

Greater Norwich Development Partnership

Matter 3c Other major growth locations in policy 10

Note: EIP93 sets out the minor changes to the text of JCS1 to address revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Wymondham (see also matter K concerning public transport in the A11 corridor)

A Does the JCS make justified and effective growth proposals for the town?

1. Wymondham is justified as a growth location as it is a significant Market Town with a good range of jobs and services and facilities, while serving its own catchment and having good sustainable transport links to Norwich.
2. This location was supported by the results of the initial Issues and Options consultation (JCS6) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the initial 12 potential growth locations (EIP12). These led to the rejection of alternative locations and established Wymondham as part of the initial draft Preferred Option (later Option 1) for growth in the Norwich Policy Area. Subsequent sustainability tests applied to the development of further options, and the SA applied to the Regulation 25 Technical and Public consultations (EIP14), supported the continued inclusion of Wymondham as a growth location.
3. The proposed scale of growth is consistent with the results of the evidence studies. It is considered to be an appropriate balance between environmental considerations and the provision of jobs, services and facilities.
4. The scale of growth proposed is considered to be effective and deliverable due to the strong interest of a number of prospective developers.

- B What are Wymondham's critical infrastructure dependencies and can growth there take place within the timescale set out in Appendix 6 (p111) of the JCS?

1. Wymondham shares its priority one transport requirements with the other locations for growth in the A11 corridor.
2. Reinforcement of electricity infrastructure will be required late in the plan period.
3. A revised version of JCS Appendix 7 "Implementation Framework" clarifies the requirements for, and provision of, key infrastructure in response to this issue (EIP 84) as expanded by the LIPP (EIP 85).
4. Wymondham is dependent on Thickethorne junction improvements which are subject to an ongoing study in conjunction with the Highways Agency and local developer interests.
5. Public transport service and infrastructure enhancements leading towards BRT on the corridor have already been delivered and further incremental improvements can be delivered early in the plan period.
6. The GNDP is confident that growth can take place within the required timescale due to the expression of significant developer interest. The trajectories do not envisage significant growth starting in Wymondham before 2014/15.

- C If the JCS is unsound in relation to Wymondham, are there any specific changes that would render it sound? [It would be necessary to consider whether these required further consultation or sustainability appraisal.]

1. The GNDP considers that the proposals for Wymondham are sound.

Hethersett (see also matter K concerning public transport in the A11 corridor)

- D Does the JCS make justified and effective growth proposals for Hethersett? Is it allocated more growth than suggested by its position as a 'key service centre' in the identified hierarchy of centres (see policies 14 and 19)?

1. The identification of Hethersett for major growth is justified by its location. It is a significant settlement with a wide range of services

and facilities and has good sustainable access to Norwich and strategic employment locations, including Norwich Research Park, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital and Wymondham. It is also well located for Hethel and Longwater employment locations. Its location in the A11 corridor will also enable the provision of enhanced public transport services and the provision of Bus Rapid Transit.

2. This location was supported by the results of the initial Issues and Options consultation (JCS6) and the SA of the initial 12 potential growth locations (EIP12). These led to the rejection of alternative locations and established Hethersett as part of the initial draft Preferred Option (later Option 1) for growth in the Norwich Policy Area. Subsequent sustainability tests applied to the development of further growth strategy options and the SA applied to the Regulation 25 Technical and Public consultation growth options (EIP14) supported the continued inclusion of Hethersett as a growth location.
3. The proposed scale of growth is consistent with the results of the background evidence studies. It is considered to be an appropriate balance between environmental considerations and the provision of jobs, services and facilities. It contributes towards the provision of a variety of scales of major growth locations within the NPA to enable the delivery of the overall housing requirement.
4. The proposals are considered to be effective and deliverable due to significant developer interest.
5. Hethersett ranks relatively low in Policy 19: Hierarchy of Centres because the development of its commercial facilities has been subdued by the impact of the settlement's close proximity, and easy access to, the superior choice of shops and services in Norwich. Population growth will encourage enhanced local facilities.

E What are the critical infrastructure dependencies for this location and can delivery of growth take place within the timescale set out in Appendix 6 (p111) of the JCS?

1. Hethersett shares its priority one transport requirements with the other locations for growth in the A11 corridor.
2. The solution to wastewater transmission infrastructure is expected to be shared with Cringleford and Easton/Costessey.
3. A revised version of JCS Appendix 7 Implementation Framework (EIP84) clarifies the requirements for, and provision of, key

infrastructure in response to this issue (EIP84) as expanded by the LIPP (EIP 85).

