

North Norfolk District Council

Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal Report

An addendum to the main Sustainability Appraisal Report of the North Norfolk Local Plan Proposed Submission Version, prepared in response to the Planning Inspectors Interim Findings on the Norfolk North Local Plan Examination.

November 2024

**North Norfolk District Council
Planning Policy Team**

01263 516318

planningpolicy@north-norfolk.gov.uk

Planning Policy, North Norfolk District Council,
Holt Road, Cromer, NR27 9EN

www.north-norfolk.gov.uk/localplan



Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal Report

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Purpose and scope of the document
3. Summary of methodology
4. Appraisal of proposed revised or updated draft Policies
5. Appraisal of draft Additional Site Proposals and Extensions to existing Site Allocations (Preferred Options) and Alternative Site Options
6. Summary of Significant and Cumulative effects
7. Evaluation of Significant Effects

Appendix A – Appraisal of Draft Policies SS 1 Spatial Strategy and HOU 5 Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople’s Accommodation.

Appendix B – Appraisal of Draft Additional Site Proposals - Preferred Options

Appendix C – Appraisal of Alternative Site Options

1. Introduction

Background

- 1.1 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) are tools used at the plan-making stage to assess the likely effects of the plan when judged against reasonable alternatives. A sustainability appraisal of the proposals in each Local Plan is required by section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and incorporates the required strategic environmental assessment. More generally, section 39 of the Act requires that the authority preparing a Local Plan must do so “with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development”.
- 1.2 **This document is an addendum to the main submitted SA Report [A3] of the North Norfolk Local Plan Proposed Submission Version, at Regulation 19 Publication Stage [A1].**
- 1.3 Following the Local Plan examination hearing sessions in January – March 2024, an initial post-hearings letter dated 24 May 2024 [EH006 (f)], (delayed due to the General Election and received by the Council on 22 July 2024) was received in which the Inspector raised three main soundness issues that the Council is required to address and re-consult on.
- 1.4 These matters are separate to other proposed main modifications which will be addressed later and in terms of a sustainability appraisal will form part of a further associated SA report and public consultation.

Interim Findings

- 1.5 The three main soundness issues are:
 - A shortfall in housing provision;
 - The approach to Small Growth Villages (SGVs) as set out in Policy SS 1 Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan;
 - Updating the Gypsy and Traveller evidence base to reflect the change in definition in December 2023 and to bring forward any necessary changes to the Local Plan that might arise from the updated evidence.
- 1.6 The Inspector’s letter is available as examination document [EH006 (f)], along with the Councils response [EH006 (g)].

Response to the Interim Findings

- 1.7 After consideration of the Inspectors correspondence an Action Plan has been devised and endorsed through the Council’s Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party (PPBHWP) and Cabinet to address the soundness issues identified by the Inspector. Therefore, this additional Sustainability Appraisal (SA) assessment solely

relates to the following matters required to address the soundness concerns raised by the Inspector:

- Small Growth Villages within Policy SS 1 Spatial Strategy:
 - (i) Increase the number of Small Growth Villages by adding a proposed additional ten villages to the list within the Selected Settlements of Policy SS 1 as evidenced by the draft Addendum to the Distribution of Growth Background Paper 2 (updated May 2023) [[C2](#)].
 - (ii) Increase the indicative housing allowance for growth from 6% to 9% across all of the identified SGVs (existing and proposed) within Policy SS 1.
- Additional site allocations and extensions to existing site allocations within Large Growth Towns, Small Growth Towns and Large Growth Villages identified as Selected Settlements within Policy SS 1 Spatial Strategy.
- Update to the Gypsy and Traveller Evidence and make any necessary amendments to Policy HOU 5 Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople's Accommodation and the supporting text.

1.8 The Inspector's subsequent reply to the draft Action Plan is available to view here [[EH006 \(h\)](#)] and which confirms at para. 5 that *'the Council's proposals to increase the supply and flexibility of housing delivery by approximately 1,300 to 1,500 additional dwellings over the plan period, depending on how it is done this should be a good basis for the examination to proceed.'*

1.9 The Inspector states in para.4 of this letter that *'in addition to publishing an updated Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople's accommodation needs assessment, the Council should consider what steps need to be taken to address the findings in the plan, including if necessary proposing allocations or amending the criteria in Policy HOU 5. Any proposed changes to the plan should form part of the forthcoming six-week public consultation.'*

2. Purpose and scope of the document

2.1 The purpose of this document is to provide a summary of the additional SA assessment work undertaken by the Council in order to positively respond to the initial findings and conclusions reached by the Inspector, as detailed in Section 1 above.

2.2 Alongside the baseline information set out in the submitted SA Report, the scope of the SA work within this report is supported by the following supplemental evidence papers:

- Additional Sites Review Background Paper, November 2024.

- Addendum to the Distribution of Growth Background Paper 2, November 2024.
- Settlement Boundary Review: Small Growth Villages Background Paper (Addendum) October 2024.
- North Norfolk Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment 2024.

2.3 The assessment of Draft Policy SS1 Spatial Strategy

Draft Policy SS 1 Spatial Strategy is assessed against the SA Objectives of the Sustainability Framework with the inclusion of ten additional villages within the SGV tier of the settlement hierarchy. An Addendum to the Distribution of Growth Background Paper 2 [C2] has been produced to support this proposal, which sets out the village assessments where ten suitable SGVs, based on a revised level of required services and facilities of 1 key service and 3 secondary or desirable services.

2.4 The proposed additional ten additional villages are:

- (i) Beeston Regis
- (ii) Erpingham
- (iii) Felmingham
- (iv) Itteringham
- (v) Langham
- (vi) Northrepps
- (vii) Great Ryburgh
- (viii) Stibbard
- (ix) Tunstead
- (x) Worstead

2.5 The proposal would see the total number of Small Growth Villages increase from 23 to 33 and would provide a slightly more dispersed pattern of growth than presented in the submission version of Policy SS1 Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan [A1]. The proposed increase of the Indicative Housing Allowance for SGVs from 6% to 9%, where a total increase of existing and proposed SGVs would allow the opportunity for growth of approximately 873 dwellings (a net increase of 421 dwellings).

2.6 The assessment of proposed new, additional and extended sites.

The proposed sites are grouped into Preferred Site Options (Group A) and Alternative Site Options (Group B) within the Additional Sites Review Background Paper. Group A sites are those that were previously assessed through the Local Plan's Site Assessment Process and were considered to be suitable for development but were not identified for allocation at Regulation 19 submission stage of the Local Plan. Group B sites are those that have been selected through a review of individual site assessments contained within each Site Assessment Booklet. This review looked at

the potential for sites that were not considered suitable for development but were discounted from the process on grounds that could still allow some development to occur albeit on a smaller scale. Table 1 below sets out the draft additional site proposals and indicates the type of allocation that is being put forward.

