

Greater Norwich Local Plan Examination 2022

Inspectors Matters Issues and Questions (Part 1)

Tuesday 8 February : Matter 4 : Issue 1 : Is Policy 2 Justified,
effective and consistent with national policy

Para 1: My earlier representation (23335) refers.

It is evident that Broadland's Planning Officers are having significant difficulty in reacting to the development proposals submitted in respect of allocation REP1, and those that are now approved for REP2.

Firstly, the submitted "Statement of Common Ground" (ref D2.113) for REP2, states 'site consented', what it does not say is that the consent (appln 20180963) is not in accordance with the allocation. Specifically it required 20 market houses but none have been provided, as all the housing is restricted to C2 (residential institutions) use, and not C3 (residential) use.

Secondly the submitted "SoCG" (ref D2.112) is between Lovell Partnerships and 'The Partnership', however there is more than one applicant involved in the overall scheme of the 3 long standing interlinked applications (ref 20200469 – Broomhill Lane Widening) by Norfolk Highways Authority, (ref 20200847 - 141 Dwellings) by Lovell Homes, and (ref 20201183 – New Sports Hall) by Reepham High School & College, all submitted in March,, April and June 2020 and still undecided. This statement should have been agreed by all parties to the applications. Even the Planning Officers now 'recognise that modifications may be proposed by the Inspectors. Their final sentence 'that the land is available and has realistic prospects for development' within the agreed time frame is totally incorrect. In respect of Policy 2 Issues remain regarding Access, Green Infrastructure, Densities and Travel. REP 1 is no longer 'sound' or fit for purpose and should be de-allocated as there are other allocations in Reepham that previously had Broadland's support (GNLP 0180 and GNLP 0183 in 2016) and should be reconsidered.

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

