

# Taverham Neighbourhood Plan

## RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF January/February 2019 consultation on draft policy ideas

<b>SUMMARY OF THE EVENT – Consultation 3: draft policy ideas</b>	
<b>Purpose</b>	To identify key issues and themes in the parish
<b>Date and location</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Morning, 24<sup>th</sup> January at Taverham High School 6<sup>th</sup> Formers</li> <li>• 12noon-5pm on Saturday, 26<sup>th</sup> January at Taverham Village Hall</li> <li>• 3pm-8pm on Friday, 1<sup>st</sup> February at Hinks Meadow</li> <li>• Online, open for a month</li> </ul>
<b>Consultees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 129 people in total</li> <li>• The 20 – 40 age group were notable by their absence</li> </ul>
<b>Publicity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flyers</li> <li>• Posters</li> <li>• Facebook</li> <li>• Article in Taverham Newsletter, including front page</li> </ul>
<b>Preparation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steering Group briefing paper and meeting.</li> <li>• Consultation materials.</li> </ul>

### Who attended/responded?

<b>Gender</b>	Taverham High School	Saturday	Friday	Online	Total
Female	6	31	21	12	70
Male	2	29	17	11	59
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>129</b>

<b>Age</b>	Taverham High School	Saturday	Friday	Online	Total
0-10 years old	0	0	0	0	0
11-20 years old	8	1	5	0	14
21-30 years old	0	0	1	0	1
31-40 years old	0	0	0	1	1
41-50 years old	0	5	3	10	18
51-60 years old	0	8	7	5	20
61-70 years old	0	23	14	4	41
71-80 years old	0	26	4	2	32
81+ years old	0	6	2	1	9

How would you describe yourself?	Taverham High School	Saturday	Friday	Online	Total
Taverham parish resident	6	69	27	22	124
Taverham parish business owner	0	1	1	0	2
Work in Taverham	0	2	0	1	3
Visitor to the area	0	1	3	0	4
None of the above, just interested	2	0	3	0	5

How did you hear about today?	Saturday	Friday	Total
Facebook	3	6	9
Village website	4	1	5
Parish Council	5	1	6
Flyer	11	3	14
Poster	4	2	6
Taverham Newsletter	38	18	56
Word of mouth	9	13	22
Email	0	0	0

---

## Comments on the Vision

- Taverham should remain a village and should not be joined up by development to the surrounding areas
- Footpaths and cycle paths needed where no pathways
- Agree with the draft vision, need to stress the importance of the village remaining district and not a satellite of a greater Norwich – a dormitory
- Those here in 2040 will not have had the joy we oldies have had in the last 20 years, by what I see the plans are all about
- Please please no more houses, UNLESS the proper infrastructure is put in, i.e. GPs, schools etc.
- A well balanced plan that combines woodland, foot/cycle paths and housing would keep the attractive character of Taverham
- This is what I would like to think will be the case.
- The one most significant point in any long-term development is to ensure that along with the expansion of the area, an ADEQUATE COMMUNICATION strategy i.e. a suitable road network is provided along with all the proposed developments. The A1067 is an artery road to and from the city and will need improvements. Even now, with roadworks, accidents and

other hold-up issues, a buildup of road traffic is instant as a result of these problems. Also, I watch with interest how the NDR will be linked to the A47 - another problem affecting the A1067 at present.

- We need to accept that additional housing has to be built near to other housing, to allow young people to be able to live in their community (more houses will (potentially) reduce the growth in house prices, making them more affordable.) Equally housing for older residents (single level - i.e. bungalows or small scale flat developments are required to allow older residents to downsize and live in their own homes for as long as possible.
- Good words, but no details can't comment
- Great
- I agree with all the above... at the moment. But I hope it will remain as such in 2040
- Sounds good
- Load of rubbish. Doctors can't cope now yet alone with extra houses. Traffics is terrible, with terrible dangerous speeding. Crime is on the rise!
- Sounds good, just don't want too many homes being built to spoil the countryside we have left.
- Only if it's looked after now and not allowed to become too big. Schools need more investment.
- I would like to think that the above statement is correct but I don't think it will be
- Yes agreed but services need to be improved.
- Agree

---

### **Generally where do you think housing should go and not go?**

- No house in GNLP337 please
- No house in GNLP please or any other building
- GNLP0337, no link roads from Broom Close or Breck Farm Lane
- Knock the schools down and build them there
- No more housing is needed, we should preserve the housing for farming and wildlife
- Not GNLP0337 because of the estimated increase in Taverham population. Existing population of 12,000 additional in GNLP0337 4000, an increase of 33%
- Housing should go in GNLP0337, but needs to include other amenities
- Stop garden developments that are increasing density and changing the nature of the village – soon will be too over built, gardens are the local character
- Prime importance is that Taverham retains its own identity as a village, not to become part of Norwich
- Perhaps housing could be nearer to the NDR for accessibility. This would may be less disruptive
- While brown field development is popular with central government it can remove local employment opportunities. Needs a case by case approach
- None. Area is closing in, try elsewhere!! (1 dot added)
- Complete the NDR by-pass link before more housing development. Current road network unable to cope at present (2 dots added)
- The Wensum Valley should be protected. Not much scope for further development without spoiling the village
- Protect the Wensum River. Please don't build houses near it (1 dot added)
- Avoid development to the south of Taverham. Too close to Wensum Valley and Taverham Road is not wide enough to take more cars
- All new estates must have green open space. Houses must have garages. Weston Valley, no houses
- Housing should be a close to existing housing and possible