Table 1: Draft Additional Site Proposals (Preferred Site Options -Group A) and Alternative Site Options (Group B)

Settlement	Site Reference and Location	Type
Group A Preferred Options		
Blakeney	Draft BLA01/B Land West of Langham Road	Additional allocation
Briston	Draft BRI02/C Land West of Astley Primary School	Extension to existing allocation
Cromer	Draft C10/1 Land at Runton Road/ Clifton Park	Additional allocation
Cromer	Draft C22/4 Land West of Pine Tree Farm	Extension to existing allocation C22/2
Hoveton	Draft HV01/C Land East of Tunstead Road	Extension to existing allocation HOV01/B
Hoveton	Draft HV06/A Land at Stalham Road	New allocation
Ludham	Draft LUD01/C Land South of School Road	Extension to existing allocation LUD01/A
Mundesley	Draft MUN03/A Land off Cromer Road & Church Lane	Extension to existing allocation MUN03/B
North Walsham	Draft NW16 Land East of Mundesley Road	Additional allocation
Stalham	Draft ST04/A Land at Brumstead Road/ Calthorpe Close	A small portion of site STO4 could be considered suitable.
Stalham	Draft ST19/B Land adjacent to Ingham Road	Extension to existing allocation ST19/A
Group B Alternative Site Options		
Cromer	Draft C19/2 Land at Compit Hills	A small portion of site could be considered suitable
Fakenham	Draft F05	The site is located within the existing settlement boundary

	Land between Holt and Greenway Lane	and as such, policies already allow it to come forward for development.
Hoveton	Draft HV05 Land at Horning Road	Site was available at Regulation 19 stage. Deliverability not known.

2.7 Draft Policy HOU 5 Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople's Accommodation

The draft policy HOU 5 is reviewed and updated based on the findings of the North Norfolk Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment 2024, which provides the specific proposed accommodation needs for the revised plan period, based on the updated Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (PPTS) definition (2023) and a further figure based on ethnic identity and broader ethnic definition.

3. Summary of Methodology

- 3.1 The SA assessments are undertaken in full alignment with the Methodology set out in Chapter 2 of the main SA Report [\[A3\]](#) using the same sustainability appraisal framework as set out in Chapter 6 of the Report [\[A3\]](#). The effects of the proposed options are assessed against each objective of the framework using the decision-making criteria as a guide. The aim of the overall appraisal is to identify whether the Local Plan will have a positive or negative effect on the objectives and whether the effects are likely to be significant on the environment which is a SEA Directive requirement.
- 3.2 It is worth being reminded that it is not the role of the SA to determine the options to be chosen but to inform with the identification of the appropriate options, by highlighting the sustainability implications of each. The determination of which policy approach to use is a matter of a wider judgement with regard to the appropriate strategy.
- 3.3 The approach taken is by using symbols as a way of presenting information regarding the likely effects, for example, beneficial, adverse, uncertain, not significant, combined with commentary seeking to justify the symbol in relation to the baseline information relevant to the sustainability objective. This then aids in the identification of options around enhancement and mitigation.
- 3.4 The SA Objectives are broad indicators of sustainability while many policies are focused on single issues, in some cases the indicator is not applicable, and the assessment is marked with an N/A. The SA key below can be used in association with the cumulative tables in Chapter 6 and the full SA assessments contained within Appendices A, B and C.

Sustainability Appraisal Key

++	Likely strong positive effect
+	Likely positive effect
0	Neutral/no effect
~	Mixed effects
-	Likely adverse effect
--	Likely strong adverse effect
?	Uncertain effect

- 3.5 For the purposes of this Addendum to the main SA Report [[A3](#)], the proposed preferred site options, including extensions to existing site allocations, as well as alternative site options, have been assessed as whole sites, as the nature and context of the SA Objectives and SA Framework have been designed to be applied on this basis, particularly as the assessment of part of a site as an extension would not provide a comprehensive approach to .
- 3.6 The findings of the sustainability appraisals are presented in Appendix A for the draft Policy SS 1, Spatial Strategy and draft Policy HOU 5, Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople’s Accommodation. Appendices B and C respectively present the sustainability appraisals for the draft additional Preferred Site Options and Alternative Site Options.

4. Appraisal of proposed revised or updated draft Policies

4.1 Policy SS 1 Spatial Strategy has been chosen as the preferred policy approach, as detailed in Chapter 8 of the submitted SA Report [A3] pages 70-72. The details below identify the purpose of the policy, the proposed changes and why it is the preferred policy approach. The proposed changes incorporate the inclusion of ten additional villages as Small Growth Villages and a proposed increase to the Housing Indicative Allowance to 9% growth for all of the SGVs, the additional 10 and the existing villages as set out in Table 2 Small Growth Villages Housing Apportionment of the Plan [A1], pages 63-65, with the exception of Horning, which has been designated as a Constrained Small Growth Village during the Local Plan Hearing Sessions, where no housing allowance is apportioned to the settlement.

Draft Policy SS 1- Spatial Strategy

Policy Approach	Why it is preferred
<p>SS 1 – Introduce a policy that sets out the spatial strategy and context for North Norfolk, providing the hierarchy of settlements and overall framework to deliver growth and meet existing and future needs – including the additional draft proposals of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The addition of a further ten villages to the list of SGVs in the hierarchy from 23 to 33 villages. • An increase in the level of growth for all SGVs to 9%. 	<p>The Policy Approach sets out the spatial strategy and context for North Norfolk, providing the hierarchy of settlements and overall framework to deliver growth and meet existing and future needs.</p> <p>This settlement hierarchy policy, along with the proposed site allocations being in the Plan for settlements in the top three parts of the hierarchy, provide a specific focus and degree of certainty, where sites will be developed during the plan period.</p> <p>In addition, alongside existing Small Growth Villages, additional villages have been identified based on the provision of a revised number of services, updated as described in para. 2.3 of this document.</p> <p>A number of criteria have been added to clarify the qualifying conditions and quantities for development in small villages and the types of development that would be permitted as a function of the development boundary to help direct all development.</p> <p>The Preferred Approach ensures that the number of dwellings in any of the selected Small Growth Villages will have the opportunity for small scale growth through an increase of approximately 9% growth from the date of adoption of the Plan. The level of growth is seen to align with approximately 10% of the overall housing target of 8,900 dwellings and accords with the broader strategic policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Policy Approach scores well against most of the environmental, social and economic SA Objectives as the focused growth pattern will help preserve the rural character of the district, while supporting a total of 33 SGVs to grow and thrive in accordance with the para. 83 of the NPPF (2023).</p>
<p>See pages 70-72 of the main SA Report for the full list of Preferred and Alternative Options and why they are not preferred.</p>	

- 4.2 Draft Policy HOU5 Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople’s Accommodation has updated 2024 evidence in the form of the North Norfolk Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment, which provides the proposed accommodation needs based on the updated Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (PPTS) definition (2023) and a further figure based on ethnic identity and broader ethnic definition. The study recommends that the Council adopt the ‘ethnic’ definition of accommodation needs figures, i.e. meeting the accommodation needs of all households who ethnically identify as Gypsies and Travellers.
- 4.3 The assessment identifies that there is an overall accommodation need across North Norfolk between 2024 and 2040 of 11 pitches (ethnic need) and 9 Pitches (PPTA,2023). There is no additional accommodation need for Travelling Showpeople. The policy approach is updated in accordance with the study’s recommendations.
- 4.4 The draft policy provides for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers by setting criteria, aligned with the PPTS, and by which windfall planning applications can be approved. This flexible approach will ensure that at least a further 11 pitches can come forward between 2024 and 2040 but also allow more subject to demand. The details below identify the purpose of the policy, the proposed changes and the preferred policy approach.

