

## **Site Allocations Development Plan Document**

### **Consultation Statement**

#### Regulation 25 (1) consultation

The public consultation for the draft Site Allocations plan took place between November 2009 and February 2010. It involved a wide range of consultees, including statutory and special interest bodies and residents across the city. Specifically, all neighbours within a certain distance of a proposed site were sent invitation letters for comments. There were approximately 8,000 letters sent in total. Officers held a series of exhibitions across the city and held neighbourhood focus groups at different locations. Officers also attended meetings of external organisations to deliver presentations and answer questions. At the end of the consultation period, about 400 representations were received. These formed part of evidence base for the site selection process.

This consultation statement summarises the representations received. Officers' responses are also attached for each of the representations made where appropriate. While officers have responded to every representation made, similar issues have been covered collectively where appropriate.

There are two types of representations: site specific comments, and general comments about the document. These representations are summarised separately in the following document.

Representations received for the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) are not included in this document. Instead, they are dealt with in the SA process specifically.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
M039	H001	H001/001	Miss Buttifant	Object	Object to proposed housing on site, as it would reduce enjoyment of house and resale value. Concerned that any development would lead to a loss of privacy, light, and air and lead to overlooking. There are covenants on Copenhagen Way restricting residents from growing tall trees; this must be taken into account when considering new development on this site. Concern about noise in the mostly residential area. The current industrial units cause little nuisance in this regard.	Issues like privacy, noise will be treated in future Development Management Policies in determining detailed planning applications.
		H001/002	CPRE Norfolk	Comment	The greater use of brownfield land in Norwich for housing will mean less pressure on greenfield land in the Norwich Policy Area and Greater Norwich Area. Many Broadland and South Norfolk residents commute to work in Norwich and employment allocations should reflect this.	The need to make use of brownfield land in urban area is noted.
		H001/HEART	Norwich HEART	Comment	Only acceptable if access achievable from other than Aylsham Road or by 'carriageway' access. Reason: need to reinstate historic frontage to road	Comments regarding highway access and historic frontage noted
NOR0043	H002	-	-	-	-	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
M039	H003	H003/002	Rev Bazely	Support	Existing industrial use inappropriate in residential area. The only 'mixed' use that would be appropriate would be uses in associated with the housing, such as parking or play space.	Noted
		H003/003	Miss Brown	Support	Would strongly prefer to see housing on this site than the existing industrial use.	Noted
		H003/EH	English Heritage	Comment	There is a II* church (St Catherine's) and its grade II church hall some 200m south west of this site. This site and the land in between currently has a number of individual warehouse/industrial buildings with considerable amounts of open space. It is unclear if there are any views of the church to consider from this site or its surroundings, but the land appears to have been proposed for a range of uses. There may be a cumulative impact if all of these are taken forward, and heights, massing and densities will need to be appropriate. The church appears to sit just outside the Mile Cross Conservation Area, although in the March 09 CA appraisal, it was suggested the boundary be redrawn to include the church. We do not know if this change was implemented. Development appears acceptable, as long as development does not exceed two storeys.	Historic built environment issues are noted and will be taken into account in the site policy.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
-	H004	H004/001	Mr Flett	Object	Own part of site, unhappy at land being put forward by someone else.	Negative view of owner of part of this site is noted.
		H004/002	Mr & Mrs Gordon	Object	Traffic issues: Parking pressures and damage to cars Delivery vehicles to shops Parent of school children	Highway safety issue is noted.
		H004/003	Ms Moseley and Dr T C	Object	1) Site description/title is incorrect 2) Existing use description incorrect, includes gardens 3) Deeds state access rights 4) Traffic problems - Bately Court, flats over shops, shops, entrance to Recreation Road/schools, cemetery 5) Land should remain greenfield	Site description issue noted; Traffic issue noted.
		H004/004	Mr&Ms Ings and Sandra	Object	Majority of site is green field land. Large trees on site and significant habitat for wildlife. Site is used for community amenity. Both potential site accesses are dangerous, busy road due to cemetery, schools.	Wildlife issue noted.
		H004/005	Mr&Mrs Bright	Object	1) We own part of this site, as previously stated in local plan review of 2000 none of the garden owners wish to sell to the developer. 2) Even if land were available there would be concerns over safe access, the wildlife haven, the TPOs and the value of a green corridor this provides. 3) The access road on to Earlham Road frequently has near-miss accidents. The 100 yard stretch of road has a supermarket and 16 shops, 40 flats above the shops, Bately Court	Ownership issue noted; Wildlife/tree issue noted; Highway safety issues noted; Parking issue should be taken into account in future development if site is found suitable

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					sheltered housing, Recreation Road (with sports centre and recently enlarged school), College Road (with school), cemetery and crematorium and 2 bus stops. 4) Added to this is the hugely increased on-street parking, partly due to the increased on-street parking from the closure of the former parking area to the rear of Earlham House shopping precinct (by Hibbert and Key). This combination causes gridlock, we know as we live here.	
		H004/006	Dr Wallace	Object	1) Land not in ownership of developer. Some land owned by residents of Earlham Road with no intention of selling to developer. 2) All land use as gardens and has amenity value for local community. 3) Trees on the land have TPOs on them in recognition of their amenity value to local community. 4) Access to much of the land cannot be access by developer. 5) Additional access routes to proposed housing would lead to over-congestion of this area.	Ownership issues noted; Access issue noted; Issue of TPO trees noted.
		H004/007	Mr Paul	Object	The area is already over developed with schools over subscribed. More traffic would be dangerous. Loss of green space would adversely affect the local environment	New development will have to contribute to education needs as part of an agreement with developers.
		H004/008	Miss Rix	Object	Traffic situation already difficult and will worsen with development. Road is fast and visibility	Traffic issue is noted, further comments will be sought

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					restricted. Since permission granted for 223 visibility has reduced and have to rely on pedestrian to advise if road is clear. Would cause problems for cemetery traffic. Two schools and shopping centre would be problematic for propose Recreation Road access, with existing parking problems as cars are parked on both sides of the road. One of the few green spaces left at the moment, which can soak up rain water. Earlham Road is a river when there is heavy rain, more development would worsen this problem.	from Highway Authority.
		H004/009	Miss Vinall	Object	Loss of view to rear of property since sports centre was built, further development would detract from view to rear of house and will increase overlooking. Request that the properties are single storey only to avoid problems of privacy and spoiling outlook, detracting from enjoyment of property. More buildings would have an adverse impact of value of house.	Privacy issue will be considered by DM policies DPD in determining planning applications for future housing development. It is worth noting that site allocations plan only sets out development principles.
		H004/010	Dr Martin	Object	Site unsuitable as land is not owner by developer and the remaining lands owners will not give up their gardens or the land to be developed. The owners will include covenants to prevent this from happening. Traffic problems on Earlham Road - car has been damaged badly twice from hit and run incidents as the strip of road narrows on a curve around 208 Earlham Road and often cars meet	Ownership issue noted; Traffic issue noted; Access issue noted; Wildlife issue noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					speeding buses coming down hill and realise there is not enough room to pass. This is still the case even though cars partially park on the pavement. More traffic would increase the problem, unless the council re-categorised the road to slow this down. Area is a wildlife haven that should be preserved. It is part of the urban green belt including the cemetery, Recreation Road playing fields and Heigham Park.	
		H004/011	Mrs Sears	Object	Site is unsuitable. More houses would bring more cars, which are not needed on this road, especially at this site opposite the cemetery. Traffic situation is already appalling with the bus stop. Access onto the road already impossible from some houses, with residents needing to ask passing pedestrians if the road is clear. This has been made worse since 223 Earham Road was granted permission as cars parked on the bend make clear vision of oncoming traffic difficult. The access on to Recreation Road would also be a problem due to the two schools, leisure centre, delivery vans and shoppers cars that all make the area very busy.	Highway safety issue noted; Traffic issue noted.
		H004/012	Mrs Slater	Object	Several plots within the site are private gardens and the owners may not wish to sell. Many trees on this plot have TPOs on them. The exit onto Earham Road from this site would be dangerous considering the shopping centre and opposite a new proposed bus stop. The land is	Ownership issue noted; TPO trees issue noted; Wildlife issue noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					a haven for wildlife including woodpeckers and wild bluebells.	
		H004/013	Mr Rowe	Object	Clarity needed on the site description. Some of the land included remains in private ownership. All gardens are heavily used by residents. Number of TPOs, not feasible to build without damaging these. New houses would mean a loss of amenity for terrace residents who benefit from this 'green lung'. Earham Road very busy at point of site access, with the roads in use by emergency vehicles, opposite Crematorium, near shopping centre and so any additional traffic would be a hazard and access from proposed location would have poor visibility. Access onto Recreation Road would increase the traffic on a small road, where there is already heavy use due to the school. Delivery lorries use this road for the shopping centre as well. Would like to register objection from the outset of this process.	Ownership issue noted; TPO trees issue noted; Traffic and access issue noted.
		H004/014	Mrs Clark	Object	1) Harmful to residential amenities of dwellings on Earham Road and Christchurch Road 2) Serious risk to highway safety from increasing traffic movements into and out of Earham Road and/or Recreation Road 3) Unreasonable addition to traffic congestion in Recreation Road and a hazard during school dropping off and picking up times. 4) Traffic hazards are likely to be increased by creation of a further access road onto	Highway safety issue noted; Traffic issue noted; Wildlife issue noted; TPO trees issue noted.



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>Recreation Road where there are already access roads to the Sport Centre and Shopping Centre. Slowing down and turning movements of vehicles would unreasonably increase risk to highway safety.</p> <p>5) Land to the rear of the houses is an urban wildlife area, and deserves to be retained or protected. Residential development would harm this.</p> <p>6) Planning permission has previously been refused in 2002, most of these reasons still apply including the loss of mature trees, many of which have TPOs.</p>	
		H004/015	Miss Ward	Object	<p>1) The open spaces behind the houses currently provide a space for community activities such as bonfire night, folk club meetings and street parties which help bring the community together.</p> <p>2) Parking is already difficult and would worsen with any development</p> <p>3) Access on and off of Earlham Road already considerable considering shopping centre and local school. Given that Earlham Road is a busy route to N7NUH and UEA any further potential congestion should be avoided.</p> <p>4) Love green space and think as many of them should be preserved as they can be.</p>	Access issue noted.
		H004/016	Mrs Clarke	Object	Dangerous entry/exit onto Earlham Road as vehicles is always parked before and after proposed access by cars using shopping centre	Highway safety issue noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					and people who live on Earlham Road. Almost opposite Crematorium. There is a shortage of amenity land and this piece of land should be kept as an area for wildlife.	
		H004/017	Miss Vinall	Object	Duplicate representation as H004/009	n/a
		H004/018	Mrs Bushell	Object	Loss of green site/garden land and mature trees, which are a haven for wildlife next to the school playing field, increase in road traffic on Earlham Road which has; cars parked on both sides due to terraced housing with no off-road parking, a shopping precinct, city and county bus services, direct routes to N&NUH and university, entrance to crematorium and several schools.	Tree/wildlife issues noted; Traffic and highway safety issues noted.
		H004/019	Mr Critchley	Object	The area has become a 'cash-cow' for the council and developers (increased council taxes and permission granted on the garden of the White House). More development would only increase traffic problems, with construction and end occupiers. What about aims to preserve/enhance green areas, this development would degrade the quality of the area. The residential density is high enough in this area. The exit onto Earlham Road is opposite the crematorium which would be hazardous, difficulties of those using crematorium would be increased. Suggest consulting the staff at the crematorium for an opinion on this matter. Cannot see one redeeming feature for this development and	Traffic issue noted; Highway safety issue noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					hope that it is not allocated.	
		H004/020	Miss Hogg	Object	<p>Site name is misleading - the site covers the rear of 180 to 208 Earlham Road, and land behind shops and flats and Bateley Court. Existing description unclear as some land is still private garden land. Hibbert and Key do not own all of the land.</p> <p>The land to the rear of 180-208 is greenfield land with tree preservation orders and also mature trees to rear of Bateley Court with TPO. Access from Earlham Road would constitute a serious hazard, the track to the side of 180 Earlham Road very close to entrance to Bateley Court and shopping centre car park, opposite entrance to cemetery and bus stop, on street parking on both sides of the road. Access from Recreation Road would increase volume of traffic using this road. Huge number of cars dropping off and picking up children from school along with the shopping centre car park and entrance to the recently built sports centre.</p>	<p>Site name and description will be investigated; Ownership issue noted; Highway safety issue noted; Access issue noted.</p>
		H004/021	Ms Carlo	Object	<p>Concerns over the loss of amenity land, loss of area for wildlife, loss of mature trees. The council has designated this land as a greenfield site to avoid development pressures. The area of hard standing on site could be used for housing as long as the development does not adversely affect the boundary trees. It would be better to include the former garage land and</p>	<p>Though the Local Plan designates open space, rather than greenfield land, this site is not designated as an open space; Government now defines gardens as "Greenfield"; Note suggestion that the</p>

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					Earlham Shopping Centre as part of any future redevelopment at the same time.	former garage land is better to be included in future Earlham Shopping Centre regeneration if possible.
H005	<b>H005</b>	H005/001	Norwich Day Services	Suggest changes	Use part of the land for affordable housing, for use by people with learning disabilities. Use profits to build a new day centre. Staff from day centre could support people in the housing.	Noted. Norfolk County Council are responsible for finding suitable land for people with learning disabilities.
		H005/002	Mrs Clissold	Object	The existing use is important. Danby Woods should not be disturbed as valuable to wildlife and Yare Valley.	Importance of Danby Woods will be acknowledged in site allocation policy if the site is found suitable.
		H005/003	Mr&Mrs Kirk	Support	Brownfield site with good access and services nearby. Current building eyesore. Redevelopment using good design would improve this southern gateway to the city.	Noted.
		H005/004	Mr Rivett	Comment	Current use important, but if use did change: - no development onto Danby Wood site - high buildings would be obstructive, keep single storey - trees and hedges should be left.	Importance of Danby Woods will be acknowledged in site allocation policy if the site is found suitable. Building heights, trees will be dealt with in appropriate planning policy in DM policies DPD.
		H005/005	Mr Frost	Suggest changes	Need for adult social care, this is a suitable location.	Norfolk County Council are responsible for finding suitable land for such needs.
H006	<b>H006</b>	H006/001	Notre Dame RC VA High School	Comment	School keen to work with any developers to provide community facilities around school site, particularly sports and performing arts facilities.	Noted

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		H006/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward.	Noted.
		H006/EH	English Heritage	Comment	This site is within the city centre conservation area, and the street as a whole has benefited from English Heritage HERS grant. The site is immediately adjacent to the Ferry Boat Inn, listed at grade II, and is opposite the redundant grade I listed St Etheldreda's Church. Development here will need to be of an appropriate scale for the surrounding buildings.	Historic built environment issues noted; allocation will take this into account in determining the form of development.
H007	<b>H007</b>	H007/001	Mrs Weir	Comment	Privacy and amenity (noise) of existing residents of concern. Established trees and birdlife to protect.	Privacy and amenity issue will be dealt with in DM policies DPD. Tree issue is noted.
-	<b>H008</b>	H008/001	Mr Nash	Support	Existing commercial use leads to residential amenity issues. Any housing development should have adequate parking. What about the sites with permission that are not being built, why are more being considered?	Employment land issue noted however will be balanced against loss of employment opportunities; new housing development will be expected to providing parking space according to the Council's parking standards; More sites must be considered as this plan will meet medium and long term

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments	
						housing site needs.	
		H008/002	Mr Farbon	Object	Employment within housing area reduces the need to travel to work. Proposals will also change existing industrial and housing character of area. Focus efforts on getting sites redeveloped such as Little John Pub and Earl of Leicester pub.	Loss of employment land noted and will be taken into account in site suitability assessment.	
		H008/003	Mr&Mrs Coombes	Object	Site should stay as an employment area. Fear of job losses amongst employees of occupier of this site. Other jobs being lost in the area - they should be preserved and new businesses encouraged in the area.	Loss of employment land noted and will be taken into account in site suitability assessment	
H009	<b>H009</b>	H009/001	Mr Miller	Support	Agree with housing use, may have concerns over other uses.	Noted	
		H009/002	Corton House Ltd	Comment	Concerns include: Height of building if more than 2 storeys; Off road parking/parking issues; Increase on street parking; Access to proposed development; Increase in traffic on already busy road; Public transport on City Road.	Issues including building heights, parking provision etc will be dealt with through policies in DM policies DPD.	
-	<b>H010</b>	No comments received					
-	<b>H011</b>	H011/001	Mr&Mrs Mitchell	Object	Access poor, extra traffic not suitable. Development would spoil green field land, detrimental to residents and wildlife. Once lost it's too late, how much more development can	Lack of identified vehicular access noted; impact on green space and woodland noted.	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					the city sustain.	
		H011/002	Mr Edwards	Comment	Chalk mines under this site.	Ground condition issue noted.
		H011/003	Mr&Mrs Harris	Comment	Vehicle access an issue. Learner drivers currently a problem. Traffic improvements would be needed onto Ipswich Road to allow local residents out onto the road. Impact of development on bats in Bazzar's Mine. Other site where subsidence is not a problem should be used first, like an old garage site for instance.	Access issue noted; Ground condition issue noted.
		H011/004	Mrs Warminger	Object	Issues with construction sites in past in this area, inconsiderate builders. Future development should avoid these problems.	Comments relate to detailed design issue which will be dealt with separately in delivery stage.
		H011/005	Mr Sargent	Object	Several investigations into potential development of Danby Park have taken place since 1964, each on finding chalk mines underneath land to be an issue. Popular amenity land, people parking in Danby Close an issue at the moment.	Ground condition issue is noted.
		H011/006	Mr Hood	Object	Access to the site would be over amenity land/Danby Park. May set a precedent for former ESSO petrol Station on Ipswich Road. Access via Golf Course/ Sunningdale would cause further problems with its junction at Newmarket Road.	Access issue noted.
		H011/007	Mr Ambrose	Object	No access with using Danby Park or demolishing a house. Natural extension to	Access issue noted; Impact on CWS, river valley,

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					Danby Woods/CWS. Harford Chalk Mines underneath. Site designated under NE1 as a green wedge. Loss of trees contrary to Council's Tree Strategy. Site is PAROS under policy SR3.	individual trees, woodland and open space noted; Ground conditions noted.
		H011/008	Mrs Tunnell	Object	Impact on nature reserve, biodiversity and River Valley. Danby Wood should be a SSSI for its ecological value and bats in the underground caves. Loss of trees - which are an extension to Danby Wood/CWS and should be protected. Proper designation is required. More houses, children and pets will have an adverse impact on this area. Chalk mines underneath. Contrary to policies NE1 and SR3 to protect river valley.	Impact on CWS, river valley, individual trees, woodland and open space noted; Ground conditions noted. SSSIs are designated by Natural England.
		H011/009	Mr Johnson	Object	Damage to mature trees; Poor access to highway; Extends the southern boundary of Norwich's built up area into greenspace/ woodland.	Impact on woodland/ green open space noted.
		H011/010	Mr&Mrs Leatherdale	Object	Chalk mines and mature trees. Site is a nature reserve. Possible mine used as Home Guard base - if so this should be preserved for historical sake. More houses cause water shortages. Access would reduce Danby Park and reduce amenity space for public. Tree removal would impinge on Marston Lane Nature Reserve. In the wood to the south of the quarry is an old ice house, an important historic relic of the past. The number of houses could adversely affect and de-value properties in area. Eaton Golf Club have dumped rubbish in	Ground conditions noted; Impact on woodland/ green open space noted. Access issue noted. Historical value noted.



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					the quarry. Where will this rubbish go now? Eaton Rise busy with learner drivers. An increase in traffic would increase the existing problem.	
		H011/011	Norfolk Plant Heritage	Object	Part of green lung for city and wildlife habitat. Access - none at present or main services available. Chalk pits underneath. Extra traffic cause problems as park widely used, especially in school holidays. I'm not a NIMBY, but I think this is not an area for dense housing.	Access issue noted; Ground condition issue noted; Impact on woodland/ green open space noted.
		H011/012	Mrs Blanch	Object	Traffic increase in area detrimental to wildlife. Old chalk mines underneath.	Ground condition issue noted.
		H011/013	Mrs Barnes-Clay	Object	No access without using Danby Park or demolishing a house; Disturbing wildlife (in CWS); Destruction of woodland contrary to council's Tree Strategy; Destroy PAROS where children play; Site is designated as a green wedge and therefore unsuitable for development; Over old Harford Chalk Mines; Traffic increase up Danby Close and Constable Road.	Access issue noted; Impact on CWS, river valley, individual trees, woodland and open space noted; Ground conditions noted..
		H011/014	Mr Barnes-Clay	Object	Identical representation as above	n/a
		H011/015	Mrs Clissold	Object	No access without using Danby Park; Yare Valley wildlife corridor, natural extension to Danby Woods/CWS, haven for wildlife; Chalk mines underneath; PAROS under policy SR3; Traffic disruption to residents and valuable wildlife and cause unwanted traffic increase in Danby Close and Constable Road.	Access issue noted; Impact on CWS, river valley, individual trees, woodland and open space noted; Ground conditions noted.
		H011/016	Ms Coy	Object	Loss of natural habitat and visual amenity;	Access and traffic issues

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					Reduce price of my house; Development would upset elderly mother; No access without destroying communal land/natural habitat; Haven for wildlife; Chalk mines underneath, fires set alight by people; Contrary to policy NE1; Vacant brownfield land should be used first before greenfield land; Trees are protected under council's Tree Strategy; Increase in traffic noise and pollution and detrimental to wildlife; Prices of surrounding houses severely affected.	noted; Impact on CWS, river valley, individual trees, woodland and open space noted; Ground conditions noted. Need to prioritise brownfield land development noted.
		H011/017	Mrs Smith	Object	Chalk mines underneath; Access would be through Danby Park, which is not suitable as it is PAROS where children can safely play; Haven for wildlife; Traffic bad for Constable Road, existing learner drivers cause problems; Loss of woodland contrary to council's tree strategy.	Ground condition issue noted; Impact on woodland/ green open space noted.
		H011/018	Dr Livingstone	Object	No specific comments - see H011/036 for comments.	n/a
		H011/019	Dr Shakir	Object	Loss of greenfield and wildlife area; Lack of infrastructure - water, electricity, sewerage, roads to area; Construction will disrupt resident's amenity; Increase in traffic, disturbing peace; New people will disrupt social structure of neighbourhood; Chalk mines underneath; Increase in noise pollution; Development would encourage golf club to sell more land; New houses around Norwich are currently not selling.	Access, traffic and noise issues noted; Impact on woodland/ green open space noted. Ground conditions issues noted.
		H011/020	Mrs Turner	Object	Chalk mines underneath; Amenity value of	Ground condition issue

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					land; Danby Park would be used for access which is currently used by Eaton Rise Residents Association and Eaton Rise Townswomen's Guild who have put effort into retaining the area for recreation; Would result in the removal of attractive woodland and would detract from the pleasant and tranquil green space.	noted; Impact on locally valued woodland/ green open space noted.
		H011/021	Mrs Gribben	Object	Haven for wildlife; chalk mines underneath.	Natural environmental and Ground condition issues noted.
		H011/022	Mrs Phillips	Object	Woods and wildlife area important; Access to site would be through Danby Park or demolishing an existing house; Old chalk mines underneath; Policies NE1 and SR3 protect this site; Increased traffic on Constable Road and Danby Road is undesirable.	Ground conditions and access issues noted; Impact on woodland/ green open space noted.
		H011/023	Eaton Rise Residents Association	Object	Chalk mines underneath site; Designated as open space, adjacent to Danby Wood/CWS and nature reserve; Development would adversely affect wildlife; Access would reduce size of Danby Park, damaging amenity value of park; Housing would be out of character, increase traffic; Adverse effect on adjacent residents; Suggested change: Council to buy site and amalgamate with Danby Park and adjacent wildlife area.	Access and traffic issues noted; Impact on CWS, river valley, individual trees, woodland and open space noted; Ground conditions noted. Suggestion that council should buy land noted, though funding is very limited. Localism agenda provides more opportunity for community led initiatives.
		H011/024	Mr Smith	Object	Should remain woodland, once lost cannot be	Impact on woodland/ green