- Near to NDR (1270) to decrease traffic within Taverham. Maintain the Wensum Valley as green space
- No! No! No!
- No more development until NDR complete and then only north of 1067
- Don't build around the new NRD Horsford roundabout. Taverham, Drayton, Hellsesdon and Horsford will end up merging into one.
- Most of these sites do not take local roads into account. Are you suggesting a new estate feeds directly onto the NDR (mind you, would be notice yet another roundabout)
- New housing estates need roads wide enough for 2-way-traffic – not path part of the road as some already area. Adequate parking
- If you build on agricultural land – what are we going to eat? Housing needs to be in sensible locations within roads and other infrastructure in FIRST
- Housing needs to remain close to current housing. Agricultural land, woodland etc. needs to be kept intact
- So glad I knew the area before all the destruction so it is gradually and systematically destroyed. What ever will be all may say
- Would the area near the A1270 be easier to access for new houses?
- No more housing I the area. We need to preserve our open spaces for recreation and farming
- Avoiding the south western area, as there are not many buildings here anyway
- More affordable (1 or 1 bed) housing instead of large expensive
- Agricultural land should not become hosing especially near the Wensum Valley/river
- On Fir Covert Road
- Need to complete NDR western link up before increasing number of houses. The infrastructure is failing as it is; too many cars using NDR/Fir Covert Road/Ringland route
- Not on South side of 1067. It has expanded enough in the past 50 years and has some great views without obstruction
- Not go; (a) around Wensum Valley, (b) as infill to any public green areas which already exist. Preferably go on development areas included in the existing call for sites in well planned development complementing existing Taverham
- The questions are biased in favour of the development having been agreed. Save our green spaces
- Why not?
- It should not go in the Wensum Valley, which is a very valuable landscape feature and wildlife corridor. It should go in the area north of Fakenham Road and south of the Northern Distributor Road.
- Close to main road links NDR
- Please see my remarks regarding an ADEQUATE COMMUNICATIONS strategy to support any expansion of housing . I live on the Thorpe Marriott development and it is the case that many houses have 3, 4, or even 5 vehicles to accommodate, hence our valued grass verges are used as 'supplementary' parking for such properties. With many homes, I suspect the garage(s) are used for storage!
- Between the new NDR and Thorpe Marriot (accessed from NDR roundabouts), but with Green space retained in the developments. Beech Avenue (site next to Hockey club), but with suitable road enhancements.
- Not in the Wensum Valley, the infrastructure won't support it. Round the NDR makes sense, so long as community facilities and proper road infrastructure is provided
- Beech road and fakenham road
- Not in Taverham
- As much as possible within the confines of Taverham so as not to spoil the surrounding countryside, which is so vital for the physical and mental health of the community. Present woods and individual trees should remain.

- I don't mind where as long as it is well planned and appropriate for younger people and that the infrastructure is there to support it.
- There are several sites in and around Taverham and all should get the go ahead
- In more built up areas where there's derelict space. Not on the green belt
- Should go on brown field sites where business buildings were but might be no longer viable. Use old housing sites where the property needs to be totally rebuilt. Don't use fields that have a history of flooding. Some areas are clogged up with traffic, local schools are full to bursting point. We're constantly losing our farming land to housing, we need to produce crops to eat. I love the fact we're surrounded by countryside and not buildings everywhere.
- Next to NDR
- We need housing, and nobody wants it in their own neighbourhood, but it has to be built somewhere. It won't be all the sites immediately, but over a number of years.
- Leave our existing green spaces alone.
- New houses should be close to the NDR not on roads which are really busy already such as Beech Ave & Ringland Road
- Not to be placed near the river because of the wildlife.
- The map seems reasonable, with the majority of housing adjacent to the NDR
- It depends on the individual circumstances. Large developments should take into account spaces at schools, doctors etc

## Housing & the Built Environment

	Agree	Disagree	Comments
<b>Draft objective 1: To provide high quality, diverse, affordable and innovative housing within Taverham.</b>	<b>16</b>  <b>16 online</b>	<b>5</b>  <b>4 online</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The objectives already assume the development is going ahead</li> <li>• Some of the planning / development gain must go into providing affordable (for rent) housing that is for local residents, but which cannot be 'bought' at a discount (i.e. it needs to be recyclable - for the next generation of residents that can't afford to buy). Developments must be made to provide single storey houses for older people to retire too ('must' stated because bungalows take up more space...and reduce (potentially) developers profit margins</li> <li>• So long as it is provided with adequate infrastructure and facilities</li> <li>• Taverham amenities cannot cope</li> <li>• Starter homes should be built for the younger generation</li> <li>• As long as it is supported by infrastructure and services.</li> <li>• But keeping green spaces surrounding taverham</li> <li>• Not enough services to accommodate this.</li> </ul>

