



Sustainable Development Panel

16:00 to 17:40

7 March 2022

Present: Councillors Stonard (chair), Giles (vice chair), Carlo, Grahame, Hampton (substitute for Councillor Davis), Lubbock, Maxwell, Oliver and Stutely (substitute for Councillor Everett)

Apologies: Councillor Davis and Everett

1. Declarations of interest

There were none.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meetings held on 9 November 2021 and 16 November 2021.

3. Adoption of Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (GIRAMS)

The planning policy team leader presented the report.

The chair commented that the proposed GIRAMS was the result of discussions and negotiation between Broadland District Council, South Norfolk Council and Norfolk County Council.

During discussion, the planning policy team leader referred to the report and answered members' questions. She referred to paragraph 15 of the report, which explained the methodology for calculating the tariff of £185.93 and following adoption the tariff would be subject to an annual adjustment for inflation as set out in the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) policy. A member expressed concern that the lack of provision for administration costs to the council was unrealistic and that could cause funding intended for green infrastructure to be diverted. It was noted that this would be reviewed in 18 months' time following adoption. Members were also referred to paragraph 26 of the report which sets out the financial and resources implications. There would be additional costs to the authority for the validation and collection of the tariff, whilst other resource implications would be met within the existing resources of the planning service.

A member referred to the baseline data from 2015, with 77 per cent of visitors travelling to the habitat sites by car and said that she expected that this would change between now and 2036 (the period covered by the GIRAMS). There needed to be more use of public transport or cycling/walking as part of the mitigation

measures. Members were advised that visitor travel plans would be required from areas under development through the planning process. In reply to a member's question, the planning policy team leader confirmed that the tariff would apply to all new residential development (as set out in paragraph 18 of the report) and included holiday homes. The governance arrangements for GIRAMS included a board to oversee it and the appointment of a delivery officer, who would monitor residential development to trigger tariff collection, liaise with the habitat site rangers and monitor mitigation measures. The Norfolk officers would be looking into the job description and role of the delivery officer and could feed into that process.

A member asked how the GIRAMS applied to East Norwich with regard to existing green infrastructure, such as Whitlingham Country Park and Thorpe Woods. The planning policy team leader said that there was a two-pronged provision. As part of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP), the Green Infrastructure Strategy was being updated to identify green infrastructure and recreational sites in the Greater Norwich area to help reduce the impact on protected sites. East Norwich would improve connectivity with Whitlingham Country Park and its capacity for visitors would need to be assessed as part of the review of the Green Infrastructure Strategy. A member commented that Natural England had criticised the emerging GNLP for its lack of a strategy on green infrastructure. The planning policy team leader said that the review of the strategy would provide an opportunity for a better understanding of local green spaces and the use of the biodiversity net gain. The GNLP would not be affected by the fact that the Green Infrastructure Strategy had not been implemented at the time of its adoption.

RESOLVED to endorse the report and recommend it to cabinet.

4. East Norwich Masterplan Update

(Martyn Saunders (director of planning and regeneration, Avison Young) (the lead consultant) and Anthony Benson (Allies and Morrison) attended the meeting for this item.)

The chair welcomed Martyn Saunders and Anthony Benson to the meeting, and introduced Ian Charie, the interim project manager East Norwich project, to the panel.

The planning policy team leader presented the report.

Martyn Saunders and Anthony Benson presented the power point presentation. (The presentation is available on the council's website [here](#) and there is a live stream of the meeting available on the [Norwich City Council Meetings YouTube channel](#).) The presentation provided members with an overview of the draft supplementary planning document (SPD) and advised members of any changes that had been made following the Stage 1 Masterplan, as a result of public engagement and consultation with stakeholders.

During discussion, a member commented that she was encouraged by the work that had been accomplished, particularly regarding flood risk issues.

Following the presentation, the consultants answered members' questions. The panel was advised that heritage was at the heart of the project. The listing of buildings on the site was a useful piece of work to identify opportunities to celebrate the heritage of the area but did not present any problems as none of the buildings had been proposed for demolition. The listed buildings would be considered at the planning application stage. In addition, Historic England had provided useful feedback on the development and the heights of buildings.

Discussion ensued on the Stage 2 Masterplan provision for new homes (3,630) and new jobs (4,100) which had increased from the Stage 1 Masterplan, due to reassessing assumptions previously made at the initial stage and opportunities for mixed employment uses at Carrow House and the Deal Ground, and in the visitor and leisure economy around the proposed marinas, that would be supply led and supported by higher education in the city. Members were advised that the plans were indicative of what might be expected at this stage but that the detail would come at the planning stage.

During discussion a member asked about the upgrading of the Trowse rail-bridge. It was noted that Network Rail was an important member of the East Norwich Partnership and that there remained an aspiration for a second track, but no decisions had been made as to whether it would be a fixed bridge or could open for navigation. The proposal in the masterplan was that the pedestrian/cycle bridge from Geoffrey Watling Way and the bridge to the Utility Site would come forward before Network Rail made a decision on the railway line. The Broads Authority was a stakeholder that would be fully consulted on the type and timescale for the bridges.

In reply to a member's question, the consultant advised members that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan included for provision of community facilities, and the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) referred to delivery alongside housing development.

During discussion, members were advised that the total numbers of new homes and jobs in the revised masterplan, were lower than initial predictions but based on a sound evidence base. The revised masterplan did not encroach on the county wildlife site boundary changes.

A member asked whether East Norwich would exacerbate existing pressures on the roundabout adjacent to County Hall, and King Street and Bracondale. Members were advised that the priority of the development was to minimise dependency on car trips to encourage active and sustainable modes of transport. No modelling had been undertaken at this stage which would be part of the Transport Assessment as part of the planning application stage. Careful decisions needed to be made regarding the infrastructure to address the issue of the road network and bring forward the bridges over the two rivers to open-up this area for development. Co-location of facilities in neighbourhoods which residents could access by walking, cycling or wheeling would relieve pressure on road networks. It was a brownfield site at the edge of the city with a 10 to 15 minutes' walk to the station and city centre and it was proposed to be served by a new bus route.

Members also noted the images in the presentation which demonstrated the transition from the urban, heritage buildings along the riverbank towards the Broads.

The consultant said that the East Norwich scheme would be based on being compliant with the 33 per cent affordable housing policy. Viability was being tested and consideration being given to the varying types of affordable housing provision.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) thank the consultants for their presentation;
- (2) note the progress on the Stage 2 work on the East Norwich Masterplan, particularly the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) along with emerging work on viability, funding and phasing.

CHAIR