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					replaced; Roads not suitable for traffic increase; Chalk mines underneath, known to council for subsidence; Policy SR3 seeks to retain this area as open space.	open space noted.
		H011/025	Mr Powell	Object	No access to site without demolishing a house; Area above chalk mines; Only reason it is put forward is as Golf Club need money; Traffic is bad enough at present with all of the learner drivers using roads.	Access issue noted.
		H011/026	Mrs Bussey	Object	No access without using Danby Park or demolishing a house; wildlife haven, natural extension to Danby Wood/CWS; Above Old Harford Mines; Site is a green wedge, unsuitable for development under policy NE1; Key strategy of Norwich is to use vacant brownfield land over greenfield land; Loss of trees contrary to council's Tree Strategy; Area designated PAROS under policy SR3; Access to site would increase traffic through Eaton Rise and traffic on Danby Close and Constable Road.	Access issue noted; Impact on CWS, river valley, individual trees, woodland and open space noted; Ground conditions noted.
		H011/027	Mr Cooper	Object	Site falls within area of policy NE1 and should be protected. Danby Woods is a CWS and LNR, contrary to policy NE7, development would be detrimental to nature conservation and geological interest. PPG9 and council's policies, inc. Tree Strategy, seek to protect this type of land. Access would result in loss of housing or park land. Could increase traffic down Danby Close	Access issue noted; Biodiversity and Geodiversity issues noted; Impact on CWS, river valley, individual trees, woodland and open space noted; Ground conditions noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					and Eaton Rise which is already busy. Would be a danger to children using the park and play area.	
		H011/028	Mrs Magem	Object	No access to site. Recently rubbish fires in old mines, fire brigade attend via Danby Close, access poor. Danby Woods are a CWS regularly used by families. Old chalk mines underneath. Contrary to council's tree strategy.	Access issue noted; Ground condition issue noted; Impact on woodland/ green open space noted.
		H011/029	Cllr Bearman	Object	No access except through Danby Park, which is an important recreational site, or by demolishing a house. Site above old chalk mines as shown on drawing 41/4669 from survey carried out by Wardell Armstrong for the council. Area important for wildlife and a natural extension to CWS of Danby Wood. Council's Tree Strategy states that woodland should be enhanced not destroyed.	Access issue noted; Impact on biodiversity, CWS, river valley, individual trees, woodland and open space noted; Ground conditions issue noted.
		H011/030	Mr&Mrs Steel	Object	A few extra houses resulting in the loss of trees would be ok if they were replanted elsewhere. Access not shown but would most likely be through park which is currently appreciated by public. It should be anticipated that the golf club will put forward all its land for housing, but the land from the east and south boundaries of H011 to Ipswich Road and Marston Lane should remain to be of recreational benefit to people of	Access issue noted; The golf club overall is a designated urban green space which, under present policies, is not likely acceptable for housing development.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					Norwich.	
		H011/031	Mrs Shailer	Object	Trees would have to be removed, contrary to Tree Strategy. Old chalk mines underneath. More traffic on Danby Close, dangerous for children walking to park and woods. More noise and congestion in Eaton Rise, already suffers from large amount of learner drivers.	Ground condition, access and traffic issues noted; Impact on green open space noted.
		H011/032	Mr Rivett	Object	Access would be through Danby Park damaging pleasantness and safety of public park. Site contains mature trees. Better to concentrate on brownfield sites. Housing would lead to the loss of green space and public amenity.	Access issue noted; Impact on woodland/ green open space noted.
		H011/033	Eaton/Lakenham Liberal Democrat Focus Team	Object	Site wooded area with mature trees and wildlife, should be protected from development. Greenfield site and not suitable for housing. No access, access would mean through Danby Woods which would be detrimental to the play area reducing its size and quality. Underground chalk workings, said to be bats in the tunnels.	Access issue noted; Impact on biodiversity, protected species, individual trees, woodland and open space noted; Ground conditions issue noted.
		H011/034	Norfolk and Norwich Transport Action Group	Object	Natural woodland and a designated CWS. No access without using Danby Park or demolishing a house. Directly above old Harford Chalk Mines. Tree felling contravenes council's Tree Strategy.	Access issue noted; Impact on CWS, individual trees, woodland/ green open space noted; Impact on the amenity of surrounding residential area

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					Area designated as Publically Accessible Recreational Open Space by council. Construction would negatively impact on amenity of our adjacent property.	would be dealt with through DM policies DPD.
		H011/035	Dr Merz	Object	No access except through playing field which is used for recreation. Open space and trees of value to wildlife. Yare Valley is of scenic importance and this would intrude into this. Access by knocking down a house would lead to disturbance of whole neighbourhood.	Access issue noted; Impact on river valley, woodland/ green open space noted.
		H011/036	Dr Livingstone	Object	Residents have chosen area due to amenities such as Danby Woods and the green space that is accessible. Would ruin recreational users' experience of Danby Wood. Site must be under green belt protection? Sewage drainage would increase pressure on existing sewers. Noise and street lighting would increase Subsidence problems with underground mines. Profits would go to Golf Club at expense of local resident's loss of amenity.	Access issue noted; Impact on woodland/ green open space noted.
		H011/038	Mrs Barnes-Clay	Object	Access either through Danby Park or through demolishing a house. Wildlife haven - natural extension of Danby Woods which is a CWS. Above old Harford Chalk Mines. Site designated as green wedge in policy NE1. Regional planning guidance states to use	Access issue noted; Ground condition issue noted; Impact on CWS, individual trees, woodland/ green open space noted; Prioritisation of brownfield

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					vacant brownfield land before greenfield. Removal of woodland contrary to council's Tree Strategy. Designated as Publically Accessible Recreational Open Space in policy SR3. Increase in traffic on Danby Road and Constable Road.	sites issue noted
		H011/039	Mrs Butcher	Object	Traffic already an issue on Constable Road due to learner drivers using road.	Traffic and possible mitigation measures will be part of the suitability assessment.
		H011/040	Mr Killingback	Object	Chalk workings underneath site. Value of nature reserve/trees on site. Increased traffic on small, residential Constable Road.	Ground condition issue noted; Impact on woodland/ green open space noted.
		H011/041	Dr Nobes	Object	Site provides local community with green site, with trees and wildlife.	Impact on woodland/ green open space noted.
		H011/NWT	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Object	It will result in significant adverse impacts on biodiversity. The site forms a natural extension to Danby Wood County Wildlife Site and LNR. The southern portion (approximately 2/3) of the site consists of identical habitat to Danby Wood. This area forms part of an ecological corridor and green infrastructure link. Development on this site will not be compatible with green infrastructure policies. Tunnels below this allocation are very likely to contain bat roosts and if this allocation were to be allowed this would have to be considered as	Comments related to habitats, biodiversity, designated site, protected species and green infrastructure noted and will be taken into account in site assessment.



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					a constraint on development.	
H013(M)	<b>H013</b>	H013/001	Ms Parker	Comment	Currently site is base for our charity, would need help relocating if required. Once TPO on site and part Wooded Ridge, needs management as it is an accessible natural asset for Norwich and a biodiversity resource for Norwich. Only available green space in area, should be excluded from possible development.	Impact on wooded ridge noted, mitigation measures will be required should this site be allocated.
		H013/002	Natural Areas Officer, Norwich City Council	Comment	Wooded Ridge that is open space on a steep slope that would be difficult to develop. Limited green space in city, site should be designated PAROS. Has biodiversity value in own right and forms ecological network. Future development should seek to manage the Wooded Ridge better through raising the area's profile or through the use of Section 106 agreements.	Topography issue noted; Impact on and value of wooded ridge is noted.
		H013/003	Notre Dame RC VA High School	Comment	School keen to work with any developers to provide community facilities around school site, particularly sports and performing arts facilities.	Noted.
-	<b>H025</b>	H025/EH	English Heritage	Comment	The scheduled site of St Leonards Priory appears to be currently screened from this site by the large warehouse building to the north but, if that is removed (NOR009 - proposed mixed use and housing), these two sites could have an impact on the Priory remains. Currently the area between is heavily wooded but the Priory is more elevated than the proposed site, and so could be affected. Building heights should be carefully controlled	Comments are noted, however development has commenced - no need to be carried forward as allocation

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					to ensure the setting is not harmed. In addition, although the site sits just outside the conservation area, the topography would suggest that it is likely to be visible from it, and most importantly from the cathedral close, due to its position on the slope rising up from the river valley, immediately opposite the playing fields between Bishopgate and Ferry Lane. Ferry Lane in particular leads towards this site, and development may have an impact in the view on the walk from the cathedral towards the scheduled and II* listed Water Gate, and the neighbouring 17th century property 25 Ferry Lane, also II*. This site would need to be developed very carefully. A design brief should be produced to ensure that development does not harm sensitive settings/views.	
H027	<b>H027</b>	No comments received				
H028	<b>H028</b>	H028/001	Mr Nash	Support	Existing commercial use leads to residential amenity issues. Any housing development should have adequate parking. What about the sites with permission that are not being built, why are more being considered?	Employment land issue noted however will be balanced against loss of employment opportunities; new housing development will be expect to providing parking space according to the Council's parking standards
		H028/002	Mr Farbon	Object	Employment within housing areas reduces the need to travel to work.	Loss of employment land noted and will be taken into

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					Proposals will also change existing industrial and housing character of area. Against wishes of land owner, council have been chided in the past for attempting to re-zone this area. Focus efforts on getting sites redeveloped such as Little John Pub and Earl of Leicester pub.	account in site suitability assessment.
		H028/003	Mr&Mrs Coombes	Object	Site should stay as an employment area Fear of job losses amongst employees of occupier of this site. Other jobs being lost in the area - they should be preserved and new businesses encouraged in the area.	Loss of employment land noted and will be taken into account in site suitability assessment
H029 & H029a	<b>H029</b>	H029/EH	English Heritage		This site could affect the setting of the conservation area, as it is a little way north of H025 and could be visible from Bishopgate, or the area near the Cow Tower. Bishop Bridge Road is part of the inner ring road and therefore potentially busy. This site is in a small gap between three conservation areas - the city centre, Thorpe Hamlet and St Matthews. As a brownfield site, it is potentially suitable for development but is a very sensitive location - densities and design are important. We would like to see a design brief here and be involved through the planning process if this site is selected. The costs of the decontamination of the gas holder should not be considered justification to push the density up beyond that appropriate to the townscape.	Sensitivity of the site location noted; Appropriate mitigation will be considered if site is allocated.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments	
H030	<b>H030</b>	H030/001	Mr Seadon	Comment	[No specific comments, query over how planning permission related to the Site allocations plan]	Site with planning permission thus will be part of the allocation	
H031	<b>H031</b>	H031/001	Sprowston Parish Council	Comment	Site has a public right of way and it should be retained in any future development.	Public right of way noted and will be taken into account in site policy if site is allocated.	
		H031/002	Templemere Residents' Association	Support	Problems with rats and pigeons, a visual eyesore that should be developed.	Noted.	
		H031/003	Dr Beaumont	Support	Current demolished/empty site has led to rat infestations (confirmed by Env Health officer)	Noted.	
H032	<b>H032</b>	No comments received					
H033	<b>H033</b>	H033/001	Mr Kent	Suggest changes	Site plan out of date as new block has been constructed in site. Revised site plan will assist comment on site, where would housing go?	Boundary will be amended to reflect the most up-to-date land availability plan	
		H033/002	Mr Champion	Comment	Site not suitable for residential or commercial building. Would be conflict with current role. Building for use by hospital staff would be a good idea. Any damage to buildings on Merton Road from any construction works should be fully rectified. Recent work shook adjacent buildings, and near by chalk mines were of concern. Would oppose plans to develop woodland near site. No access from Merton Road. No building work should commence earlier than 7:30am.	Some matters raised are not planning considerations, however access and ground condition issue will be taken into account in subsequent site assessment.	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					Site should remain free for hospital development.	
		H033/003	Holly Drive Residents Association	Object	Noise was disruptive last summer when new ward was built. Concerned that new housing will be too close to our property. Parking is limited, could worsen.	Amenity issue will be dealt with in DM policies DPD.
		H033/004	Mrs Mouncer	Object	Hospital valued and needed. Recently stroke ward has opened. Land should be used for hospital expansion. Ensure infrastructure is in place for any housing development around the city as roads are already congested.	The need for community hospital is noted, and the allocation will reflect the Hospital's long-term operational plan.
		H033/005	Mr&Mrs Coleman	Comment	Surprised site is designated for housing as works have just been completed for a new ward. Traffic impact on Bowthorpe Road. Merton Road and Bond Street are already used as cut-throughs.	The need for community hospital is noted, and the allocation will reflect the Hospital's long-term operational plan.
		H033/EH	English Heritage	Comment	The site is just to the north of the Norwich Cemetery (grade II registered historic park). This is a large site (nearly 3 hectares) and there could be considerable impacts on the setting of the park. The potential impact on the registered park should be considered by the city conservation team.	Comments noted and will form part of site policy if the site is allocated
H034 & H034a	<b>H034, NOR0017, NOR0018</b>	H034/001	Notre Dame RC VA High School	Comment	School keen to work with any developers to provide community facilities around school site, particularly sports and performing arts facilities.	Site HO34 has planning permission and will be allocated as part of larger site with neighbouring site.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
H035	<b>H035</b>	H035/EH	English Heritage	Comment	From the maps available to us, it is unclear whether this site is just inside or just outside the St Matthew's Conservation Area. It is a prominent location which is significant in views from the approach into Norwich Station, and could affect the setting of the conservation area. This site would benefit from a development brief and we would welcome the chance to comment on this in more detail because it forms part of the gateway into Norwich.	Noted. The site is outside the Conservation Area. English Heritage will be consulted further at the planning application stage.
-	<b>H036</b>	H036/001	Royal British Legion (Norwich Branch)	Object	Future residents may object to activities in RBL club next to the site. Access inadequate for what is proposed.	Further assessment will be made on access issues. Policies in the DM policies DPD will address potentially conflicting neighbouring uses.
		H036/002	Mrs Moncur	Object	Tree on site - possible TPO; Parking problems, increased if church lost their car park; Loss of privacy as gardens not that big; Park would be a better use or handing use to school for gardening use?	Transport, access, local amenity and environmental issues noted.
		H036/003	Mr Tuckey	Object	Increase in traffic; Increase in parking problems Noise issue with building of new houses.	Many of the comments relate to detailed issues which will only be considered at planning application stage and which will be covered by the DM policies DPD.
		H036/004	Cllr Gihawi	Object	Access onto Aylsham Road and increased congestion; Loss of privacy and overlooking. Aspect would be ruined, historically has been an adventure playground for children; Habitat for wildlife; This is why many people have chosen to live in area.	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		H036/005	Mrs Vesey	Object	Access and parking in area bad; Loss of church car park would make parking in area worse; Increase danger for young children when getting home after a trip out. Loss of privacy and overlooking.	
		H036/006	Mr Spauls	Object	Loss of privacy and loss of view from rear of house.	
		H036/007	Mrs Sealby	Object	Loss of view from back of house; Loss of privacy; Loss of value of property; Access onto Aylsham Road would be poor, lead to further congestion and hazards.	
		H036/008	Cllr Gihawi	Object	Loss of play area for children; Housing would have bad access, congestion on roads would increase, would not be able to find parking spaces on roads; Concerned about loss of outlook from rear of house and loss of privacy.	
		H036/009	Cllr Blakeway	Object	Loss of car parking facilities for church and community use. Elderly/disabled rely on being able to access church by car. No further on-street parking available, losing this facility may prevent people from using the building.	
		H036/010	Rev Vesey	Object	Harm to amenity of existing residents; Loss of parking for church; Public transport not available in evenings when church activities take place; Displaced cars from car park will increase parking pressure on streets for local residents; Church is a community facility and important for different people; British Legion often use car park too; Site does not meet criteria of PPS3 -	Transport, access, local amenity and environmental issues noted. Most of the site is owned by the church therefore it is assumed that the Church does not wish to put this site forward for development. However, a further request

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments	
					available, achievable and suitable; Access onto Aylsham Road for new residents would increase pressures and increase chances of accidents; Is not brownfield, should reconsider this; Remediation may be required; Noise and loss of privacy to adjacent residents.	will be sent to the landowners to verify the land availability issue.	
		H036/011	Mr Keal	Object	Poor access; Loss of privacy onto Eade Road and Aylsham Road; Increased noise pollution. Loss of recreational playing field, concern for families; PPG17 supports development of other sites before this site. Should be assessed through; Open Spaces Strategy and guidance by CABE on open spaces; Empty private-rented houses - what is being done about this? Parking will lead to more problems in an already congested area.	Transport, access, local amenity, open space and environmental issues noted. Further assessment of access issues will be needed.	
		H036/013	Dr Tanner	Object	Reduced parking for church will be problematic; will disperse parking onto streets which will adversely affect permit holders/residents.	Further assessment of access issues will be needed.	
		H036/014	Mr Webster	Object	Enjoyed view of open space, development would encroach on privacy; No access, would add to congestion on roads.		
H037	<b>H037</b>	H037/001	Glenn Palmer Cars	Object	Have used the site for this business since 1986. With more houses surely people will need the services that my garage offers.	Loss of land for small business will be considered however should be balanced against the need for housing.	
H039	<b>H039</b>	No comments received					



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
H040	<b>H040</b>	H040/001	Ms Johnson	Comment	Would like to see allotments or sheltered housing; Enjoyed views from house since 1973; Concerned about losing enjoyment of garden and blocking out of light; Concerned about traffic from first school opposite site. There would be less traffic and noise with old peoples home.	Traffic issue is noted and will be taken into account in site assessment. Overlooking issues would be considered through a planning application.
H041	<b>H041</b>	H041/001	Mr Farbon	Object	Employment within housing area reduces the need to travel to work; Proposals will also change existing industrial and housing character of area; Focus efforts on getting sites redeveloped such as Little John Pub and Earl of Leicester pub.	The need of employment land noted, however this must be balanced against the need for housing. Site allocation in this plan likely to meet medium to long term housing need.
H042	<b>H042</b>	H042/001	Mr Sidhu	Object	Loss of light and views for property; Increase in noise pollution from cars and people; Loss of amenity during construction; Loss of car parking for general public.	Amenity issue will be covered by DM policies DPD. Loss of car park will be covered by city centre car park review.
		H042/002	CBRE	Comment	Concern on road layout and access/egress from site; Increased pressure on traffic on Westwick Street, could impact on operational viability of the Cathedral Retail Park; Would support the scheme if improved linkages could be created between CRP car park and this site.	Noted. Access will be taken into account in site policies.
		H042/003	English Heritage	Comment	The map shows that the terminal edge of the city wall comes up to the edge of the site; This is an unscheduled area of the wall and unless it is known to have been destroyed in the past, it should be assumed that important remains may	Conservation issues are noted and will be taken into account in site policies.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					be identified; These could warrant statutory designation; As a terminal point, and a site adjacent to the river, there may be strong archaeological potential here, including waterlogged deposits, depending on previous disturbance; The advice of the county archaeologist should be sought to identify the likely archaeological interest before any allocation is confirmed.	
H043	<b>H043</b>	H043/EH	English Heritage	Comment	The site is within the conservation area, and immediately opposite 'The Great Hall', no. 123 Oak Street, which is listed at grade II. We understand that the Norwich Preservation Trust currently has an interest in this building, and would be interested to know if your conservation team consider the building to be correctly graded. If any of the buildings on the site are of interest in terms of their contribution to the character or appearance of the CA, they should be retained, in accordance with the demolition tests of PPG15. The design of any redevelopment should aim to preserve or enhance the conservation area.	Conservation issues are noted and will be taken into account in site policies.
M042	<b>H044</b>	H044/001	Rouen Road Area Residents Association	Object	Object to area of wildlife being developed and publically accessible footpath; Hope to develop whole ridge into wildlife area; What will new population use for recreation. And there are no job opportunities.	Negative effects on open space, accessibility and biodiversity and could be mitigated through excluding the wooded ridge from the site boundary
		H044/002	Ms Parker	Comment	The Wooded Ridge has been included in this site and it should not have been for	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					environmental/ wildlife/ open space preservation reasons.	
		H044/003	Natural Areas Officer, Norwich City Council	Comment	Wooded Ridge that is open space on a steep slope that would be difficult to develop; Limited green space in city, site should be designated PAROS; Biodiversity value in own right and forms ecological network; Future development should seek to manage the Wooded Ridge better through raising the areas profile or through the use of Section 106 agreements.	
		H044/EH	English Heritage	Comment	There is a grade I church, St Julian's, on the other side of the car park, to the east of the site. Any development here could be visible from the church, although it would be replacing the current warehouses and light industrial buildings. It is within the conservation area. We would wish to be consulted on the detailed design.	Conservation issues are noted and will be taken into account in site policies.
-	<b>H045</b>	H045/EH	English Heritage	Comment	This site is within the city walls and the city centre conservation area; It fronts the river and is therefore quite prominent; This is a significant site, and scale and massing will need careful thought; We consider that density and height should not be increased; The current buildings are not of great architectural importance, but any redevelopment will need to meet the preserve and enhance tests; We would be like to be consulted as detailed proposals come forward.	Comments on setting and design noted. Site is included in NCCAAP – will not be included in the site allocations

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
-	<b>H046</b>	H046/001	Ronaldsons	Object	Parking is an issue as area is permit parking. Where will more cars go?	Site is too small to allocate through this plan. However, parking and amenity issues relating to any possible future planning application will be covered in DM policies DPD. All current garage users will be offered alternative spaces in the locality.
		H046/002	Mr Miller	Object	Overlooking if houses built on Orchard Street. Would be ok if built on Exeter Street with gardens running parallel to Orchard Street; Parking for more houses would cause a problem.	
-	<b>H047</b>	H047/001	Mr&Mrs Goudie	Object	Where will cars park if garages are taken away and more homes built on the site.	All current garage users will be offered alternative spaces in the locality.
H048	<b>H048</b>	H048/001	Mr Cook	Comment	Site was identified a few years ago but was shelved due to mains supplies for the city running under the site.	Noted. This issue will be investigated further if the site is allocated
		H048/002	Ms Bradley	Object	Parking problem will increase if garages removed; Already a crowded area, concern over more people moving to area; If affordable house prices of private houses will fall.	Noted. All garage users will be offered alternative spaces in the locality. Any development would have to provide appropriate mitigation of site issues such as services.
H049	<b>H049</b>	H049/001	Ms Pinching	Object	Parking already a problem will increase with new residents and loss of garages; Would rather have green verges paved over and a small fee charged to ensure parking was available.	
		H049/EH	English Heritage	Comment	The site shares a boundary with the Mile Cross CA and would replace 0.24 ha of garages with housing. The design of the housing should follow the garden city principles of the adjacent conservation area.	Noted

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
-	<b>H050</b>	H050/000	Sustainable Living Initiative	Comment	Would like to use this site for offices for allotments and storage space for equipment.	The site is too small to allocate through this plan. Any planning application for development of the site will be assessed against appropriate policies in DM policies DPD, in this case most specifically those concerning access and effects on neighbouring uses. All garage users will be offered alternative spaces in the locality.
		H050/001	Mr Chatten	Object	Use garage at present. Parking outside house would be detrimental to oak tree. Overlooking from new development. Comment on how garages are managed - empty garages in block but long waiting list.	
		H050/002	Mr Dugdale	Object	I currently have access by car over the garage land to my property, which I have permission from the council to do so. Please advise me on my position on parking.	
		H050/003	Mr Warnes	Object	Concerned about contamination of allotments which are directly next to the site. I keep chickens here, grown fruit and vegetables and I'm concerned about the impact on these.	
		H050/004	Mr&Mrs Warnes	Object	Development would affect access to our garden and garage. Have to drive through garage site to access our garage, but garage is in our ownership. Not being able to get into garage would devalue our property.	
		H050/005	Mrs Wright	Object	Loss of garages would lead to nowhere to store mobility car. Husband is disabled and we do not want to lose this to vandals. Husband cannot walk very far, which is why we took up this flat as it is near the garages. Parking is a problem at the moment, this will only increase.	
-	<b>H051</b>	H051/001	Ms Pyne	Object	Where will cars be parked. Noise from new housing Loss of privacy.	The site is too small to allocate through this plan. Any planning application for

