



MATTER 3 – STRATEGY FOR THE AREAS OF GROWTH

ISSUE 3 – THE KEY SERVICE CENTRES

Question 2

Is Policy 7.3 otherwise justified, effective and consistent with national policy ?

As indicated in the response to Matter 2, Issue 2, Question 4, 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 be centred 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.

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, positive allocations for additional residential development should be made.



ISSUE 4 – VILLAGE CLUSTERS

Question 1

Is Policy 7.4 in respect of additional sites justified and effective ? Is there a limit to how many such schemes could be allowed within one village ?

Whilst the intention behind the Policy is generally supported, the limited-level of positive identification/allocation of sites and the loosely-defined criteria upon which 'additional' sites will be considered are factors which in combination are likely to be counter-productive in respect of delivery. Given their relatively small-scale, the level of risk associated with any promotion of such sites is likely to be disproportionately high, which in-turn is likely to dissuade developers from actively pursuing such potential opportunities.

Similarly, whilst there appears to be no definitive restriction upon more than one site coming forward within a given Parish or Cluster under this Policy, in reality, the likely level of resistance from some existing residents towards such further growth is, as outlined above, likely to dissuade developers from actively pursuing such potential opportunities.

Is it clear what the 'Greater Norwich Local Plan Sites Plan' referred to in the Policy is ? Is this simply the Greater Norwich Local Plan i.e. the submitted plan ?

As inferred, further enhancement of the proposed relationship between the 'Sites Plan' and the Core Document of the 'Local Plan' itself would be beneficial for all parties.

How does this Policy relate to Policy 7.5

Policy 7.5 appears to provide further, smaller-scaled opportunities to those otherwise offered via Policy 7.4, but as inferred by the subsequent Questions, would have the potential to encourage and allow new residential development in less-sustainable locations, at the expense of appropriate development in more sustainable, higher-order settlements.