Draft Policy HOU 5 Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople’s Accommodation

Policy Approach	Why it is preferred
<p>HOU 5 – Introduce a policy to meet the needs for both permanently occupied and transient pitches for the gypsy and traveller communities. The updated evidence provides information that is included in the Policy wording regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updating policy to specify the minimum number of permanent pitches that will be provided to meet accommodation needs over the revised Plan period. • Adding a further criterion to protect against the loss of existing sites and pitches unless demonstration of the criterion can be met. 	<p>The updated policy approach provides the overall accommodation needs based on the updated Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (PPTS) definition (2023) where the broader ethnic needs are taken into account. The policy approach also sets criteria, aligned with the PPTS, and by which windfall planning applications can be approved. This flexible approach will ensure that as a minimum, a further 11 permanent pitches can come forward between 2024 and 2040 but where more is allowed subject to demand. In addition, a further criterion is added to protect against the loss of existing sites and pitches. Overall, the approach ensures more certainty and flexibility in alignment with the wider sustainable approach and needs of the Local Plan. The Policy Approach scores well against relevant social SA Objectives.</p>
<p>See page 86 of the main SA Report [A3] for the full list of Preferred and Alternative Options and why they were not preferred.</p>	

5. Appraisal of Draft Additional Site Proposals and Extensions to existing Site Allocations – Preferred and Alternative Options

- 5.1 The following tables provide a summary of the proposed additional preferred site options, including extensions to existing site allocations within the Local Plan, which have been identified through the Additional Sites Review Background Paper (November 2024) in order to achieve the required increase in housing provision and the reasons for selecting them.
- 5.2 The full sustainability appraisals for the additional preferred site proposals and alternative site options are set out in Appendix B and Appendix C. These detail the scores against the sixteen SA Objectives and also provide an overall conclusion based on the environmental, social and economic groupings of the SA Objectives.

Blakeney Additional Preferred Option

Site Ref	Site Name	Proposed Use	Why it is preferred
BLA01/B	Land South of Morston Road	Residential	The site has good access to local facilities and services, where access would be from Langham Road. The site sits within the Norfolk Coast National Landscape and close to a number of natural and historic designations. There are also long ranging views of Blakeney Marshes when looking northwards from Langham Road. Consequently, a limited area of the site area is suitable for development where the site abuts the existing built form of the village. Any such development would also need to include sensitive mitigation that incorporates the enhancement of existing natural buffers in conjunction with open space. The Sustainability Appraisal for the site scores neutral overall.

Briston Additional Preferred Option

Site Ref	Site Name	Proposed Use	Why it is preferred
BRI02/C (Extension to existing allocation BRI02)	Land West of Astley School	Residential	The proposal would extend the existing allocated site BRI02 further southwards, which would also wrap around the rear of Astley Primary School. The site is well integrated to village facilities and services within both Briston and Melton Constable. The extended site scores positively in the Sustainability Appraisal.

Cromer Additional Preferred Options

Site Ref	Site Name	Proposed Use	Why it is preferred
C10/1	Land at Runton Road	Residential	The is well positioned for access to services and to the town centre. There are good pedestrian links

	/ Clifton Park		available and public transport is in walking distance and suitable access can be provided. Overall, the site scores positively in the Sustainability Appraisal, but there is a mixed Environmental score due to the potential for a negative biodiversity impact being in close proximity to CWSs (Cromer Sea Front, Hall Wood & Cromer Old Cemetery) and SSSI & local geodiversity site (East Runton Cliffs). The site is adjacent to and within the setting of the Norfolk Coast National Landscape. Mitigation measures will need to be incorporated, in terms of the location, scale and design of a development and sensitive landscaping. Overall, the site Sustainability Appraisal scores positively.
C22/4 (Extension to existing allocation C22/2)	Land West of Pine Tree Farm	Mixed Use (Residential + Sports Provision)	The proposal would extend the existing site allocation C22/2 further south of Beckett's Plantation, within the Norfolk Coast National Landscape, where landscape mitigation, along with careful layout and design, will be required to off-set the wider visual impact. Mitigation requirements in relation to the impact on the Grade II Pine Tree Farmhouse are already established in the site-specific policy (C22/2). Overall, the extended site Sustainability Appraisal has a negative and positive score. The Social and Economic objectives score positively, and the Environmental objectives have a mixed score, given the potential negative impact on the designated landscape, biodiversity and nearby heritage asset.

Cromer Alternative Additional Site Option

Site Ref	Site Name	Proposed Use	Why it is not preferred
C19/2	Land at Compitt Hills (Larners Plantation)	Residential	The entire site is not considered to be suitable for development, as it has a number of constraints. There may be potential for a smaller area to be considered for development. It also has poorer access to services and facilities in Cromer and Roughton Road itself is considered to be sub-standard and unsuitable for large scale development. The Sustainability Appraisal has a positive score overall.

Fakenham Alternative Additional Site Option

Site Ref	Site Name	Proposed Use	Why it is not preferred
F05	Land Between Holt Road & Greenway Lane	Residential, Retail	The site falls within the settlement boundary of Fakenham and is currently allocated for residential development. The Sustainability Appraisal for the site is positive overall. The site could therefore come forward at any time and does not require allocation.

Hoveton Additional Preferred Options

Site Ref	Site Name	Proposed Use	Why it is preferred
HV01/C (Extension to existing allocation HOV01/B)	Land East of Tunstead Road	Residential	The proposal would extend the existing site allocation HV01/B further northwards. The larger site may potentially have some impact on heritage assets to the north including Hoveton Hall Park and Gardens, and as such, landscape mitigation to the northern boundary will need to be carefully considered. Access for the site is from Tunstead Road, the extension will not require an additional access however it does provide an opportunity to provide a through connection to Stalham Road and the adjoining allocation, HV06/A. Overall the site scores positively in the Sustainability Appraisal.
HV06/A	Land at Stalham Road	Residential	The site has existing residential development on both sides and on the opposite side of Stalham Road. Access can be achieved from Stalham Road and there is potential for vehicular and pedestrian access to connect to the adjoining allocation, HV01/C. Overall, the site scores positively in the Sustainability Appraisal.

Hoveton Alternative Additional Site Option

Site Ref	Site Name	Proposed Use	Why it is not preferred
HV05	Land South of Littlewoods Lane	Residential	A smaller area of this site has been considered for development. The site is well related to the village and services. However, it is considered that the issues previously cited for the site cannot be resolved, being highly visible in the landscape, extending into open countryside beyond the current confines of the village and the potential for an adverse impact on the wider landscape. The overall Sustainability Appraisal scores positively.

Ludham Additional Preferred Option

Site Ref	Site Name	Proposed Use	Why it is not preferred
LUD01/C (Extension to existing allocation LUD01/A)	Land South Of School Road	Residential	The proposal is for the extension of the existing site allocation LUD01/A where the site forms an L-shape form extending to the south and west. The site is within walking distance of a number of local facilities and services. Access to the southern part of the site will be provided from Norwich Road and an area of open space should be provided to allow retention of views of the Grade I Listed St. Catherine's Church tower. In addition, landscape buffers could mitigate and soften views of the site from the north and west. The overall Sustainability Appraisal for the extended site has a positive and negative score.