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		H051/002	Mr Block	Object	Garages needed to prevent cars from being vandalised.	development of the site will be assessed against appropriate policies in DM policies DPD, in this case most specifically those concerning access and effects on neighbouring uses. All garage users will be offered alternative spaces in the locality.
		H051/003	Mr Howes	Object	Garages currently empty - should be let out to raise money for council. High water table, used to be a marsh.	
		H051/004	Mr Metcalf	Object	More cars parked on roads. Access to site would need to take away some of our garden space	
		H051/005	Mr Riddell	Object	Garages provide essential service in protecting vehicles, relieve on road parking, help prevent damage to grass verges.	
H052	<b>H052</b>	H052/001	Mr Crosby	Comment	Would whole site be redeveloped or only the houses that are structurally unsound? What would density and height be of any new dwellings. Who is responsible for building on structurally unsound ground - will the council re-compensate for this? What are the costs of new build versus repair? What guarantee is there that this problem won't happen again?	The repair of the properties on Argyle Street was not economic for NCC but may have been for another organisation with different financing arrangements and access to alternative funding. The executive of the council decided the best solution was to sell the land to a local housing association for the development of new affordable housing and the cost of additional work for piling etc will be reflected in the land value. The question of guarantees should be directed at the designers of

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
						any new development not NCC as this will be a major consideration for a new development during the design and the future maintenance will be the responsibility of the housing association.
		H052/003	Ashby	Object	Economic and environmental value of demolishing an estate that is only 20 years old over stabilising a few homes within it. Current red line around site would cut out our vehicle access to 1,2 and 3 Southgate Lane and our parking area.	Access to the properties in Southgate Lane would have to be retained in the redevelopment. This issue will be covered in the Site policy and at the later planning application stage.
		H052/EH	English Heritage	Comment	Within the city centre conservation area, and the city walls. The open space to the east of the site contains the grade II remains of St Peter Southgate church. We wouldn't object to the principle of redevelopment here, subject to suitable scale, form and massing. The new buildings should respect the traditional built forms nearby and not dominate the area. There may be archaeological impacts.	Conservation matters noted.
H053	<b>H053</b>	H053/001	Mrs Collingsworth	Object	Leave site for open and green space. Traffic already an issue on the road. Schools create problems and more traffic would be a danger to school children. The road near the Start-Rite show factory should not have been closed.	As a brownfield site, development would be acceptable here. Please note that this site now has planning permission and

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
						development has commenced. It will therefore not be allocated in the Site Allocations plan.
		H053/002	Mr Squire	Comment	Parking problems in area - more consideration needed. Road used as overspill parking from other roads with permits. Used as a park and walk facility to city centre. Traffic issues with new development at former Start Rite shoe factory. Branford Road should be reopened.	Park and walk facility is not likely to be supported and feasible. This plan does not deal with general parking issues. Please note that this site now has planning permission and development has commenced. It will therefore not be allocated in the Site Allocations plan.
H054(M)	<b>H054</b>	-	-	-	-	
E001(O)	<b>E001</b>	E001/001	Hellesdon Parish Council	Object	- Unacceptable traffic on an already extremely busy main highway - Increased pollution levels, severe inconvenience to neighbours	Most of the comments made relate to traffic and the existing site access into Holt Road. This issue will be further investigated and reflected in future sites proposal;  Although currently vacant land, the site is not a designated green open space and therefore
		E001/002	Mr & Mrs Slattery	Object	- The proposal will create a lot of additional traffic in particular service vehicles - There has already been a large volume of additional traffic created by housing development at Horsford and Thorpe Marriott. - The need for additional commercial premises in this area is questionable as there are many vacant and derelict properties on and around the airport	



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Screening has been destroyed during the past few years.</li> <li>- The paddocks site offers both a visual and sound barrier to the noise and activities of the airport and need to be maintained</li> <li>- The proposal would create an additional noise and pollution nuisance.</li> <li>- During the recession the need for more commercial properties is not needed if a case for a need could be proven, other brownfield site locations should be considered as a priority.</li> <li>- The proposal has been refused by the council and the inspector in the past, and should be consistent in these objections</li> </ul>	<p>development is acceptable in principle;</p> <p>Amenity issues will be addressed through DM policies DPD and will be applied at detailed application stage;</p> <p>It is appreciated that the stand alone employment allocation on the edge of airport might not be desirable;</p>
		E001/003	Mrs Plumstead	Object	Identical representation (as above )	<p>However it is worth noting that the need for airport expansion is recognised in the Joint Core Strategy.</p>
		E001/004	Mr Mickleburgh	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal will increase traffic on the road which will be more dangerous as the road is now one of Norwich's busiest roads.</li> <li>- The potential use of bright lights and burglar alarms for security purpose will increase light and noise pollution to the area</li> <li>- A recent inspector's report advised to allow the site to return to grazing paddock and provide visual and sound barrier to the airport activities.</li> </ul>	
		E001/005	RT. Smith	Comment	Consideration should be given to the views of the public regarding the proposal during the decision making process.	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		E001/006	Mr&Mrs Knight	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The development will create a lot of additional traffic, with A140's traffic volumes are already high and increasing</li> <li>- The need for more commercial developments in this area in questionable as there are many empty and derelict properties in and around the airport</li> <li>- Screening from the airport runway has been destroyed over the last few years by other commercial development</li> <li>- This site should return to "green lung" barrier between the runway end and residential properties.</li> <li>- There have been refused planning applications in recent years on the site</li> <li>- There will be a loss of visual amenity and have adverse financial implication on the value of nearby homes.</li> </ul>	
		E001/007	DLP Planning (on behalf of C A Trott (Plant Hire) Ltd.)	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site is available, and with owners willing and capable of delivering suitable development.</li> <li>- No part of the land has any productive or beneficial use or is likely to have beneficial use in the foreseeable future.</li> <li>- The site has no contiguous boundaries with the open countryside or with any part of the built up area other than the operational area of the Airport.</li> <li>- Development of the site would not have any adverse effect on interests of environmental value or the green corridor strategy.</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of the site would not risk impacting on the amenity of any residential properties due to distance, the intervening presence of Holt Road and existing boundary planting.</li> <li>- The site is suitably located to attract business investment and is unconstrained.</li> <li>- Allocation of the land for employment uses would be consistent with the Core Strategy.</li> <li>- The site is suitable to provide a range of small scale employment opportunities in a sustainable location in accordance with strategic policy.</li> <li>- The site is not dependent on strategic highway works and can be satisfactorily accessed from the public highway without ransom. It offers scope to secure a material improvement in highway safety through the creation of a new junction with appropriate turning and pedestrian facilities</li> <li>- The site is well located to support journeys to work by public transport</li> <li>- There are no infrastructure constraints to development</li> <li>- The site is not at flood risk</li> </ul>	
-	<b>E002</b>	E002/001	Mr Page	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The grassed and tree planted area bordering Queens Road should be preserved as it is a rare asset in the city and enhances the area</li> <li>- There is no objection if the proposal only restricts to the office block and car park.</li> </ul>	Comments noted and the green open space will be excluded in further allocations.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		E002/002	Mr&Mrs Morgan	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The surrounding houses date from 18th century and are likely to be affected by heavy construction nearby</li> <li>- This will greatly increase construction &amp; habitation noise affecting quality of life</li> <li>- Light and overshadowing will be a main issue for surrounding neighbours</li> <li>- St Stephen Road will need improved drainage</li> </ul>	Residential amenity issue and impact on neighbours will be addressed through DM policies DPD
		E002/003	Bidwells	Suggest Changes	<p>This site should be allocated for mixed use redevelopment for the reasons below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed uses and boundary of the site are not conducive to maximising the potential of the site. If comprehensively redeveloped, this site could significantly improve the attractiveness and functionality of this area and gateway to the city centre</li> <li>- The existing access for vehicles can accommodate a large office premises and therefore is suitable for various redevelopment options.</li> <li>- The site does not have any statutory designations, but part of site is within a conservation area</li> <li>- This site is a brownfield site with good connections to services that could be utilised if redeveloped</li> <li>- The site is immediately adjacent to the town centre therefore access to local facilities is within walking distance</li> <li>- The site is opposite the bus station, and is</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted and will be taken into account in the site selection process. However, the details of the allocation proposal will be determined after the site assessment undertaken;</p> <p>However, initial assessment shows that the site is naturally separated by the ring road from the City Centre retail area and there is no strong pedestrian link thus may affect future viability of a retail centre on this site;</p> <p>The importance of city centre office floorspace will have to be addressed;</p>

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>considered to be a highly sustainable location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A tree survey was undertaken</li> <li>- The site is within a single ownership</li> <li>- Redevelopment of the site for town centre uses is likely to have a positive impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre</li> <li>- Redevelop the site will ensure Marsh to relocate to new or refurbished premises within the city centre</li> <li>- The proposed allocation should be "The Victoria House site is suitable for general retail/town centre uses, but other employment uses or residential uses will also be appropriate"</li> </ul>	<p>The Joint Core Strategy city centre policy does not include this site as Primary Shopping area.</p>
		E002/EH	English Heritage	Comment	<p>This site is against the edge of the conservation area, which is bounded by Queens Road. There is an area of scheduled city wall on the opposite side of Queens Road. The southern edge of this site abuts properties on the north side of Victoria Street - 12 of the 23 properties are listed, as are 24 St Stephen's street immediately adjacent to the site, a further 8 properties on the opposite side of Victoria Street, all grade II, and the pub opposite the site entrance, at 9 St Stephens Street (The Coach Makers Arms) is also grade II. The site is currently an office building with surface parking and it is proposed to extend the office and build a multi-storey car park. There is the potential for this to impact on both the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					conservation area and the setting of a number of listed buildings. Whilst we do not object to the principle of development here, it is a sensitive site and we would wish to be consulted on the detailed proposals, as it will be important to ensure that the design and scale are appropriate.	
E003(H)	<b>E003</b>	E003/001	Ms Hall	Suggest changes	- The site adjoins the Dolphin pedestrian and cycle path, a vital link to the Marriott's Way, which is currently too narrow. - Any development of the E003 site should include a widening of the Dolphin Path on the western boundary, making E003 slightly smaller.	The issue of improving Dolphin path is noted.
		E003/EH	English Heritage	Comment	This is adjacent to the II* Dolphin Inn, which includes the remains of a C16th Bishops Palace. The site currently contains warehouse and depot buildings, but also considerable open space. The design and scale of development will require careful consideration.	Conservation issue noted.
-	<b>E004</b>	-	-	-	-	
E005(H)	<b>E005</b>	E005/001	Mr Flowerdew, Old Laundry Court Owners Association Ltd	Comment	- Generally supportive, providing it is a quality business park development for B1, with a specific theme such as Innovation or similar to and complementary to The John Innes Centre and the UEA. - The eastern end buildings within conservation area must be preserved and high Victorian wall	- Business centre proposal is questionable and further assessment will be needed for its suitability, especially transport issues;

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>separating the riverside gardens of Old Laundry Court is retained - both these will act as a buffer for our domestic development from the business park.</p> <p>- The classical lines of the old pumphouse must be retained and developed as a centre point for the business park, preferably with improved access for public use outside of the normal business hours, in order to keep the area "live" into the evening - maybe some form of riverside restaurant/forum/meeting point should be developed on the south bank, similar to that created in Cambridge and Oxford where the river forms a focal point with use of punts etc - this section of river is flow and level controlled (as is the Cam and Isis) from Hellesdon Mill to New Mills and should be made more use of throughout its length, which will help to maintain the banks and riverbed</p> <p>- Any riverside access should include a new pedestrian/cycle bridge from the Marriots Way on the North bank of the Wensum, and at the same time upgrading the riverside path on the north bank. Retention of part of the Waterworks will limit the extension of the riverside walk/cycle route to entry and exit only from the North bank over this new pedestrian/cycle bridge, because of security requirements. It would however be essential that the best should be made of the opening up of this stretch of the south river bank, and not make</p>	<p>- Conservation matters are noted</p> <p>- Importance of riverside access and riverside walk are noted;</p> <p>- Further allocation will also be subject to agreement with HSE.</p>

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>the same mistakes again as at Riverside.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ingress and egress will be problematical with over 600 cars on site and needs careful research - design as shown will cause considerable congestion at MileCross bridge traffic lights with Heigham St, as traffic currently backs up at rush hours morning and afternoon. Single exit shown currently directs lorry traffic one way to Mile Cross due to tight turn onto Waterworks Road. Entry and exit for heavy commercial traffic needs careful planning if the current perimeter walls are to be retained. Consider 2 entry and 2 exit points with interlinked internal one way systems that enable traffic to chose best exit/entry dependent on inward/onward journey - as such it would be sensible to take into consideration the traffic system for the whole site, not just the eastern end currently under consideration.</li> <li>- There will be a need to consider traffic light control at Dereham Road/Waterworks Road junction.</li> </ul>	
		E005/002	Mr&Mrs Pye & Turner	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traffic on Waterworks Road is already very busy with long queues at all peak + other times. Additional businesses with 600 parking spaces will make this worse</li> <li>- Our house is a stand alone property with open land behind. Any development adjacent to our property will have an intensive and imposing effect on us in terms of visual, noise and</li> </ul>	Traffic and transport infrastructure issue noted; Amenity issue will be dealt with in DM policies DPD if the site is to be allocated.



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					privacy. - There will be impact on wildlife - There are many more sites with a better road infrastructure and less impact	
		E005/003	Mr Hamilton	Object	- This site should be removed from the Site allocations list - This is a regionally important industrial garden, as identified by the Norfolk Historic Gardens Survey.	Noted
		E005/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward. The level 2 SFRA demonstrates that these sites, either wholly or partially, have a hazard rating of 'danger for most' or 'danger for some' in the 1 in 100 year flood event. This would not meet our safety requirements. This should be taken into consideration when deciding whether to take the site forward.	The site partially falls into Flood Zone 3; this will be addressed if the site is to be allocated.
		E005/EH	English Heritage	Comment	Large site suggested for use as a business park. There is a scheduled and listed site just to the east of this - the ruins of St Bartolomew's Church, set in a public garden. It is grade II. Development on the eastern end of the site is likely to impact on the setting of this church and	Conservation matters noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					development needs to be proportionate. The views of the local authority conservation team should be sought. There could be archaeological impacts.	
-	<b>E006</b>	E006/001	Hellesdon Parish Council	Comment	Hellesdon Parish Council does not support any access onto Boundary / Drayton Road	Comments noted. These sites are identified employment areas which will be defined in the DM policies DPD.
-	<b>E007</b>	E007/EH	English Heritage	Comment	We do not have comments on any historic environment impacts here, but would note that the information given in the consultation document was not helpful in locating the site. The site name does not allow for convenient GIS search, and the scale of the map means street names are illegible. For future reference, it would be helpful if at least two road names were available for identification of sites, as is usually considered good practice for individual planning applications.	
-	<b>E008</b>	E008/001	RPS (London SE1)	Suggest changes	Proposed Site E008 (Hall Road) is stated to comprise existing employment uses. The proposed use is 'Primary Employment Area'. The site covers a large area of land however the allocation does not accurately reflect the range of uses. In particular, the southern end of the site includes a new B&Q DIY store, associated garden centre and customer car park. The B&Q store represents recent development granted by the Council for Class A1 development. Although the DIY store provides a significant number of local jobs it does not fall within Class	Noted, amendments to site boundary will reflect this.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					B of the Use Classes Order which is confirmed by the draft policies of the Joint Core Strategy. Furthermore, the proposed allocation of the B&Q store for 'employment' purposes is inconsistent with the Council's approach in respect of the Hall Road Retail Park which includes a HomeBase DIY store and lies to the north of the E008 allocation but is excluded from it. Accordingly, the B&Q store should be excluded from the proposed 'Primary Employment Area' allocation thereby reflecting its recently established retail use and to ensure consistency with the treatment of other out of centre retail facilities.	
-	<b>E009</b>	-	-	-	-	These sites are identified employment areas which will be defined in the DM policies DPD.
-	<b>E010</b>	-	-	-	-	
-	<b>E011</b>	E011/001	Hellesdon Parish Council	Comment	Hellesdon Parish Council does not support any access onto Boundary / Drayton Road	
-	<b>E012</b>	E012/TrowsePC	Trowse with Newton Parish Council	Suggest changes	This site could also include the old railway sidings adjacent to Europa Road that are currently used.	
-	<b>E013</b>	-	-	-	-	
-	<b>E014</b>	E014/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward	
-	<b>E015</b>	E015/001	Ms Hall	Suggest changes	Because of the good cycle and pedestrian links to the city centre, site E015 should change to	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					mixed use to include both housing and employment.	
		E015/002	Cgms	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The requirement of certain infrastructure works imposed by the Local Plan policy EMP15.1 should be retained. (i.e. Vehicular access upgrade; a new pedestrian and cycle route; reserve land for utilities site access)</li> <li>- The road adjacent to the River End of the Norwich City Football Club stadium, known as Geoffrey Waltling Way, should be earmarked for use by emergency vehicles serving the Harbour Triangle area and proposed development.</li> <li>- There is a strong case for establishing a high quality pedestrian/cycle route along the River Wensum in accordance with Policy SR11 of the Local Plan and propose to provide such a route through the Utilities site to connect to Whitlingham Country Park.</li> </ul>	
		E015/003	Norfolk Landscape Archaeology	Comment	The structure of Gothic Works itself is of considerable industrial archaeological value. NLA do not object to the reuse of the building itself, but would object to its demolition.	
		E015/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward. The level 2 SFRA demonstrates that these sites, either wholly or partially, have a	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					hazard rating of 'danger for most' or 'danger for some' in the 1 in 100 year flood event. This would not meet our safety requirements. This should be taken into consideration when deciding whether to take the site forward.	
		E015/EH	English Heritage	Comment	All of the cottages in the triangle to the north of the site are listed. This site doesn't directly affect the conservation area but redevelopment could make it much more prominent as it forms a gateway into Norwich for people arriving by train. The nature and design of development here therefore merits careful consideration.	
-	<b>E016</b>	-	-	-	-	
-	<b>E017</b>	-	-	-	-	
-	<b>E018</b>	-	-	-	-	
-	<b>E019</b>	E019/001	Ms Hall	Suggest changes	This site adjoins the Mile Cross Road and the Marriott's Way. At the moment there is a path linking the east side of the Mile Cross Road to the Marriott's Way, through Anderson's Meadow, but nothing on the west side. If site E019 is developed then there is an opportunity to create a path from the west side of the Mile Cross Road to the Marriott's Way. This would not just assist cyclists but also provide a badly-needed pedestrian crossing of the Mile Cross Road, via the underpass.	Site does not involve change of use and will be defined in the DM policies DPD for employment uses.
-	<b>E020, M025, M055</b>	E020/001	Cgms	Support	There should be a requirement to include a riverside pedestrian and cycle route and an emergency access adjacent to the River Stand at Norwich Football stadium (see also	Most of site has planning permission and development has commenced - no allocation

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					comments for E015)	
		E020/EH	English Heritage	Comment	The site lies within the city centre conservation area, and is part of the St Stephens Street masterplan area. Development should to follow the principles of good urban design and should be of a similar scale to numbers 33 and 34.	is necessary
-	<b>E021</b>	E021/EH	English Heritage	Comment	This site comprises a car park adjacent to the grade I Norwich Union building, and is proposed for office buildings. Development should be limited to the southern end of the site, to avoid harm to the setting of the Norwich Union building.	These sites represents opportunities for improvement in St Stephens Area, however they will only be feasible if they are considered holistically within the area. These small sites will not be allocated on their own.
-	<b>E022</b>	E022/EH	English Heritage	Comment	The detailed design should respect the setting of the conservation areas and adjacent buildings	
E023	<b>E023</b>	E023/001	Norwich Society	Comment	Information provided in terms of historical ownership issue. (see original note for details) Freehold of the site were bought by Land Securities and leased back to the Norwich Union.	Noted
		E023/EH	English Heritage	Comment	It is a little unclear if this involves new build or reuse of the bingo hall. This site is acceptable in principle, subject to the detail of the proposals, but the aim should be to preserve and enhance the conservation area. If the bingo hall is to be replaced, it should be with an office building(s) of higher quality.	Conservation matters noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
-	<b>E024</b>	E024/001	The Landscape Partnership	Object	It is crucial for a city to have breakout points from the monotony of building. Places where the density of the city can be relaxed. A place where the visual and emotional atmosphere can be set back from the street. This site is very close to a number of tall Aviva office blocks which block out light and become incongruous on Surry Street and the surrounding areas. With the removal of even more open areas, the area would become much less appealing to the pedestrian public and further cut off the area as a place people only associate with offices. This site is one of the last places within the area which allows a visual mix of housing, offices and open space.	Open space issue is noted.
		E024/EH	English Heritage	Comment	This site is adjacent to St Catherine's Close, a grade II* building, originally an C18th house, now used as offices. Development would not only remove the green space immediately adjacent to the listed building, but would also appear to incorporate a part of the building within the site boundary. Some redevelopment might, in principle, be acceptable, but the relationship needs to be carefully thought through. We would wish to be involved in the detailed discussions of design.	Conservation matters noted.
	<b>E025</b>	-	-	-	-	These sites are identified employment areas which will be defined in the DM policies DPD.
-	<b>E026</b>	E026/001	Ms Hall	Suggest changes	Because of the good cycle and pedestrian links to the city centre, site E026 should change to mixed use to include both housing and	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					employment.	
		E026/EH	English Heritage	Comment	The site incorporates both E003 and E018. The same concerns relating to the Dolphin Inn apply here as to E003. The lower part of the site is separated from the conservation area by the width of the main road, but we do not think there will be a major impact on the conservation area.	
-	<b>E027</b>	E027/001	Mr&Ms Pye & Turner	Comment	We would like to be consulted on any development of this area as it would directly affect us. There have been permissions on neighbouring land without our knowledge.	
		E027/EH	English Heritage	Comment	This site could encroach on the setting of the southern side of St Bartolomew's Church (Scheduled ancient monument/grade II listed building) as much as E005 would on the west. The same comments apply.	
-	<b>E028</b>	-	-	-	-	
-	<b>E029</b>	E029/001	Cgms	Support	It will be important to ensure that environmental quality is enhanced along the river frontage and that provision is made for pedestrian and cycle routes to provide a traffic-free alternative to National Cycle Network route 1 and link to Whitlingham Country Park.	
		E029/002	Norfolk Landscape Archaeology	Comment	This allocation surrounds a scheduled monument. Any development within this area must respect both the monument and its setting	
		E029/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of	



