

## Submission by Bryan Robinson

### 1. Matter 3 - Strategy for the Areas of Growth.

#### **Issue 6: Preparing for new settlements**

***Issue 6.2 - The supporting text to Policy 7.6 indicates that, whilst there are enough sites to meet needs in this plan period, the delivery of new settlements may occur from 2026 onwards. This is only 4 years from the adoption of this Plan. Does the evidence support that delivery could really be that soon after the adoption of this plan? What effect would this have on land supply in the plan period given that a significant buffer has already been included in the housing provision in the Local Plan including a contingency site?***

- 1.1. There needs to be a clearer understanding of what is meant by a contingency site and how this will effect a planning application.
- 1.2. The local newspaper reported on 11 January 2022 that a developer has agreed terms with the landowners and will soon be applying for planning approval prior to marketing the site.
- 1.3. Is a contingency site in the plan or not and does it have an implication on the land supply figures and buffer percentage?
- 1.4. If this comes forward, will it be part of the windfall expectation?
- 1.5. Currently, this appears as yet another buffer provision.
- 1.6. On the wider picture, I fail to understand what a policy for new settlements which may be included in the next plan achieves.
- 1.7. On the basis of an annual housing need of approximately 2,000 homes, the existing land supply with contingencies and the full expectation for windfalls provides sufficient land until 2044.
- 1.8. Noting the current global problems and the solutions which will be required for their solution, 2015 is too far away to determine the needs of a future Greater Norwich.
- 1.9. If the concept of a new settlement is being promoted as an alternative to some of or in addition to the current proposals, it should have been offered as an alternative in the current proposals with proper consideration of the merits and implications.
- 1.10. The inclusion as part of this plan is yet another 'mission creep' tactic commonly used by the various authorities in Norfolk of **additional** later provision using this tacit, tenuous approval.

- 1.11. If it remains in the plan, even as a possible future option, it should still be subject to a full sustainability and environmental scrutiny of the three potential schemes noted.