Mundesley Additional Preferred Option

Site Ref	Site Name	Proposed Use	Why it is preferred
MUN03/A (Extension to existing allocation MUN03/B)	Land at Cromer Road and Church Lane	Residential	The proposal extends the existing allocation MUN03/B to the south and southwest, where two parcels of land are linked by part of a former railway embankment, which provides an opportunity for an enhanced area of open space that connects the two distinct parts of the extended site allocation. The site is well located to access the local village facilities and services and there are good public transport options available. Access to the extended southern part of the site would be from Church Lane. Overall, the Sustainability Appraisal for the extended site has a positive and negative score.

North Walsham Additional Preferred Option

Site Ref	Site Name	Proposed Use	Why it is preferred
NW16	Land at End of Mundesley Road	Residential	The site has good access to local services, education facilities, peak time public transport links, leisure and cultural opportunities, as well as employment opportunities. A short section of CWS Paston Way & Knaption Cutting crosses the northwest corner of the site and along with other nearby natural and historic environment designations the site will require sensitive landscape mitigation and buffers. Overall the Sustainability Appraisal has a positive and negative score.

Stalham Alternative Site Options

Site Ref	Site Name	Proposed Use	Why it is not preferred
ST04/A (Small portion of ST04)	Land at Brumstead Road / Calthorpe Close	Mixed Use	The site ST04/A is a smaller area of the previously assessed ST04. The site has good access to local services, education facilities, peak time public transport links, leisure and cultural opportunities, as well as employment opportunities. There are opportunities to retain and enhance existing landscape features within and adjacent to the site and improve connectivity via the PROW to the east. In addition, landscape mitigation will need to be provided in relation to longer views from the north. Overall, the Sustainability Appraisal for the proposed smaller site scores positively.
ST19/B (Extension to existing allocation ST19/A)	Land Adjacent Ingham Road	Residential	The site ST19/B is an extension to the existing site allocation ST19/A. The site would be extended to the northeast, being well situated to existing housing. It has good access to local services, education facilities, peak time public transport links, leisure and cultural opportunities, as well as employment opportunities. Landscape mitigation will be required along the north-eastern boundary

			to off-set the impact on wider views and provide a buffer between the development and existing dwellings. The overall Sustainability Appraisal score is positive.
--	--	--	---

6. Summary of Cumulative and Significant effects

Prediction, Evaluation and Mitigation of the Effects of the Plan

6.1 In the context of the main SA Report and this Addendum, the strategic actions are the draft policies and proposals. The prediction of effects seeks to consider the direct and indirect effects of the policies against the baseline and considers the scale, probability and impact of them. The effects have been identified through the full appraisal in the main SA Report Appendices B and C, with those assessed within this Addendum being updates to those policies and proposals and the cumulative appraisal below.

Summary of Cumulative Assessment

6.2 Table 2 below summarises the most sustainable policies as well as cumulative impacts and details how the different policies promote different aspects of sustainability across the 16 SA Objectives.

Table 2: Mitigation, Cumulative, Secondary and Synergistic Impact - Policies

Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
CC1 – Delivering Climate Resilient Sustainable Growth	++	+	+	+	+	++	++	++	++	++	0	+	+	0	0	+
CC2 - Renewable & Low Carbon Energy	0	+	+	++	+	+	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a
CC3 - Sustainable Construction, Energy Efficiency & Carbon Reduction	n/a	+	+	++	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	n/a	+	n/a	0	n/a	n/a
CC4 - Water Efficiency	n/a	++	++	++	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a
CC5 – Coastal Change Management	+	n/a	n/a	+	+	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CC6 - Coastal Change Adaptation	+	+	n/a	++	+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	+	n/a	+	n/a	+	n/a	n/a
CC7 - Flood Risk & Surface Water Drainage	n/a	n/a	++	++	n/a	++	+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CC8 - Electric Vehicle Charging	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	+	+	n/a	+
CC9 – Sustainable Transport	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	+	n/a	~	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	+	+	+	n/a	++
CC10 – Biodiversity Net Gain	+	n/a	+	++	n/a	++	++	++	+	+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a
CC11 - Green Infrastructure	0	n/a	+	+	n/a	++	++	++	+	++	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	+

CC12 – Trees, Hedgerows & Woodland	0	n/a	n/a	++	n/a	++	++	++	+	++	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CC13 – Protecting Environmental Quality	+	+	+	n/a	++	0	n/a	+	n/a	+	n/a	0	+	n/a	n/a	0
DRAFT SS1 – Spatial Strategy	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	++	+
SS2 - Development in the Countryside	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	n/a	+	+	+	n/a	-
SS3 - Community Led Development	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	++	+	++	++	+	0	0
HC1 – Health & Wellbeing	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	+	n/a	+	n/a	+
HC2 – Provision & Retention of Open Spaces	0	n/a	+	+	n/a	+	++	++	++	++	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	~
HC3 - Provision & Retention of Local Facilities	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	+	+
HC4 – Infrastructure Provision, Developer Contributions & Viability	n/a	n/a	+	0	+	++	+	n/a	n/a	++	n/a	+	n/a	+	n/a	0
HC5 - Fibre to Premises (FTTP)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	+	+	+	+	++	+	+
HC6 - Telecommunications Infrastructure	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	+	+	+	n/a	n/a	+	+	+	+
HC7 - Parking Provision	+	n/a	n/a	+	~	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	+	+	+	+	+
HC8 - Safeguarding Land for Sustainable Transport	0	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	~	+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	0	+	+	+	+
ENV1 - Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty & The Broads	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	+	+	+	0	0	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	-
ENV2 - Protection & Enhancement of Landscape & Settlement Character	++	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	+	++	++	++	+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	+	n/a
ENV3 - Heritage & Undeveloped Coast	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	~
ENV 4 Biodiversity & Geodiversity	n/a	n/a	+	+	n/a	++	++	++	+	+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a
ENV5 – Impacts on International & European sites, Recreational Impact Avoidance Mitigation Strategy	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	++	++	+	+	++	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0
ENV6 - Protection of Amenity	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	++	+	+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a
ENV7 - Protecting & Enhancing the Historic Environment	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	++	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a
ENV8 - High Quality Design	++	n/a	+	++	n/a	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	n/a	+	+	+
HOU1 – Delivering Sufficient Homes	-	0	-	+	n/a	?	+	+	?	+	n/a	++	+	++	++	+
HOU2 – Delivering the Right Mix of Homes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	++	n/a	++	+	n/a	0	n/a
HOU3 - Affordable Housing in the Countryside	-	n/a	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	n/a	++	n/a	+	0	-