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward.	
		E029/EH	English Heritage	Comment	Two of the Carrow Works buildings, in the north western corner of the site are listed at grade II. However the building, now apparently used as main offices and boardrooms, comprises the grade I listed Carrow Abbey, and the site plan provided appears to show the boundary cutting through this building. The grounds around it are also scheduled as Carrow Priory (NF33). Some of these scheduled remains, particularly areas with standing ruins, are excluded from the site allocation, whereas other parts of scheduled ground are within it. Our scheduling information makes it clear that previously the monument was managed by the Colmans factory who occupied all of the surrounding buildings. We would have significant concerns relating to this site. Even in/under the existing factory buildings, there could be significant archaeological remains, and dividing the site in the way proposed is likely to raise significant issues with regard to the ongoing management of the site.	
M019	<b>R001, M019</b>	R001/001	Templemere Residents' Association	Support	The association supports the development of this site by a national food store as the area is without such a facility within easy walking distance. The site has been derelict for years and should be developed as soon as possible.	Support noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		R001/002	Ms Cane	Support	- A decent retail (food) shop is needed in this area and the density of housing in this area would mean any food shop would get a lot of foot traffic. Currently there are not food shops within walking distance. R001 needs access through M019.	Support noted.
		M019/001	Ms Cane	Support	Site has been vacant for many years (at least since 1988) and its development is long overdue. A decent retail (food) shop is needed in this area and the density of housing in this area would mean any food shop would get a lot of foot traffic. Currently there are not food shops within walking distance. R001 needs access through M019.	Support noted.
		M019/002	Templemere Residents' Association	Suggest changes	Support redevelopment of the site as currently eyesore and detrimental to the amenity of the area. However: the site is owned by 2 parties and there are entirely separate plans for each; Support prompt development on basis of retail use for the part for which Aldi have obtained permission and for residential use of part known as land north of Windmill Road; If Aldi is not going to be built imminently so access is not available the Association supports any use of land north of Windmill Road which causes the site to be cleared and maintained e.g. green space, parking even if it is just temporary.	Noted. However, short term arrangement should be made by the landowner and should not compromise the deliverability of the site.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
-	<b>R002</b>	R002/001	Hellesdon Parish Council	Object	Hellesdon Parish Council would not support any access onto Boundary / Drayton Road.	An appeal was refused for retail use on this site; significant inconsistencies with strategic policies. Site will be considered as part of employment area in DM policies DPD; no assessment needed
		R002/002	Ms Hall	Object	Norwich is already well served by retail parks that are only feasibly accessible by car. Suggest changing this allocation to housing or employment.	
		R002/EH	English Heritage	Comment	This site comprises the western corner of E011. This may have an impact on the setting of the scheduled wayside cross.	
-	<b>R003</b>	R003/001	Savills (L&P) Limited	Support	<p>1. The Riverside Retail Park is a well established retail destination with Norwich City Centre and is an important part of the City's overall retail provision and attraction. This is recognised by the allocation in the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>2. The Council has recently confirmed that retail land uses are acceptable in this location and that it does not have any in principle objection to additional retail development at the Retail Park.</p> <p>3. The allocation is consistent with the GNDP's decision to designate the Retail Park as a defined retail centre in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>4. The Retail Park is easily accessible by a range of modes of transport and provides opportunities for linked trips between other</p>	Proposal does not conform to higher level strategies; this area should not be allocated as Primary Retail Area; no assessment needed.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					commercial and residential land uses in and adjacent to the City Centre. It follows that the Retail Park and its continued use for retail purposes fully accords with the objectives of achieving sustainable forms of development.	
-	<b>R004</b>	R004/001	Drivers Jonas LLP	Suggest changes	Site R004 alongside the existing Retail Warehouse Park and Site M038 and parts of Site E008 formed a part of an approved planning application for a new District Centre and additional retail warehousing alongside. On this basis, the SADPD should reflect the principle of the range of uses that have been accepted through the extant permissions. The permissions resulted in two distinct parts to the application site; the new District Centre; and an extension to the existing retail warehouse park. We therefore suggest the boundary of Site R004 be extended to include the entire existing Retail Warehouse Park (Hall Road Retail Park), to reflect the extant consent for new retail warehouse floorspace and food and drink uses and allocated for: 'Retail Warehouse Park and possible retail park extensions.' A red line plan of 'Proposed Site R004' is attached.	Retail warehouse park will be considered in the DM policies DPD.
-	<b>R005</b>	R005/EH	English Heritage	Comment	This site could impact on a number of high grade listed buildings, such as City Hall, immediately to the west (II*), and the Church of St Peter Mancroft, immediately to the south, (grade I). It is also within the conservation area. Quality of design will be important.	There is no need to allocate as it does not involve principle change of use - no assessment needed.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
-	<b>R007</b>	R007/001	English Heritage	Comment	Extension of retail proposed within St Stephen's Street area masterplan. We are happy with this specific site, and would like to note that we are supportive of the masterplan in general.	
-	<b>R008</b>	R008/001	NLP on behalf of Marks and Spencer	Support	On behalf of Marks & Spencer Plc, NLP support the suggested allocation for increased floorspace on the site, which will strengthen the retail offer on this key city centre site and the overall vitality and viability of the city. The suggested allocation is in line with the planning application recently submitted (Your ref: 09/01567/F) to extend and improve the M&S store.	
		R008/EH	English Heritage	Comment	This site is within the conservation area and adjacent to the grade I church of St Stephen. We have recently made separate comments to your authority on development here, submitted as a formal application during this consultation, reference number 09/01567/F. Those more extensive comments should be applied to this consultation.	
-	<b>M001</b>	M001/001	Ms Tipler	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A loss of inner city green space.</li> <li>- A loss of a playing field site in the city.</li> <li>- A loss of city centre allotments</li> <li>- The density proposed is too high.</li> <li>- The view from the river to the cathedral will necessarily be obscured.</li> <li>- Archaeological evidence will require extensive excavation</li> <li>- The process of construction will cause major</li> </ul>	Some of the issues are not planning considerations. Conservation issues are noted and will be taken into account in site selection.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>disruption to people living in the surrounding properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access via existing allotments for the number of properties proposed will mean excessive traffic movement through the Cathedral Close.</li> <li>- The area is vulnerable to flooding and run off of water from the proposed properties.</li> <li>- The architects selected (LSI) have no record of building successful small scale residential developments. Given the high standard of buildings in the close, it is unlikely that anything they design will improve the environment.</li> <li>- It is not clear whether these properties would be for rental or sale. Sale would compromise the character of the close as an integrated community</li> </ul>	
		M001/002	Judge Downes	Object	<p>The description of the proposed development will be sited "at the rear of ..." is not entirely correct. Whilst this is correct in relation to the premises to the west of No. 44 The Close, it is in fact at the front of my property, as my only garden area is at the front south facing part of the house. This also applies to our neighbour to the east of my property.</p>	<p>Noted. Further investigation will be made to inform site selections.</p>
		M001/003	Mrs Wood-Percival	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Our beautiful cathedral and ground should not become just petrified ancient monuments. Instead, they should continue to be part of the heart of our vibrant city community.</li> <li>- It would also provide a great opportunity for new and exciting, environmentally sympathetic</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. However, development should not harm the view and setting of the Cathedral Precinct.</p>

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					design and plans; perhaps a competition. If the proposals are anything like the new refectory and hostrey, they will add a contemporary signature on the living history of Norwich.	
		M001/004	Mr Fisher	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constraints and suitability: The primary objections to this proposal rest on its impact on the environment and ecology close to the city centre.</li> <li>- Highway impact and improvements and access: Provision of access to the area proposed would involve a substantial increase in traffic via either the Tombland and the Ethelbert gate, an area already under strain from excessive traffic, or via Bishopgate and the rear access to the cathedral, a narrow street used by children at the school en route between Lower School and the main building and/or the playing fields.</li> <li>- Existing designations: Any development would be visible from the Riverside Walk and from Bishopgate.</li> <li>- Site conditions: The area is described as "moderate" flood risk by the environment agency.</li> <li>- Public transport access: The nearest bus stops with a frequent service are approximately 10 minutes walk from the area.</li> <li>- Viability: Existing uses: Removal of the tennis courts would result in these being erected elsewhere, with a consequent effect on</li> </ul>	Comments noted. Issues will be considered as part of the site selection process.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					drainage and the ecology. - Impact on other uses: Addition of approximately 25 houses to the area would radically affect the quality of life of those living nearby.	
		M001/005	Mr Bushby	Suggest changes	As suggested, the development of this site would have to provide a "long-term legacy in which design quality and quality of place are seen as significant aspects." As identified it must not impinge on the view of the cathedral but should complement and reflect existing architecture in the close. Green space in any future development should be given due priority. Both upper and lower close are characterised by small front gardens and backyards.	Noted. View of the cathedral will be an important factor to inform the site selection.
		M001/006	Mr& Mrs Aylott	Object	Wellbeing of the environment of The Close is a major consideration; Any significant move to fill 'vacant' areas with housing could permanently destroy a unique area of Norwich. It is extremely sensitive. No.21 which has a garden area marked on the proposal. Neighbours are in a similar position. Brown's Meadow car park is also marked out for potential use for housing. Filling these spaces would very seriously spoil the amenity of this area and apply considerable population pressure to The Close as well as its surrounding area which already contains much sheltered housing.	Issues raised relating to the conservation value of the Cathedral Precinct will be taken into account in site selections.



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>The same argument applies to other spaces which are marked out in the plans. This sheltered housing and other dwellings outside the walls which overlook The Close enjoy garden perspectives and trees. The addition of housing en masse would remove this attractive amenity.</p> <p>Environmentally the value of open spaces in a City is well acknowledged and every effort should be made to preserve this where possible. This would include trees in areas with preservation orders on them and which are in areas marked on your plans. Birds and other animals are also a feature of these spaces.</p> <p>Any consideration of this housing issue should be based very much on the long term for future generations and not on a quick fix to relieve an immediate accommodation pressure or to satisfy a desire by any party to attempt to gain more funds by generating a housing investment.</p>	
		M001/007	Mr Ayers	Comment	<p>This site lies within the Cathedral precinct, probably straddling the line of a pre-Conquest road on the edge of the gravel terrace above the marsh of Cowholme to the east. Pre-Conquest features as well as monastic features associated with the cathedral priory can therefore be expected below-ground.</p> <p>The question has to be asked: why develop?</p>	Comments noted. Issues will be considered as part of the site selection process.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>The rationale given in the document is that new build will "provide an 'edge' or backdrop to the fields". One would consider that the cathedral itself forms an adequate backdrop while the impact on the view of the cathedral church across the fields will be considerable. This is an exceptionally sensitive site and any development, if it must go ahead, should be to the highest standards and, as it would be a modern addition to the precinct, ought to be a modern contemporary design.</p> <p>Evaluation excavation followed, as necessary by excavation, recording, analysis, synthesis, publication and the provision of public information should take place in the event of development proposals proceeding.</p>	
		M001/EA	Environment Agency		<p>The level 2 SFRA demonstrates sites M001 and M002 to have a hazard rating of 'danger for some' and 'danger for all' respectively in a 1 in 100 year flood event. This would not meet our safety criteria. In addition, the level 1 SFRA demonstrates part of site M002 to fall within flood zone 3b with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding whether to take the site forward.</p>	Noted.
		M001/EH	English Heritage		<p>This is a significant location within the conservation area and close to the Cathedral. Development would replace existing open space. English Heritage is very concerned</p>	Conservation matters noted and will taken into account in the subsequent site selection process.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>regarding the potential impact. There are 11 II* buildings along Hook's Walk (and two II* and one grade I in the Lower Close) to the south of the site. Access to the site would be very difficult, since access from Hook's Walk, or around the east end of the cathedral, would be unsuitable. Nos. 43-44 are listed II*, immediately to the north of the site, while 57-60, to the immediate west of the site are listed grade II. The complex of buildings around St Helen's Square/St Helen's Church includes a further 6 grade I buildings and one grade II* building. The potential impact on the setting of the cathedral, grade I listed, and important views (for instance from Bishopgate or the Great Hospital) must be understood. This site is highly sensitive and English Heritage has very serious concerns regarding its suitability for development.</p>	
-	<b>M002</b>	M002/001	Ms Tipler	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A loss of inner city green space</li> <li>- A loss of city centre allotments</li> <li>- The density proposed is too high</li> <li>- The view from the river across the close will be diminished</li> <li>- The process of construction will cause major disruption to people living in the surrounding properties.</li> <li>- If access is via existing allotments through Hooks Walk, traffic will be dangerous for people living on Hooks Walk which is a single track</li> </ul>	<p>Some of the issues raised are not planning considerations. Conservation issues are noted and will be taken into account in site selection.</p>

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>lane where houses open directly onto the narrow street. This will also compromise the enjoyment and safety of people who walk through the close.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The area is vulnerable to flooding and run off could make my home more vulnerable. Building on the flood plain should in principle be avoided.</li> <li>- The architects selected (LSI) have no record of building successful small scale residential developments. Given the high standard of buildings in the close, it is unlikely that anything they design will improve the environment.</li> <li>- It is not clear whether these properties would be for rental or sale. Sale would compromise the character of the close as an integrated community</li> </ul>	
		M002/002	Mr Bushby	Object	The loss of more back gardens and allotments is a dilemma. If granted, development here would not visually impinge on views of the cathedral, but we can not continue to sell off gardens for housing without considerable thought and justification.	Noted.
		M002/003	Mr Fisher	Object	<p>Constraints and suitability Highway impact and improvements and access. The only existing access to the area proposed is via Hooks Walk, a narrow street where most houses' only entrances are straight onto the street. There is no pavement. Opposite No 40, there is a builders' yard and the two vans are</p>	Comments noted. Issues will be considered as part of the site selection process.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>usually parked filling the street. To avoid Hooks Walk, a new road would have to be built, using part of the school playing fields, either from Bishopgate or from Ferry Lane. Whatever route was taken would furthermore put a strain on either of these two narrow roads.</p> <p>Existing designations Most of the land is currently used as allotments, but part of it forms the major part of the garden of No. 40 The Close. It is understood that undertakings were given at the time that the pavilion was erected on the adjacent playing field to not further develop this part of the Cathedral Close. Although there is a line of trees across part of the site, these are mostly deciduous and therefore any development would be visible from the Riverside Walk, to the east for much of the year.</p> <p>Site conditions Flood risk: The area is described as "moderate" flood risk by the environment agency.</p> <p>Accessibility Public transport access: The nearest bus stops with a regular service are approximately 10 minutes walk from the area.</p> <p>Viability: Existing uses: Most of the area is used as</p>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>allotments by residents of the Cathedral Close, together with the garden of No. 40. The allotments appear to be actively cultivated, and most users live in property with little or no garden. There is currently a waiting list for allotments in the City.</p> <p>The garden of No. 40 is in the process of renovation, and the proposed area of development would destroy its character and radically affect the character of the house. The proposed line abuts the kitchen area and the back door. This elevation of the house appears frequently on paintings and photographs of the Cathedral from the East. There appears to be a development line along the north elevation of the house for which no written explanation has been received at the time of writing. This could isolate the house from the remaining garden. The primary objections to this proposal rest on its impact on the environment and ecology close to the city centre. The Royal Horticultural Society states "there is a growing body of evidence that suggests that the contribution urban gardens could make to sustainable development has been under valued, and is more extensive than has previously been thought" Natural England says: We call for...valued environmental assets to be conserved through policies and decisions on major development proposals seeking first to</p>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					avoid loss or harm, before considering the need for mitigation or compensatory measures [and] ...private gardens to be recognised as a valuable part of green infrastructure networks. Impact on other uses.	
		M002/004	Mr&Mrs Aylott	Object	<p>Wellbeing of the environment of The Close is a major consideration; Any significant move to fill 'vacant' areas with housing could permanently destroy a unique area of Norwich. It is extreme sensitive. No.21 which has a garden area marked on the proposal. Neighbours are in a similar position. Brown's Meadow car park is also marked out for potential use for housing. Filling these spaces would very seriously spoil the amenity of this area and apply considerable population pressure to The Close as well as its surrounding area which already contains much sheltered housing.</p> <p>The same argument applies to other spaces which are marked out in the plans. This sheltered housing and other dwellings outside the walls which overlook The Close enjoy garden perspectives and trees. The addition of housing en masse would remove this attractive amenity.</p> <p>Environmentally the value of open spaces in a City is well acknowledged and every effort should be made to preserve this where possible. This would include trees in areas with</p>	Issues raised relating to the conservation value of the Cathedral Precinct will be taken into account in site selections.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					preservation orders on them and which are in areas marked on your plans. Birds and other animals is also a feature of these spaces. Any consideration of this housing issue should be based very much on the long term for future generations and not on a quick fix to relieve an immediate accommodation pressure or to satisfy a desire by any party to attempt to gain more funds by generating a housing investment.	
		M002/005	LSI Architects	Suggest changes	As a consequence of the public consultation, a garden had incorrectly been included within a site. The area of the site needs to be amended to exclude the garden of no. 40 Hook's Walk. A detailed drawing is attached.	Noted. Site assessment will be based on the amended boundary.
		M002/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	The level 2 SFRA demonstrates sites M001 and M002 to have a hazard rating of 'danger for some' and 'danger for all' respectively in a 1 in 100 year flood event. This would not meet our safety criteria. In addition, the level 1 SFRA demonstrates part of site M002 to fall within flood zone 3b with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding whether to take the site forward.	Flooding issue noted.
		M002/EH	English Heritage	Comment	This is currently open land (car park and gardens) proposed for high density mixed use - 80 dwellings per ha, including flats. The site is within the conservation area, and could affect the cathedral and a number of other important buildings. 25 The Close at the north east, and	Conservation issues noted and will be taken into account in site selection process.



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					26 The Close at the north west of the site are both listed II* and would be affected by these proposals, while there are a number of grade II buildings to the immediate north and south of the site. 22, 23 and 24 The Close are all listed separately, while the full length of the stabling range on the other side of Ferry Lane and all 22 Almshouses within Stuart Court to the south are also listed. The remains of the precinct wall are along the southern edge of this site and there could also be significant archaeological impacts. This site is highly sensitive and English Heritage has very serious concerns regarding its suitability for development.	
-	<b>M003</b>	M003/001	Mr Folger	Comment	Accessibility - You state a 'highways study' is being carried out to review capacity for additional traffic from Prince of Wales Road but also a study from Ferry Lane should be carried out because the site is within the precinct walls. As the land and Ferry Lane is owned by Norwich Cathedral it would make sense if access could be all or part from Ferry Lane. With the continuous talk of Prince of Wales Road being closed at certain times at night this should also be considered within the review. 2) The small triangular piece of land immediately adjacent to our house is separated from the rest of the site by the old precinct wall. The only way onto it is from the river walk which is closed at dusk or by removing part of the	Access issue noted and will be investigated in site selection process.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					Precinct Wall which should be resisted by everyone. In the past the planners have been very protective of this wall and supported in that quest by most of us. We feel without details of which road or roads that will be used for access an opinion as to whether we are for or against the proposals cannot be reached.	
		M003/002	Mr Talks	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Although there may be potential for residential building in Browne's Meadow Car Park, the idea of "several stories" would be detriment of important views of the cathedral and its setting.</li> <li>- I would be inappropriate to take over part of the garden of No. 20 The Close, especially those with several trees with preservation orders are important feature of Norwich's landscape</li> <li>- A sympathetic approach to the aesthetic and environmental surrounds of the cathedral should be ensured</li> <li>- The same applies to the city in general, where gardens are the town's "green lung" and add enormously to the quality of the urban environment and life in general</li> </ul>	Comments relating to aesthetic and environmental surrounds of the cathedral will be considered as part of the site selection.
		M003/003	Mr Fisher	Object	<p>Constraints and suitability Highway impact and improvements and access: The access to the area proposed is via Recorder Road, and then to Prince of Wales Road. Access to Recorder Road is via very narrow spaces between residential buildings used in part as sheltered housing.</p>	Comments noted. Issues will be considered as part of the site selection process.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>Existing designations: Much of the land is currently used as car parking and it is understood that this has in the past been zoned for development. However, a substantial portion is currently forms part of the gardens of numbers 20 to 24 The Close.</p> <p>Site conditions Flood risk: The area is described as "moderate" flood risk by the environment agency.</p> <p>Accessibility: Public transport access: The nearest bus stops with a frequent service are approximately 5 minutes walk from the area.</p> <p>Viability Existing uses: Providing it does not impact on existing residents in sheltered housing, there is no objection to the use of the car park for development.</p> <p>The primary objections to this proposal, so far as it affects the gardens, rest on its impact on the environment and ecology close to the city centre.</p> <p>The Royal Horticultural Society states "there is a growing body of evidence that suggests that the contribution urban gardens could make to sustainable development has been under</p>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>valued, and is more extensive than has previously been thought"</p> <p>Natural England says: We call for...valued environmental assets to be conserved through policies and decisions on major development proposals seeking first to avoid loss or harm, before considering the need for mitigation or compensatory measures [and] ...private gardens to be recognised as a valuable part of green infrastructure networks.</p> <p>Impact on other uses: Addition of approximately 70 houses to the area would radically affect the quality of life of those living nearby. Commercial use would be impractical, given the difficulty of access and limited on-street parking.</p>	
		M003/004	Mr Bushby	Suggest changes	There is no objection to the development of the car park on this proposed site. However, loss of the back gardens is the major concern. Norwich was once a city famed for its gardens, so it should not continue to be developed.	Noted.
		M003/005	Mr&Mrs Aylott	Object	see comments made for M001 and M002	As M001 and M002
		M003/006	Ms Tipler	Object	similar issues raised as for M001 and M002	As M001 and M002
		M003/007	Mrs Anderson	Comment	Part of the site includes a substantial proportion of garden belonging to No 22 The Close. The proposal for several-story houses would	Garden issue noted and will be looked into in site selection.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					overlook the house and garden. Access would be difficult from the north side. Building on green land and open space encourages flooding and this is already a flood-risk area. The site should be proposed for recreational use, e.g. children's play area, young persons skateboard rink and/or allotments as there is little of this type nearby. Transport links would encourage access to recreational services from elsewhere in the city. The soil is good for allotments and it would preserve open space in the centre of Norwich.	
		M003/008	Mr Folger	Comment	Identical comments has been made as M003/001	n/a
		M003/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	We have concerns regarding the flood zone classification of this site. The level 1 SFRA demonstrates the site to partially fall within Flood Zone 3b. The site is proposed for a mixed use development including residential, commercial, educational and other uses. None of the proposed uses are appropriate within Flood Zone 3b and therefore, based on current evidence, this allocation would be contrary to PPS25.	Flooding issue noted.
		M003/EH	English Heritage	Comment	Nos 7-12 and 14a are all listed at II*, in 4 separate listings. These buildings are all just to the north of this site, but there could also be impacts on a wider range of buildings, including the cathedral, and the conservation area. In	Conservation issue noted and will be part of the site assessment.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					addition, the remains of the precinct wall are noted as running along the southern edge of the site. This site is highly sensitive and English Heritage has very serious concerns regarding its suitability for development.	
	<b>M004</b>	M004/001	Mr Bushby	Suggest changes	There is no objection to the development of the car park on this proposed site. However, loss of the back gardens is the major concern. Norwich was once a city famed for its gardens, so it should not continue to be developed.	Garden issue noted and will be looked into in site assessment.
		M004/002	Mr&Mrs Aylott	Object	see comments made for M001, M002 and M003	n/a
		M004/003	Ms Tipler	Object	similar issues raised as for M001, M002 and M003	n/a
		M004/EH	English Heritage	Comment	Nos 7-12 and 14a are all listed at II*, in 4 separate listings. These buildings are all just to the north of this site, but there could also be impacts on a wider range of buildings, including the cathedral, and the conservation area. In addition, the remains of the precinct wall are noted as running along the southern edge of the site. This site is highly sensitive and English Heritage has very serious concerns regarding its suitability for development.	Conservation matters noted and will be part of the site selection.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
-	<b>M005</b>	M005/001	Emery Planning Partnership	Support	<p>Town centre considerations: The hotel will provide a wide range of employment opportunities for the local area thus having a positive impact on the job market. The site should not be allocated for employment use within the emerging local development framework and this would be inappropriate and contrary to PPS4.</p> <p>There is an identified need for hotel development and the proposals would not have an impact upon vitality and viability. Reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a high demand for business and tourism accommodation in Norwich</li> <li>- The core business of the proposed budget hotel would be business tourism</li> <li>- There is demand for a budget hotel in Norwich</li> <li>- There is very little in the way of hotel provision to the west of Norwich</li> <li>- The hotel would look to generate trade from the existing business park</li> <li>- The site is the most sequentially preferable when moving out from Bowthorpe District Centre</li> </ul> <p>Accessibility: The site is located in an accessible location and is well served by public transport and an existing area of mixed commercial development. Bowthorpe Centre is approximately 800m to 900m walking distance</p>	<p>An appeal was refused for such proposal on this site; significant inconsistencies with strategic policies. Site will be considered as part of employment area in DM policies DPD; no assessment needed</p>

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					to the south of the site and accommodates a range of retail and service type facilities. There are a number of bus routes in this area. In terms of sustainability, the site at present is a major leisure use and generates an attendant amount of activity. The site is in an accessible location and is well served by public transport. The proposal would not result in an unacceptable increase in travel by car.	
		M005/EH	English Heritage	Comment	We understand that development here has recently been rejected on appeal. The reasons for refusal should be considered.	Noted.
M006	<b>M006</b>	M006/001	Mr Bushby	Support	Opportunity to create landmark development. Development in flood plains not usually a good idea, but if approached in the right way (such as in the Netherlands) then it could be a viable and unique development. Any development should not have an adverse impact on ecology/biodiversity. Development should not impinge on flood plain. River should be utilised to avoid car use.	Although there are significant constraints, the site presents a significant opportunity to regenerate the wider area.
		M006/002	David L Walker Ltd.	Comment	On behalf of Lafarge: Site boundary should be amended, New uses should be limited to conservation and leisure uses as any office or residential uses would adversely impact on existing industrial nature of the vicinity.  Flood risk: - much of site in flood risk zones, development would be contrary to PPS25 in these instances.	Flood risk issue noted and will be addressed as part of the mitigation if the site is to be shortlisted; The emerging Joint Core Strategy has reference made for the regeneration of east Norwich, i.e. the Deal Ground and the Utility site.



