares between 13% and 20% (by 2031) which are lower than those already achieved at Long Stratton for the key peak hour commuting period and peak travel demand to workplace destinations. This position is not reflected in the SAF.

It also fails to consider that the Park and Ride at the Harford interchange on the Ipswich Road corridor into Norwich is a public transport facility that will be used by many travelling from the south on the A140, including outbound residents of Long Stratton. In overall terms the capture of such trips from the development at Long Stratton is estimated at 13% and, on this basis, the overall bus mode share including park and ride could already be as high as 38% for destinations in the centre of Norwich.

Long Stratton has a high potential for containment of trips and there is substantial evidence from within the 2001 Census that employers in the settlement, including a major employer within South Norfolk (South Norfolk Council), draw much of their workforce from the local community.

Overall, many comments in the SAF appear unjustified and do not reflect the more detailed work carried out by both the promoters of development at Long Stratton and GNDP in their own studies supporting the JCS.

	C - 11124 - 8390 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -
11154	<p>Coal Authority (Miss Rachel Bust Planning and Local Authority Liaison) [7444] - COMMENT</p> <p>Paper - 12/06/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.</p> <p>C - 11154 - 7444 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8750	<p>Brooke Parish Council (Mr Edward Jinks) [8053] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>We have no other comments</p> <p>S - 8750 - 8053 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
10120	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - SUPPORT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>As long as the development is retained within Norwich on brownfield sites and at a new town in Long stratton and therefore more manageable. There should not be any PFI's</p> <p>S - 10120 - 8239 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8099	<p>Mrs Eleanor Laming [7880] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 26/03/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>The suggestions in this document are not stringent enough. Far more emphasis needs to be placed on:-</p> <p>Making homes and businesses as energy conserving as possible, and using new energy sources</p> <p>Reducing the impact of waste and increasing recycling</p>

	<p>Cutting out road transport, cars and lorries</p> <p>Allowing for the increasing in flooding we are likely to see from sea level rise and heavy rainfall events</p> <p>Ensuring that instead of looking at increasing economic growth we look at conserving what we have and making sure that people depend and work more with local businesses</p> <p>O - 8099 - 7880 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8648	<p>Mr Steve Dowall [8033] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 23/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>The proposed sites S39-02a S39-02 would be detrimental to the character, scenic quality and visual benefits of the area.</p> <p>O - 8648 - 8033 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
8761	<p>Ms Sarah Smith [8059] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 24/04/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>Travel and road assessments have not been carried out to consider the impact of such a size of development (S39-02a). The development would be damaging to the environment and is not in accordance with Broadland District Council's policy with regards to ENV 8 - Landscape value/character.</p> <p>The proposed area to the north of Post Office Road has been assessed as having Landscape Value.</p> <p>O - 8761 - 8059 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
10121	<p>Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs Jane Fraser) [8239] - OBJECT</p> <p>Web - 30/05/09</p> <p>Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?</p> <p>I could support this document if development was retained within Norwich on brownfield sites and at a new town in Long stratton rather than the scattergun approach suggested which will spoil a huge area around Norwich</p> <p>O - 10121 - 8239 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -</p>
10254	<p>Bidwells Norwich (309) (Mr Glyn Davies) [7725] - OBJECT</p>

Web - 02/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

The comment/justification included in the first sentence of ENV1, 'Growth Location: Including the Long Stratton Bypass' is incorrect. Whilst strategic scale growth in Long Stratton will be dependant upon the provision of a bypass, recent correspondence with the County Department of Planning and Transportation indicates that the A140/Flowerpot Lane Junction could accommodate at least the extra traffic from an additional 100 dwellings ,if not more, if MOVA were to be installed at the existing traffic lights on the A140. Hence the words 'Strategic scale' need to be added before the opening phrase 'growth in Long Stratton' to clarify matters.

O - 10254 - 7725 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

10552 MR Adrian Vernon [8312] - OBJECT

Web - 09/06/09

Joint Core Strategy Public consultation Reg25: Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal?

Has proper representation been made to government to explain that there are not jobs for all these households and that this is a low employment area. There is no likelihood of a jobs expansion and that other areas of the country better served by good road links etc would be better for development. This is not being a NIMBY it is simply true, it is why Norfolk is a poorly paid low populated area.

O - 10552 - 8312 - Q28 - Is there anything else you'd like tell us that hasn't been covered previously Or do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal? -

4. Appendix

1 Public Exhibition Timetable

Public Exhibition Timetable

Date/Time	Location
14 March 9am – 5pm	The Forum
16 March 1pm – 7pm	Thorpe End Village Hall
16 March 2pm – 7pm	Little Melton Village Hall
17 March 12pm – 6pm	Bure Room, Acle Recreation Centre
17 March 2pm – 7pm	Mulbarton Village Hall
18 March 2pm – 7pm	Jubilee Community Centre, Long John Hill
18 March 2pm – 7pm	Poringland Community Centre
19 March 1pm – 7pm	Sprowston Parish Council offices
19 March 9:30am – 6pm	South Norfolk Council Offices Long Stratton
23 March 9am – 5:30pm	Castle Mall (Level 1)
23 March 1pm – 7pm	Hellesdon Community Centre
23 March 2pm – 7pm	Easton Village Hall
24 March 2pm – 7pm	Diss Corn Hall Stables
25 March 1pm – 7pm	Aylsham Town Hall
25 March 2pm – 7pm	Trowse Parish Rooms
26 March 12pm – 6pm	Rackheath Holy Trinity Community Centre
27 March 2pm – 7pm	Eaton Park Community Centre, South Park Avenue
28 March 9am – 5:30pm	Wymondham Central Hall Eddie Buttolph Room
30 March 2pm – 7pm	Bowthorpe Clover Hill Community Centre (Meeting Room)
31 March 1pm – 7pm	Drayton Village Hall
31 March 2pm – 7pm	Thorpe Hamlet Pilling Park Community Centre, Pilling Park Road
1 April 1pm – 7pm	Wroxham Church Hall
1 April 2pm – 7pm	Hethersett Village Hall
2 April 1pm – 7pm	Old Catton Church Hall
2 April 2pm – 7pm	Swardeston Village Hall
2 April 2pm – 7pm	Wensum Community Centre, Hotblack Road
3 April 2pm – 7pm	Cringleford Patteson Rooms
6 April 2pm – 7pm	Costessey Breckland Hall (Barnes Room)
6 April 2pm – 7pm	Marlpit Community Centre, Hellesdon Road
7 April 11am – 7pm	The Forum
8 April 10am – 5pm	Harleston Budgens car park
8 April 2pm – 7pm	The Norman Centre (Appleyard/Bignold Room), Bignold Road
16 April 11am – 6pm	The Forum
15 April 2pm – 7pm	Hingham Village Hall
16 April 2pm – 7pm	Loddon The Hollies Library Annexe
18 April 9am – 5:30pm	Castle Mall (Level 1)

About Insight Track Limited



Insight Track Ltd is an independent market research consultancy based in Norfolk. Our core business integrates marketing research and marketing consultancy. We specialise in qualitative and quantitative research, marketing communications, brand development, strategy and communications planning.

Insight Track Ltd provides full service qualitative and quantitative market research solutions to a variety of public sector organisations.

**For further information and consultation please contact:
Hannah Edwards at hannah@insighttrack.co.uk or on 01603 626800
The Glasshouse
Kings Lane
Norwich
NR1 3PS**

Pictures taken from the following websites

<http://www.tournorfolk.co.uk>

<http://www.fotosearch.com/photos-images/young-people.html>