



Sustainable Development Panel (Extraordinary meeting)

16:00 to 17:40

9 November 2021

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

Apologies: Councillor Davis

1. Declarations of interest

There were none.

2. East Norwich Masterplan Progress Update Report

(Martyn Saunders (director of planning and regeneration, Avison Young) (the lead consultant) and Anthony Benson (Allies and Morrison) attended the meeting for this item. Other members of the project team were also in attendance.)

The chair introduced the report and general introductions ensued.

Martyn Saunders and Anthony Benson gave a power point presentation on the East Norwich Masterplan.

(A copy of the [presentation](#) is available on the council's website and a recording of the meeting can be viewed on the [Norwich City Council YouTube channel](#). The East Norwich Masterplan Stage 1 is available on the council's website as follows: <https://www.norwich.gov.uk/ENMPart1> and <https://www.norwich.gov.uk/ENMPart2>)

The chair thanked the consultants for the comprehensive presentation which had also been made to the project board and stressed the importance of the unusual position of the project having the support of all stakeholders working in partnership to deliver regeneration in East Norwich.

During discussion, the consultants, together with the executive director of development and city services answered members' questions on the draft East Norwich Stage 1 Masterplan.

Members were advised that both the pumping stations at Trowse Millgate were locally listed. Members were advised that Historic England and Homes England had been commissioned to review the heritage assets on the site and therefore the list of listed or locally listed properties could change.

Members were advised that the masterplan incorporated the most up to date flood risk modelling and built-in resilience for climate change based on estimates. Homes England would fund further work around flood risk which would be shared with the statutory agencies. The Environment Agency had not issued any new baseline information. The modelling was based on a good understanding of existing flood risk patterns. The support of the Environment Agency was important and there would be further statutory consultation as part of the Greater Norwich Local Plan adoption process. East Norwich was a significant brownfield redevelopment site. Mitigation for flood risk and surface water drainage included setting buildings back from the river, remodelling low lying areas of the riverside walk and the two marinas.

A member suggested that to ensure the development was sustainable, communities needed basic provision of schools and primary health care facilities, particularly within walking or cycling distance of homes. The chair agreed that this was an issue that would be taken up at the project board. Members noted that the masterplan had allocated spaces where a school or health centre could be placed. There had been engagement with the county council's education service and discussions with the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG). During stage 2 there would be further work around the delivery mechanism for the work and employment spaces. This would include retail, leisure and entertainment provision.

In reply to a question, Martyn Saunders said that there had been no focus on the provision of facilities for Travellers as part of the masterplan process. The executive director of development and city services said that there was a separate exercise being undertaken to identify sites for Gypsies and Travellers across the Greater Norwich area which was due to report back later in the year.

During discussion a member commented on supporting self-build boat builders and the importance of residential moorings. Members noted that the Broads Authority was keen to support the principle of residential and visitor moorings.

Discussion ensued on the urban design of the development with high buildings on the riverbank reflecting the heritage and conservation area. The consultants shared members' concerns about the amount of hard standing. The existing environment at Carrow Works was mainly hard standing. Measures such as green roofs and walls were a consideration for a later stage. There would be opportunities to develop the public realm with hard and soft landscaping. The south side, west of the bridge, would be more urban development to reflect its current function and its direct relationship with the river. There would be less dense development to the south and east in relation to the country park and the broads. Flood risk and landscaping would be addressed across all sites.

Members were advised that it was important to promote the principle of bus routes at this concept stage. A member commented that the bus service to Geoffrey Watling Road had been ceased despite the creation of a bus only lane. During discussion members noted the reliance on commercial bus services but considered that car use should be discouraged. A member suggested that some areas should be car free, reducing the allocation for car parking on the site, and that public transport and use of the car club should be promoted. Members sought to ensure that community facilities were accessible for pedestrians and cyclists.

During discussion a member raised concerns that the new road bridges connecting the sites would create “rat-runs” connecting County Hall and King Street with Thorpe Hamlet. Members were advised that the design lines and use of 20 mph zones discouraged through traffic and “rat running”.

Members noted the discussion at the previous meeting about the potential to reopen the Trowse Rail Halt and were reminded of the response from the rail operators that it was not a viable proposition because of its proximity to Norwich Station and that the quantity of customers would not be achieved, and that it would affect main line services. The station building was locally listed and would be considered for non-residential use.

A member commented that the masterplan proposal reminded her for Salford Quay. The executive director of development and city services confirmed that Salford Quay had been one of the places that had been considered during initial scoping of the project.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) thank the consultants for their presentation;
- (2) recommend the draft stage 1 Masterplan to cabinet subject to noting that the panel:
 - (a) considers that there should be further engagement with the Environment Agency in relation to flood risk in the context of climate change, using the indicative proposed layout as set out in the masterplan based on existing flood risk;
 - (b) welcomes the provision of community infrastructure for schools, health facilities and public transport but seeks assurance that there will be further consideration at the development stage to ensure that this infrastructure is provided.

CHAIR