<b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> Encourage a wide range of housing to enable a mixed community, including:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retirement living housing (e.g. supported housing, bungalows, retirement complexes, sheltered housing, warden controlled)</li> </ul>	<b>78</b> <b>3 online</b>	<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient care homes already exist in Taverham. More help for the elderly in their own homes to keep them more independent for longer</li> <li>More bungalow needed</li> <li>Affordable care needed</li> <li>Increasing housing aimed at older people would free up family sized homes locally</li> <li>We have sufficient care homes, but not older type residential provision</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Family housing 3-4 beds, including affordable housing</li> </ul>	<b>26</b> <b>2 online</b>	<b>9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Larger garages to enable cars to parked in them</li> <li>Areas keep wheelie bins with easy access</li> <li>Build homes that people can afford (1 dot added)</li> <li>Enough parking per property/per development to keep verges clear (1 dot added)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Starter homes/first time buyers</li> </ul>	<b>34</b> <b>3 online</b>	<b>6</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adaptable, 'life time' homes</li> </ul>	<b>9</b> <b>3 online</b>	<b>4</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing (see definition sheet) – 'pepper potted' around the site, not in clusters</li> </ul>	<b>28</b> <b>2 online</b>	<b>5</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-build</li> </ul>	<b>17</b> <b>1 online</b>	<b>8</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eco Housing</li> </ul>	<b>28</b> <b>5 online</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>Any others?</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Care homes, i.e. Oak Farm</li> <li>The software is not allowing me to tick more than one 'policy idea'. I support 'Retirement living housing', 'family housing', 'starter homes' and 'affordable housing'</li> <li>None of the above</li> <li>None</li> <li>All of the above</li> <li>All of the above</li> </ul>

<b>Draft objective 2: To enable appropriate location, density, design and layout of</b>	<b>6</b> <b>16 online</b>	<b>0</b> <b>3 online</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schools, doctor and dental surgeries, shops, roads that are designed to minimise conjection, affordable and</li> </ul>
---	------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

<p><b>development, which reflects existing development and provides for a safe and integrated environment.</b></p>			<p>reliable public transport, leisure facilities, green spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doctors schools</li> <li>• Doctors, road speeding/ calming measures.</li> <li>• Shops, Doctors and dentists, community centre</li> </ul>
<p><b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> Focus development away from the sensitive Wensum Valley River corridor (because of impacts on landscape, wildlife and floodplain)</p>	<p><b>57</b> <b>4 online</b></p>	<p><b>2</b></p>	
<p>Focus development where there is easy road access, good connections, public transport, close to existing development e.g. close to the NDR</p>	<p><b>63</b> <b>6 online</b></p>	<p><b>2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NDR already built with access for housing – it's a foregone conclusion</li> </ul>
<p>Any new development to create its own physical centre/heart/focal point. Depending on size of the development this could be a central green space or community building(s), e.g. similar to Thorpe Marriott Green</p>	<p><b>51</b> <b>6 online</b></p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Church</li> <li>• We need amenities for all this prospective housing, doctors surgery schools, nursery. Not just a large supermarket</li> </ul>
<p><b>What facilities are needed in new developments?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GP surgery</li> <li>• More schools</li> <li>• Traffic system cope with extra cars with extra building</li> <li>• GP surgeries</li> <li>• Good off road parking</li> <li>• Adequate on site or drive way parking to accommodate size of house/bungalow</li> <li>• Good youth club facilities</li> <li>• Adequate public green spaces</li> <li>• Enough off road parking. Shops, school</li> <li>• Only have more development once doctors surgery, shops/facilities are built. Facilities first then houses</li> <li>• Doctors surgery and schools (1 dot added)</li> <li>• Don't forget about schools, doctors etc.</li> <li>• Doctors surgery needed</li> <li>• We need appropriate infrastructure – GPs, shops, schools etc.</li> <li>• Affordable housing should be genuinely affordable, based on the average family income in the area, not on 20% below market rates. Work with community land trusts if any exist in Norfolk</li> <li>• Schools, GP surgeries, green spaces</li> <li>• Schools, doctors surgery, open spaces (large) and trees</li> <li>• A medical centre</li> <li>• Schools</li> <li>• Traffic ease required in Drayton</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools, doctors</li> <li>• Supporting additional infrastructure essential, e.g. schools, doctors surgery. Preserve open spaces</li> <li>• Houses should have reasonable front gardens plus off road parking</li> <li>• More green spaces, better library</li> <li>• GP surgery, schools, central shops to area</li> <li>• More doctors, dentists, schools needed</li> <li>• Shops and work opportunities</li> <li>• Need wide roads with grass verges for main road</li> <li>• Additional surgery facilities required to cope with increased population</li> <li>• GP surgery of the kind built at Roundwell</li> <li>• Better public transport and cycling facilities. Not sure it is good to encourage more car ownership</li> <li>• Off road parking for residents – stop cars parking/blocking pavements</li> <li>• Robust public transport system; additional NHS doctors/dentists; variety of local shops; roads fit to carry all the additional traffic</li> <li>• Decent, reliable public transport. Doctors surgery, community facilities, independent shops</li> <li>• Appropriate speed limits and properly policed</li> <li>• Thorpe Marriott was built with pub, church and a row of shops, no school, no doctors. Will it be the same again?</li> </ul>
--	---