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>- Run-off to adjacent areas of ecological importance, and also on Trowse depot. - Increased amounts of run-off not accounted for in feasibility studies of flood risk to date.</p> <p>Planning Policy: - Some areas of DG not brownfield, contrary to Policy 17 of emerging Core Strategy. - Lack of protection of strategic railhead site, lack of continuity with regional and county policies.</p> <p>Safeguarding: - Minerals policy statement - seeks to protect railheads. Barrier should be created between DG and existing operations. Allow landscaping and acoustic baffles. Uses in Initial Options report suggest residential and office development, potentially avoid future conflicts.</p>	
		M006/003	Lanpro Services	Comment	<p>Highway impact and improvement: - Limited existing network. Advised by Contemporary Transport consultants that an area wide travel plan for this part of the city and other highway improvement networks will enable sufficient road capacity.</p> <p>Access: - Safe pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access is able to be achieved into DG site via existing points off The Street, Trowse that will be upgraded as part of these proposals.</p>	Comments noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- new bridge link over River Yare will also help to achieve this. Must be to high design standards.</li> <li>- Pedestrian and cycle access to Utilities from DG will be achieved through a new bridge link over River Wensum, to high design standard.</li> <li>- Extension of riverside walk around perimeter of DG site. Controlled pedestrian access to Carrow Marshes CWS via elevated boardwalk, for educational and recreational purposes.</li> </ul> <p>Existing designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cross boundary site( between SNDC and NCC)</li> <li>- May Gurney site (DG) allocated for residential and/or employment use in SNDC Local Plan (2003).</li> <li>- Despite not being visible from A47 May Gurney site is allocated in SNDC local plan as being an area forming the landscape setting for the A47.</li> <li>- DG allocated for employment in NCC local plan (2004), part of DG allocated as being suitable for housing in same document.</li> <li>- Sites are in flood risk zones 1, 2, 3 and areas both described as being in river valleys.</li> <li>- Emerging masterplan by Atelier Pro Architekten fully aware of existing site designations and constraints.</li> </ul> <p>Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project team is advised that gas, electricity, water and sewage capacity is sufficient to</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>service both existing allocations in SNDC and NCC local plans and the emerging mixed use proposals.</p> <p>Flood Risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project team is fully aware that site is part located in functional floodplain, and emerging masterplan is proposing mixed use development and has full regard of flooding impacts that may result from development.</li> </ul> <p>Hazardous Risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Non known hazardous risk</li> </ul> <p>Site contamination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- site investigation and soil testing will commence on completion of masterplanning works when final end use and remediation requirements understood</li> </ul> <p>Local access to shops and services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DG well related to existing convenience and entertainment facilities within the village of Trowse.</li> <li>- Site within 1100m or 14 minute walk of Bracondale/Queens Street local centre.</li> <li>- Site will be redeveloped in line with masterplan that seeks improved connections with riverside walk/Connect 2 project.</li> <li>- When sites are redeveloped a new bridge link is available for use enabling DG to be within 700m or 9 minute walk of Primary Retail Area (inc. Morrisons Supermarket). DG also within 1000m or 12 minute walk of entertainment at Riverside - swimming pool and football club.</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>Public transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Anglian buses 587 and 588 run along The Street, Trowse and a request only bus stop to southern boundary of May Gurney site.</li> <li>- Access to station and potential river bus.</li> <li>- All public transport will be in line with masterplan.</li> </ul> <p>Viability:</p> <p>Land value is not known at this time.</p> <p>Existing uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May Gurney - lawful employment and car, storage sales and repair uses. Land currently used as hard standing for car parking or plant storage associated with business.</li> <li>- SNDC recently granted permission for new headquarters, existing buildings will be demolished on site once this is constructed.</li> <li>- DG has lawful employment use.</li> </ul> <p>Availability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May Gurney available for redevelopment from 2012. DG immediately available. No longer any ownership or ransom issues that prevent development.</li> </ul>	
		M006/004	Cgms	Support	<p>Requirements of policy EMP9 should be retained, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- new vehicular access from south via new bridge across River Yare.</li> <li>- vehicular, pedestrian and cycle routes through site designed to extend the river corridor pedestrian/cycle network.</li> </ul>	Comments noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>- leaving sufficient land to allow future provision of a bridge connection to north bank of River Wensum. These will ensure vehicular access of appropriate standard could be constructed from The Street through the Deal Ground to access the Utilities site. .Should be sufficient land at the end of the access on the DG side of Wnesum to enable all purpose vehicle turning and drop off area to serve Utilities site. This should include requirements for emergency services.</p> <p>Important for both sites to benefit from access by a variety of non-car modes of transport, including walking and cycling. Access road should be of an appropriate standard to accommodate public transport service vehicles. Provision should be made to enable a District Heating System, served from the Utilities site. System should be flexible to facilitate extension to adjoining employment areas, using housing in Trowse and other near by occupiers/potential users - County Hall, Carrow Works and Norfolk Ski Club.</p> <p>Support extension of DG site boundary to include Lafarge Depot. Facility should be retained and uses explored that are complementary to the area - making use of rail connection and rail sidings. Any redevelopment should include regeneration of land around the</p>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>Old Waterworks to south west of existing red line, as part of this area is owned by the owners of the DG. Remaining is under ownership of Anglian Water for use as a pumping station and holding tank for pumping brown water to Whitlingham Sewage Works.</p> <p>Other issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Design, massing setting of any development and environmental quality of access routes should reflect fact Utilities site is a destination of regional significance.</li> <li>- redevelopment should include challenging energy targets making use of proposed District Heating System.</li> <li>- aspiration of Broads Authority for a River Bus service along River Wensum should be incorporated into policy. All major redevelopments along the river front should make provisions for potential river bus stops.</li> </ul>	
		M006/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	<p>We have concerns regarding the Flood Zone classification, flood storage and safety of this proposed site. The level 1 SFRA demonstrates that a large proportion of the site falls within Flood Zone 3b, the functional floodplain. Within this zone only water-compatible and essential infrastructure development types would be appropriate. The proposal is for a mixed use development comprising residential, employment and a local centre. This use is not</p>	<p>Flood issue noted. Further flood risk assessment will be done to inform the allocation.</p>

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					considered to be appropriate to Flood Zone 3b and therefore, based on current evidence, this allocation would be contrary to PPS25. Furthermore, we have concerns regarding the safety of the site. The level 2 SFRA highlights that a proportion of the site would be subject to a hazard rating of 'danger for most' in a 1 in 100 year flood event. This would not meet our safety requirements. In order to take this allocation forward further work/information would be required.	
		M006/NWT	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Comment	The document suggests that the entire site is brownfield land, whereas a large part of the site adjacent to the River Yare consists of semi-natural floodplain habitats including fen, wet grassland and scrub. This area is designated as a County Wildlife Site (CWS) and is protected by policies within the Norwich Local Plan and draft Core Strategy for Greater Norwich. In our view this site should only be taken forward if the CWS is excluded from the area to be zoned for development and if mitigation proposals are included to protect the CWS.	Noted. Mitigation measure will be considered where necessary.
		M006/TrowsePC	Trowse with Newton Parish Council	Object	Development of this area would significantly increase the traffic flow in and out of the village.	Proposals will be supported by further transport assessment which will investigate its transport implications

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		M006/EH	English Heritage	Comment	This site includes a grade II bottle kiln. The large grade II historic park, Crown Point, is just east of Whitlingham Lane. The southern part of the site is excluded from this consultation because it falls outside the city council boundary but there is potential for impact on the setting of the grade I church of St Andrew in Trowse with Newton	Conservation matter noted and will be part of future site policies in terms of mitigation measure.
M007	<b>M007</b>	M007/001	Mr Amies	Object	Object to houses, would be ok to have sport or recreational use. Concern about traffic on surrounding roads.	Most comments raised relates to the recreational value of the site and suggesting opening this site as a public accessible recreational open space. However this site is a private land and has been made available as publicly accessible recreational open space. The development will mean that a portion of land will be reserved for recreational use whilst part
		M007/002	Mrs Sadler	Comment	Concerns over development of cricket ground - out of character of the site and status as a future amenity. Concern over access to this site.	
		M007/003	Mr Dunning	Object	PAROS important for local community. Council designated this land as open space - is this still the case?	
		M007/004	Mr Crowther	Object	Area should remain green space, it should not be developed.	
		M007/005	Ms Ruiz-Heredero	Comment	Site should be ornamental gardens like Eaton Park or PAROS for community to use. Concerned about increase in traffic any development would bring.	
		M007/006	Mrs Ryan	Comment	Site should remain open space for community. Originally acquired for this use. Community use such as play group would be a good idea.	
		M007/007	Mr Worman	Comment	Important to have PAROS on this site. Good for the health of the local community. Useful community resource for all of community - child	



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					play areas, areas to just sit and enjoy the area.	of the development will bring back recreational facilities.
		M007/008	Mrs King	Comment	Would like to see the future use of the green space.	
		M007/009	Mr&Mrs Rimmer	Comment	Object to use of current access to site for more housing. Traffic concerns. Any development should relate to community needs - e.g. PAROS.	
		M007/010	Mr Blois	Support	Create local sports centre for residents and council staff. Boundary of site could be extended to include part of county hall. A small amount of residential development with a small health club/gym would be a good solution for this land. Pedestrian link from Cricket Ground Road to county hall.	
		M007/011	Mr Kelly	Comment	Use land as PAROS. Have fitness centre/gym on site.	
		M007/012	Mr Yellop	Comment	Re-open sports centre and make land PAROS. Discounted rate for Norwich and Norfolk County Council employees. Use current building for gym and overflow meeting room space for both councils.	
		M007/013	Mrs Stafford	Object	Valuable PAROS. Useful public access across land to cut through from county hall to shops. Enough traffic in area	
		M007/014	Mr&Mrs Parkinson	Object	Green space should be retained for community, valuable community use. Traffic would be an issue along with pollution. Parking concerns. Norwich already has adequate sports, fitness and conference facilities.	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		M007/015	Ms Trevor	Comment	Retain green space and open it back up again. Should be family housing only if there has to be housing at all. Area has transient community through buy-to-let properties. Community spirit is all but dead. Jubilee Park is too rough to use. Miss leisure centre. Concerns over traffic on site - where would access be?	
		M007/016	Mr Hart	Comment	Site was given to community by Colmans to be used as green space. This should be remembered with any planning permission granted. Sports facility on site should be adapted and the pavilion repaired for future use of both. No residential development on the site. Office and restaurant development would be ok.	
		M007/017	Mr Barnes	Comment	Site should remain in public recreation and leisure use - why has council let this valuable space fall into disrepair and be closed to the public. Heritage site for cricketing history of Norwich.	
		M007/018	Ms Wilson	Comment	At least 50% of site should be kept PAROS. Adequate parking should be provided on site for whatever the use	
		M007/019	Mrs Stafford	Comment	Land should be publically accessible. Should be a route through site to allow people to get to local shops easily on City Road. Housing will lead to more noise and cars. A café and toilets should still be provided on site.	
		M007/020	Mrs Williamson	Comment	Land was given to community by Colmans therefore should stay that way. Housing over	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					existing leisure centre would be ok but rest should be green space - orchard and allotments or a community garden.	
		M007/021	Mrs Daley	Object	Cricket ground should be re-opened. Council should buy it and let local people use it. Feeling in local area is that owner will allow it to become dilapidated and then the land will be CPO'd.	
		M007/022	Mrs Brister	Comment	Keep as sports ground, use existing changing facilities. Use as an area for the young people of Lakenham.	
		M007/023	Miss Moore	Comment	Do not develop for residential, keep open space for sports and leisure and plant more trees.	
		M007/024	Mr Middleton	Comment	Open access should be retained for sport and leisure and benefit of local community. Low level residential of existing leisure centre acceptable, same height as terrace housing.	
		M007/025	Ms Ward	Comment	No tall buildings. Care homes acceptable. Should be protected from developing to just another housing estate. Pavilion could be used as a creche. Open areas should continue for sport and leisure use to serve needs of many people.	
		M007/026	Mr Dunning	Object	Oppose building, should remain as open green space. Retain leisure use for community. Access problems including traffic and safety.	
		M007/027	Mr Browning	Object	Previously had been involved in Riverside planning processes - objected to retail, suggested concert venue but this did not happen. Don't consider my views to count for	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					much. Would like to seek community use for local residents on this site.	
		M007/028	Mrs Sadler	Object	Should be kept as an open space for the amenity of local residents. Access also concerning.	
		M007/029	Sillett	Object	Left as green space for benefit of community - sports and leisure use. There should be no housing on site. Other brownfield sites should be used first elsewhere around the city.	
		M007/030	Mr Benfield	Suggest changes	Car access only in small volumes. Existing use should remain as green space and recreation. Object to any housing on this site.	
		M007/031	Mr Fiddes	Comment	Keep area as green space. List pavilion. Retain old trees on site. Cricket Ground fence on Meadowbrook Close/ Lakenfields should be retained.	
		M007/032	Miss Earl & Mr Bowler	Comment	Site should be kept as open green space or sold to the school. Concern over parking and highway impact of any new housing on site.	
		M007/033	Mrs Woods	Comment	Concerns over traffic from planning permission. Should be kept for use by local community.	
		M007/034	Mr&Mrs Minns	Suggest changes	Potential for good recreation site - putting green, skateboard park, picnic area. Few green sites left in city, council have obligation to provide some sort of community use sites too.	
		M007/035	Ms Plowman	Object	Increased noise and traffic. Site should be developed for local community use - e.g. swimming pool which would encourage healthy lifestyles. Open space would need to be supervised. Should not encourage more car	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					use. Do not need more expensive houses.	
		M007/036	Mrs Brocklebank	Support	Support retaining current use and green space. Consideration needed over traffic flows. Do not support residential use.	
		M007/037	Mr&Mrs Johnstone	Comment	Use open space and preserve pavilion. Concerns over traffic on Smithfield Road. Do not want residential properties on the site. No bars, restaurants or shops. Do want sports or conference facilities.	
		M007/038	Eaton/Lakenham Liberal Democrat Focus Team	Object	Site was given to community by Colmans therefore should remain a community asset. Pavilion should be listed. Retain open space for community benefit - community gardens, orchard or allotments. Sporting facilities would be useful for area as densely developed. Important to ensure trees on site preserved and pedestrian/cycle access allowed through site. Half the site should remain as open space. Adequate parking should be provided. Sheltered housing or family housing appropriate. Traffic concerns on roads and given only once access point to site. Concerns over road safety. Council should ensure community use by CPO powers.	
		M007/039	Eaton/Lakenham Liberal Democrat Focus Team	Object	Valuable community green space. Planning for Real event should be held for local community. This approach could re-introduce public access across the site.	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		M007/040	Lanpro Services	Comment	<p>Highways: - Understand highway network has capacity.</p> <p>Access: - Site has been designed to increase accessibility. Should encourage links with employment at Deal Ground Site.</p> <p>Designations: - Existing only has open space. Proposed to be publically accessible open space to offset loss of view of existing open space.</p> <p>Services: Sufficient to serve proposals.</p> <p>Flood Risk: Floor zone 1.</p> <p>Hazardous Risk/Site contamination: None known.</p> <p>Local access to shops and service: Good access.</p> <p>Public transport: highly accessible. Viability: Land value not known. Existing use vacant, D2 permission. Residential permission has been granted in recent years.</p> <p>No ownership issues known.</p> <p>Impact on other uses: Not envisaged any proposed uses would have an adverse impact on existing.</p>	
		M007/041	Mr Callf	Comment	<p>Land not publicly accessible or a green space. Land should be developed for housing, if done sympathetically. Access via Cricket Ground Road only suitable for a few cars or pedestrian access. Good access from Martineau Lane roundabout, would have to work with County</p>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					Hall to do this.	
		M007/042	Mr Claxton	Suggest changes	Designate space as a public park.	
		M007/043	Mr Pritchett	Suggest changes	Green space and trees important. Suggest park for public use.	
-	<b>M008</b>	M008/001	Mr Caine	Support	Norfolk Tower should be retained and refurbished, as a hotel. Taller buildings ok provided that they do not impede views of historic city. Would like to see Westlegate Tower and Sovereign House. St Stephens should be regenerated and the more shops the better in Norwich.	Loss of office floorspace in city centre location does not conform to higher level strategies; site should be considered in DM policies DPD and protected for office use
-	<b>M009</b>	M009/001	Mrs Phillips	Object	Site should be left as open space, area used for ballooning should be left for that purpose. With Eaton Park and UEA there is no need for more parkland. Some infill may be appropriate on site between existing houses on Bluebell Road and extending no deeper than depth of existing gardens.	The majority of comments about this site relate to a number of key constraints: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of large scale green open space</li> <li>- Impact on River Valley and County Wildlife site</li> <li>- Impact on traffic</li> <li>- Flood risk issue</li> </ul> However, it is also
		M009/002	Cringleford Parish Council	Object	Oppose proposed development as important to protect unique river valley setting. There are already pedestrian linkages across valley no more are required.	
		M009/003	Mr&Mrs Green	Object	All previous applications have been refused as site has been identified as 'green lungs' for the city. As Norwich continues to grow this space is more valuable. Site description of brownfield site is misleading as most greenfield land. Further development would make traffic	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					situation worse.	<p>acknowledged that fact that green infrastructure and public open space will also be part of the proposal.</p> <p>A balance will be made at site selection process, as the City needs to find most suitable land to deliver the additional growth as required by the emerging Joint Core Strategy.</p>
		M009/004	Mr Baker	Object	Several applications have been refused on site. Yare Valley is currently protected and there is no evidence as to why this protection should cease. Valuable recreational space and wildlife space. Current development on site not suitable for river valley.	
		M009/005	Mr&Mrs Cadwell	Object	Lungs of the city. Wildlife here is part of Norwich's heritage and development would ruin this. Traffic an issue due to relocation of N&NU Hospital, closure of Colney Lane and expansion of UEA. Roads were not built for this level of traffic. AONB used by many walkers and runners, students and residents alike. Wildlife important.	
		M009/006	Dr Thurman	Object	Site should be protected from development, integral part of the sensitive and valuable Yare Valley. Open space is essential green lungs, particularly between city and southern bypass.	
		M009/007	Mrs Jary	Support	Supportive if development is single storey bungalows, suitable for the elderly. Should be associated facilities for elderly as well.	
		M009/008	Mr&Mrs Girling	Object	Object as a river valley and flood area. Traffic congestion and noise would increase; roads do not have the capacity. We should keep our green areas.	
		M009/009	Mrs Stephens	Object	Development would ruin the green spaces. Impact on wildlife and biodiversity. Grass snakes, foxes, rabbits, moles, mice, voles,	



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					squirrels in garden. Footpaths attract tourists and are an asset to the local area. Site a flood plain.	
		M009/010	Mrs McCulloch	Object	Important site for wildlife and site important PAROS. Important for river habitat. Housing or business development will impact on built environment and traffic. Development will spoil enjoyment of this area.	
		M009/011	Yare Valley Association	Object	Site should not be developed with housing as site is sensitive to maintenance of recreational green corridor for the city.	
		M009/012	Yare Valley Society	Object	The committee would like to point out that previous applications have been refused and appeals dismissed. Officials have consistently considered the site valuable green space, with Bluebell Road the limit of development from the city.	
		M009/013	Mr Dunn	Object	Green space/PAROS valuable. Even limited housing development would ruin views of valley. Traffic is worsening, any more development would worsen this further. Increase risk of flooding, implications on house insurance?	
		M009/014	Mrs Smith	Object	Site should be used for conservation purposes. No housing on site, particularly in flood plain. Would not object to a building for community use. This development would set precedence for further development up to UEA broad.	
		M009/015	Mrs Clissold	Object	Part of open space, wildlife corridor/Yare Valley Conservation Area. Already shops nearby and	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					it should not be used for mixed housing and commercial uses. Should be kept as an area for wildlife in some form.	
		M009/016	Yare Valley Society	Object	No reason why council's stand should alter. Bluebell Road should remain hard edge of development of city. River valley should retain its landscape value.	
		M009/017	Eaton and University Community Forum	Object	Wildlife and recreational asset. Joint Core Strategy identifies land as a 'Green Infrastructure Priority Corridor'. Current use more to do with historical uses rather than new status identified in the JCS. Planning history has recognised importance of not extending the land use in the past.	
		M009/018	Sustainable Living Initiative	Comment	Site should be used as a green space for local community. Area should be used as allotment and nature park.	
		M009/019	Dr Thurman	Object	Importance of Yare River Valley as a green space on fringe of city has repeated been noted as an important asset by planning authorities/inspectors. As development pressures around the southern bypass increase the importance of these green spaces increase.	
		M009/020	Mr Ayton	Comment	Site not Brownfield, majority greenfield. Protection of river valley important for wildlife and landscape. Protection of Yare Valley as a green wedge important. Any such development should be resisted.	
		M009/021	Eaton/Lakenham Liberal Democrat	Object	Damaging to river valley and amenity value of area. Green barrier between city and south	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
			Focus Team		Norfolk. Development would ruin views over valley. Increases in traffic. Increased risk of flooding. Previously refused over loss of green wedge. Increased pressures for development along southern bypass should not lead to the loss of this site.	
		M009/022	Mr&Mrs Pope	Object	Traffic increase on Bluebell Road. Restricted visibility when leaving site by car. Loss of open space and wild habitats. Part of River Valley. Existing brownfield sites should be used first where there is infrastructure in place.	
		M009/023	Miss Page	Object	Site subject to flooding Increased traffic problems	
		M009/024	Mrs Page	Object	Loss of view and there would be increased traffic on roads.	
		M009/025	The Landscape Partnership	Support	Supporting statement covers development of 57 acre holding for sustainable housing for the community, 450 dwellings, 15ha of public park, community facilities to complement Eaton district centre, market square, park centre, extended cycle and pedestrian access along river and valley, access to riverside activities.	
		M009/026	Mr Grimble	Object	Yare Valley important for biodiversity. Current use appropriate for wildlife and views over valley. Site important green wedge.	
		M009/027	Mr Fletcher	Object	Important part of river valley, green space. Traffic increases on Bluebell Road. South western part of site in flood plain.	
		M009/NWT	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Comment	Parts of this site are adjacent to the floodplain of the River Yare and to County Wildlife Sites.	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					Within the River Valley. In our view, if this site is taken forward there should be no development on the lower slopes adjacent to the floodplain and CWS in order to buffer and mitigate for impacts on these areas. Consideration also needs to be given as to whether development conflicts with current local Plan policy NE1 that protects river valleys and with emerging policies to protect green infrastructure in the Greater Norwich LDF	
-	<b>M010, M011, M016</b>	M010/EA			It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward.	Majority of site has planning permission and development has commenced according to the masterplan. No assessment needed.
		M011/EA			It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward.	
		M016/EA	Environment Agency		The level 2 SFRA demonstrates that these sites, either wholly or partially, have a hazard rating of 'danger for most' or 'danger for some' in the 1 in 100 year flood event. This would not meet our safety requirements. This should be taken into consideration when deciding whether to take the site forward.	
M012	<b>M012</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
M013	<b>M013</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
M014	<b>M014</b>	M014/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward.	Although there are significant constraints, the site presents a significant opportunity to regenerate the wider area.
		M014/NWT	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Comment	This assessment should take full account of the biodiversity value of the river corridor including river bank habitats and the need to mitigate for adverse impacts in relation to protected species including otter and bats which use the river corridor. In order for this to happen a buffer may need to be provided between the river and areas to be developed.	Biodiversity issue will be taken into account.
		M014/TrowsePC	Trowse with Newton Parish Council	Object	Development of this area would significantly increase the traffic flow in and out of the village	Proposals will be supported by further transport assessment which will investigate its transport implications
		M014/001	Mr Bushby	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unique opportunity to create a truly amazing and landmark development</li> <li>- River gateway to Norwich</li> <li>- Don't normally support development within floodplain but this site, could be viable and truly unique if approached in sensitive way- look at examples in Netherlands of similar sites</li> <li>- Development should work in harmony with ecological processes</li> <li>- Development should not impinge on floodplain</li> </ul>	Comments noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					but work with it - River should be utilised to its full capacity in terms of ecology, transport and recreation...lets not make it easy for the car.	
M015	<b>M015</b>	M015/001	Mr Bushby	Suggest changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Missed opportunity</li> <li>- Place needs new park not generic riverside redevelopment</li> <li>- Site has much history and strong contextual character</li> <li>- Site does not need landmark building but a landmark public open space flanked by appropriately scaled mixed use developments that reflects site history and character</li> <li>- More space should be given to a high quality and meaningful landscape as the setting for a new development and not a mediocre hard landscape with lollypop trees for large scale multicoloured cold facades full of generic bars and restaurants. If it ends up looking and working like the riverside development, then it has failed.</li> <li>- Lets give Dragon Hall the context it deserves.</li> </ul>	Comments noted, and will be addressed in the site policy where appropriate.
		M015/002	Baltic Wharf Management Committee	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need for development of site although the planned allocation appears to include both a very high density and tall buildings that do not seem to be consistent with the fine grain and elegant recent redevelopment of King Street and Baltic Wharf.</li> <li>- Concerned about degradation of homes at Baltic Wharf as a result of noise or disturbance</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					and issues around security and safety caused by future development. - There was early plan which passed a road next to Baltic House. Would wish to limit noise, perhaps including the use of trees to help soundproofing and ensure security is maintained as well as avoiding the loss of privacy, light or views. - Future plans need to bear in mind potential traffic congestion, particularly exiting Mountergate onto Rose Lane.	
		M015/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward.	Flood risk issue is noted and will be considered in relevant site policy.
M017	<b>M017</b>	M017/001	Mr Ayers	Comment	- Existing buildings consist of a variety of structures which almost certainly contain evidence of post-medieval and possibly earlier buildings as well as information regarding historic urban activity. In addition the south wall of no 129 King Street contains much evident reused material. The disposition of the buildings, together with Hobrough Lane itself reflects the historic topography of the riverside at King street, the historic grain. - Development should only be considered after 1) a thorough archaeological survey and assessment of the extant buildings	Archaeology will be listed as part of the constraints for development. The approach towards archaeological survey requirement will be covered by the Development Management Policies DPD