HOU4 - Essential Rural Worker Accommodation	-	n/a	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	++	n/a	+	n/a	+	0	0
DRAFT HOU5 - Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople's Accommodation	-	n/a	0	0	?	?	n/a	+	?	+	+	+	n/a	+	n/a	0
HOU6 - Replacement Dwellings, Extensions, Domestic Outbuildings & Annexed Accommodation	+	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	+	?	+	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
HOU7 - Re-use of Rural Buildings in the Countryside	+	0	0	?	0	0	n/a	-	+	+	n/a	+	+	+	n/a	-
HOU8 - Accessible & Adaptable Homes	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	n/a	++	+	+	+	n/a
HOU9 - Minimum Space Standards	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	n/a	++	n/a	?	n/a	n/a
E1 - Employment Land	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	++	++	+	+
E2 - Employment Areas, Enterprise Zones & Former Airbases	+	n/a	n/a	0	+	n/a	n/a	+	+	+	n/a	n/a	++	++	+	~
E3 - Employment Development Outside of Employment Areas	++	n/a	n/a	?	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	++	++	n/a	~
E4 - Retail & Town Centre Development	+	0	0	+	n/a	?	+	+	+	+	++	+	+	+	++	++
E5 - Signage & Shopfronts	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	++	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	++	n/a
E6 - New Tourist Accommodation, Static Caravans & Holiday Lodges & Extensions to Existing Sites	~	0	0	+	+	++	n/a	+	?	~	n/a	n/a	+	++	n/a	+
E7 - Touring Caravan & Camping Sites	~	0	0	0	+	++	n/a	+	?	+	n/a	n/a	+	++	n/a	-
E8 - New Tourist Attractions & Extensions	0	0	0	0	+	+	n/a	+	?	+	n/a	n/a	+	++	n/a	-
E9 - Retaining an Adequate Supply & Mix of Tourist Accommodation	+	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	+	+	n/a	n/a

Table 3: Mitigation, Cumulative, Secondary & Synergistic Impacts – Sites

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
BLA04/A	Blakeney	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	?	-	?	+	+	++	0	0	+	0
DRAFT BLA01/B	Blakeney	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	0	-	0	+	+	++	0	0	+	0
BRI01	Briston	Residential	0	++	+	++	~	?	0	0	?	+	+	++	0	0	+	+
DRAFT BRI02/C	Briston	Residential	0	++	+	++	~	?	0	0	?	+	+	++	0	0	+	+
C07/2	Cromer	Residential	+	++	+	++	++	-	0	-	0	++	+	++	+	0	++	+
DRAFT C10/1	Cromer	Residential	-	++	++	++	0	-	?	-	0	+	+	++	+	0	++	+
C16	Cromer	Residential	-	++	+	++	+	-	0	-	0	++	+	++	+	0	++	+
DRAFT C22/4	Cromer	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	?	--	-	+	+	++	+	0	++	+
F01/B	Fakenham	Residential	-	++	+	++	+	?	?	-	0	++	+	++	++	0	++	+
F02	Fakenham	Residential	-	++	~	~	0	?	0	-	0	+	+	++	0	0	++	0
F03	Fakenham	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	?	0	-	0	+	+	++	++	0	++	+
F10	Fakenham	Residential	+	++	+	+	0	-	+	-	0	++	+	++	++	0	++	+
H17	Holt	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	0	-	-	+	+	++	+	0	++	+
H20	Holt	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	?	-	-	+	+	++	+	0	++	+
DRAFT HV01/C	Hoveton	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	?	?	-	0	++	+	++	++	0	++	++
DRAFT HV06/A	Hoveton	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	?	0	-	0	++	+	++	++	0	++	++
DRAFT LUD01/C	Ludham	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	?	0	-	0	0	+	++	0	0	+	0
LUD06/A	Ludham	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	0	-	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	+
DRAFT MUN03/A	Mundesley	Residential	-	++	~	~	+	-	0	-	-	~	+	++	+	0	+	+
DRAFT NW16	North Walsham	Residential	-	++	~	++	0	-	?	-	-	++	+	++	+	0	++	+
SH04	Sheringham	Residential	0	++	~	~	~	-	0	0	0	++	+	++	+	0	++	++
SH07	Sheringham	Residential	-	++	~	~	0	-	0	-	0	++	+	++	+	0	++	+

SH18/1B	Sheringham	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	?	-	-	++	+	++	+	0	++	+
DRAFT ST04/A	Stalham	Residential	-	++	~	~	0	?	0	-	0	++	+	++	+	0	++	++
DRAFT ST19/B	Stalham	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	?	?	-	0	++	+	++	+	0	++	++
W01/1	Wells	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	?	-	0	+	+	++	+	0	++	+
W07/1	Wells	Residential	-	++	+	+	0	-	0	-	-	++	+	++	+	0	++	+
NW01/B	North Walsham	Mixed Use	~	++	+	++	+	?	0	-	-	++	+	++	++	+	++	+
NW62/A (includes new area of land at northern end)	N. Walsham	Mixed Use [Residential, Employment, School, Open Space]	-	++	~	++	~	?	+	~	-	++	+	++	+	?	++	+
ST23/2	Stalham	Mixed Use [Residential & Employment]	0	++	~	~	0	-	?	-	-	++	+	++	++	++	++	++
H27/1	Holt	Employment	+	++	+	++	0	-	?	-	-	+	+	N/A	++	++	++	+
NW52	N. Walsham	Employment	--	++	~	++	~	?	?	--	0	-	+	N/A	++	++	~	0
E7	Tattersett	Employment	~	++	~	~	~	-	0	~	-	--	+	N/A	++	++	-	--

Conclusions of Cumulative Assessment

- 6.3 Almost all of the policies, including the updated draft policies and proposals assessed, are predicted to have positive effects on the relevant SA indicators.
- 6.4 The proposed revisions and updates to the two draft policies, SS 1 Spatial Strategy and HOU 5 Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople's Accommodation, bolster the significant positive cumulative effects in relation to the strategic and housing policies of the Plan. Where cumulatively, they are likely to have a positive effect upon the baseline indicators relating to different types of residential accommodation, by setting an appropriate framework for the delivery of homes that seek to boost supply in a sustainable way.
- 6.5 The cumulative assessment also confirms that the natural and historic environment including landscape character, biodiversity and heritage indicators would continue to achieve an overall positive cumulative effect when incorporating the proposed changes.
- 6.6 In terms of the overall site options, including the additional draft site proposals set out in Table 3 above, the majority of the sites score positively against SA Objectives SA10 and SA12, which relate to improving the quality of where people live and ensuring that everyone has the opportunity of a good quality, suitable and affordable home to meet their needs.
- 6.7 **Overall, the incorporation of the draft changes to the policies and proposals in the Plan, is likely to strengthen the predicted significant positive effects on the environmental, social and economic aspects of sustainability.**

7. Evaluation of Significant Effects

- 7.1 Twelve of the sixteen SA Objectives refer to one or both of the two draft policies, SS1 Spatial Strategy and HOU 5 Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople's Accommodation, in their assessments of significant effects. These have been reproduced and reviewed below. The complete significant effects assessment is contained within Chapter 10 (pages 145 – 155) of the main SA Report [A3] and this will be fully reviewed as part of the further SA assessment in relation to the proposed Main Modifications of the Local Plan, particularly as this will include the full complement of modifications to all of the policies and proposals.
- 7.2 In light of the narrow scope and content of this Addendum, the required 'Evaluation of Mitigation Measures' will be carried out as part of the further SA assessment in relation to the Main Modifications of the Local Plan.