<p><b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b></p> <p>Design should consider layout, orientation, materials, styles, density, heights of buildings, including:</p>	<p><b>20</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to push for eco-friendly low energy housing design</li> <li>• Need to develop a Taverham ‘local vernacular’ which covers all aspects of housing design to prevent Taverham being filled with bland national building styles</li> <li>• Reference two options above concerning the motor vehicle, we must not forget the impact that can only increase that the motor vehicle will make on any developments in the future.</li> <li>• Each house to have off road parking for 2 cars minimum. Good lighting and ensure all areas safe</li> <li>• Why are these questions being asked, surely these should be standard in the design.</li> <li>• Parking for at least 2 cars per property.</li> </ul>
<p>Avoid dwellings of 3 storeys or more, especially next to existing lower rise development</p>	<p><b>63</b></p> <p><b>10 online</b></p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	
<p>Preference for parking in front of properties rather than the rear</p>	<p><b>25</b></p> <p><b>3 online</b></p>	<p><b>14</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As long as there is off road parking it doesn’t matter (2 dots added)</li> <li>• Also extra parking for visitors</li> </ul>



Parking for visitors	<b>37</b> <b>1 online</b>	<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking ban for cars close to school</li> <li>• Roads need to be wide enough for people to park on when visiting, and for vehicles to be able to pass</li> </ul>
Storage for waste and recycling	<b>36</b> <b>1 online</b>	<b>0</b>	
Community safety built into the design developments	<b>37</b> <b>2 online</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>What other design aspects are important for new development in Taverham?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 bed houses need 3 car parking spaces (not one). 4 beds have 4 parking spaces, not a single tiny garage as a parking space</li> <li>• Better cycle ways that do not zig zag everywhere</li> <li>• Adequate parking needs to be provided at least 2 parking spaces per dwelling</li> <li>• Houses need to fit in with current housing styles</li> <li>• New houses must have character and proper design to match the current houses not generic 'matchboxes'</li> <li>• Don't lose green spaces that are accessed by all</li> <li>• Don't change the beauty of Taverham Road by building on gardens</li> <li>• Variety of design important</li> <li>• Green areas, cycle paths, doctors surgeries, schools</li> <li>• Taverham Road is already dangerous with a lot of traffic and high speeds. Adding new housing that access this road will be untenable</li> </ul>		

**As part of the Neighbourhood Plan we have the opportunity to identify 'non-designated heritage assets' – that are important locally. The following have been suggested. Please add more...**

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>St Edmunds Church, graveyard and Glebe</b>	<b>55</b> <b>8 online</b>	<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St Edmunds needs its own church hall, church is often overflowing</li> </ul>
<b>Old School House and house alongside</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Old Rectory</b>	<b>32</b> <b>2 online</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Renovated barns</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	

<b>Taverham sign opposite the church</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Taverham sign at the top of Sandy Lane</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Marriott's Way sign (Pendlesham Rise)</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Cottage opposite Church, end of Sandy Lane (was the Blacksmiths)</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Mill houses on both sides of The Street</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Any others?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to maintain heritage of Taverham, creates variety and character</li> <li>• Leave Taverham Road and adjacent areas alone</li> <li>• Current mix of old and new is good – overdevelopment will dilute this and remove the character of this lovely place</li> <li>• Does Mill Houses include the nature reserve, if not please add to the list</li> </ul>		

## Transport & Access

	Agree	Disagree	Comments
Draft objective 3: To provide the infrastructure to encourage safe walking, cycling and the use of public transport within and beyond Taverham Parish	<b>33</b> <b>20 online</b>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Made suitable for mobile scooters and wheelchairs</li> <li>• Priority signage required at the pinch points on Taverham Road (should be in place now)</li> <li>• Round about required at the end of Beech Avenues. Access to the Fakenham Road is impossible</li> <li>• To encourage cycling and walking it is important to have continuous traffic-free routes (not just cycling lanes on busy roads).</li> <li>• But not at the expense of improving vehicle driving</li> </ul>

<p><b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> Where new development takes place there will be new footpaths and cycle routes, connecting to existing routes and the NDR, with improved signage</p>	<p><b>58</b> <b>20 online</b></p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only if personal safety of those that are using it is incorporated</li> <li>• 20 mph limit on Taverham Road</li> <li>• Do not completely disagree, however, Marriott's Way often routes to many places including the city centre.</li> <li>• Problem with NDR already incredibly dangerous. Any possible routes adding to that would need to ensure minimized confusion</li> <li>• The current roads in many parts of Taverham are at capacity. No large scale development. Needs to address this to be accommodated.</li> <li>• Access to Garden Centre etc. from behind Broom Close via foot/cycle paths would be welcome</li> </ul>
<p><b>Draft objective 4: To provide adequate private and public parking</b></p>	<p><b>20 online</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My comments already made emphasise the need to take serious account of the impact of the motor vehicle which at present dominates our daily lives.</li> </ul>
<p><b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> Parking requirements for new developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Off street parking</li> <li>• Adequate parking for the size of the dwelling</li> <li>• Visitor parking</li> <li>• Garages to be of size to accommodate an actual car</li> </ul>	<p><b>60</b> <b>18 online</b></p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pendlesham Rise needs a lengthy layby. Car parking at present is a real hazard</li> <li>• 30 mph on Fir Covert Road (S)</li> <li>• Flashing lights on Sandy Lane 'SLOW'</li> <li>• Moved here from a place where parking was a real problem, mostly there seems to be plenty here</li> <li>• Emphasis on off street parking. Improves safety of pedestrians and drivers</li> <li>• I agree about off street parking and garage sizes.</li> <li>• We must ensure that garages are used for the motor car NOT JUST FOR STORAGE!</li> <li>• All the above are necessary. Most homes have at least two cars</li> <li>• All of the above</li> <li>• No off street parking!</li> </ul>

