

Written Statement prepared by Andrew Martin Associates
on behalf of Goymour Properties Ltd in relation to the
Examination into the Joint Core Strategy

Matter 10

Key service centres, Service Villages, and Smaller Rural Communities
(policies 14-16)

Andrew Martin Associates
Croxton's Mill
Little Waltham
Chelmsford
Essex
CM3 3PJ
01245 361611
michael.calder@amaplanning.com

Matter 10 Key service centres, Service Villages, and Smaller Rural Communities (policies 14-16)

Introduction

1.1 These submissions are made on behalf of Goymour Properties Ltd and the Royal Norwich Golf Club in relation to Matter 10. Andrew Martin Associates will not be giving oral evidence at the Examination as we have detailed our response to the Submission version (and also earlier versions) of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). This written response seeks to respond to specific questions raised by the Inspector and therefore should be considered in conjunction with our earlier representations to the Submission JCS.

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?

1.2 The JCS does not make clear what mechanisms 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.

1.3 We consider that it is imperative that a more flexible and responsive approach to housing delivery and phasing needs to be established within the JCS so that sufficient sites can be brought forward elsewhere within the NPA if the Growth Triangle building programme falls below the current estimates. A more flexible strategy which provides a better redistribution of growth to other areas in the NPA will provide greater certainty that the minimum RSS housing targets will be achieved within the Plan period to 2026. We consider that the strategy is not effective and that there is a requirement for further contingency and flexibility within the strategy.

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.]

1.3 One suggestion that has been consistent throughout our submissions is the possibility to increase the growth aimed at the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) which is a focus for major growth and development in the JCS. To address the above it has been considered necessary to add further flexibility to Policy 9 of the JCS to include a provision which will allow a flexible reallocation and phasing of growth to meet the minimum housing delivery set out in the strategy.

1.4 We propose to add the following wording to policy 9:

"The Norwich Policy Area (NPA) is the focus for major growth and development. Housing need will be addressed by the identification of new allocations to deliver a minimum of 21,000 dwellings distributed across the following locations:

- ...[...].
- Broadland sites in the NPA: 2,000 (rising to 3,000 if required) dwellings;
- *Allocations in the Norwich Policy Area may include possible additions to address any shortfalls in delivery at the Growth Triangle. This will*

be subject to plan, monitor, manage approach in PPS3 and will contribute towards delivery of a minimum of 21,000 dwellings in the NPA by 2026.”