SA Objective: SA1 - To promote the efficient use of land, minimise the loss of undeveloped land, optimise the use of previously developed land (PDL), buildings and existing infrastructure and protect the most valuable agricultural land.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
Loss of Greenfield land	CC1, CC2, CC5, CC6, CC13, DRAFT SS1, SS2, SS3, HC7, ENV 1, ENV 2, ENV8, HOU1, HOU3, HOU4, DRAFT HOU5, HOU6, HOU7, E2, E3, E4, E6, E7, E9	Negative	District Wide	Long term	Permanent	Certain
<p>Assessment: The NPPF requires Local Plans to include a target for the number of homes planned and to clearly explain how the Plan will deliver at least this amount. Within North Norfolk, there is a limited amount of previously developed land, meaning that the majority of development across the District will result in the loss of greenfield land. For development on agricultural land, Local Plans must have regard to the NPPF requirement to recognise the benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land (NPPF, 2021 para. 174 p. 50). In respect of efficiency, the NPPF requires that planning policies support development to make efficient use of land.</p>						
<p>Mitigation Proposal: The loss of greenfield land will be mitigated against by the allocating of sites for development in line with identified needs and locations. Each site allocation has undergone a detailed assessment, and the individual allocation policy identifies the appropriate minimum number of dwellings</p>						

balancing the requirement for the efficient use of land whilst respecting the distinctive local character. Final policies and allocations should be reviewed to ensure that excessive land is not allocated, and density is optimised in relation to this Objective and account is taken of any surroundings and constraints.

SA Objective: SA4 - To continue to reduce contributions to climate change and mitigate and adapt against it and its effects.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
The reduction of contributions to climate change is encouraged, as it the mitigation and adaptation against it and its effects	CC1, CC2, CC3, CC4, CC5, CC6, CC7, CC8, CC9, CC11, CC12, DRAFT SS1, HC2, HC7, ENV2, ENV3, ENV4, ENV5, ENV8, HOU1, E4, E6	Positive	District Wide	Long term	Permanent	Uncertain
<p>Assessment: Climate change is recognised as a significant effect locally, nationally and globally. Climate change is a cross-cutting issue with the potential to have wide-reaching effects, including on biodiversity and flooding. As a low-lying District and coastal area, North Norfolk is particularly vulnerable to sea level changes. In respect of climate change, the NPPF requires planning to mitigate and adapt to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. Through the Norfolk Strategic Framework, Norfolk authorities have identified climate change as being a strategic land use issue with cross boundary implications and have agreed to reduce Norfolk’s greenhouse gas emissions as well as the impact from, exposure to, and effects of climate change, including by locating development so as to reduce the need to travel, effecting a major shift away from car use, maximising the energy efficiency of development and promoting the use of renewable and low carbon energy sources and managing and mitigating against the risks of adverse sea level rise and flooding. Through the Duty to Cooperate, NNDC has worked with other authorities to produce Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, which assesses the extent of flooding taking into account climate change allowances as agreed with the Environment Agency.</p>						
<p>Mitigation Proposal: The Local Plan includes policies reflecting the presumption in favour of climate resilient sustainable development. Development is generally directed to being in and close to the towns and larger villages, where services can be found and access to public transport obtained. Although there are policies that seek to support growth in more rural locations for social and economic benefits, the negative impacts around increased reliance on private car use and Green field sites will be minimised, as only limited small scale growth is envisaged. Throughout the Plan there are policies encouraging renewable energy, managing flood risk, including the assessment of surface water, coastal erosion, groundwater run-off and potentially incorporating Sustainable Urban Drainage systems. In addition, specific policies promote sustainable transport, support the transition from carbon based vehicles to electric power and promote increased connectivity and open space provision, along with ensuring biodiversity and geodiversity remain important considerations in the development process. There are specific policies included on green infrastructure, open space, water efficiency, sustainable construction, energy efficiency and low carbon energy. It is recognised that development could lead to additional cars and emissions, but the approach taken in the Local Plan is to reduce contributions to climate change and to mitigate and adapt to its effects.</p>						

SA Objective: SA5 - To minimise pollution and to remediate contaminated land.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
Pollution is minimised and contaminated land is remediated	CC1, CC2, CC5, CC6, CC9, CC13, DRAFT SS1, HC4, HC7, E2, E6, E7, E8	Positive	District Wide	Long term	Permanent	Uncertain
<p>Assessment: The NPPF requires planning to minimise pollution, including preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution. Furthermore, contaminated land should be remediated and mitigated where appropriate (NPPF, 2021, para. 174 p.50). In terms of air quality, North Norfolk currently meets all of the national air quality objectives. In terms of water pollution, by 2019, 5 out of 6 of the district’s water bodies were rated as moderate for ecological status or potential and all 6 were rated good for chemical status (EA, 2019). The majority of the district is within an area designated as being at risk from agricultural nitrate pollution.</p> <p>Mitigation Proposal: As well as proposing a policy directly relating to pollution and hazard prevention and minimisation, which requires all development proposals to avoid, minimise and take every opportunity to reduce through mitigation measures, all emissions and other forms of pollution, the Local Plan also proposes a number of other policies, which would contribute towards this Objective, including encouraging sustainable development, directing development in or close to towns and larger villages, encouraging renewable energy, reducing the need to travel and maximising the use of sustainable transport. It is recognised that development could lead to additional cars and emissions, but the approach taken in the Local Plan seeks to avoid, prevent and minimise pollution when schemes come forward. The significant proportion of the planned growth relate to allocated sites, which are located in the larger settlements.</p>						

SA Objective: SA7 - To increase the provision of green infrastructure.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
The number of sites which contribute to GI within the District.	CC1, CC7, CC9, CC10, CC11, CC12, DRAFT SS1, SS2, SS3, HC2, HC4, HC8, ENV2, ENV4, ENV5, ENV8, HOU1, E4	Positive	District wide	Long term	Permanent	Uncertain
<p>Assessment: Through the NSF, Norfolk authorities have identified GI as being a strategic land use issue with cross boundary implications. This has culminated in the Green Infrastructure and a Recreation Avoidance Strategy (GIRAMS). New development has the potential to provide and enhance GI. Many policies</p>						

collectively are seeking enhanced provision, which will improve connectivity across the District and Policy CC11 has been designed specifically to ensure that all development delivers GI through the Plan.

Mitigation Proposal: As well as proposing a policy directly relating to the safeguarding, retention and enhancement of the GI network, the Local Plan proposes the inclusion of a number of other policies that seek to protect and provide GI. This includes policy HC2, which has been informed by the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (GIRAMS). As part of the North Norfolk Open Space Assessment (2019), an open space calculator was created to calculate the quantum of on-site open space to be provided, based on the number of bedrooms proposed by a residential development. In addition, large scale residential development will be required to provide additional enhanced GI order to assist in recreational mitigation measures and compliance to Habitat Regulations.