<p>Anything else?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More bus routes especially linking Taverham with the hospital, to avoid lengthy diversions through the city centre and discourage car use. It would help if there was a public transport link at the Park and Ride at Longwater</li> <li>• Stop parking on green verges, provide laybys (1 dot added)</li> <li>• All minor roads should be 20mph to discourage short cuts, i.e. Roedich Drive, St Edmunds Road/Rise</li> <li>• Charging points for electric cars</li> <li>• Dangerous parking and dropping off around school times isn't good. Potentially schemes could help or reduce presence of PCSOs</li> <li>• Roadside parking is becoming a real problem!</li> <li>• Stop parking areas near bus stops being used as park and ride or the city</li> <li>• Discourage parking on paths and verges</li> <li>• Good size garaged so that you can get out of the car when in garage</li> <li>• Excessive levels of traffic pass Taverham High School as drivers attempt to leave NDR and connect with A47 via Ringland. Hazard to all who live and move around this location – Beech Avenue</li> <li>• Don't squeeze too many in a small space with little or not parking. Most families have 2+ cars now. If not, it will create future problems</li> </ul>
-----------------------	---

## Environment & Landscape

	Agree	Disagree	Comments
<p><b>Draft objective 5: To protect and enable access to green areas within Taverham and the surrounding countryside and woodland</b></p>	<p><b>19</b> <b>19 online</b></p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Wensum Valley is an extremely valuable landscape feature and wildlife corridor. It is very disappointing that access to this area is so limited. It's clear from the popularity of Marriott's Way and the paths in Ghost Hill Wood that residents would appreciate and use additional footpaths/ cycleways if they existed. A footpath and/or cycleway beside the river between Drayton and Ringland would be a huge asset.</li> <li>• It is vital that residents still have access to green areas</li> </ul>
<p><b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> Greater access to the countryside via the Marriott's Way for recreation</p>	<p><b>49</b> <b>19 online</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, but we also need access to the Wensum Valley.</li> <li>• Marriott's way is way too narrow even at present for cyclists, dog walkers, pedestrians</li> <li>• All</li> </ul>
<p><b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> Protect the following views:</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Views of Wensum Valley generally</li> </ul>	<p><b>52</b> <b>13 online</b></p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	

• Views of the Golf Links and valley beyond	36	5	
• View of Thorpe Marriott Green	34 4 online	0	
• Views of the church	39	1	
<b>Any other important views?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further housing (1 dot)</li> <li>• No houses in the Wensum Valley (1 dot)</li> <li>• Taverham Road/Macks Lane (9 dots added)</li> <li>• Green areas provided on Marriott's Park (1 dot added)</li> </ul>		

<b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> Protect 'Local Green Spaces' from development	26	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect them all – we will all have our personal favourite in our local areas</li> <li>• Green areas necessary without Marriott's Park when development take place</li> <li>• Also do more to support wildlife like bat boxes, owl boxes etc.</li> <li>• There must be green spaces left when the development of Thorpe Marriott take place. Cannot be all houses</li> </ul>
<b>1. Tree belt forming part of the proposed Broadland District Council Greenway project – public</b>	39 1 online	0	
<b>2. Marriott's Way – public</b>	47	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect any existing and incorporate new green areas</li> </ul>
<b>3. Thorpe Marriott Green – wooded areas, open space and recreation areas – public</b>	40 1 online	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much land either side of Marriott's Way is preserved/protected?</li> </ul>
<b>4. Windsor Chase – wooded area and open space – public</b>	28	0	
<b>5. Gardyn Croft – wooded area – public</b>	28	0	
<b>6. Tree belt forming part of the Greenway project – public</b>	26	0	

<b>7. Tree belt forming part of the Greenway project – public</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>8. Tree belt – pine trees – private</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect tree belt, no housing in field (beyond area 8)</li> <li>• Desecration of belt of trees was destroyed – despite protected – where were you then?</li> </ul>
<b>9. Hinks Meadow – open space and recreation areas – public</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proper landscaping with native tree, not the ugly scrub they usually put in along roadsides (1 dot added)</li> </ul>
<b>10. Foxwood, Walsingham Plantation, Heathwood – woodland and open space – - county wildlife sites – private</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>11. Fakenham Road – wooded area – private</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>12. Fakenham Road tree belt – public</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>13. Beech Avenue wooded areas and tree belt – public</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>14. Firethorn Close – wooded area – public</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>15. Taverham High School – playing fields and tree belts – academy</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>16. Beech Avenue playing field – recreational space – public</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	

