



MATTER 2 – VISION, OBJECTIVES AND THE SPATIAL STRATEGY

ISSUE 2 – HOUSING GROWTH

Question 2

Is the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy 1 appropriate and consistent with the evidence ?

Whilst in principle, the ‘Settlement Hierarchy’ as categorized within Policy 1 is broadly appropriate, as previously outlined, in order for the growth strategy to be considered ‘sound’ and ‘consistent with the evidence’, the defined ‘Key Service Centres’ identified in Paragraph 191 (iii) should include a number of other settlements throughout the Plan area which are of a size and functional role which can suitably accommodate additional residential growth in a sustainable way. Proposed levels of growth should then be apportioned in a manner broadly comparable and commensurate with the settlement’s size and position within the hierarchy.

As the question appears to elude to, there does not appear to be any published evidence-base upon which the various settlements within the Plan area have been assessed, so as to determine which level of the proposed settlement hierarchy they should fall within.

In this respect, notably, Hopkins Homes have proposed sites on the periphery of the villages of Mulbarton and Scole within South Norfolk, both of which settlements benefit from facilities and good connections with nearby higher-order market towns which enable them to accommodate higher levels of growth than are currently envisaged through the proposed Strategy.

In particular, the village of Mulbarton, with an existing population in excess of 3,500 is larger and more sustainable than over half of the currently designated Key Service Centres, whilst the village also benefits from a proportionately good range of services and facilities.

Moving on to the settlements which have been designated as Key Service Centres, it is noted that whilst Wroxham has been identified as a ‘Key Service Centre’, no additional allocations are currently proposed to enable future housing growth of this settlement. Hopkins Homes have previously made Representations to the GNLP that in order to suitably fulfil its role as a Key Service Centre, positive allocations for the proportionate further residential growth of Wroxham should be made.



Question 3

Are all of the settlements listed in the correct level within the hierarchy ?

As indicated within the previous response to Question 2, Hopkins Homes would suggest that for the Plan to be made 'sound', the settlements of Mulbarton and Scole should be added to the list of settlements defined as 'Key Service Centres' and the Key Diagram and Map 7 updated to reflect this.

As previously outlined, sufficient levels of growth should then be allocated to each of the defined 'Key Service Centres' to enable them to respectively fulfil their roles to provide for sufficient housing and economic growth over the Plan period.

Question 4

Is the distribution of growth in line with the settlement hierarchy justified by the evidence ?

As previously outlined within the response to Question 1, Hopkins Homes have identified that in order for the growth strategy to be considered 'sound' and 'consistent with the evidence', the defined 'Key Service Centres' identified in Paragraph 191 (iii) should include a number of other settlements throughout the Plan area which are of a size and functional role which can suitably accommodate additional residential growth in a sustainable way. Proposed levels of growth should then be apportioned in a manner broadly comparable and commensurate with the settlement's size and position within the hierarchy.

As previously outlined, the villages of both Mulbarton and Scole within South Norfolk benefit from facilities and good connections with nearby higher-order market towns which enable them to accommodate higher levels of growth than are currently envisaged through the proposed Strategy.

Whilst Wroxham has been identified as a 'Key Service Centre', no additional allocations are currently proposed to enable future housing growth. Hopkins Homes have previously made Representations to the GNLP that in order to suitably fulfil its role as a Key Service Centre, allocations for the proportionate further residential growth of Wroxham should be made.

The suggested justification for not proposing any allocations for the growth of Wroxham within Paragraph 373 appears to centre upon unsubstantiated claims of undue traffic and air quality impacts, together with perceived landscape impacts due to the proximity to The Broads. The available evidence does not support these claims.



Hopkins Homes Ltd

Greater Norwich Local Plan Examination

Inspectors Matters, Issues and Questions (Part 1)

January 2022

In respect of traffic and air quality matters, Norfolk County Council's '*Wroxham and Hoveton Network Improvement Strategy*' of February 2020 highlighted the good level of available public transport in Wroxham, whilst also noted that existing air quality issues are focussed to the north of the Bridge between Wroxham and Hoveton, with the dominant direction of travel being south towards Norwich. As such, additional growth to the south of Wroxham would have no material impact upon these matters.

In respect of landscape impacts and proximity to The Broads, previous studies and evidence have concluded that additional growth to the south of Wroxham would have no direct visual relationship or impact upon The Broads, with significant resulting separation remaining in place.

Given the otherwise wholly sustainable location of the available land to enable the future growth of Wroxham, in order to suitably fulfil its intended role and function as a Key Service Centre, allocations for additional residential development should be made.

Question 7

Is the figure of 1,200 homes assigned to the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Site Allocations Local Plan justified ?

Whilst Hopkins Homes support the identification of village clusters to accommodate additional residential development to support the sustainable growth of rural areas, there should be no defined numerical restraint upon the size of site area or the number of dwellings proposed for allocation in this way. Instead, any such allocations should be made so as to be proportionate to the size of settlement cluster within which they are located and the range of facilities available, in order that they successfully meet local housing needs, to include affordable housing needs.