

Modifications made to the Main town centre uses and retail frontages SPD in response to consultation

| Page/Para | Modification | Reason |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Page 3 Summary | <p>Amend introductory paragraph to read:</p> <p>This supplementary planning document (SPD) supports and interprets policy DM20 of the Norwich Development Management Policies DPD <u>local plan</u> and policy 11 of the Greater Norwich Joint Core Strategy (JCS); both policies relating to the development, expansion and positive management of uses in Norwich city centre <u>to achieve the most beneficial mix of uses to secure its continued vitality. In particular, Policy DM20 implements one aspect of this strategy by seeking</u> seeks to protect the retail function of key shopping streets; by ensuring that shops continue to make up the majority of the primary shopping area, resisting the loss of retailing where possible and ensuring that <u>aiming to maintain a minimum</u> the proportion of street frontage devoted to shopping in each area does not fall below a specified minimum level which would threaten to protect its vitality and viability. The policy also encourages a range of beneficial supporting services such as cafés and restaurants contributing to the diversity and attractiveness of the city centre for residents and visitors.</p> | <p>Reference to “local plan” rather than “DPD” reflects the title of the plan as adopted (advice from the Planning Inspectorate is that development plan documents should now be called <i>local plans</i>). Commentary amended to emphasise the need to achieve the most beneficial mix of uses, to address a representation by Norwich BID. References also updated within the document.</p> |
| Page 3 Para 1.2 | <p>Amend first sentence to read</p> <p>1.2 For many years, as part of its planning strategy for shopping generally and the city centre in particular, Norwich City Council has successfully implemented a suite of planning policies to proactively manage changes of use <u>facilitate beneficial new development and change</u> in city centre shopping areas.</p> | <p>Commentary amended to emphasise the need to achieve the most beneficial mix of uses, to address a representation by Norwich BID.</p> |
| Page 3-4 Para 1.3 | <p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>1.3 <u>It is acknowledged that despite significant planned housing and population growth in greater Norwich, a substantial expansion of comparison retailing in the city centre envisaged in JCS Policy 11 is less likely given the changing role of the high street, the move to online retailing and the continuing trend</u></p> | <p>Commentary amended to acknowledge that the expansion of city centre comparison retailing provided for in the JCS is now unlikely to occur and to emphasise the importance of the SPD</p> |

| Page/Para | Modification | Reason |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| | <p><u>toward downsizing of town centre property portfolios, especially among the major retailers. The health of the city centre in future is more likely to rest in successfully adapting to change and allowing for a greater diversity of uses.</u> The JCS recognises <u>this by acknowledging the</u> increasingly important role of leisure and early evening economy uses in Norwich city centre and the need to support its vitality, diversity and attractiveness. Whilst emerging policy provides the general parameters for managing change <u>through the planning process</u>, local policies and supplementary guidance are able to give further advice on qualitative issues, such as the contribution that specialist retailing and evening economy uses <u>may</u> make to particular areas of the centre and the considerations that will be important in the council's decision making process when assessing individual proposals for change of use and new development.</p> | <p>in managing change through the planning process. Responds to a representation by Norwich BID .</p> |
| <p>Page 5 Para 2.1</p> | <p>Amend fifth sentence as follows: <u>One of many factors contributing to this success has been a positive and proactive retail planning strategy approach to planning and economic development</u> which has encouraged new shopping development in the city centre, prevented the wholesale exodus of shops and supported environmental improvements...</p> | <p>Commentary amended to acknowledge that planning policy has been one factor, albeit certainly not the sole factor, in supporting the success of Norwich as a shopping destination. Responds to a comment by Norwich BID.</p> |
| <p>Page 6 Para 2.4</p> | <p>At end of paragraph add the following sentence: <u>The main changes in the definition of frontage zones between the current and previous local plans are shown in paragraph 0 below.</u></p> | <p>Cross-reference to new section explaining the main changes in the frontage zone definitions from the 2004 replacement local plan.</p> |
| <p>Page 7 Para 2.8</p> | <p>After the end of the first sentence, inset: <u>The database derives from a city council audit of floorspace initially carried out in 1993 and updated regularly thereafter using information from on street</u></p> | <p>Further explanation re the shops database used for monitoring the health of city centre shopping areas.</p> |