17. Wensum Valley Golf Club – open spaces, woodland and tree belts – private	28 1 online	4	
18. Roundwood - woodland – private	33	2	
19. Beech Avenue / Ringland Road – triangle of land known as Seven Sisters – NCC highway	33	0	
20. Ringland Road – wooded area – private	46	2	
21. Taverham Hall – ancient woodland and historic parkland – private	44	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No more houses etc. at Taverham Hall (1 dot added)</li> <li>• Leave all trees. Taverham will be barren without them</li> </ul>
22. Ringland Wood – woodland – private	28	2	
23. Three Corner Plantation, Blyth's Wood and other woodland – ancient woodland, pools and county wildlife sites - private	24	2	
24. Taverham Mill – woodland and nature reserve – Anglian Water / private	42	2	
25. Sandy Lane – open space with village sign – NCC highway	30	0	
26. Sandy Lane playing field – recreation spaces and tree belt – public	35 1 online	0	

<b>27. Sandy Lane Scout Hut – wooded areas and open space – private</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>28. Nightingale Drive – wooded area / tree belt – private</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>29. Nightingale Infant School – playing field and tree belt – academy</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>30. Scotch Hill – woodland – public</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>31. Scotch Hill – woodland – private</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>32. Scotch Hill Road – woodland – private</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>33. Sandy Lane – open space with village sign – NCC highway</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>34. Sandy Lane– Springfield Plantation – public</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>35. St Edmund’s Church Glebe – open space -</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>36. Taverham VC CE Junior School – playing fields and tree belts – LA</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on this field would destroy view of Wensum Valley .</li> <li>• School needs space for children</li> </ul>



37. Taverham Road – Victoria Plantation – private	34 2 online	0	
38. Ghost Hill Infant School – playing field and tree belt – academy	32	0	
39. Eastfield / Ghost Hill Wood – open space and woodland – public	34 1 online	0	
40. Eastfield / Trimming Walk – open space, recreation area – public	30	0	
41. Cameron Green / Orchard Way – Poll Tax Plantation – public / private	33	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More parking</li> </ul>
42. Sylvan Way – woodland – public / Woodland Trust	37	0	
43. Costessey Lane – wooded area, open space – private	26	0	
44. Transport Plantation and other woodland and spinneys – private	24	0	
Any green areas missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep Taverham Green!!! (1 dot added)</li> <li>• Marriott’s Park – preserve as green area (2 dots added)</li> <li>• Maintain all existing green areas (2 dots added)</li> <li>• Must have green open spaces with new development. Broadland policy</li> <li>• Need to keep same areas green, not every bit of land with houses and tarmac</li> <li>• Keep green spaces in Marriott Park (2 dots added)</li> <li>• Stickers for no development – protect Green Spaces around Taverham</li> </ul>		

Agree

Disagree

Comments

<b>Draft objective 6: To maintain a green gap between Taverham and adjacent settlements</b>	<b>20</b> <b>20 online</b>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you want one large village or separate individual communities</li> <li>• Where this is still possible! Taverham and Drayton are already a continuous built up area.</li> <li>• Protect green spaces</li> </ul>
<b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> Protect the landscape setting of the parish	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Wensum Valley is especially important.</li> <li>• All</li> <li>• Both the above</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect the undeveloped areas between Taverham and other settlements, Drayton/Norwich fringe</li> </ul>	<b>61</b> <b>8 online</b>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No more development near the Wensum River, bad for wildlife</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect the River Wensum corridor for landscape and habitat value, and flood risk</li> </ul>	<b>62</b> <b>10 online</b>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No houses in Wensum Valley</li> <li>• You have already filled it up on plans, so plans to do so are already in place</li> </ul>
<b>Any other areas need protecting?</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gardens on Taverham Road</li> </ul>

<b>Draft objective 7: To improve and provide high quality public spaces in the village</b>	<b>8</b> <b>20 online</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new developments must have green open space – Broadland Policy</li> </ul>
<b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA:</b> New green areas for new developments for e.g. recreational, amenity, play areas etc.	<b>41</b> <b>7 online</b>	<b>0</b> <b>1 online</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good idea</li> <li>• Will there be any green spaces left?</li> <li>• Existing areas of woodland and meadow with open access (e.g. Ghost Hill Wood, Eastfield) are very heavily used. This is evidence of their value to the community, but because they are so heavily used, it is difficult to conserve them. We desperately need more open spaces and more paths in areas of attractive landscape - especially the Wensum Valley.</li> <li>• Parkland with walking space</li> <li>• Everything</li> <li>• Parks, better lit parks and play areas</li> </ul>
<b>What new green spaces are needed in Taverham?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any new development must include decent appropriate sized green spaces (1 dot added)</li> <li>• Preserve any and as many as you possibly can</li> <li>• Simply ensure new development provides adequately to break up the housing, i.e. not a huge area of houses with no green public areas</li> <li>• Green areas needed on potential building on Marriott's Park</li> </ul>		
<b>What areas could be enhanced?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorpe Marriott – good open spaces and wide roads – keep it that way (1 dot added)</li> <li>• Improve access to reservoir (3 dots added)</li> <li>• Re-open access to lakes</li> <li>• More access to Marriott's Way from Breck farm lane</li> </ul>		

