

Greater Norwich Local Plan Examination  
Inspectors Matters Issues and Questions (Part 2)  
Tuesday 8 March (am) Matter 11 : Key Service Centres  
aa Land off Broomhill Lane, Reepham (Ref REP1)

This further submission results from The Partnerships responses to the Inspectors Six Questions concerning REP1.

Q1: The 2016 REP1 Allocation was claimed by Broadland to be 'sound, available now, and deliverable' with an 'agreement to proceed' in 2016 signed by Hopkins Homes and Ian Malton Associates to complete the development of 120 houses over a 5 year period to 2021, within the existing Development Plan period. This has not happened and the withdrawal of Hopkins Homes and Ian Malton Associates has now resulted in 3 separate applications, submitted in early 2020. This has resulted in a significant hiatus of housing development in Reepham since 2016 and consequently no significant market/affordable housing has been available.

Q2: There are significant materially outstanding issues with the 3 applications, 20200847, 20201183 and 20200469 submitted by different applicants and agents, that remain unresolved after 2 years. There are still significant objections from a number of statutory consultees and local residents regarding the many amendments and changes from the original REP1 requirements. The LPA were too ambitious.

Q3: The latest Viability Assessment dated June 2021 is inconsistent with this timescale as it now projects completion of the whole site by August 2025. Even the applicants original Viability Assessment concluded 'Technically, the proposed scheme is not therefore viable due to build costs having increased out of proportion with sales revenue over the past 14 months since issuing our initial viability assessment in March 2020'. The Statement of Common Ground is not Co-authored by all of the applicants involved in the development of REP1 and therefore has little weight as objective evidence concerning the development of the site as a whole.

Q4: Notwithstanding the Statement of Common Ground and Viability Statements there is a significant shortfall regarding the housing trajectory for Reepham as no other housing development is allocated for the period 2016 -2036. Allocations GNLP0183 and GNLP 0180 should therefore be reconsidered.

Q5: The detailed policy requirements are not justified as they cannot be fulfilled, with a significant material change concerning an uplift of 41 dwellings and removal of the Sports hall, and an unacceptable design and layout and infrastructure constraints.

Q6: No justification has been submitted for the significant uplift of 41 homes to the allocation of 100 homes. It should in fact be reduced to 50 homes in total, to 2038.

Hugh Ivins BA (T & C Planning) MRTPI (retired) 23 February 2022