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>2) an assessment of reuse and adaption of as many of the extant buildings as possible (demolition of the south wall of 129 King Street ought to be avoided)</p> <p>3) the retention of the historic grain of the area, specifically the line of Hobrough Lane and the tenement pattern either side of it</p> <p>4) Archaeological evaluation below-ground so that any discoveries can inform the disposition of the new build.</p>	
M018	<b>M018</b>	M018/001	Dr Farthing	Comment	<p>- In previous plans reference has been made to riverside planting as part of development to enhance green credentials. Subsequent plans have no greenery present.</p> <p>- Over the last 2-3 years a number of trees have been removed to the detriment of local wildlife</p> <p>- Plans should include planting of native species to enable wildlife to remain in city.</p>	Green infrastructure and biodiversity requirement will be set out separately by the DM policies DPD.
		M018/002	Miss Raven	Comment	<p>- Concerned that mixed use includes night time economy such as restaurants and bars/clubs. This would cause noise nuisance</p> <p>- Access could be problem. Duke Street is very busy. There have been many accidents on the cross roads at the top of Duke Street/Charing Cross. There would be need to modify junction of site with Duke Street.</p>	Site has planning permission for mixed use which includes restaurant/cafes. There is an existing access established from Westwick Street.
		M018/003	Mr Rogers	Comment	<p>- Heard rumours that vacant buildings currently adorned with the prose of Thomas More is to be removed in favour of housing</p>	Comments noted.



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					- Must insist that the site is large enough to build hundreds of homes without losing this urbane curiosity, which with minimal effect could be made a restaurant or gallery?	
		M018/004	Mr Burgess	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Keen to see full consultation</li> <li>- Concerned about height of buildings close to border of properties on Anchor Quay. Developments over 2 storeys would deprive light and privacy.</li> <li>- Developer should maintain and improve security of the boundary between site and neighbouring properties</li> <li>- Concerns were shared with developers- want confirmation that developers will continue to consult and adapt plans to reduce impact on those most affected.</li> <li>- Support development as site has been unused for many years and is eyesore and security risk; however object to any attempt by the developers to avoid consultation with local residents.</li> </ul>	Amenity issue will be considered in the DM policies DPD. Developer consultation is covered by the council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
		M018/005	Mrs O'Day	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of detail (proposal is for housing and what)?</li> <li>- The proposal that Targetfollow put forward left residents of Anchor Quay unhappy as the height of the proposed buildings and intensity of buildings on site would overshadow homes.</li> <li>- Traffic issues on Westwick Street</li> <li>- Concern that new homes and offices may remain empty as with many sites across the city</li> </ul>	Detailed proposal will be set out after this consultation. This consultation is to establish development principles. Green infrastructure issue will be covered by DM policies DPD. Access to river/riverside walk will set

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- site should be developed with more green options such as gardens along the riverside. Site is currently home to variety of wildlife including about 15 bird types.</li> <li>- In previous plans by Targetfollow there was talk of an Art Gallery - this would be great for Norwich. Cultural improvements would attract more visitors</li> <li>- More use of the river would be good- possibly river bus service?</li> </ul>	out in the development requirement.
		M018/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward.	Flood issue noted and will be taken into account.
M019	<b>M019</b>	M019/001	Ms Cane	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- site has been vacant for many years (at least since 1988) and its development is long overdue.</li> <li>- A decent retail (food) shop is needed in this area and the density of housing in this area would mean any food shop would get a lot of foot traffic. Currently there are not food shops within walking distance</li> <li>- R001 needs access through H019.</li> </ul>	Support noted.
		M019/002	Templemere Residents' Association	Suggest changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support redevelopment of the site as currently eyesore and detrimental to the amenity of the area. However:</li> <li>- the site is owned by 2 parties and there are</li> </ul>	Noted. However, funding for temporary open space use is not likely to be available and it would not be cost-

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>entirely separate plans for each.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support prompt development on basis of retail use for the part for which Aldi have obtained permission and for residential use of part known as land north of Windmill Road.</li> <li>- If Aldi is not going to be built imminently so access is not available the Association supports any use of land north of Windmill Road which causes the site to be cleared and maintained e.g. green space, parking even if it is just temporary.</li> </ul>	effective if the site is to be redeveloped in a short period of time.
-	<b>M020</b>	M020/001	Ms Jones	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- So much development has occurred in area over the past 10 years. New football stand replaced trees and listed cottages, corner shop closed, old pub was knocked down and excess land has become a dumping haven.</li> <li>- Access to and from Harbour triangle is severely restricted on match days and evenings. The area has been stripped of its existing character and facilities for the local community. Only benefit has been the development of the children's play area although it is dangerous to children as play area is so close to new road.</li> <li>- Roads are becoming increasingly busy and congested. This is biggest problem of more development.</li> <li>- It would be great to see some allotments developed or more green space so that the residents can re-build the sense of community</li> </ul>	Site has planning permission. General issues are noted from the comment. Children's play facility need has been reviewed in the Council's Open space and needs assessment. Allotment is also looked at separately in the Council's other strategies.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					which once existed, rather than have absent landlords. Current residents deserve to be respected more.	
		M020/TrowsePC	Trowse with Newton Parish Council	Comment	This development would increase the amount of parking available for Norwich City Football Club, increasing the number of cars parked in Trowse village during events at the football ground.	Proposals will be supported by further transport assessment which will investigate its transport and parking implications.
-	<b>M021</b>	M021/001	Cgms	Support	Allocation should be subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the provision of an east-west access road to link Geoffrey Watling Way/Carrow Road to Hardy Road in order to provide a high standard of access to sites E015 and M014.</li> <li>- A new pedestrian and cycle route or routes alongside the River Wensum designed to facilitate the extension of the pedestrian and cycle network along the river corridor.</li> <li>- The requirement for an emergency access adjacent to the River Stand at Norwich City Football club stadium also applies (see E015)</li> <li>- Design, massing and setting of the development should reflect the importance of the approach to the utilities site as a destination of regional significance.</li> <li>- redevelopment should include challenging energy targets</li> <li>- River bus passenger service should be incorporated</li> </ul>	Noted.
		M021/002	Ms Jones	Object	Identical comment made as of M020/001	See above.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
M022	<b>M022, NOR0010, NOR0012</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
M023	<b>M023</b>	M023/001	Miss Williams	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally support as there are a lot of disused buildings</li> <li>- Concerned that development many go against independent business that keep Norwich a destination city.</li> <li>- There needs to be retail opportunities for smaller boutique stores which would improve area particularly where culture exists in Timberhill already.</li> <li>- Residential development should be sympathetic to traditional buildings and not just like toytown developments of Chapelfield/riverside.</li> </ul>	Comments noted. Support and protect for small businesses, amenity, build environment issues are covered by DM policies DPD in general and will be applied at detailed planning application stage.
M024	<b>M024</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
	<b>M025</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
M026	<b>M026</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	<b>M033</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
M034	<b>M034</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
M035	<b>M035</b>	M035/001	Mr Barnes	Suggest changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should look at sites M035, M044 and NOR0010 together.</li> <li>- Opportunity for more satisfactory concert hall than St Andrews with retail and residential use around it.</li> <li>- Need better venue to attract best ensembles</li> </ul>	M035 and NOR0010 are the same site and will be merged to reflect its actual boundary, however it is difficult to combine with M044 due to significant

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>in the country. The use of all three sites would establish a second cultural centre (Theatre Royal, Forum, Hall for concert) to the St Andrew's, Cinema City, Playhouse one proposed. This would enable the city to become a much more significant force in European cultural life.</p> <p>- Access for cultural use would not be problem and public transport is better than St Andrew's.</p>	<p>differences in levels and different ownership; Other comments noted, future uses will be flexible to reflect the location of the site.</p>
M036	<b>M036</b>	M0036/001	CBRE	Comment	<p>Do not object in principle however have the following concerns:</p> <p>- Support the intensification of this site provided the retail and leisure uses are of an appropriate scale and do not impact upon the vitality and viability of the town centre or Cathedral Retail Park. Comments are subject to a review of the council's retail and town centre study and reserve judgement on these proposals until more detail has been submitted.</p> <p>- Would like to review highway information to ensure no adverse high implications on Cathedral Retail Park.</p> <p>- Concerned of loss of car parking as would put greater pressure on existing car parking within the city and the Cathedral Retail Park car park.</p>	<p>Comments noted. New scheme will take parking into account and would provide its own parking if necessary.</p>
M037a(H)	<b>M037, M037a</b>	M037/001	Panks Pumps	Suggest changes	<p>The plan has included No. 9 Heigham Street but not No 15. As Panks Auto Electrical Ltd trades from both of these premises, the plan should include No. 15 or exclude No. 9.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be taken into account.</p>

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		M037/002	Ms Hall	Suggest changes	It should change from mixed use to housing due to excellent cycle and pedestrian links.	Proposed use will depend on land availability and conformity to higher level spatial strategies.
		M037/003	A. & W. Cushion Limited	Comment	Cushion has no present plans or intentions to cease or relocate. However, there is no objection to the site being allocated as "mixed use".	Availability issue noted.
M038	<b>M038</b>	M038/001	Drivers Jonas LLP	Suggest changes	It should reflect the principle of the range of uses that have been accepted through the extant permissions. The permissions resulted in two distinct parts to the application site; the new District Centre; and an extension to the existing retail warehouse park (map supplied) Site M038 and the part of Site E008 that made up the permitted scheme be allocated for the following: "District Centre to provide for a range of uses including: retail, food and drink, non-retail services, leisure, hotel, housing, employment, arts centre and parking."	Site with planning permission. Boundary will be extended to reflect the boundary of the planning consent.
M039	<b>M039</b>	M039/001	Smith & Pinching	Suggest changes	To proposed a change of boundary to this site to include 295 Aylsham Road and all of Aylsham Crescent. It would seem more appropriate to do this to the whole area and with additional road frontage, give the site much more of a presence.	Noted.
		M039/002	Carter Jonas on behalf of George J Goff Limited	Support	The expansion of the District Centre to include this additional land would encourage further retail development, and other appropriate uses, which could in turn support and enhance the	Noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					existing centre.	
M041(H)	<b>M041</b>	M041/001	Mr Woodgate	Object	The open ground should be left for the public as an area of leisure and outdoor activities. This is an integral part of the community.	Site with planning permission. Site policy will reflect the detail in the planning permission.
		M041/002	Roys of Wroxham	Object	Any additional retail provision should be based upon enhancement of the Bowthorpe Local Centre. The Local Plan allocation HOU8 C30 did not require the provision of any retail units and a continuation of that approach is the practical way forward.	
		M041/003	Mr Baldwin	Comment	1. should have a good access road built before work commences as Earlham Green Lane will be over used. 2. More and better shopping at Bowthorpe centre would be an asset.	
		M041/004	Mr Wilkinson	Object	1. the development will result in the loss of a public open space and culture resource for residents of Bowthorpe and West Earlham 2. Loss of wildlife habitat and biodiversity a) habitat loss will have detrimental impact on fauna and flora. Bird species will be affected; they rely on the meadow for feeding and breeding. b) The meadow is a wildlife corridor bordering a number of County Wildlife Sites such as sites Bowthorpe Marshes, Twenty Acre and Bunker Hill c) Water run off following development may also affect the biodiversity and water quality of the river Yare	



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		M041/005	Dr Pearson	Object	The site contributes to both towards Biodiversity Action Plan targets and in the provision of functional green space. A number of bird species are depend on the meadow and scrub habitat on the site, e.g. skylark, house sparrow and starling. As well as bats. In terms of biodiversity, the site creates an important buffer between the built environment and the Bowthorpe Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) This site makes a valuable contribution to the well-being of the local community and provides a vital link with the wider countryside	
		M041/NWT	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Suggest changes	Following our previous submission, a relatively narrow corridor is shown linking Bunkers Hill to the river. In our view this corridor should not just be a narrow green access corridor but be broad enough to encompass a habitat link between Bunkers Hill and the County Wildlife Sites along the River Yare.	
M042	<b>M042</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
M044	<b>M044</b>	M044/001	Mr Barnes	Suggest changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should look at sites M035, M044 and NOR0010 together.</li> <li>- Opportunity for more satisfactory concert hall than St Andrews with retail and residential use around it.</li> <li>- Need better venue to attract best ensembles in the country. The use of all three sites would establish a second cultural centre (Theatre Royal, Forum, Hall for concert) to the St Andrew's, Cinema City, Playhouse one</li> </ul>	M035 and NOR0010 are the same site and will be merged to reflect its actual boundary, however it is difficult to combine with M044 due to significant differences in levels and different ownership.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					proposed. This would enable the city to become a much more significant force in European cultural life. - Access for cultural use would not be problem and public transport is better than St Andrew's.	
-	<b>M045</b>	M045/001	Ms Helgesen	Comment	1. There is a tree on the western edge of the site with TPO. 2. There is limited information on the nature of the development. How households in Peacock street will be affected is unknown 3. If the development is "mixed use", the current access via Cowgate will not suitable for commercial traffic 4. Late night use and restaurants will cause issues of late night noise.	Comments noted. This site is allocated in the adopted Northern City Centre Area Action Plan and will be removed from this document.
		M045/002	Roys of Wroxham	Object	It is therefore unclear at present what purpose any comments made in respect of this site(s) will serve if and when the Area Action Plan is approved, or found to be sound. object to the loss of the surface car parking currently existing on this site which helps customer access both to their store, located immediately to the north of that part of the site off Peacock Street, and to Anglia Square generally. The loss of surface car parking in the vicinity of the existing retail offer will be detrimental to street trade generally and the provision of a new multi-storey car park is unnecessary when one already exists at Anglia Square.	Comments noted. This site is allocated in the adopted Northern City Centre Area Action Plan and will be removed from this document.
		M045/003	Building	Suggest	M045 is allocated in the NCCAAP. The land to	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
			Partnerships	changes	the east of site M045 is not included, which was also allocated in the NCCAAP (Smurfit Kappa) - this site should be included to be consistent with the NCCAAP.	
		M045/004	Mr Ayers	Comment	A strategic policy which sought planning gain in the form of a buried Inner Ring Road is the sort of directional policy which one would like to see adopted here. The site lies close to historic Stump Cross which was possibly the location of a pre-Conquest, possibly predating the market place on Tombland. Evaluation excavation followed, as necessary by excavation, recording, analysis, synthesis, publication and the provision of public information should take place in the event of development proposals proceeding.	This site is allocated in the adopted Northern City Centre Area Action Plan. Archaeological issues will be covered in DM policies DPD in general.
M046(H)	<b>M046</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
M047	<b>M047</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	<b>M048</b>	M048/001	Cllr Sands	Comment	The disabled people who use the workshops are particularly affected. The workshops have been part of their re-enablement programme and as a community interaction function, they are invaluable asset.	Most comments addressed related to the community value of the workshops and the importance of small businesses.
		M048/002	Mrs Hardy	Object	Unit 5A provides an essential service to both NHS, private tenants who would have great difficulty in leading a normal life without the footwear that is had made here. If the development goes ahead, the present tenant	It is also acknowledged that the workshops are locally listed which presents significant constraints for

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					has to be offered an alternative at the same rate to retain such service. This tenant does an essential and important job and should be helped to continue to operate.	development.
		M048/003	Mrs Storie	Object	The units have historical significance to this area as they are old milking sheds. They are with a unique character and offering employment opportunities.	
		M048/004	Saint Michael and All Angels Ruin Trust	Object	The workshops are "locally listed buildings" and are a community asset as a historical core. The workshops are already of economic importance in this area where there is a lot of housing land available. Commercial services (takeaways, etc) are already provided in the main centre nearby, but the workshops are effectively the only premises on Bowthorpe that fulfil the creative industries brief being pursued by the City Council as part of its bid for City of Culture and as part of the basic plan for Bowthorpe of having a balanced development. All the workshops are well used and provide unique services, mainly by crafts-people who have built up their clientele over many years.	
		M048/005	Creed Designs	Object	The business in Unit 5B has been in operation in this place for 12 years. There is no justification to lose provision of craftsman workshops for housing as there is poor availability for such provisions. These workshops add needed distinctiveness and variety in Bowthorpe.	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		M048/006	W E Smith & Son	Object	Unit 5A is specialised and is concerned with the manufacture and alteration of footwear dealing with disability with most work comes from surgical referrals from NHS and Hospital sources. This business has been at this location for 19 years and difficult to be relocated especially for the specialised facilities. It is a community asset to have such specialised business in this area.	
		M048/007	Mr Fielding	Object	The workshops and businesses are important community assets. Some disabled people from the community working there; Flats and takeaways are already exist in nearby shopping area, and should not be favoured.	
		M048/008	Ashwood Studios Ltd	Object	Ashwood studios have been established for nearly ten years. The studio would be very difficult/ impossible to relocate unless a full compensation on the investment. The workshops are grade II listed building and located within conservation area.	
		M048/009	Rev Stokes	Object	Barns form part of historic area of old village and conservation area, part of community history and roots. Current businesses employ people. Would like to see current barns improved and access improved to ensure viability of these businesses.	
-	<b>M049</b>	M049/001	Ms Bradley	Object	Do not want to see more housing, with Dowson School being built there are too many people living in one area which is a strain on existing resources and lead to anti-social	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					behaviour. Reduce value of houses in area. Lead to traffic problems. Depot site most likely in flood plain, river has silted up and will lead to more flooding. If development still goes ahead maybe low rise industrial units or small affordable workshops. Housing - need for low rise sheltered housing. Concern over new buildings leading to overlooking, loss of light and view of trees by the river. Ideally land would be linked to Sloughbottom Park.	
-	<b>M050</b>	M050/001	Ms Hall	Object	Retained as open space. Much of it is taken up by the Dolphin Path and the remainder could be added to Anderson's Meadow, which is already very well used as green space for local housing residents	This land will be jointly considered with adjacent land. The current footpath will be retained.
		M050/002	Toucan Hire Services Plc	Comment	Support council looking into changing designation of site from industrial to housing.	Noted.
-	<b>M051</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	<b>M052</b>	M052/001	The King of Hearts	Object	Nearest car park to King of Hearts where there are regular corporate and private meetings, weddings, parties, music concerts. Without the car park the business would suffer.	Most comments raised relate to potential loss of parking space which will affect the surrounding businesses, community facilities and residents.
		M052/002	Octagon Concert Series	Object	The Octagon car park is home to the only Unitarian congregation in Norwich. The congregation is growing in size and there are services once a week as well as being open to the public and take part in the Heritage Open Days. The congregation use Colegate car park.	It is also noted that there might be archaeological constraint.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		M052/003	Octagon Concert Series	Object	The loss of the car park would be detrimental to the Octagon Concert series which take place at the Octagon Chapel as concertgoers use the car park.	<p>Viability of the development is also addressed which will be investigated.</p> <p>The car park also accommodates service points for the shops in Magdalen Street.</p>
		M052/004	Mr Harvey	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transformation of the car park into housing would not benefit anyone.</li> <li>- It is a very well used car park by residence.</li> <li>- Businesses on Magdalen Street rely on space for loading</li> <li>- Due to constraints e.g. still allow space for loading, need for car parking for new residents, few houses could be built- unlikely to be economically viable.</li> <li>- Tall houses would inhibit the amount of light to surrounding residential properties.</li> <li>- Traffic issues would arise from development</li> </ul>	
		M052/005	Norwich & Norfolk Community Arts	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of parking outside Martineau Memorial Hall so rely on Colegate</li> <li>- It would not be appropriate to 'drop' housing into this space as it is behind a parade of shops and is a historic area.</li> </ul>	
		M052/006	The Last Wine Bar	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Colegate car park offers customers of the Last Wine Bar somewhere to park</li> <li>- Agenda to try to remove cars from the city is making it harder for businesses to retain their customers and to attract new ones.</li> <li>- There is little point in regeneration if there are no businesses left to support the new residents.</li> </ul>	
		M052/007	Mr Seligman	Object	- Frequently used car park and its development would restrict availability to park centrally. It	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					would disadvantage local residents. - Would restrict access to the rear of the commercial properties (Oxfam and Country Pine)	
		M052/008	Mrs Hughes	Object	- Loss of amenity to local residents and businesses - Limited on road residents parking so visitors use car park despite charges - More housing and business would exacerbate the problem	
		M052/009	Mrs Mahood	Object	-Already lack of parking when visiting Magdalen Street, King of Hearts, Play House, Cathedral and Doughty's hospital - Car park is useful amenity - Small and hidden space makes a tremendous difference when visiting area	
		M052/010	RR Office Stationers	Object	- Business like RR Office Stationers depend on car park for customers. Closing the car park may mean businesses close too. - Lead to traffic problems, noise and litter - Lack of school facilities in the area - Access onto Colegate is too narrow	
		M052/011	Ms Barnett	Object	- Already insufficient parking for residents and visitors - Business, shops, restaurants, charities rely on car park for customers - Shops back onto car park and rely upon it for access thus reducing congestion on Magdalen Street - Used by people who come to shop in city	