## Business and Employment

	Agree	Disagree	Comments
<b>Draft objective 8: To provide sufficient land, buildings and infrastructure to support local economic development</b>	7 14 online	0 3 online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic gets bad in rush hours at present, more adequate infrastructure required if further housing is to be built</li> <li>The infrastructure needs to be strengthened so that it isn't overwhelmed</li> </ul>
<b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> Protection of existing areas that are currently in business use. Prevent them from becoming housing e.g. Beech Avenue; Fir Covert Road; Taverham Garden Centre, Longs on Fakenham Road	52 15 online	1 4 online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without viable local employment Taverham will become a dormitory suburb of Norwich</li> </ul>
<b>Draft objective 9: To enable an attractive and viable village</b>	8 19 online	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have most things but not a good local pub/restaurant (silver fox is not appealing!)</li> <li>We have most things but not a good local pub/restaurant (silver fox is not appealing!)</li> </ul>
<b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> New businesses to be directed to existing employment sites	39 12 online	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With plenty of parking spaces</li> </ul>
New retail at Taverham Garden Centre site	28 6 online	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retail – no more shops such as the ones behind the garden centre. Less popular and more run down. But still keep the existing shops, don't add more</li> <li>Fast food. Aldi my make Taverham more popular</li> <li>I do not agree that we need more retail at Taverham Garden Centre. Retailing is generally in decline.</li> </ul>
<b>Any other ideas?</b>			

## Community & Services

	Agree	Disagree	Comments
<b>Draft objective 10: To provide opportunities for all residents to access community, cultural, leisure and sports activities within Taverham</b>	15 17 online	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doctors surgery and school</li> <li>Not sure we need any more buildings, but outside space is needed</li> <li>If needed, along Fir Covert Road and behind Taverham Garden Centre</li> <li>On the bigger new build sites</li> <li>Village Hall could be improved with a permanent stage and backstage facilities although that would probably mean relocating the library</li> </ul>

<p><b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> New meeting spaces and facilities as a result of development, which complement the existing provision within Taverham, not in competition with existing facilities</p>	<p><b>31</b></p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internet café for example. A more casual hub for study as Taverham has a variety of age ranges at school</li> <li>• Library seems so small – live up to it’s full potential</li> <li>• Library would benefit from a larger range of books aimed at young adults</li> <li>• Encouraging small local businesses that are unique to Taverham</li> <li>• Larger library or another one to serve new development</li> <li>• Regarding the above comments, we are lucky to have a library at all – go to the Forum</li> <li>• A good pub</li> <li>• Internet café</li> </ul>
<p><b>What meeting space facilities are needed in Taverham?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An internet café for young people</li> <li>• A decent pub required for the village</li> <li>• Farmers Market, Doctors, Schools</li> <li>• Community centre, retail, leisure facilities, doctors surgery</li> <li>• Doctors needed before development</li> <li>• Fir Covert Road</li> <li>• Doctors surgery, schools before any more houses. Facilities first then houses</li> <li>• Doctors, schools before another brick is laid</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Where should new facilities go?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A large community hall, may be like the one on long water land, Costessey. Fir Cover Road</li> </ul>		
<p><b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> New recreation ground and sports facilities as a result of development</p>	<p><b>31</b> <b>16 online</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leisure pool</li> <li>• Swimming pool, low cost gymnasium</li> <li>• Beech Avenue where there is room</li> <li>• On new build sites</li> </ul>
<p><b>What recreation ground and sports facilities are needed in Taverham?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swimming pool, fitness park, sports park (tennis cricket) (2 dots added)</li> <li>• Swimming pool</li> <li>• Outdoor public bowls facility, green/cub hut</li> <li>• Badminton Courts</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Where should new facilities go?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planned in any new development</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Draft objective 11: To ensure there are sufficient medical facilities within Taverham to meet community requirements</b></p>	<p><b>33</b> <b>19 online</b></p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage new GPs to join the surgery</li> <li>• Keep trying</li> <li>• With the new NHS intention to push more services out to GPs/community medicine, a Taverham version of the Roundwell Surgery should be a priority</li> <li>• This is very important as Taverham continues to grow and as its population ages.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Taverham doctors is not big enough for the area</li> </ul>
<b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> Support for new or expanded Primary Health Care provision	<b>64</b>  <b>19 online</b>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With the amount of housing and aging population, health care provisions seem limited</li> <li>A local area walk in centre is required</li> <li>Doctors surgeries</li> <li>Large medical centre, as at Longwater Lane, Costessey</li> <li>New surgeries in place before new houses are built</li> <li>Local treatment centre to relieve pressure on NNUH</li> </ul>
<b>What is needed?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We need a polyclinic with specialist doctors coming into our community</li> <li>Doctors priority</li> <li>Additional doctors surgery at Thorpe Marriott (1 dot added)</li> <li>A new state of the art medical centre, like at the top of Longwater Lane, Costessey</li> <li>Doctors MUST BE FIRST</li> <li>Medical centre needs to be on a bus route or have a bus stop. Sandy Lane cannot be reached from Thorpe Marriott by bus</li> <li>Doctor's facilities first, with welfare clinic for mums/babies, elderly complaints not needing a doctor</li> <li>Priority – more doctors, another surgery</li> </ul>		
<b>DRAFT POLICY IDEA</b> Support for expansion of existing schools and new school provision	<b>51</b>  <b>17 online</b>	<b>2</b>  <b>2 online</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specialised building on school sites, for example a separate out building for 6<sup>th</sup> formers</li> <li>BUT provide onsite drop off/pick up points, i.e. off existing roads</li> <li>Important to have infant school and early years provision in a new housing complex with young children, so able to walk there</li> <li>School parking should only be available 15 minutes either side of school start/end times</li> <li>If you're building more house then schools must be expanded (preferably at the developers expense)</li> <li>High school is big enough at present and no more students should be introduced as queues are long enough at present for toilet, lunch, etc.</li> <li>Like what?</li> </ul>

