

**The main issues raised during consultation on the Norwich Research Park (NRP) Development Framework with responses and actions**

Issue	Response	Action
<p><b>1. Concern that the Framework is overly prescriptive:</b></p> <p><b>(Links to 2 &amp; 6 below)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various changes suggested to the Framework to make it less prescriptive.</li> <li>• The Framework should be less prescriptive about the scale, massing, footprint etc of buildings. Need to stress that the information in the Framework in relation to buildings, plot ratios, design etc is only intended as a guide for developers and is not intended to preclude other development options.</li> <li>• Reword the Framework to give a positive indication of acceptable development to facilitate alternative schemes to come forward. Need to stress that although the NRP is not a suitable place for general employment it may be possible to allow non-research and development uses if they are related to/ancillary to established uses and the main anchor institutions. Need to ensure that the strong links between NRP and the University, Hospital and existing research institutions are emphasised.</li> </ul>	<p>Wording of the Framework has been amended to stress this point. Detail about scale, size and layout of buildings has been removed from main Masterplan diagrams. Design sections now stresses that principles are for guidance only.</p> <p>A list is now included in the Framework to provide guidance as to the range of uses that may be acceptable:  <b>Acceptable</b> = Research and Development, health uses  <b>Possible</b> = Some assets of manufacturing/service activity where it is clearly related and ancillary/subordinate to the primary use of Research and</p>

Issue	Response	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to emphasis that although Local Plan policy is fixed the Council can have a degree of flexibility at the planning application stage to facilitate development to come forward e.g. recent consents granted at Colney Hall for non research and development uses.</li> </ul>	<p>Development/health uses  <b>Unacceptable</b> = General manufacturing, offices and other uses where there is no or limited linkage to the existing institutions at NRP/Hospital</p> <p>The Framework also now includes a list of ancillary/subordinate uses that may be acceptable</p> <p>Text now included in the Framework to recognise that the nature of the NRP has changed since Local Plan policy was adopted and that the Council may have a degree of flexibility at the planning application stage to accommodate alternative uses.</p>
<p><b>2. General:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The important role of NRP in the Norwich Area economy</li> <li>• Links between the different parts of the NRP</li> </ul>	<p><b>The important role of NRP in the Norwich Area economy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to ensure that the wording of the document brings out the importance of the NRP to the economy of the Norwich Area.</li> <li>• Need to stress that the area is seen as a strategic employment site in the Regional Spatial Strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>The wording of the introduction has been changed to mention the strategic importance of the NRP in the East of England Plan.</p>

Issue	Response	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about the slow rate of growth historically</li> <li>Can development be commercially viable</li> <li>General issues about content of introduction, Vision and Objectives</li> </ul>	<p><b>Links between different parts of the NRP:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to ensure that the document appreciates the strong links between the different organisations that make up the NRP and that this is a unique selling point of the area. Particularly important to ensure that Colney Hall and the UEA are seen as part of the whole and not detached from it. Need to stress that although Colney Hall is part of the NRP it is treated differently in the Framework due to its special circumstances.</li> <li>It is suggested that the idea of a central meeting point/hub should be included in the Framework, one suggested location is the area of allocation closest to the existing development at JIC. This could be key to connectivity. However it must be recognised that it could be difficult to connect through from the UEA/Colney Lane to the allocated land as at the moment the route is constrained by existing development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concern about the slow rate of growth historically/ can the development be commercially viable?:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to make it clear why the Development Framework is being prepared. Emphasis that the area is seen as having strategic importance in the Regional Spatial Strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>Various amendments made throughout the document to stress links between different elements of the NRP. Holistic campus idea now promoted. Core Area now renamed 'Central Campus'</p> <p>The idea of a 'central hub' is now incorporated into the final document with some explanation of what types of facilities a 'hub' might include. A suggested location is shown in the document, but this is for illustrative purposes only and would not preclude a developer suggesting an alternative location.</p> <p>Various minor amendments made throughout the document to reflect the strategic importance of the NRP, the extent of the Local</p>