4. Hethersett is dependent on Thickthorn junction improvements which are subject to an ongoing study in conjunction with the Highways Agency and local developer interests.
5. Public transport service and infrastructure enhancements leading towards BRT on the corridor have already been delivered and further incremental improvements can be delivered early in the plan period.
6. The GNDP is confident that growth can take place within the required timescale due to the expression of significant developer interest. The trajectories do not envisage significant growth starting in Hethersett before 2014/15. A later start would not compromise delivery in the plan period.

- F If the JCS is unsound in relation to Hethersett, are there any specific changes that would render it sound? [It would be necessary to consider whether these required further consultation or sustainability appraisal.]

1. The GNDP considers that the proposals for Hethersett are sound.

Cringleford (see also matter K concerning public transport in the A11 corridor)

- G Does the JCS make justified and effective growth proposals for Cringleford?

1. Cringleford is justified as a growth location as it is in the Norwich fringe with good access to a wide range of services and facilities (including the adjacent Eaton District Centre), Norwich and other strategic employment locations. These include the Norwich Research Park and the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, which are both close by. Cringleford's sustainable location in the A11 corridor also has good potential for the enhancement of public transport and the provision of Bus Rapid Transit.
2. The proposed scale of growth is consistent with the results of the background evidence studies. It is considered to be an appropriate balance between environmental considerations and the provision of jobs, services and facilities. It contributes towards the provision of a variety of scales of major growth locations within the NPA to enable the delivery of the overall housing requirement.

3. The proposals are considered to be effective and deliverable due to significant developer interest.

H What are the critical infrastructure dependencies for this location and can the growth take place within the timescale set out in Appendix 6 (p111) of the JCS?

1. Cringleford shares its priority one transport requirements with the other locations for growth in the A11 corridor.
2. The solution to wastewater transmission infrastructure is expected to be shared with Hethersett and Easton/Costessey.
3. A revised version of JCS Appendix 7 Implementation Framework (EIP84) clarifies the requirements for, and provision of, key infrastructure in response to this issue (EIP 84) as expanded by the LIPP (EIP84).
4. Cringleford is dependent on Thickthorn junction improvements which are subject to an ongoing study in conjunction with the Highways Agency and local developer interests.
5. Public transport service and infrastructure enhancements leading towards BRT on the corridor have already been delivered and further incremental improvements can be delivered early in the plan period.
6. The GNDP is confident that growth can take place within the required timescale due to the expression of significant developer interest. The trajectories do not envisage significant growth starting in Cringleford before 2015/16. A later start would not compromise delivery in the plan period.

J If the JCS is unsound in relation to Cringleford, are there any specific changes that would render it sound? [It would be necessary to consider whether these required further consultation or sustainability appraisal.]

1. The GNDP considers the proposals for Cringleford are sound.

Public transport in the A11 corridor

Comments: The NATS implementation plan at p61 of the JCS indicates a proposed bus rapid transit corridor running through Norwich-Cringleford-Hethersett-Wymondham. However, the summary findings of the Sustainability Appraisal state that the strategy for major expansion of a number of existing

communities in South Norfolk places *'increased difficulty of achieving a degree of self-containment and providing attractive public transport options that encourage people to use their cars less'*. It observes that growth in the A11 corridor is focussed on areas *'where there should be potential to connect to Norwich via a bus rapid transit service, although it is difficult to be completely certain about deliverability/financial viability at this stage'*. Para 2.257 of the SA states that none of the growth areas under the South Norfolk distribution are of sufficient size to support a turn-up-and-go bus service in 2021, and para 2.2.59 says that the proposal for 4,400 dwellings on the corridor is *'at the borderline'* of providing a potential market sufficient in size to support the development of bus rapid transit.

K In the light of the comments above, can these growth locations effectively support objective 7 on p27 of the JCS (enhancing transport provision to meet the needs of existing and future populations while reducing travel need and impact)? Is there a clear and convincing strategy to ensure that adequate bus provision will be made in line with housing growth at a stage sufficiently early to influence travel patterns? What are the expected timetables and funding sources for achieving the NATS public transport proposals for the corridor and are these likely to be delivered?

1. Paragraphs 5.3 to 5.3.7 of EIP 88 set out the issues relating to public transport. They show that taken together, the growth locations along the A11 corridor provide for a sufficient market to support high quality public transport services. The overall number of households served, taking in to account existing population, and proposed growth would comfortably provide a sufficient market to support Bus Rapid Transit.
2. Appendix B of EIP 88 shows how services and interventions will be phased in relation to the overall scale of growth on this corridor.
3. The report to Norfolk County Council Cabinet 6 April 2010 (EIP9) sets out a high level NATS Implementation Plan the County Council remains committed its delivery. Funding of interventions will be from a wide variety of sources. The public transport proposals can be phased in. There is extensive public transport infrastructure already in place on the corridor, with the most recent enhancement, the extension of the Newmarket Road bus lane being completed in May 2010.