### What should money be spent on locally?

- Developers should not be allowed to waive CIL payments as is happening in some areas
- Developers must not use 'reduced profits' as an excuse to avoid CIL
- Catch 22, cause need more houses to get CIL money. What percentage of improvements will this cover

- Providing more access to the Wensum Valley! This would make Taverham a much more attractive location.
  - Better road connections, local swimming pool, better shopping facilities
  - Leisure facilities
  - More of the above.
  - Health care in the community with strong focus on community taking care of each other.
  - After school courses for children like language courses, creative writing, coding, chess, science as currently kids need to go to Norwich which is difficult if both parents are working full time. Would be much easier if there is a place to go locally. Gym/swimming pool needed as well
  - Everything. You need proper youth facilities
  - Schools and leisure
  - Better recreational facilities. Better transport links.
  - Could additional use of Mattiotts Way be made for better public transport into Norwich e.g. a (possibly raised, to allow for walkers, cyclists etc.) light rail or monorail transport system?
- 

### **Comments on the draft character areas**

- Area 1, second bullet point – not all houses are detached
  - Area 6, Bryon Road – this is used by parents for additional school parking, ignoring the lay-by. Not all residents utilise their off street parking
  - Area 6, the end of Eastfield – virtually a no-go area at school start/end due to traffic volumes
  - Area 8 – can the pitches at Hinks be (sensitively) opened up for public used? They are under lock and key most of the time, although the football club want to protect the pitches (understandable) this is a large unusable green space much of the time
  - No housing on GNLPO337!!
- 

### **Further comments on email and in notebooks**

- I completed the questionnaire at the Village Hall the other day but there was something I meant to add but later realised I had yet to do so. A problem we as a nation consistently suffer from is developing housing without developing the necessary facilities and services at the same time, such facilities and services including doctor's surgeries, pharmacies, schools, useful local shops (with adequate parking), social centres, pubs, green spaces and play areas, and the like. All too often such facilities and services get added only many years later and only after it has been proven that the additional burden of the new developments on the existing facilities and services had resulted in significant long-term problems, such problems being to the detriment of all. Rectifying such lack of facilities can take many years and the job is rarely done well as it is a retrospective action, damage has already been done, and the remedial action often ignores the further developments that have occurred in the meantime. I would like to see that all plans for future developments include the identification and actual provision of the necessary facilities and services at the time of the development, not merely a mention that they are needed and 'will' be provided at some point in the future (whenever that should prove to be). It should be part of the process that plans which do not include sufficient such facilities and services are automatically rejected. Furthermore, it should be compulsory that such facilities and services are built and provided at the same time as the housing, indeed, if not beforehand (on the lines of "no facilities and services - no housing!"). I would like to see it that, if we are to have all this extra housing, the extra facilities and services are in place before the people arrive in their new homes. I think that there is very good reason to insist that any such additional housing is accompanied at the same time by the facilities and services it will require. We should insist

on this and any development which does not include the necessary facilities and services should not be allowed to even start. If we get it right, the new developments will be good for the people who will live in them and could add to the existing area. If we do not get it right, we will be downgrading the lives of the existing residents - and that should not be allowed. We should all be living in a world that is improving, not one that is going downhill, especially one that is caused to go downhill by developments which are forced upon us.

- When they build housing between Thorpe Marriott and the NDR, they should have new exits onto the NDR, and should not be joined onto the Thorpe Marriott roads, because there is already enough (too much) traffic that has to use the exits off Thorpe Marriot already.
- We need more 1, 2 and 3 bedroom houses so people who don't want to leave the area can downsize
- 'Opening up' Drayton Dregray will only give access to vandals and hooligans. It will be ruined. Part of it is ancient woodland and should be protected. It is a haven for wildlife and I frequently see minkjacks, roe deer, foxes, buzzards, rabbits, woodcock etc etc. With more and more people going into the wood this will be lost. Taverham has green spaces galore – why do they all need to be 'opened up'? When will the promised cycle path for the whole length of the NDR be completed?