Issue	Response	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to stress that the land is already allocated in the South Norfolk Local Plan and that the exact area covered by the Framework is not up for discussion.</li> <li>• The Framework should recognise how the nature of uses at the NRP has changed since the SNLP policy was written, particularly the medical aspects at the hospital/Colney Hall.</li> <li>• To give potential developers more certainty about what would be expected it is proposed to include a Section 106 style 'Developers Checklist' within the document to bring together all the different things that would need to be provided or contributing to as part of a development.</li> </ul> <p><b>General issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To simplify the Framework extra information on Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment should be moved into an appendix.</li> <li>• Various amendments to the Vision and Objectives are suggested to refer to sustainable development, carbon neutrality, water and material efficiency.</li> </ul>	<p>Plan allocation, its importance in the Regional Spatial Strategy and the changing nature of uses at the NRP.</p> <p>A 'Developers Checklist' is now included as part of the Framework</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment are now to be included as an appendix, available on request, with only brief detail given in the Framework.</p> <p>Various amendments made to the Vision and Objectives to emphasis need for sustainability</p>

Issue	Response	Action
<p><b>3. Access/Transport issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport infrastructure,</li> <li>• Park &amp; Ride/public transport</li> <li>• Cross Valley link</li> <li>• Extension of pedestrian/cycle links</li> <li>• Car Parking</li> </ul>	<p><b>Transport Infrastructure:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many respondents have concerns about the capacity of the B1108 as the main access road to the NRP. A Transport Assessment (TA) was carried out by Mott Macdonald to consider the impact of new trips arising from future development at the NRP. It looked at various alternative transport strategies and a mixed public transport and car access strategy was chosen. Modelling work undertaken as part of the TA shows that the transport measures put forward are appropriate for the levels of traffic generation and future traffic growth anticipated without resulting in a more congested network. It is not suggested that any amendments be made to the document but it is proposed to include a summary of the TA as part of the Framework (perhaps as an appendix). It is likely that a more detailed TA will be needed at a later stage to support any planning applications.</li> <li>• There is also an issue about the implications of further development at the NRP on the A47/B1108 junction. Discussion is ongoing with the Highways Agency but it is unlikely that any detail will be available for inclusion in the Framework.</li> </ul>	<p>No change proposed to the Framework, but the TA will be available as an appendix, on request.</p> <p>An 'in principle' agreement has been reached between Norfolk County Council and the Highways Agency regarding the A47 junctions at the B1108 and Thickthorn interchange and this has been written into the Framework. The Framework makes it clear that detailed design and final approvals from the Highways Agency</p>

Issue	Response	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was intended to expand the combined Masterplan diagram in the Framework to show all existing development at the NRP and include the main existing and planned transport infrastructure. This plan should be given a full page in the Framework. This will make it easier for people to see how the planned transport infrastructure improvements fit with the overall scheme for development in the area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Park &amp; Ride/public transport:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Park &amp; Ride links seem very important and are currently not mentioned in the draft Framework, respondents seemed particularly keen to utilise the Park &amp; Ride site at Cringleford. Norfolk County Council have been asked to look at how Park and Ride can be used as an opportunity to aid development at the NRP and they suggest that whilst the Cringleford Park &amp; Ride is the favoured site greater capacity exists at the Costessey site. Ideas include running some kind of shuttle bus service to the NRP or individual arrangements to lease car parking spaces. Infrastructure contributions from the development would need to be set aside to fund such schemes.</li> </ul>	<p>will be a matter for individual developers.</p> <p>This is now included in the 'Access and Movement' figure, which puts the NRP allocation into context with its surroundings.</p> <p>The potential of Park &amp; Ride, using existing or new sites, is now included in the Framework.</p>

Issue	Response	Action
	<p><b>Cross Valley Link:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consultation flagged up very different opinions on this issue. It is considered that the final Framework needs to be clearer and more up front about the cross valley link as the draft Framework tended to try and gloss over the issue and people found it difficult to ascertain exactly what was meant.</li> <li>• Generally acceptance of the link depends very much on design and operation. It is suggested that the Framework should recognise the importance of enhancing linkages but reserve judgement over its exact form. The Framework must recognise the environmental sensitivity of the Yare Valley and should make it clear that any link would be for public transport/internal use only. Any further detail would be reserved for the planning application stage.</li> </ul>	<p>The following wording is now included in the Framework:  ‘The importance of enhancing the linkage between the existing elements of the NRP, including the UEA and the NRP west of the River Yare, is considered essential to facilitating the development and viability of the new allocations and their sustainable transport links. This linkage should be consistent with the transport strategy shown in Figure 3 and should respect the environmental and landscape character sensitivities of the river valley. An indicative route option for such a link is shown in Figure 3. Whilst both the specific design and route of the link will be dealt with at the planning application stage, its use should be strictly restricted to public transport, pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