Long Stratton

L Does the JCS make justified and effective growth proposals for Long Stratton bearing in mind its poor assessed performance in sustainability appraisals undertaken since 2007?

1. The location is justified as Long Stratton has a self-contained housing market (see document ref: H2) and the best range of local shops, services and job opportunities of the strategy area's Key Service Centres, not far below the level of a main town. It serves a rural catchment and has good bus links to Norwich, especially when measured in a local context. It also has regular bus links serving other parts of its catchment and other main settlements.
2. Long Stratton has suffered from the long standing adverse air quality and other environmental impacts of road traffic on the A140. There is a need to improve air quality by the removal of through traffic, as identified by the South Norfolk Sustainable Community Strategy (JCS 17.3). The provision of a bypass, funded by new development, is the only means of achieving this. The level of development proposed is considered to be justified in response to this issue.
3. The iterations of the SAs have acknowledged that Long Stratton is less accessible to Norwich than other major growth locations. Evidence demonstrates that this difference is relatively marginal. The SAs have also acknowledged its good range of employment opportunities, services and facilities. The proposed growth will have no adverse impact on the sustainability of the overall strategy, and the settlement has potential to be developed as a more self-contained community (Pre-Submission JCS SA, JCS 3).
4. Documents EIP 86 and EIP 88 set out the potential transport improvements and a basis for the development of a Vision for the growth of Long Stratton as a more self-contained sustainable community. The transport and accessibility issues are also addressed in response to question (N) below.
5. The proposed scale of growth is consistent with the results of the background evidence studies. It is considered to be an appropriate balance between environmental considerations and the provision of jobs, services and facilities. It contributes towards the provision of a variety of scales of major growth locations within the NPA to enable the delivery of the overall housing requirement and to deliver a bypass.
6. The proposals are considered to be effective and deliverable due to significant developer interest.

M Is the town allocated more growth than suggested by its position as a 'key service centre' in the identified hierarchy of centres (see policies 14 and 19)?

1. Long Stratton has been allocated a high level of growth to address

long standing environmental issues arising from the A140 traffic that passes through the village, i.e. through the provision of a bypass.

2. The village has a range of services approaching those of a main town, and the SA (JCS3) has acknowledged that the village has many attributes and the potential to be developed as a more self-contained community. Long Stratton also has good public transport links to Norwich with the potential for their enhancement. See EIP 86 for more detail.
3. The settlement is a suitable location for additional major growth as one of the largest and best served settlements in South Norfolk. It is already relatively self-contained. Growth has the potential to develop Long Stratton to main town status, with enhanced services, facilities and local environmental improvements through the provision of a bypass.

Comments: The Sustainability Appraisal of the submitted JCS (like those undertaken at all previous stages of its evolution since 2007) identifies Long Stratton as being *'less suited to encouraging more sustainable patterns of travel...(as it is)...geographically isolated from Norwich and major employment locations in comparison with the other major growth locations and...there is little potential to deliver public transport improvements that will have a realistic chance of encouraging people out of their cars'*. It concludes that this is *'undoubtedly a significant negative effect of the strategy and probably the major issue that has been highlighted through this SA'*. Despite this the SA states that the scale of the growth at Long Stratton (as a proportion of the JCS total) is not such as to *'place in question the overall sustainability of the JCS in terms of achieving sustainable travel'*. After discussing the proposed growth as the only means of securing a bypass and its associated benefits, the SA finds it *'more difficult to say whether the local level benefits associated with growth at Long Stratton outweigh the more strategic disbenefits'*. It concludes that *'irrespective of the answer to that question there must be focused efforts to mitigate negative effects and recommends that there is justification for going further, perhaps by developing a bespoke vision for achieving an ambitious degree of self-containment within Long Stratton'*.

- N In the light of the above comments, is the retention of the growth/ bypass proposal sound? Is there convincing evidence to conclude that the required culture change from car-borne transport to more sustainable modes could be achieved? How would this be done? [The JCS is silent on this point.]

1. Growth in Long Stratton is not solely about meeting the highest public transport standards. Long Stratton has a good range of local

services and employment, easy to access by walking and cycling. Development builds on Long Stratton's self containment and supports local services.

