

Greater Norwich Development Partnership

Joint Core Strategy DPD Examination

Matter 10

Key Service Centres, Service Villages and Smaller Rural Communities (Policies
14 – 16)

October 2010

Written Statement on behalf of Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd

KEY SERVICE CENTRES (POLICY 14)

A Does the JCS provide sound core strategic guidance for the future planning of these settlements? Does the evidence demonstrate that the key service centres are appropriately listed as such, with no additions/deletions?

1.1 The JCS identifies five levels of settlement:

- Norwich;
- Main Towns;
- Key Service Centres;
- Service Villages; and
- Linked Service Villages.

1.2 Classification of the settlements in this manner is considered appropriate. Policy 14 identifies the level of development to be provided subject to a detailed assessment “including impact on form and character and the resolution of any specific servicing constraints.” We are of the view that further guidance should be provided within the JCS as to the scope of any such ‘detailed assessment’.

B Is the scale of the development for the individual villages soundly based?

1.4 Loddon is identified as a Key Service Centre within the JCS meaning that is considered to be one of ten settlements which “...have a range of facilities enabling them to meet the local needs of residents of surrounding areas.” Loddon is allocated within the JCS for 100 – 200 dwellings. We have no objection to the principle of the allocation of development to Key Service Centres but are concerned that the level of development identified for particular settlements – Loddon specifically – is not soundly based.

1.5 Nowhere within Policy 14, or the explanatory text thereto, is there a justification as to the number of units proposed. There appears to be no evidential basis for the housing numbers provided, although the Key Service Centres within the South Norfolk Policy Area are all expected to provide the same level of housing presumably on the basis that the GNDP consider each settlement to be largely

similar in terms of scale, demographics and service provision. We are of the view that the JCS needs to provide more reasoned justification for the housing numbers it proposes.

- 1.6 Hingham is allocated a lower level of new housing (approximately 100 dwellings) on the presumption that it is "...one of the smaller rural centres with a range of basic shops serving everyday needs." Loddon, on the other hand is described as "...providing a range of shops and services with bus links to Norwich and nearby towns. The adjoining village of Chedgrave shares those shops and services in addition to having its own." It is curious that Loddon, which differs in nature and scale to Hingham, is only considered capable of accommodating 100 dwellings over and above that allocated at Hingham. On the basis that housing requirements are a minimum, and on the premise that Loddon is capable of sustaining and supporting a greater number of units than that currently proposed given the quality of existing social and physical infrastructure and that which could readily be put in place by expedient development of the representor's site at George Lane (identified within the current Site Allocations DPD consultation) our position is such that the wording of Policy 14 of the JCS should be changed to read "**approximately 100 - 300 dwellings**" at Loddon, or, indeed, "**at least 100-200 dwellings.**"
- 1.7 The same situation arises in relation to Poringland, which is a similar distance from Norwich as Hethersett and significantly closer than Long Stratton – all have been identified as Key Service Centres within the JCS however Poringland is only allocated for 100 – 200 units as opposed to 1,00 units at Hethersett and 1,800 units at Long Stratton.
- 1.8 It is noted that the first sentence of the policy suggests some flexibility in its statement that "Land will be allocated for residential development **broadly of the scale** indicated below" but we are of the view that this is not strong enough to reflect the capacity and ability some of the Key Service Centres such as Loddon to accommodate a higher level of development in a sustainable manner.
- 1.9 We refer to our detailed representations made in December 2009 which set out our assessment of the capability of Loddon specifically to accommodate a higher level of growth than currently proposed within the JCS.

THE SERVICE VILLAGES (POLICY 15)

C Does the JCS provide sound core strategic guidance for the future planning of these settlements? Does the evidence demonstrate that the service villages are appropriately listed as such, with no additions/deletions?

1.10 No Comment.

D Is the scale of development for the individual villages soundly based? Other villages (Policy 16)

1.11 No Comment.

OTHER VILLAGES (POLICY 16)

E Does the JCS provide sound core strategic advice for the future planning of these villages? Does the evidence demonstrate that the 'other villages' are appropriately listed as such, with no additions/deletions? Allowance for development on 'smaller sites in the NPA' (policies 9 and 14 – 16):

1.12 No Comment.

ALLOWANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT 'ON SMALLER SITES IN THE NPA' (POLICIES 9 AND 14 – 16)

F Does the JCS make clear what mechanism(s) will be used for resolving whether or not '*additional development*' is necessary at any of the key service centres, service villages or other villages in order '*to deliver the "smaller sites in the NPA" allowance?*' To be effective on this point, should the JCS be clearer/more specific about this? What would it need to say?

1.13 No Comment.

G If the JCS is unsound in relation to any of the above matters, are there any specific changes that would render it sound? [It would be necessary to consider whether these required further consultation or sustainability appraisal].

1.14 No comment.