Issue	Response	Action
	<p><b>Pedestrian/Cycle links:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The maps in the Framework need to be clearer and show existing pedestrian/cycle links as well as the missing links that need to be provided by developers</li> <li>• Many respondents wanted to see an extension to the cycle links to be provided as part of the Framework to connect the NRP with surrounding areas such as Little Melton and Hethersett. This matter was referred to Norfolk County Council and although they recognised the desirability of such links a balance needs to be struck between the infrastructure that is desired and that which can reasonably be provided in conjunction with this allocation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Car Parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern has been expressed that current car parking levels provided for in the Framework seem very restrictive, especially with uncertainty about the provision of public transport. Norfolk County Council (NCC) have been looking into this point and suggest that the parking standards proposed in the Framework do compare favourably with targets set in Travel Plans for the Cambridge Business Park. The current approach in the Framework allows for more car parking to be provided early on in the development to be off set by non-car modes as later phases progress. The suggested parking standards also compare favourably with the</li> </ul>	<p>Clarity of maps in the Framework will be improved to show existing pedestrian/cycle links as well as the missing links that need to be provided by developers.</p> <p>Car Parking standards in the Framework have not changed but more flexibility has been written in to explain how you can juggle car parking standards, plot ratios and traffic generation figures to come up with a more flexible development scenario.</p>

Issue	Response	Action
	<p>current relationship between gross floor area and parking spaces at the existing NRP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to note the staff recruitment/retention issues in the Framework and how it is vital to have the right staff. Issue of providing off peak bus services for support staff.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4. Plot Ratios:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many respondents expressed concern over the plot ratio of 24% in the draft Framework, suggesting that it is too low. It is intended to alter the Framework to stress that this is an average figure and it is flexible. Trade offs in plot ratio could be permitted to create denser development in some areas and leaving other areas more open. This would be possible without increasing the total development floorspace.</li> </ul>	<p>The Framework now stresses that the plot ratio of 24% is an average and more flexibility has been written into the Framework to explain how you can juggle car parking standards, plot ratios and traffic generation figures to come up with a more flexible development scenario.</p>
<p><b>5. Phasing of development:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No one supported the current approach to phasing in the draft Framework so it was clear that alternative ideas needed to be investigated. There seems to be general agreement that the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of development should be closest to the existing buildings and working outwards. It is suggested that this approach is adopted in the Development Framework.</li> <li>• If the phasing is changed in the final Framework it must be recognised in the Framework that this has implications for infrastructure provision. A particular issue is the need for a new link road and how this would be funded. This scheme</li> </ul>	<p>The Framework now includes a section on phasing considerations rather than a prescriptive approach to phasing. It is accepted that as some infrastructure improvements, (including the new junction on the B1108 at Colney Hall Drive and the Link Road to Hethersett Lane) can be put in place in advance of any building on the allocation, a developer</p>

Issue	Response	Action
	<p>has been included as a bid in the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) Growth Point Delivery Programme and this should be mentioned in the final Framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to make it clear in the Framework that the area of land covered by policy COL2 is actually a contingency reserve and is not part of the main NRP allocation. This area of land should not automatically be developed and should only be brought forward if needed within the context of the policy</li> </ul>	<p>could potentially build on any part of the allocation and a prescriptive approach to phasing is no longer necessary.</p>
<p><b>6. Land use at the NRP:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater demand for medical uses</li> <li>• Confusion over the definition of ancillary uses</li> </ul>	<p><b>Greater demand for medical uses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents to the consultation have suggested that the focus of the NRP has shifted since the SNLP policies were written and now includes a much greater emphasis on medical uses. This needs further consideration but a certain area of land at the NRP is already allocated for hospital and hospital related uses i.e. medical uses, so a precedent exists. The Framework could build upon this and note a certain flexibility in potentially allowing a proportion of the overall allocation to be used for medical uses without specifying a definite location. It is important that medical uses are recognised at NRP given the focus that has been brought on Colney since the construction of the NNUH. Developers can always seek to suggest there are 'material considerations' in justifying such an approach.</li> </ul>	<p>A list is now included in the Framework to provide guidance as to the range of uses that may be acceptable on the NRP and health uses are listed as 'acceptable'. This builds in an element of flexibility regarding the location of such uses.</p>

Issue	Response	Action
	<p><b>Confusion over the definition of ancillary uses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some respondents to the consultation seemed to be confused about the definition of ancillary uses so it is intended to make this clearer in the final Framework. The focus should be on small-scale facilities that could be used by workers from NRP e.g. small retail outlets, dry cleaners etc. It should not be a back door way of diluting the B1(b) land use.</li> </ul>	<p>A definition of ancillary uses has been included in the Framework.</p>