| Page/Para | Modification | Reason |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p><u>surveys, planning application records and other commercial sources.</u></p> | <p>Responds to a comment by Norwich BID.</p> |
| <p>Page 9 Paras 2.13-2.14</p> | <p>Amend commentary as follows</p> <p>2.13 In August 2013 <u>April 2014</u> the government consulted on options for <u>introduced</u> a further round of changes to the General Permitted Development Order. These could allow (for example) changes of use of smaller A1 retail or A2 financial and professional services premises to housing without the need for planning permission. It is proposed that these <u>The provisions would do not</u> apply in conservation areas, so in theory would <u>will</u> not directly affect the city centre, although in practice the likelihood is that refusal of permission for any such change within the centre would need to be based solely <u>mainly</u> on conservation reasons, (<u>because a corresponding change outside a conservation area could be made without permission and in that case other factors, such as amenity or economic impacts could not be taken into account</u>).</p> <p>2.14 Although no detailed response has yet been published on the results of the 2013 consultation, the government announced in April 2014 that it would consult on <u>As part of its more wide ranging Technical Consultation on Planning published in July 2014, the government has consulted on a</u> number of further prospective changes to the General Permitted Development Order and Use Classes Order. The further changes could <u>One of the changes proposed would</u> bring banks and <u>and</u> building societies and other <u>financial and professional services</u> (currently in the Financial and Professional Services <u>planning use class A2</u>) within the same class as retail shops (A1). They could also see betting shops, <u>Betting shops and pay day loan stores would however remain</u> which are currently in a much reduced use class A2, made a separate sui generis use, meaning that planning</p> | <p>Updated commentary to take into account the proposals in the CLG <i>Technical consultation on planning</i> published in July 2014 and the changes to the General Permitted Development Order introduced in April.</p> |

| Page/Para | Modification | Reason |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>permission would always be needed <u>in most cases</u> to establish a betting shop or change a betting shop to an alternative use. This prospective change responds to widespread concerns over the proliferation and perceived harmful impacts of betting shops on town centres and the lack of planning controls over them.</p> | |
| <p>Page 10 Para 3.3</p> | <p>Insert new paragraph 3.3 as follows <u>3.3 City centre shop surveys (and local and district centre surveys) are now normally undertaken annually, but could be more frequent if additional resources became available or if a particular issue meant that survey evidence had to be brought up to date urgently. The council would welcome opportunities for cooperation and collaboration with other agencies and city centre stakeholders to look into the possibility of surveying the centre more frequently.</u></p> | <p>To respond to a representation by Norwich BID requesting more frequent surveys of the city centre shopping areas and explaining the constraints currently preventing this.</p> |
| <p>Page 11 Para 3.8</p> | <p>Insert new paragraph 3.8 as follows <u>3.8 Figure 2 on page 13 shows a comparison between the primary area frontage zones as defined in the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004 and in the DM Policies Plan 2014. The main changes have been:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Designation of Caste Mall, Chapelfield and the Gentlemans Walk area as <i>core frontage zones</i> where retaining a generally higher proportion of retail use is a priority;</u> • <u>Reclassification of Riverside and Sainsbury’s Brazen Gate from primary retail areas to a large district centre and a secondary retail area respectively (this change is consistent with the hierarchy of centres in Policy 19 of the adopted JCS).</u> | <p>To respond to a representation by Norwich BID asking for more detail on how the frontage zone definitions have evolved.</p> |

| Page/Para | Modification | Reason |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Inclusion of Red Lion Street and Castle Meadow North as primary frontage zones or part zones (these were previously discrete areas where no specific limits on retail uses applied, resulting in some confusion in interpreting the previous local plan policy).</u> • <u>Redefinition of zone boundaries in the Guildhall Hill and St Giles Street area to group these streets with the west end of London Street as The Lanes East. (The Pottergate/Lower Goat Lane area as defined in the Replacement Local Plan remains as a secondary shopping area with broadly the same boundaries as before but is renamed as The Lanes West).</u> • <u>Redefinition of zone boundaries in the Westlegate and Timberhill area to group Westlegate and John Lewis at All Saints Green with St Stephens Street rather than being grouped with Timberhill. Timberhill is grouped instead with Red Lion Street.</u> <p><u>Extension of the primary shopping area to include Chapelfield Plain (under construction at the time of the 2004 local and premises at the north end of Ber Street.</u></p> | |
| Page 13 Figure 2 | Add new figure 2 maps showing frontage zones in the previous and current local plans. | Ditto, as above. |
| Page 19 PC02 Castle Mall | <p>In the third bullet point of the policy guidance add a reference to leisure use, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support the extended use of Level 4 (Timberhill) for early evening economy uses such as restaurants and cafés, <u>and for complementary leisure uses;</u> | To respond to an individual comment asking that consideration is given to the scope for arts and cultural facilities in Castle Mall – while the symphony hall suggested is unlikely to be a practical proposition, there may be scope for complementary leisure and evening economy uses supporting the Vue |