SA Objective: SA8 - To protect, manage and where possible enhance the special qualities of the areas’ landscapes, townscapes and seascapes (designated and non-designated) and their settings, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
New development maintains and strengthens the local distinctiveness and the sense of place of the landscape, townscape and seascape	CC1, CC2, CC6, CC11, CC12, SS3, HC2, HC6, ENV1, ENV2, ENV3, ENV4, ENV5, ENV8, ENV7, HOU1, DRAFT HOU5, HOU6, HOU7, E2, E4, E5, E6, E7, E8, E9	Positive	District Wide	Medium to long term	Permeant	Uncertain

Assessment: North Norfolk is considered to be outstanding in a national context for both its geology and its landforms. The importance of the District’s landscape has been assessed through a Landscape Character Assessment SPD (2021) and a Landscape Sensitivity Assessment SPD (2021). In addition, a number of Conservation Areas have Conservation Area Appraisal documents and there is a review programme being carried out to complete and adopt more.

Mitigation Proposal: Many of the policies proposed within the Local Plan contribute towards this Objective, including requiring that the natural character and beauty of the AONB and the Broads National Park is conserved and enhanced, the protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character, limiting development in the Heritage and Undeveloped Coast, protecting certain trees, hedgerows and woodland, encouraging the creation, enhancement and protection of open space and the protection of Local Green Space, the protection, enhancement and promotion of Public Rights of Way, encouraging high quality design and protecting and enhancing the historic environment. Overall, these policies require developers to consider the impacts and address environmental impacts positively and help to mitigate against proposals, which could harm the areas’ landscapes, townscapes and seascapes.

SA Objective: SA10 - To maintain and improve the quality of where people live and the quality of life of the population by promoting healthy lifestyles and access to services, facilities and opportunities that promote engagement and a healthy lifestyle (including open space), including reducing deprivation and inequality.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
Directing the majority of the new housing growth to the most sustainable settlements to ensure that new residents have access to services and also to support those existing services. Maximising opportunities to promote healthy lifestyles.	CC1, CC3, CC4, CC5, CC6, CC7, CC8, CC9, CC11, CC12, CC13, DRAFT SS1, SS2, SS3, HC1, HC2, HC3, HC4, HC5, HC6, HC7, HC8, ENV2, ENV3, ENV4, ENV5, ENV6, ENV8, HOU1, HOU2, HOU3, HOU4, DRAFT HOU5, HOU6, HOU7, HOU8, HOU9, E1, E2, E3, E4, E7, E8, E9	Positive	District wide	Medium – Long Term	Permanent	Uncertain
<p>Assessment: New development has the potential to impact upon the health and wellbeing of the population in a number of different ways. There are many opportunities through new development to deliver increases in public open space, cycle parking and increased access to green infrastructure networks. Although new development may have an impact upon the capacity at schools and doctor’s surgeries, the Local Plan provides the opportunity for investment to be aligned with proposed growth to ensure that new facilities and services are provided to meet the needs of the new and existing residents.</p> <p>Mitigation Proposal: Central to the Local Plan is ensuring that the population has good access to essential services and facilities. In general, this takes the form of promoting significant development in areas that have existing services but can also include requiring provision to be made for those services in response to new development. This can be sought through developer contributions as set out in policy in the Local Plan. Therefore, the significance of this effect is relatively high and essential to improving people’s health and wellbeing across the district. The emerging Local Plan seeks to ensure that open space is provided on all new major development and seeks to improve connectivity to these open spaces through a Green Infrastructure Policy and Strategy.</p>						

SA Objective: SA11 - To reduce crime and the fear of crime.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
Reduction in crime and the fear of crime through design quality	SS3, HC5, ENV6, ENV8, DRAFT HOU5, E4	Positive	Local	Medium term	Permanent	Uncertain
<p>Assessment: Whilst crime rates within North Norfolk are lower than Norfolk and England rates, crime rates are generally higher within the District's larger towns. The design of new development can play an important part in helping to reduce crime and the fear of crime within North Norfolk.</p>						
<p>Mitigation Proposal: The specific design policy and the North Norfolk Design Guide SPD reflect Secure by Design principles. Some of the principles include clearly defined private and public spaces, surveillance and overlooking of the public realm from new developments, ensuring that the street scene is overlooked by active frontages, where possible. These principles will help to ensure that new schemes can be delivered that conform to these principles, through the decision making process and thereby, help to reduce crime and the fear of crime.</p>						

SA Objective: SA12 - To ensure that everyone has the opportunity of a good quality, suitable and affordable home to meet their needs.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
Contribution towards good quality housing (including affordable housing and housing for elderly)	CC1, CC3, CC6, CC7, CC9, DRAFT SS1, SS2, SS3, HC4, HC5, HC7, ENV1, ENV6, ENV8, HOU1, HOU2, HOU3, HOU4, DRAFT HOU5, HOU6, HOU7, HOU8, HOU9, E4	Positive	District wide	Long term	Permanent	Certain
<p>Assessment: The Central Norfolk Housing Market Assessment has assessed the affordable housing requirement within North Norfolk, based on the level of need of the population within the housing market area. There are a number of policies within the Local Plan, which will have a positive impact on affordable</p>						

housing provision, with all new major developments being expected to provide affordable housing. Some of the environmental policies have the potential to have a mixed impact on the achievement of this Objective as they restrict the area where new housing can be developed.

Mitigation Proposal: Policy HOU2 seeks to secure affordable housing on all residential developments of 6 or more dwellings. This has been reduced from the previous policy requirement of 11. This will help meet the affordable housing need identified through the Central Norfolk Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Local Plan also allows for rural affordable exception sites, which have an important role in delivering affordable housing to areas outside of the locational strategy (the settlement hierarchy). There is an unknown potential impact arising from the development of small scale sites in relation to Small Growth Villages, arising from the larger profit margins for market housing over affordable dwellings. It is proposed that the delivery of rural exception sites is monitored to ensure that the delivery of these schemes within areas of identified need continues over the plan period.

SA Objective: SA13 - To encourage sustainable economic development and education/skills training covering a range of sectors and skill levels to improve employment opportunities for residents.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
Employment opportunities of residents improved through sustainable economic development and education/skills training	CC1, CC8, CC13, DRAFT SS1, SS2, SS3, HC5, HC6, HC7, HC8, ENV2, ENV4, HOU1, HOU2, HOU7, HOU8, E1, E2, E3, E4, E6, E7, E8, E9	Positive	District Wide	Medium-Long Term	Permanent	Uncertain

Assessment: The NPPF states that planning policies should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. The NPPF emphasises the importance of setting a clear economic vision and strategy that positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth, including supporting a prosperous rural economy. The Business Growth and Investment Opportunities Study (2015) identified areas for potential opportunity within the District and the key findings of this study fed into the Employment Background Paper (2019). This Background Paper underpins the policies within the Local Plan by taking account of past take up rates in order to establish the employment land requirement within the District over the plan period. The policies within the plan have a positive effect in promoting employment opportunities for residents within the District.

Mitigation Proposal: The policies within the Local Plan seek to ensure that Employment Areas are protected for employment use, a total of 271.34 hectares. New employment land is proposed through allocations in a number of sustainable locations within the District. Policies within the plan also allow for the development of employment opportunities within rural areas to ensure that employment opportunities are available to all within the District. New residential development is primarily directed towards the most sustainable settlements with employment land or good transport links to higher order settlements. This will ensure that the majority of the population of the District have access to employment opportunities and education/skills training.