2. It has a good public transport service given the scale and location of the settlement. Major planned growth in Long Stratton will enhance existing provision to a 15 minute bus service throughout the day which is a very good public transport service. Paragraphs 5.6 to 5.6.7 of EIP 88 explain in more detail the existing public transport provision, how this will be enhanced in response to growth and the physical interventions needed to support a reliable service. There is scope for bus priority measures to be introduced along this corridor to improve the reliability of bus services. Other measures will also be introduced including improved travel information, bus stop infrastructure, improved ticketing arrangements and improved walking and cycle links. Long Stratton can provide at least a 15 minute frequency of service compared to a 10 minute frequency for other growth locations.
3. A bypass provided in conjunction with development provides strategic access enhancements and local environmental benefits. A bypass is necessary if the scale of growth proposed is to be accommodated in the settlement without further eroding the strategic function of the important A140 route from Norwich south to the A14.
4. Policy 2 requires that development is designed around sustainable modes and public transport. Masterplanning required by Policy 10 will fully embrace this concept such that sustainable modes are a genuine choice.

- O What are the critical infrastructure dependencies for this location and can its delivery take place within the timescale set out in Appendix 6 (p111) of the JCS?

1. The critical infrastructure dependencies for Long Stratton are the bypass and resolution of capacity limitations at the wastewater treatment works.
2. A revised version of JCS Appendix 7 Implementation Framework (EIP84) clarifies the requirements for, and provision of, key infrastructure in response to this issue as expanded by the LIPP (EIP85).
3. The GNDP is confident that growth can take place within the required timescale due to the expression of significant developer interest. The trajectories demonstrate that a start as late as 2017/18 in Long Stratton could provide for the scale of growth proposed but

there is no barrier to an earlier start subject to infrastructure provision.

- P If the JCS is unsound in relation to Long Stratton, are there any specific changes that would render it sound? [It would be necessary to consider whether these required further consultation or sustainability appraisal.]

1. The GNDP considers the proposals for Long Stratton are sound.
2. Proposed minor changes (JCS2 and EIP93) address drafting errors and provide clarity.

Easton/Costessey

- Q Does the JCS make justified and effective growth proposals for this location? Can growth here take place in the form of an appropriate urban extension keyed into effective public transport connections?

1. Costessey is a Norwich fringe parish forming part of the Norwich urban area with good access to a wide range of services, facilities, strategic level employment opportunities and major retail provision at Longwater. The adjacent settlement of Easton also benefits from these facilities while having significant local employment opportunities at Easton College. Both places have good public transport opportunities and access to the Norwich Research Park, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, the UEA and employment opportunities at Bowthorpe.
 - This location was supported by the results of the initial Issues and Options consultation (JCS3) and the SA of the initial 12 potential growth locations (EIP12). These led to the rejection of alternative locations and established a growth location to the west of Norwich as part of the initial draft Preferred Option (later Option 1) for growth in the Norwich Policy Area. Subsequent sustainability tests applied to the development of further growth strategy options and the SAs applied to the Regulation 25 technical and public consultation growth options (EIP14) supported the continued inclusion of Easton/ Costessey as a growth location.
 - The proposed scale of growth is consistent with the results of the evidence studies. It is considered to be an appropriate balance between environmental considerations and the provision of jobs, services and facilities. It contributes towards the provision of a variety of scales of major growth locations within the NPA to enable the delivery of the overall housing

requirement.

- The proposals are considered to be effective and deliverable due to significant developer interest.

2. The two settlements are adjacent and have benefited from committed public transport investment which will lead to enhanced public transport and eventually Bus Rapid Transit services.

R What are the critical infrastructure dependencies of this location and can its delivery take place within the timescale set out in Appendix 6 (p111) of the JCS?

1. The priority one infrastructure dependencies for Easton/ Costessey are the trunk road junctions, BRT, wastewater transmission infrastructure and pedestrian cycle links to Longwater employment area.

2. Public transport service and infrastructure enhancements leading towards BRT on the Dereham Road corridor have already been delivered and further incremental improvements can be delivered early in the plan period.

3. The solution to wastewater transmission infrastructure is expected to be shared with Cringleford and Hethersett.

4. A revised version of JCS Appendix 7 Implementation Framework (EIP84) clarifies the requirements for, and provision of, key infrastructure in response to this issue as expanded by the LIPP (EIP 85).

5. The GNDP is confident that growth can take place within the required timescale due to the expression of significant developer interest. The trajectories do not envisage significant growth starting in Easton/Costessey before 2014/15. A later start would not compromise delivery in the plan period.

S If the JCS is unsound in relation to Easton/Costessey, are there any specific changes that would render it sound? [It would be necessary to consider whether these required further consultation or sustainability appraisal.]

1. The GNDP considers the proposals for Easton/ Costessey are sound.