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reducing congestion in the city centre</li> <li>- New development will cause inconvenience, dirt and invasion of privacy</li> <li>- New residential development will mean more vehicles needing spaces for residents and visitors</li> </ul>	
		M052/012	Ms Cabot	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Car park is needed as many properties, shops and facilities in surrounding streets have no parking</li> <li>- Site is not suitable for development</li> <li>- Access is poor</li> <li>- Area is already very densely occupied</li> <li>- Problems with overlooking</li> <li>- Affect setting of Old Meeting House, burial ground and listed buildings</li> </ul>	
		M052/013	Mrs Heal	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Car park good location for people arriving from north of the city.</li> <li>- Use when visiting cathedral, forum and Greenhouse in Bethel Street</li> <li>- Housing would be inappropriate</li> <li>- Colegate could not cope with additional traffic</li> </ul>	
		M052/014	Mr Durrant	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Business in area find it difficult to prosper and this car park is vital for them</li> </ul>	
		M052/016	Mrs Middleton	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conservation area</li> <li>- Overlooking problems from new development to Mottram House and Doughty's Hospital</li> <li>- Lack of street parking so Colegate car park is used by visitors throughout the year</li> <li>- Impact on local retailers, residents and the King of Hearts</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Businesses such as Model Agency, Dance School and Barristers' Octagon chambers have no parking so rely on Colegate car park</li> <li>- Used by visitors to the Cathedral and churches</li> <li>- Would remove service access for deliveries, waste collection to retailers whose frontage is on Magdalen Street</li> <li>- Redevelopment of Anglia Square will reduce car parking in area increasing need for Colegate car park</li> </ul>	
		M052/017	Mr McGee	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Redevelopment would create noise especially for old people and make parking more difficult</li> </ul>	
		M052/018	Mr Birrell	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Car park convenient for shopping, visiting Cathedral and attending Playhouse theatre and restaurants</li> <li>- There is little on street car parking and St Andrews is significantly further to walk</li> <li>- Less likely to come into Norwich if car park closes.</li> <li>- This open space needed in heavily built up area.</li> </ul>	
		M052/019	Mr Turner	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Norwich is notorious for very poor parking arrangements</li> <li>- Norwich has few open public spaces in the city centre</li> <li>- Car park is important facility for residents and visitors to Cathedral, St Andrews hall, cinema, king of hearts</li> <li>- New development could cause overlooking to</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>residents of Doughty's hospital</li> <li>- Severe impact on local businesses</li> <li>- Adversely affect tourism</li> </ul>	
		M052/020	Mr Twite	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Car park is used by clients of Octagon House Barristers Chamber and workmen that have to carry out repairs</li> <li>- Colegate car park is overpriced</li> <li>- Not viable for most of staff to use public transport</li> <li>- Council want consumers to venture into the city but slowly taking away car parks</li> <li>- Several vacant buildings on Colegate</li> <li>- How can the closure of car park be justified? If it is because it is underused then reduce the price</li> </ul>	
		M052/021	Mr Middleton	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use car park to visit residents of Doughty's Hospital</li> <li>- Car park is often full which demonstrates a demand</li> <li>- New homes should be built on true brownfield sites and not result in the loss of amenity to community.</li> <li>- New development would cause excessive noise and disturbance</li> </ul>	
		M052/022	Miss Watt	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Small site with narrow access</li> <li>- Heart of conservation area and to accommodate development would likely to mean building upward dwarfing listed buildings</li> <li>- Parking is already a premium</li> <li>- Are more offices needed when there are many</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					empty ones?	
		M052/023	Hulbert West	Object	- Use car park when visiting residents at Doughty's hospital to provide financial advice	
		M052/024	Mr Cawdron	Object	- Closure of car park will impact on local residents and businesses - There is lack of parking in area and residential developments e.g. Fishergate and Quayside have put increased pressure on spaces - Permit holders find it difficult to find spaces - Colegate car park is often full - Even if new properties had 1 car parking space this would not cater for visitors - Could make Magdalen Street one way and increase short and long term parking along its total length.	
		M052/025	Ms Baily	Object	- Area not well served with car parks. Closure of Colegate will mean local businesses, cafes and restaurants will suffer and cause difficulties to those who visit residents of Doughty's hospital.	
		M052/026	Mrs Simmons	Object	Closest car park to Perfection Skin Clinic where clients park	
		M052/027	Thorpe Clinic	Object	- Colegate car park important to the operation of Osteopath clinic in area. Closure of the car park would put enormous pressure on limited parking available. - Car park closure would cause difficulties for the residents of Doughty's Hospital	
		M052/028	Mr Bach	Object	-Development would have a negative impact on osteopath practice in area and on the lives and	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					livelihoods of residents.	
		M052/029	MacMillan	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agree there is need to reduce cars in city centre but closure of Colegate car park will not help achieve that aim</li> <li>- Since pedestrianisation of St George Street, traffic from St Crispin's Road is unable to access St Andrews car park.</li> <li>- Colegate car park essential for people using retailers, restaurants, offices and businesses in the area</li> <li>- Family and friends of Doughty's Hospital need to use car park</li> <li>- Residential development would put more pressure on parking in area</li> <li>- Residents of surrounding buildings would no longer be able to enjoy the quite of their homes and gardens</li> </ul>	
		M052/030	Mrs Scutter	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Car park is used to visit residents at Doughtys Hospital, for the Playhouse and for Magdalen Street</li> <li>- Access for new development would be poor.</li> </ul>	
		M052/031	Mr & Mrs Howes	Object	Car park is used by the Martin Singers (long established choral group of pensioners). It is vital to their continued activities.	
		M052/032	Mr & Mrs Clark	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of parking will lead to loss of business</li> <li>- 17 Colegate is recently opened Guest House. There is no on-site parking so rely on Colegate</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					for visitors. Planning permission was granted for Guest House due to proximity to Colegate car park - Unnecessary to build new offices when so many in area are vacant. - New buildings would be detrimental to the integrity of surrounding listed buildings - Gardens on Colegate would be overlooked by new buildings over 1 storey.	
		M052/033	Mr Chastney	Object	- Loss of local amenity would inconvenience local householders and businesses. As well as people visiting local residential properties, many local retailers, restaurants, the playhouse, central school of dance, the old meeting house, the king of hearts and many others rely on the car park. - Agree with minimising cars in the city; however small local amenities such as Colegate remain essential for those living or trading nearby. - Site surrounded by listed buildings - Traders on Magdalen Street rely on access to the rear of their properties.	
		M052/034	Mr & Mrs Braithwaite	Object	Car park is used for visiting family. There are disabled bays at Colegate car park. It is not possible for representor to get out of the car against a kerb.	
		M052/035	Mrs Read	Object	Car park is used by people who visit residents of Golden Dog Lane as this is permit holders only street.	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		M052/036	Ms Mayes	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Car park is used by people who visit local residents as there is permit parking on surrounding streets</li> <li>- Building would make access to the Friary impossible as it could be excavated in the future</li> <li>- Traders on Magdalen Street would loss business</li> <li>- There a loading bays to the rear of shops</li> <li>- Car park is used by people going to the Playhouse, The King of Hearts and the Cathedral as well as the restaurants.</li> <li>- This is conservation area</li> </ul>	
		M052/037	Mrs Rathbone	Object	The car park is used for business and leisure use. Concern that local residents including the elderly who are living in Doughty's hospital will be disrupted.	
		M052/038	Bartram	Object	People coming to the Doughtys Hospital use the Colegate car park for a number of events and to visit their relatives or friends- it is important that it remains for the community to use.	
		M052/039	Brown & Co	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to Golden Dog Lane is restricted. It is narrow and there is poor access to the inner ring road. The proposal presents risk to the residents and staff of Doughtys Hospital</li> <li>- Car park offers vehicular and pedestrian access to businesses operating in Magdalen Street and residential properties on Colegate. These interests should be maintained which</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					would reduce area for development - Important archaeological site - Site adjoins important listed buildings and is within conservation area. This restricts development potential i.e. building height and design - Loss of car park would adversely effect local businesses and residents.	
		M052/040	Mrs Longman	Object	Car park is used by the Martin Singers (long established choral group of pensioners). It is vital to their continued activities.	
		M052/041	Mr Ayers	Object	- Colegate car park is the site of the first Dominican Friary, established in 1226 - Occupation of the area dates from 9th Century - Although the Dominican site was superceded after 1307 to south bank, the friars retained their Colegate site until the 16th Century. - Archaeological deposits are likely to retain evidence for an early friary, a rare survival - Why develop here? The land has been open space since the 16th Century. Reinstatement of the area for public use would be better. - If development does happen (which would be regrettable), advantage should be taken to evaluate the archaeological deposits at an early stage - Evaluation could establish the ground-plan of the friary and information could feed into master-planning to enable the footprint of the	



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<p>structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Care would need to be taken with extant structures bordering the site during any development. The boundary wall to the east, for instance, almost certainly contains upstanding fabric of the medieval friary precinct wall.</li> <li>- The car park has local amenity value as a quiet through-route to Golden Dog Lane and Magdalen Street. Access should be maintained in any development proposals.</li> <li>- The current open space provides a setting for a number of important as well as locally interesting buildings including Octagon Chapel, the view southward to St Clement, the converted textile factory to the north-east and the south-facing house and garden to the north and west. In addition the tenement pattern of the buildings fronting Magdalen Street can be well-observed from here. Secluded private gardens lie both to the east and west and development design should take care not to overlook these gardens nor, in the case of that in the north-east corner, to remove its western light.</li> </ul>	
		M052/042	Ms Duffy	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Car park is useful amenity bringing much needed patrons to Magdalen Street shops and restaurants</li> <li>- It is essential for visitors to residential areas around Golden Dog Lane.</li> <li>- Much needed open space in dense urban</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					environment	
		M052/043	Octagon Concert Series	Object	The loss of the car park would be detrimental to the local community, the several churches and businesses in the area. (petition signed by 49 people)	
		M052/044	Mrs Walker	Object	Car park well used, better than on-street parking, convenient and good for elderly people visiting the city. Other comments: - Decent bins on paths - Yards between shops kept clear and tidy - All unused church clocks to be set to the same time to avoid confusion! - Avoid heavy traffic on Elm Hill.	
-	<b>M054</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
	<b>M055</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	<b>M056</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
M057	<b>M057</b>	M057/001	Miss Lingi	Object	Any new development would be too close to property. Would lose area of trees for wildlife. Do not want to be overlooked more than at present. Increased traffic, noise and too crowded already. Like space behind house as it is.	Amenity issue will be addressed in DM policies DPD.
		M057/002	Mrs Brown	Object	Overlooking from new housing and offices is the main problem.	
	<b>M058</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
-	<b>M059</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
M060	<b>M060</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	<b>OU001</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	<b>OU002</b>	OU002/001	Local Religious Charities	Comment	Ensure current use as a 'place of worship' is not excluded in the future.	Site does not involve change of use - no allocation is needed
		OU002/NWT	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Support	Consideration should be given to allocating this site as green space, as an extension to Mousehold Heath. The area was historically part of the heath and is recognised in the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Strategy as a component of a Greater Mousehold project to restore and link habitats between the existing heath and the Broads. Consideration could be given to relocating the pitch and putt course to this site and restoring the present pitch and putt site to heath land.	
-	<b>OU003-1 - OU003-15</b>	OU003-6/001	Yare Valley Association	Object	Any further impingement of university buildings into the meadow should not be allowed.	Small scale development proposals do not need to be allocated. They will be considered at the point of planning applications.
		OU003-6/003	Yare Valley Society	Object	Meadowland setting of the university near the UEA broad is a unique, valuable, scenic landscape, green open space and a wildlife corridor which should be preserved. It was fundamental to the original master plan for UEA. Development would have an adverse	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					effect on the parkland/ meadowland aspect. In particular the view from the prospect is a vital part of the open aspect of this part of the valley and it is vital that this openness remains.	
		OU003-6/004	Eaton and University Community Forum	Object	Yare Valley is valued wildlife and recreational asset. Valley's importance is recognised in the SA Scoping Report: "The Yare Valley forms a linear green space to the south of the city, providing an attractive gateway" (p.32) Its importance is recognised in the JCS with it being identified as a "Green Infrastructure Priority Corridor" (p. 29) and emphasizes the importance of "connectivity" for wild life movement (e.g. p. 33, para. 5.7), and recreational value of river valley and riverside walks (e.g. p. 74). Yare Valley is key component of the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure, for wildlife, recreation, and sustainable people movement. Development would intrude physically and visually into the valley, reduce the width of the priority corridor, and create a "pinch point". The valley's effectiveness as a multifunctional priority corridor would be impaired.	
OU003-16	<b>OU003-16</b>	OU003-16/001	Yare Valley Society	Object	Earlham Park should not lose its appeal as an open space to be enjoyed by all. Development could affect the landscape value of the park.	Mitigation measures will be in place to protect the settings of Earlham Park
		OU003-16/002	Ms Lark	Object	Land should be retained by the city council. I know of a local business man who would like to take over the old nursery site and run it as a	Land availability issue is part of the consideration. This document does not have the

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					garden centre and would contribute to the upkeep of the gardens. This would be in keeping with its former use.	remit to resolve land ownership issue.
		OU003-16/003	Eaton and University Community Forum	Object	Yare Valley is valued wildlife and recreational asset. Parkland and gardens setting of Earlham Hall is an important visual amenity. Development would have a profound and irreversible impact. Enterprise and Innovation centre would be appropriate at NRP. Site should be reserved for green infrastructure priority corridor and for enhancing setting of historic hall.	Mitigation measures will be in place to protect the settings of Earlham Park
		OU003-16/004	Eaton/Lakenham Liberal Democrat Focus Team	Object	Area was once a small garden centre. Development for innovation centre would be intrusive on Earlham Park.	
		OU003-16/005	Earlham Park Friends	Object	Where is the evidence that Norwich needs an enterprise and innovation centre and why can't it be sited elsewhere? Site is within curtilage of Grade II* listed building and intercepts its gardens. Have investigations been carried out to determine whether there is any archaeology on site? Are there rare creatures/plants on site? Are there TPOs on site? Earlham Hall is important source for recreation, local history, wildlife and beauty. Development of this site may affect the already inadequate parking situation. There has been inadequate publicity in Eaton and University Wards- local people would object. Have Norfolk Gardens Trust been consulted?	Mitigation measures will be in place to protect the settings of Earlham Park. Site policy will also address Earlham Hall conservation issue.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		OU003-16/006	Earlham Park Friends	Object	Yare Valley is valued recreational asset JCS identifies as Green infrastructure priority corridor. Parkland and Gardens of Earlham Hall is important visual amenity. Appropriate place for 'enterprise and innovation centre' is NRP. Site should be reserved for green infrastructure priority corridor and for enhancing setting of historic hall	Mitigation measures will be in place to protect the settings of Earlham Park
OU003-17	<b>OU003-17</b>	OU003-17/001	Sustainable Living Initiative	Comment	What does 'community use' mean? How is land going to be used? What is proposed? More detail please	'Community use' refers to access to woodland.
OU003-18	<b>OU003-18</b>	OU003-18/001	Yare Valley Society	Comment	Meadowland setting of the university near the UEA broad is a unique, valuable, scenic landscape, green open space and a wildlife corridor which should be preserved. It was fundamental to the original master plan for UEA. Development would have an adverse effect on the parkland/ meadowland aspect. In particular the view from the prospect is a vital part of the open aspect of this part of the valley and it is vital that this openness remains.	The setting of the prospect will be considered. Open space and wildlife issue is also noted. Significant mitigation measures are needed should this site is allocated. Further evidence will be needed to justify this allocation, through the Development Framework
		OU003-18/002	Yare Valley Association	Object	Any further impingement of university buildings into meadow should not be allowed.	
		OU003-18/004	Ms Lark	Object	This is an area of natural beauty with trees, wild flowers, birds. It is asset to Norwich including to students, local residents, children, bird watches and dog walkers. It is a slice of countryside in the city.	
		OU003-18/005	Eaton/Lakenham Liberal Democrat	Object	Meadowland area is of scenic and landscape value next to the Broad and enhances the UEA	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
			Focus Team		buildings. Important part of the wildlife corridor. Development would be intrusive and damage the Yare Valley	Strategy for UEA.
		OU003-18/006	Eaton and University Community Forum	Object	Yare Valley is valued wildlife and recreational asset. Valley's importance is recognised in the SA Scoping Report: "The Yare Valley forms a linear green space to the south of the city, providing an attractive gateway" (p.32) Its importance is recognised in the JCS with it being identified as a "Green Infrastructure Priority Corridor" (p. 29) and emphasizes the importance of "connectivity" for wild life movement (e.g. p. 33, para. 5.7), and recreational value of river valley and riverside walks (e.g. p. 74). Yare Valley is key component of the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure, for wildlife, recreation, and sustainable people movement. Development would intrude physically and visually into the valley, reduce the width of the priority corridor, and create a "pinch point". The valley's effectiveness as a multifunctional priority corridor would be impaired.	
	<b>OU003-19</b>	OU003-19/001	Yare Valley Association	Object	Motorised transport and/or widening of the path will totally destroy the recreational value and green corridor.	The impacts on river valley and biodiversity are noted. However, this potential bus link are mostly located within South Norfolk boundary and the City has no evidence to support it on its own.
		OU003-19/002	Yare Valley Society	Object	Cycle/pedestrian link already exists linking the UEA to NRP and hospital. Proposal will degrade quality of this part of the link. Object to vehicular use of link.	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					River valley is of increasing value for recreation and wildlife as large number of houses are being built/planned for this area. Yare Valley is recognised as green infrastructure priority corridor in JCS. Proposal is unnecessary as route already exists for buses on Watton Road and University Drive. Development could have safety issues. There would be increased noise, air and water pollution and reduce opportunities for wildlife. There would be the loss of a pedestrian and cycle route that forms part of a network that is available for calm and peaceful recreation and exercise.	If the scheme is raised in the future to link NRP and UEA with this bus route, specific consideration will be given in connection with South Norfolk Council.
		OU003-19/003	Ms Lark	Object	There are few open spaces where children can roam safely. Hundreds of people walk and cycle between UEA, NRP/NUH. Should stay traffic free zone	
		OU003-19/004	Yare Valley Society	Object	UEA landscape strategy (Jan 10) encourages the replacement of unsightly bridges such as the causeway link. Best way of achieving this would be to have a well designed cycle and pedestrian bridge instead with no vehicular traffic. There is no need for cars or buses to cross the river at one of its narrowest and most crucial points.	
		OU003-19/005	Eaton and University	Object	Yare Valley is a valued wildlife and recreational asset.	



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
			Community Forum		JCS identifies the valley as a green infrastructure priority corridor. A road for public transport would have a damaging effect on valley. Cycle and walking link already exists. Introduction of vehicles would be an disincentive for cycles and pedestrians Alternative route already exists between UEA and NRP.	
		OU003-19/006	Eaton/Lakenham Liberal Democrat Focus Team	Object	Yare Valley is a valued wildlife and recreational area. The current pedestrian and cycle link provides opportunity for exercise and is a pleasant and safe route. An alternative route for public transport already exists (Watton Road) Allowing buses on proposed link would be incompatible with the area and prevent cyclist and pedestrians from using the link. This is an important green infrastructure corridor.	
		OU003-19/007	Ms Robertson	Object	What is the need for bus route? Area is haven for wildlife Cyclists can currently ride without the fear of being ploughed down by a motorised vehicle. Cyclist and pedestrian safety clearly hasn't be considered. Many people who use this route are likely to be unaware of the proposal. The environmental impacts have not be	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					considered.	
		OU003-19/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	We note that this site is proposed for a public transport and cyclist/pedestrian route. The route crossed the River Yare and Flood Zones 3a (high risk) and 3b (functional floodplain. In addition, the route also crosses a County Wildlife Trust Site. Further information on the PPS 25 vulnerability classification of the proposed bridge and on its future usage would be required before we are able to comment fully on this proposed allocation.	
		OU003-19/NWT	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Comment	We are concerned that if this link is upgraded from a pedestrian and cycle link to a public transport link that this will have an adverse impact on river valley habitats and species that use the river corridor. This change should only be made there is confidence that adequate mitigation for impacts such as run-off and lighting can be incorporated.	
-	<b>OU004</b>	OU004/001	Savills (L&P) Limited	Object	HRWF are in negotiations with retailers to operate from Unit 6A and expect the retail unit to be let to a retailer shortly. The allocation for leisure uses would not be consistent with the use of the unit for retail purposes and not would it be consistent with the intended designation of the site as a defined retail centre.	Noted. Proposed use does not conform to higher level strategies.
-	<b>OU005</b>	OU005/001	Notre Dame RC VA High School	Comment	School keen to work with any developers to provide community facilities around school site, particularly sports and performing arts facilities.	Sites will be designated as open space in the DM policies DPD.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		OU005/002	Ms Hall	Support	n/a	Noted.
-	<b>OU006</b>	OU006/001	Ms Hall	Support	n/a	Noted.
		OU006/002	Eaton/Lakenham Liberal Democrat Focus Team	Support	There may be opportunity for public involvement in the maintenance of the area including planting of orchard and creation of community gardens	Sites will be designated as open space in the DM policies DPD.
-	<b>OU007</b>	OU007/001	Mr Moore	Comment	The council proposed to dedicate Grass Road as a public right of way once contraction is completed. There is unease at the Council's decision- could it be brought forward earlier? Should take into consideration the dedication of the entire route of Grass Road. From Bowthorpe Hall Park to L shape-connect to Bowthorpe Nature Reserve. There is the need to protect Grass Road from damage by construction equipment i.e. damage to tree roots. There are many ancient trees	Sites will be designated as open space in the DM policies DPD.
-	<b>OU008</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	OU009	OU009/001	St Augustine's Community Together Residents' Association	Comment	St Augustine's Community Together Residents Association support proposal. Although green space appears overgrown, it has a number of historical associations that make it an area that should be preserved and cherished. This area is a rare remnant of the Gildencroft being just one in five remaining. There is a lot of history to this site including association with important Quaker sites (see full rep and maps).	Site is allocated in the adopted Northern City Centre area action plan. Therefore it will not be allocated in this document.
		OU009/002	Cllr Lubbock	Support	Support for Malzy Court residents' association to keep this land as green space possibly for community use as community gardens,	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					allotments or orchard.	
		OU009/003	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Support	We support the retention of this area as semi-natural green space in a built up area of the city.	
-	<b>OU011</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	<b>OU012</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
OU013	<b>OU013</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
NOR004(H)	<b>NOR0004</b>	NOR0004/001	Environment Agency	Comment	It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward.	Flood risk issue noted.
-	<b>NOR0005</b>	NOR0005/001	Mr & Mrs Kirk	Support	- Brownfield site (currently derelict and an eyesore) - Good access and services - Redevelopment with imaginative and sympathetic architecture would visually enhance this southern gateway to the city.	Noted
-		NOR0005/002	Mr Rivett	Comment	Opportunity should be taken to extend Danby park. However, if housing goes ahead then should not encroach beyond site into Danby park or path between site and adult training centre. Should only be single storey as building	Noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					would be visible and spoil landscaped vista from Danby Park.	
-	<b>NOR0008</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	<b>NOR0015</b>	NOR0015/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward.	Flood risk issue noted.
NOR0016(H)	<b>NOR0016</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	<b>NOR0017</b>	NOR0017/001	Notre Dame RC VA High School	Comment	School keen to work with any developers to provide community facilities around school site, particularly sports and performing arts facilities.	Noted
-	<b>NOR0018</b>	NOR0018/001	Mrs Robbins	Comment	A further lamp post was added to the car park and shone into 15/16 Mariners Lane. It was dealt with and now causes no interference. Should car park come forward for residential development please take note of this.	Noted.
		NOR0018/002	Notre Dame RC VA High School	Comment	School keen to work with any developers to provide community facilities around school site, particularly sports and performing arts facilities.	Noted.
-	<b>NOR0025</b>	NOR0025/001	Mrs Read	Comment	If new development includes social housing for the elderly, build them close to Rowland Court so new residents can be included on the alarm system. Rowland Court could be expanded. Could a communal building be included in any future redevelopment? Such a facility makes a	Noted. However, this document does not deal with detailed implementation issues.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					difference for the elderly.	
		NOR0025/002	Mr Limmer	Object	Where on Ashby Street do you plan to build? All we have is little back gardens. Development would look uglier and make houses darker. Why not build on Sainsbury's car park? There is problem with anti-social behaviour in the area.	Amenity issue will be covered by the DM policies DPD.
NOR0026(H)	<b>NOR0026</b>	NOR0026/001	Mr Frarey	Object	Would lead to excessive traffic in close proximity to school, surgery and supermarket during construction and after completion. Housing should be targeted beyond the ring road to reduce inner city congestion.	Brazen Gate is a quiet area although there is currently traffic activity associated with the significant surface car park. Opportunities will be sought to minimise car park provisions for this development.
		NOR0026/002	Mrs Sewell	Suggest changes	- Exit to Southwell Road be restricted to emergency vehicles only as at present - Boundary to be maintained to protect surrounding properties and car park.	Noted. Access to Southwell Road will be considered and mitigation measures will be provided in the policy if necessary
NOR0031(H)	<b>NOR0031</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
	<b>NOR0042</b>	NOR0042/001	Mr & Mrs Brant	Object	Resident of Palmer Road. Development may lead to overlooking and noise pollution	Amenity and design issues are considered in DM policies Plan in general.
		NOR0042/002	Mr Dodkins	Support	Support mixed use allocation in principle. Council should adopt a flexible approach in terms of scale and mix of uses to ensure it remains attractive to future retailers and developers.	Noted. However, future retail proposals should also consider impact on other retail centres including city centre.
		NOR0042/003	Rev Bazely	Comment	Concerned about health and safety hazard presented by oil depot, tanks and telephone	Noted.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					mast. Such uses are not suitable in residential areas. Support the use of this site for residential with adequate parking and play facilities.	
		NOR0042/004	Miss Brown	Object	Object to oil depot and tanks being close to housing. Industrial uses should be located on outskirts of city. Accident or fire would be devastating to existing residents.	The site should be developed comprehensively and avoid piecemeal and patchy housing development.
NOR0043(M)	<b>NOR0043</b>	-	-	-	-	
NOR0045(H)	<b>NOR0045</b>	NOR0045/001	Ms Hall	Suggest changes	Dolphin Path is too narrow at the north end where it joins Drayton Road and the connection to Drayton Road is poor. Northeast corner of NOR0045 should be removed from the allocation.	Inclusion of the corner will provide opportunities for future improvement.
		NOR0045/002	Toucan Hire Services Plc.	Comment	Support council looking into changing designation of site from industrial to housing.	Noted.
NOR0062(H)	<b>NOR0062</b>	NOR0062/001	Ms Turner	Object	Properties on Heath Road only have small gardens. Development of 2 storeys or more would result in in these gardens receiving no sunshine and there would be problems with overlooking. Noise pollution could be problem depending on nature of commercial business. Parking in the area would be adversely affected as there is currently limited space. Hours of operation of any business would need to be sympathetic to residential area.	Amenity, design and layout issue of the potential development will be set out in DM policies DPD in general.
		NOR0062/002	Ms Clapham	Object	Proposed site includes garden of 34 Heath Road. The section of land is not available for development as is within boundary of property.	Noted. Boundary will be amended.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		NOR0062/003	Mr Moore	Comment	Concerned as to how new homes would blend in with existing homes on Starling Road. New buildings on the section currently used as a car wash may affect amount of light and levels of noise to Jolly Gardeners Court.	Amenity, design and layout issue of the potential development will be set out in DM policies DPD in general.
NOR0065(H)	<b>NOR0065</b>	-	-	-	-	
NOR0067(M)	<b>NOR0067</b>	-	-	-	-	Noted.
NOR0073(H)	<b>NOR0073</b>	NOR0073/001	Norwich Central Baptist Church	Suggest changes	Would be good to include a small corner shop	Site has planning permission.
NOR0078(H)	<b>NOR0078</b>	NOR0078/001	Miss Gothard	Comment	Site should not be used solely for Council houses. Would be interested in purchasing some of site as already own pavement alongside no. 71.	Comment is not relevant.
NOR0082(H)	<b>NOR0082</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
NOR0092(H)	<b>NOR0092</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
	<b>NOR0093</b>	NOR0093/001	Mrs Collingsworth	Object	Leave site for open and green space. Traffic already an issue on the road. Additional traffic would be a danger to school children of George White and Mousehold First Schools. The road near the Start-Rite shoe factory should not have been closed.	Comments noted.
		NOR0093/002	Mr Squire	Comment	Parking problems in area - more consideration needed before future building is undertaken. Crome Road, Romany Road and Dibden Road are used as overspill parking from other roads	



