

Greater Norwich Local Plan Examination
Inspectors Matters Issues and Questions (Part 1)

Thursday 3 February : Matter 3: Issue 3: The Key Service Centres

Para 2: My earlier representation (23352) refers.

While the designation of Key Service Centres can be justified and consistent with national policy, the GNLP selection of the eleven Towns is laudable, the distribution of proposed housing growth amongst them is not. The fact that NO additional housing is proposed for Reepham to 2036 over that allocated by the Broadland Site Allocations DPD to 2026, is solely down to the REP1 allocation, and the REP2 allocation, not progressing in accordance with the approved development guidelines.

In this case the GNLP REP 1 allocation for 'approximately 100 homes in total', that is based on the 2016 Site Allocation DPD for 'approximately 100-120 homes in total', is no longer 'sound', not having been positively prepared or effective, as evidenced by the 3 drawn out planning applications that now propose significant material changes to the REP 1 allocation and are not in accordance with either the current or proposed REP 1 allocation.

In this case it should be de-allocated and a review of the other Reepham allocations undertaken to ensure a timely supply of housing for the remainder of the plan period to 2036.

Hugh Ivins BA (T & C Planning) MRTPI (retired)
14 February 2022