| Page/Para | Modification | Reason |
|---|---|--|
| | | cinema. |
| Page 26 PR01 Back of the Inns | Amend the final sentence following the bullet point policy guidance criteria by deleting references to funding via the BID business rate levy as follows: There may be scope for <u>developer</u> funding for such initiatives either through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or the Norwich Business Improvement District (BID) business rate levy. | Public realm streetscape improvements cannot currently be funded via a business rate levy and there is no provision for such proposals in the BID's five year business plan. |
| Page 28, 29 PR02 The Lanes East | <p>a) Add sentence at the end of the second paragraph as follows: <u>Norwich BID is seeking to improve and enhance the retail offer in London Street by positioning it as a high quality prestige retailing area.</u></p> <p>b) amend the second bullet point of the policy guidance as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continue to support proposals for speciality and local independent retailing complementing the historic character and visitor appeal of the area, <u>including through promotion of prestige high quality retail especially in London Street;</u> | To acknowledge this aspiration as noted in the representation by Norwich BID. |
| Page 31 PR03 St Stephens Street/Westlegate | Amend fourth sentence of the commentary as follows: Traffic management measures to be implemented in the medium term <u>from November 2014</u> will restrict St Stephens Street <u>and Surrey Street</u> to buses, cycles and service access and introduce cycle priority measures in Surrey Street. <u>In the longer term, it is proposed to</u> remove through traffic from Westlegate altogether. | Factual update – reflects the implementation of the first stage of city centre traffic management measures in this area from November 2014. |

| Page/Para | Modification | Reason | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| Page 35 PR04 Castle Meadow North | Amend fourth bullet point of the policy guidance as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly support proposals for the reuse of redundant and underused upper floors, including for residential use <u>where consistent with policies DM2, DM12 and DM13</u>. Decisions on such proposals will <u>also</u> need to take account...” | To make clear that proposals for residential conversion can be accepted only where consistent with the relevant policies of the local plan applying to residential development and conversion to flats. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Page 41 PR05 Timberhill/Red Lion Street | Amend third bullet point of the policy guidance as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> support the retention of diverse range of uses in Red Lion Street including extending the use of upper floors for beneficial and complementary uses (including residential use <u>where consistent with policies DM2, DM12 and DM13</u>), | Ditto | | | | | | | | | | |
| Page 40, 42 PR05 Timberhill/Red Lion Street | Amend frontage zone retail/non retail analysis in zone PR05 as follows <table border="1" data-bbox="472 810 1516 1126"> <tr> <td>Percentage vacant units:</td> <td>5.7 percent</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percentage vacant floorspace:</td> <td>6.3 percent</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total length of defined retail frontage in this zone:</td> <td>436.0 423.2 metres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measured frontages retail/non retail split:</td> <td>70.2 69.3 percent A1 retail frontage</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>29.8 30.7 percent non-retail frontage</td> </tr> </table> <p>and amend map to delete section of defined frontage at 5-6 Castle Meadow and add explanatory note.</p> | Percentage vacant units: | 5.7 percent | Percentage vacant floorspace: | 6.3 percent | Total length of defined retail frontage in this zone: | 436.0 423.2 metres | Measured frontages retail/non retail split: | 70.2 69.3 percent A1 retail frontage | | 29.8 30.7 percent non-retail frontage | A printing error on the local plan policies map city centre inset as published omits 5-6 Castle Meadow from the defined frontage in this zone in error. The policies map is incorrect but lawfully this SPD is not able to rectify an error in the parent plan. Consequential change to the analysis results from the exclusion of 5-6 Castle Meadow from the frontage zone. |
| Percentage vacant units: | 5.7 percent | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage vacant floorspace: | 6.3 percent | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total length of defined retail frontage in this zone: | 436.0 423.2 metres | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Measured frontages retail/non retail split: | 70.2 69.3 percent A1 retail frontage | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 29.8 30.7 percent non-retail frontage | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Page 52 SR04 Elm Hill/Wensum Street | Add further policy guidance criterion at the end of this section, as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Consider proposals for change of use of ground floor premises to</u> | Change made at the request of the council’s sustainable development panel at their meeting of 26 November | | | | | | | | | | |

| Page/Para | Modification | Reason |
|--|--|---|
| | <p><u>residential use on a case by case basis and accept them where consistent with policies DM2, DM12 and DM13 and other relevant local plan policies. In assessing such proposals, account will be taken of the impact of individual changes on the vitality, viability and diversity of the street and the frontage zone as a whole. In Elm Hill, residential conversion at ground floor level will generally be accepted only where it results in a designated or locally identified heritage asset or other long-term vacant building being brought back into beneficial use where it is demonstrated that those benefits could not be delivered by retaining a retail use.</u></p> | <p>2014. The restriction of residential conversion of shops at ground floor level without overriding justification on conservation grounds reflects the legitimate concerns of members about the erosion of retail function in Elm Hill and upholding of the council's refusal of permission for such a conversion on appeal.</p> |
| <p>Page 54 SR05 London Street West</p> | <p>Add sentence at the end of the second paragraph, as follows: <u>As noted in the commentary to area PR02 (The Lanes East) above, Norwich BID is seeking to improve and enhance the retail offer in London Street by positioning it as a high quality prestige retailing area.</u></p> | <p>To reflect the aspiration of Norwich BID for London Street to that effect, see also PR02 above.</p> |
| <p>Page 55 SR05 London Street West</p> | <p>Amend the final policy guidance bullet point as follows support complementary uses in upper floors, including residential use <u>and visitor accommodation</u> where consistent with policies DM2 and DM12 and DM13...</p> | <p>To reflect the aspiration of Norwich BID for London Street to that effect, see also PR02 above.</p> |