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					with permits. Used as a park and walk facility to city centre- Crome Road should be permit parking. Traffic issues with new development at former Start Rite shoe factory. Branford Road should be reopened.	
NOR0099(H)	<b>NOR0099</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	<b>NOR0106</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
-	<b>NOR0108</b>	NOR0108/001	Templemere Residents' Association	Object	Support existing use as car sale and petrol station. They are useful amenities and causes no offence to neighbours. Object to housing. The site is not near bus routes and there are already a lot of houses in the area.	Noted.
-	<b>NOR0110</b>	NOR0110/001	Baltic Wharf Management Committee	Comment	Need for development of parts of site although potential allocation is too vague. Concerned as proposal may affects quality of life including loss of privacy, air and views-wish to be involved in any future decision-making. Roadway titled Baltic Wharf is private road from Mountergate to properties on Baltic Wharf and is owned by the owners of the properties via the Management company. There are proportional charges associated with any changes to volume or usage and change in purpose would need our full involvement. Concerned about degradation of homes and roadway as a result of noise or disturbance caused by future development. Potential for traffic congestion-exiting onto Mountergate and from Mountergate onto Rose Lane.	This site will be jointly considered with M022 and NOR0112 for comprehensive development. A development brief will be prepared for the regeneration of this area. Specific issues will be considered in future development brief.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
-	<b>NOR0112</b>	NOR0112/001	Baltic Wharf Management Committee	Comment	Need for development of parts of site although potential allocation is too vague. Roadway titled Baltic Wharf is private road from Mountergate to properties on Baltic Wharf and is owned by the owners of the properties via the Management company. There are proportional charges associated with any changes to volume or usage and change in purpose would need our full involvement. Concerned about degradation of homes and roadway as a result of noise or disturbance caused by future development. Proposal may result in loss of privacy, light and views. Potential for traffic congestion- exiting Mountergate.	See response above
		NOR0112/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	It would appear from the level 1 SFRA that these sites fall partially within flood zones 3a or 3b either currently or with the addition of climate change. This should be taken into consideration when deciding which sites to take forward.	Flood risk issue noted.
-	<b>NOR0115</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
NOR0124(H)	<b>NOR0124</b>	-	-	-	-	n/a
NOR0125(H)	<b>NOR0125</b>	NOR0125/001	Mr Hunt	Comment	Would be interested in future information with regards to type of housing and access in relation to the nature of the area and a problem in the past.	Site has planning permission.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
		NOR0125/002	Mrs Bass MBE	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ransom Road is unmade, quiet road in conservation area. Since building of flats there has been increased vehicular use resulting in the surface worsening.</li> <li>- Appears to be drug related crime in the area. Future housing development on this site should not be for people with criminal behaviour.</li> <li>- Development should be mindful of the consequences of any damage or weakening of the retaining wall at the rear of Cumberland Hotel.</li> <li>- Ingleby Road is a public right of way with main sewer underneath.</li> <li>- Whatever development occurs there should be low levels of parking and vehicular use due to danger of access with Thorpe Road.</li> <li>- Parking is not permitted on Ransom Road and developers should be aware of this.</li> </ul>	
-	<b>NOR0128</b>	NOR0128/001	Old Catton Parish Council	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Greatest part of site already has planning permission and the remaining land is needed as amenity land.</li> <li>- Creation of additional traffic is undesirable</li> <li>- Increased development would create the need for an additional fire exit which is not readily available</li> </ul>	Comments noted. Site partially has planning permission.
		NOR0128/002	Mr Stevens	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposals unnecessary</li> <li>- Helicopter base is within 100 metres of site which has been extended and has 24 hour lighting and noise</li> <li>- Greenfield site</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
NOR0137(H)	<b>NOR0137</b>	NOR0137/001	Mr Bromley	Comment	There is a vehicular right of way to the rear of properties on Randolph Road from Hall Road through the Hewitt Yard site.	Noted. This should be addressed at planning application stage.  Comments raised relate to loss of business units and garages. These issues will be taken into account in potential allocations. Land availability issues will also be further investigated.
		NOR0137/002	Herring & Palmer	Object	Thriving community of businesses on site. Car parking useful for local residents. Other sites that are not occupied should be used first over this site where there are existing businesses. Historic value as it was built after WW2 and used for ambulance station and decontamination centre.	
		NOR0137/003	Mr Limeburner	Object	Garages needed as cars vandalised outside my home. Registered disabled and need car for hospital appointments. Another blow to small businesses that have been part of community for many years. These are becoming lost to housing development.	
		NOR0137/004	Mr Smith	Object	Small businesses have benefited from being able to rent small affordable business units. Should be kept for future small businesses.	
		NOR0137/005	MSL Design Print	Object	- Thriving businesses - Garages of use to local people where parking is difficult on roads.	
		NOR0137/006	Mr Marshall	Object	- Garages needed to keep cars off the road in the local area - Cars otherwise would be vandalised - Parking is difficult, will get worse if garages lost - Small business trade is good for local people	
		NOR0137/007	Premier Print	Object	- Money invested in existing businesses and would cost to relocate	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Reference (as in Reg 25(2) consultation document)	Old ref (as in Reg 25(1) consultation document)	Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Established client base</li> <li>- Moving would lead to bankruptcy</li> <li>- Good working relationships within Hewett Yard that would be missed.</li> </ul>	
NOR0143(H)	<b>NOR0143</b>	NOR0143/001	Dr McCash	Comment	The property already has outline planning permission- why is it being consulted on again and brought back into the public domain?	Planning permission may not be implemented.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

General representations made on the document:

Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
SAP/001	Mr Santer	Objection	Norwich is already over crowded. Continued development in Norwich will increase pollution, crime, demand for food, consumer goods, energy, water, sewerage, waste management and traffic levels. This will also affect tourism.	Development will be primarily on brownfield sites. The growth options have been set out in the emerging Joint Core Strategy and are supported by evidences.
SAP/002	Civil Aviation Authority	Comment	General comments made from the role of Civil Aviation Authority in relation to future installation of the facilities below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Other Civil Aerodromes</li> <li>- Telecom Installations</li> <li>- Wind Turbines</li> <li>- High Structures</li> <li>- Venting and Flaring (mineral extraction)</li> </ul>	Noted, these will be taken into account in site allocations where relevant.
SAP/003	Rouen Road Area Residents Association	Comment	Wooded Ridge should be protected as it is Norwich's "green-lung"; Rouen Road car park and Argyle Street; site is not a stable site to build on due to chalk works.	Wooded ridge will be excluded in relevant site boundary; ground condition issue is noted and will be investigated.
SAP/007	Mr Lanyon	Comment	The growth requirement from national government and regional government is not justified for Norfolk.	The emerging Joint Core Strategy has set out housing target based on evidence prepared.
SAP/008	Miss Finn	Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All existing housing stock should be used and refurbished</li> <li>2. Brownfield sites should be used as priority</li> <li>3. Norwich Community Hospital should not be redeveloped as it is much needed facility</li> <li>4. The infrastructure in Norwich cannot cope with loads of new houses</li> </ol>	The housing stock is mostly in private ownership and local authorities will encourage higher utilisation of vacant properties; Other issues raised will be part of the consideration in this plan, such as prioritising brownfield development, sustainability. The Community Hospital will be allocated in accordance with the

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
			<p>5. The proposals must be proved and assessed to be sustainable</p> <p>6. Building office blocks will not necessarily attract new businesses to Norwich. There are many empty office blocks</p> <p>7. Transport to rural areas need to be improved.</p>	NHS' operational plan should buildings are redundant; most office development in city centre will be refurbishment of existing facilities; Transport to rural areas will be covered by the County Council's Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS).
SAP/009	Mr Brandrick	Comment	Shelters are key to Norwich, consideration should be given to homeless people.	This document does not directly involve sheltered housing. Sheltered housing will be sought where necessary and appropriate.
SAP/011	Mr Raiswell	Comment	<p>General comments made in relation to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction noise</li> <li>2. Control of dog waste</li> <li>3. No further night clubs in city centre</li> <li>4. Housing/shop/office/businesses mixes should be built on large development sites</li> <li>5. More sports and arts facilities are needed in city centre</li> <li>6. NDR should continue further round to connect southern main road</li> </ol>	Some comments made are not planning related. Sports and arts facilities needs are addressed in the Joint Core Strategy. NDR issue is not covered by this document.
SAP/012	Mr Burton	Comment	There is too much emphasis on providing housing. Most jobs in the local economy are low paid, there is no implications of the employment allocations will result in jobs with better wages. The housing expansion does not match the employment growth.	Existing employment/ industrial areas will be protected where relevant. Employment opportunities will also raised by enhanced retail and office development in the City Centre.
SAP/013	The Coal Authority	n/a	No comment at this stage.	n/a
SAP/014	Brummells	Object	Car parking should not be reduced in city centre which will affect businesses in the city.	City Centre car parking should be controlled to minimise traffic and encourage the use of public transport.
SAP/015	Rouen Road Residents	Comment	1. Building endless blocks of flats should be avoided, affordable homes should be provided.	Some fair points raised which will be taken into account in this document. Green infrastructure

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
	Association		2. Parking is an issue in new development 3. Green/play areas need to be provided with new development 4. There may be potential conflicts between leisure industry, pubs, night clubs and future housing close to riverside.	will be required where necessary and play areas will be provided where is a need in a local area.
SAP/016	CABE	Comment	General comments made on how to deliver good design through core strategies.	Noted.
SAP/017	Broadland District Council	Comment	1. M014 - Deal Ground site is partially outside Norwich City's boundary 2. Employment allocations are not allocated for something different. It may be appropriate for these areas to be addressed in the Development Management type policies e.g. Development Management DPD.	Boundary issue noted and has been covered by existing site plan; Employment sites will be defined in the DM policies DPD.
SAP/018	GO East	Comment	1. An Appropriate Assessment is required 2. Gypsy & Traveller allocation should be 28 pitches from 2006 to 2021. (15 to 2011 and 13 thereafter) 3. Full explanation of the proposed approach to all gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople allocations should be included at next stage.	An Appropriate Assessment is being prepared. Pitches for Gypsy & Traveller and travelling showpeople will be looked at jointly with neighbouring council's due to Norwich's limited urban area and the link with the surrounding areas.
SAP/019	East of England LGA	Comment	The Council may wish to adopt a position whereby there is a presumption against development of green sites (in particular sports and playing fields).	Green open space will be defined in the DM policies DPD and will be covered by dedicated policies.
SAP/020	Inland Waterways Association (Ipswich Branch)	Suggest changes	Public access to river (both on foot and by boat) should be included in any future development where possible.	Public access will be sought in new allocations where possible.
SAP/021	The Norwich Society	Comment	The overall approach has no assessment on the impact on the historic character of Norwich; there is no comment on building heights.	Historic character of Norwich is covered by the Norwich City Centre Conservation Area Appraisal. Issue with Cathedral Close site is noted. Flood issue on Deal Ground and Utility



**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
			Specific concerns: 1. Any building on Gooseberry Gardens site in the Cathedral Close (M001) which would impede the view of the east end of the Cathedral from riverside 2. Flood issues on the Deal Ground and Utility sites	sites are also noted and mitigation measures will be sought in allocations.
SAP/022	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Comment	Comments made in relation to each site.	These will be used in the site selection process as evidence base for related criteria.
SAP/025	Norfolk County Council	Comment	<p>General Strategic Comments</p> <p>Several of the site specific proposals suggest the development of housing on land currently used for employment purposes. While such developments may contribute to targets for developing houses on brownfield land, the loss of multiple employment sites may have cumulative impacts. In particular it is noted that there is a concentration of such proposals on the north side of Norwich and the City Council may wish to give consideration to the potential negative cumulative impacts if all of these employment sites are redeveloped for other uses, including the possibility that workers living in the north of the city may need to make longer journeys to find alternative employment elsewhere in Greater Norwich.</p> <p>Highways and Transportation The main strategic considerations of impacts are summarised below: - sites located on key radial routes are likely to be broadly OK as they will be served by the core bus network and/or proposed Bus Rapid Transit corridors - sites within the inner ring road are also likely to be broadly OK, although in some cases we need to be careful</p>	Specific comments made on a site by site basis are not listed here. However, they will be part of the evidence base used in the site selection process.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
			<p>of NATS proposals to remove through-traffic from the city centre in terms of allocating residential sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the area around the football ground – development proposals should consider the potential requirement for a bus link through to riverside and rail station (e.g. from the Deal Ground and Utilities sites)</li> <li>- on sites adjacent to the river (Wensum) - land should be reserved to enable the provision / completion of a Riverside Walk, including a strategic cycle link to Whitlingham Broad</li> <li>- Deal Ground and Utilities sites – key infrastructure would be required. Access difficulties to these sites will severely limit the scale and type of development able to be delivered. A comprehensive access strategy is required. The area will be served by proposed Connect2 cycle route.</li> <li>- Airport area – employment in this area is spread out and may be difficult to serve but the NDR will offer direct access to sites to the north (east) and the A140 corridor is served by both Park and Ride and a proposed BRT corridor.</li> <li>- Employment sites around outer ring road – there is no current (or proposed) orbital public transport provision – this might need to be re-addressed to adequately serve some of these sites by public transport.</li> <li>- UEA – the cross-valley link is not currently part of NATS although the County Council would be likely to support such a scheme</li> <li>- loss of car parking in the city centre – a number of smaller car parks are proposed as development sites. It is considered that city car parking should be consolidated</li> </ul>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
			<p>onto a few larger sites to prevent cars penetrating the city centre and creating wasteful mileage while searching for a space. Therefore the loss of these sites for car parking is broadly supported. Notwithstanding the above, it may be advisable to undertake a strategic assessment of the cumulative impact to ensure that there remains a sufficient overall number of car parking spaces to support the operational needs of town centre retail and service businesses and to consider whether there is any requirement for additional large scale car parks, both to compensate for the loss of numerous smaller sites and ensure an adequate distribution of operational car parking in the city. Consideration should also be given to any potential short term impacts on rail users, which might result from cumulative losses of car parking in the vicinity of the railway station (until adequate public transport alternatives have been provided).</p> <p>- there is a need in many cases for sites to be considered more comprehensively with those around them, rather than in isolation as is encouraged by the consultation. This point is re-iterated in the site by site table below.</p> <p><b>Minerals And Waste</b> A small portion of the proposed sites are within the 250 metre safeguarding consultation buffer of an existing waste site and existing aggregate railhead. Please see below a column in the table indicating the proposed sites involved. In principle, there is no objection to the proposed sites so long as their construction and operation does not prejudice the safe operation of the existing waste site.</p>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
SAP/026	Natural England	Comment	<p>1. Water supply and water quality - applies to all site allocations in this plan</p> <p>2. Protected species &amp; biodiversity should be considered</p> <p>3. Local Nature Reserves - site M041 is immediately adjacent to Bowthorpe Marsh Local Nature Reserve.</p> <p>4. County Wildlife Sites should be considered in the process</p> <p>5. Green Infrastructure - Opportunities have been identified to enhance the biodiversity and connectivity of habitat throughout the city and out into the wider countryside, and it is vital that this network is not compromised by allocations.</p>	Comments noted and will be taken into account in site allocations.
SAP/028	East of England Development Agency	Comment	<p>EEDA welcome the site allocations development plan document. EEDA are pleased to see that the outcomes of the Employment Growth and Employment Sites and Premises Study, which we have joint funded, has provided a robust evidence base in support of this allocations document. We recently completed a Strategic Employment Sites Study for the East of England which identified a number of sites in Norwich as being of particular significance to the regional economy. These were Norwich Airport, Deal Ground &amp; Utilities sites. The site allocations development plan document positively recognises all of these sites through the allocations and as such should make a positive contribution to meeting the aspirations of the regional economic strategy. We are also pleased to see that following our letter to you of the 1st April 2008 in which we stated our concerns over the potential loss of employment land in the city centre at Gothic Works has been recognised and that this site is now identified for employment uses.</p>	Comments noted and will be taken into account in site allocations.

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
SAP/029	CPRE Norfolk	Comment	<p>1. CPRE does not support growth agenda</p> <p>2. CPRE is not in favour of the planned expansion of housing in Norfolk</p> <p>3. JCS and the Site allocations plan should only make allocations to 2021 in line with East of England Plan.</p> <p>4. The level of growth proposed in RSS was conceived in a very different economic environment and must reviewed.</p> <p>5. Urban regeneration and the location of housing in the city as an alternative to housing in rural areas rather than as an addition.</p> <p>6. The JCS stated the need for affordable housing is 40% across GNDP. The average is at 22% in 2001-08 period. This shows a poor delivery record for affordable housing.</p>	The growth agenda is set out in the emerging Joint Core Strategy and this site allocation document should follow the guidelines set in JCS. Majority of the comment is related to JCS and thus outside the remit of this document.
SAP/032	Mrs O'Donoghue	Comment	<p>- In general, it is an excellent idea to have more houses in central Norwich and to build on some of the areas that are waste ground or under-used</p> <p>-There are some concerns about the destruction of nearly every over-ground car park. They fulfil a purpose and if they were to go, the queues to get into the multi-storeys would increase and cause congestion on the main road.</p>	Comments noted. However, car parking issue in city centre will be reviewed in line with the council's parking strategy. Also, controlling car parking in city centre will encourage the use of public transport and manage traffic in a more efficient way.
SAP/EA	Environment Agency	Comment	<p>Water Cycle Study</p> <p>The outputs of the WCS should be considered when allocating sites. In particular it has highlighted that there is limited capacity in the existing Norwich sewer network. The water company need to be consulted to consider the outcomes of the modelling when allocating sites for development.</p> <p>Protection of Groundwater</p> <p>All proposed sites fall within Source Protection Zones and overlie a Principle Aquifer of high or intermediate</p>	<p>Water issue is covered by the emerging Joint Core Strategy;</p> <p>Pollution control will be set in site policies where necessary;</p> <p>Brownfield land and designated sites will also be part of the consideration in this plan;</p> <p>Surface water management will be set out in general policies in DM policies DPD.</p>

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
			<p>vulnerability. A set of criteria in terms of Source Protection Zone1/2/3 and Principle Aquifers are attached in Appendix 1 and should be considered accordingly in site selection.</p> <p><b>Pollution Control</b> Pollution control measures should be considered wherever possible. This may include measures such as interceptors where oil contamination may occur, isolation of cleaning and washing operations and of areas involving chemicals from the surface water system, not discharging foul sewage or trade effluent to the surface water drainage system and ensuring that all facilities for the storage of oils, fuels and chemicals are provided with adequate, durable secondary bonding to prevent the spills and leakage of pollutants reaching the environment.</p> <p><b>Brownfield Land</b> Many of the proposed sites have previously contaminating uses. Please note that we will expect any applications on brownfield land to be in compliance with PPS23, which states that, as a minimum, as desktop study should be submitted, with further work carried out in the form of a site investigation and remediation if required.</p> <p><b>Designated Sites</b> Any proposed development should not damage the interest features of these sites and enhance where possible. The potential impact, either individually or in combination, of proposed development on the conservation interests of any designated site should be</p>	

**Norwich Local Development Framework**  
Draft site allocations development plan document

Response No	Consultee	Nature of response	Comments summary	Officers' comments
			<p>consideration in deciding which sites to take forward.</p> <p>Surface Water Management Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management. Larger developments (i.e. those over 1 ha. In size) have the potential to generate significant volumes of surface water run-off. Therefore, in line with our standing advice, we will object unless an adequate Flood Risk Assessment is submitted with the planning application.</p> <p>On the 22nd of June 2007 we sent your Authority a CD containing historic landfill data which has all the information we hold on the historic landfill sites.</p>	

January 2011