SA Objective: SA14 - To encourage investment.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
To encourage investment within North Norfolk	CC2, CC6, CC8, CC9, CC11, DRAFT SS1, SS2, SS3, HC3, HC4, HC5, HC6, HC8, ENV3, ENV8, HOU1, HOU2, HOU7, HOU8, E1, E2, E3, E4, E6, E7, E8, E9	Positive	District Wide	Medium-Long Term	Permanent	Uncertain
<p>Assessment: The NPPF sets out that planning policies should help create the conditions in which business can invest, expand and adapt. As the District is largely rural in nature, investment opportunities are encouraged through creating the opportunities for new housing, employment, retail and tourist facilities.</p> <p>Mitigation Proposal: The housing policies seek to meet the required housing need of the district, encouraging people to live within the District. The economic policies seek to retain Employment Areas for employment uses and the plan promotes new employment land in sustainable locations across the District, offering the platform for investment in the District. The policies in regard to new employment are considered to be flexible to ensure that new employment development can be delivered in the main towns and rural areas, to ensure that investment is promoted District wide. The retail policies within the plan encourage opportunities for investment in the Town Centres of the main market towns within the district. Tourism is vital to the district's economy and new tourism opportunities are supported through policies within the plan. Take up rates of housing, employment, retail and tourism are to be monitored to ensure that the approach maximises the opportunities for investment.</p>						

SA Objective: SA15 - To maintain and enhance town centres.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
Town centres are maintained and enhanced	CC11, DRAFT SS1, HC3, HC6, HC7, HC8, ENV2, ENV6, ENV7, ENV8, HOU1, E1, E2, E4, E5	Positive	Local	Medium Term	Permanent	Uncertain
<p>Assessment: The district's seven Market towns and the large village of Hoveton all contain town centres that provide a different range of shopping, leisure and service provision to residents of the surrounding rural communities. High streets and town centres face a significant challenge with the rise of online shopping,</p>						

the continued squeeze on disposable incomes and shop closures by national retail service providers. The NPPF places great emphasis on the role that residential development can play in ensuring the vitality of centres and to ensure that Main Town Centre Uses are directed towards the Primary Shopping Areas, where possible. The North Norfolk Retail and Main Town Centre Uses Study 2017 sets out the hierarchy of town centres within North Norfolk and provides a detailed qualitative and quantitative assessment to establish the capacity to support retail floorspace growth. The North Norfolk Employment Growth Study background paper establishes a hierarchy of employment sites within the district. Maintaining and enhancing town centres also relates to aesthetics and urban design principles, making the town centres places that people want to spend time.

Mitigation Proposal: The Local Plan establishes a settlement and retail hierarchy which ensures that the majority of the housing growth, retail growth and employment growth is directed towards the Market Towns and the large village of Hoveton. The majority of new housing is promoted directly through housing allocations to the Market Towns as the most sustainable settlements. Housing Policies are supportive of new development in the main towns within the district. Employment policies are supportive of employment development on Employment Areas within the towns and the plan seeks to promote new employment land to the market towns. Retail policies are supportive of new development that enhances the vitality and viability of the town centres and sets out a clear hierarchy of Towns within the District. The town centres are defined and Main Town Centre Uses are directed, in the first instance, towards the Primary Shopping Areas. The design policies within the Local Plan seek to ensure that any new development will maintain and enhance the aesthetics of the town centres.

SA Objective: SA16 - To reduce the need to travel and to promote the use of sustainable transport.

Effect	Policy	Positive/ Negative	Spatial Effect	Duration (short/medium/Long term)	Temporary / permanent	Probability of occurrence
New development is located in the most sustainable locations, maximising the opportunities for the use of sustainable transport options.	CC9, DRAFT SS1, SS2, SS3, HC3, HC5, HC6, HC7, HC8, ENV1, HOU1, HOU3, HOU7, E1, E4, E6, E7, E8	Positive	District Wide	Medium	Permanent	Uncertain

Assessment: North Norfolk is a relatively peripheral, rural district, with a low population density and an aging population. The majority of the population live in the seven Market Towns within the district. Much of the existing economic travel demand is seasonal and tourism related. Public transport use is limited (2% of commuting trips). The NPPF (2021) promotes sustainable transport, setting out that significant development should be focused on locations, which are or can be made sustainable. To ensure that development is promoted to the most sustainable locations, North Norfolk District Council has produced a Distribution of Growth Background Paper, which identifies the most sustainable settlements within the district.

Mitigation Proposal: The settlement hierarchy as defined within the Local Plan seeks to ensure that the majority of the growth proposed is directed towards the most sustainable settlements i.e. those with the most services and facilities. The majority is focused on the top two tiers of the hierarchy. The Plan as a whole promotes connectivity and access to open space.

Appendix A – Appraisal of Draft Policies

Draft Policy SS 1 Spatial Strategy

	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16
Policy Approach SS 1 taking account of proposed 10 additional SGVs and 9% Indicative Housing Allowance	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	++	+
Policy Approach SS 1 (Regulation 19)	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	++	+

Comment: The updated draft policy approach sees the distribution of growth focussed on those settlements that provide the broadest range of access to day-to-day services and facilities across the district and as such, scores positively in relation to the economic indicators. By directing the majority of growth to the largest towns the approach sees the optimisation of existing infrastructure and allows providers to plan in the most efficient ways. These locations have high levels of affordable housing need and are the most accessible through a variety of transport modes, with the potential of reducing the districts reliance on the private car and offering the best growth to support public transport. The approach ensures that small scale development is supported in many small growth villages across the district to allow them to prosper and thrive. The approach scores well against the environmental considerations as the focused growth pattern will help preserve the rural character of the district. However, the approach scores less well in relation to use of PDL, as development would need to rely on the use of greenfield land. Alternative approaches around dispersed growth and/or through the creation of new settlements, places more reliance on lower order settlements with unsustainable travel patterns and where there would be a likely increase on the reliance of services and jobs elsewhere.

SA objective	Effect	Timescale ST/MT/LT	Permanence T/P	Comments
1. To promote the efficient use of land, minimise the loss of undeveloped land, optimise the use of previously developed land (PDL), buildings and existing infrastructure and protect the most valuable agricultural land.	0	LT	P	The approach concentrates the majority of the growth into defined large growth towns and then small growth towns followed by (to a lesser extent) 4 large growth villages. As such, development is directed to the most appropriate land and by minimising the loss of undeveloped land and keeping sites close to existing settlement boundaries. The majority of development will be on greenfield land, due to the limited opportunities for large scale growth on brownfield sites across the district. The number of Small Growth Villages identified would increase from 23 (currently listed in the policy) to 33, which would have the opportunity to deliver proportionate small scale growth of an increased allowance of 9%. Along with windfall development these sites will be a mix of brownfield and greenfield. However, there is limited PDL within North Norfolk, which means that the majority of development will likely require the use of undeveloped land. As such, the objective is scored as having a neutral effect.

2. To minimise waste generation and avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources.	0	LT	P	Development will increase the production of waste. Through the concentration and coordination of plan led growth with the vast majority of development plan led, waste should be kept to a minimum and mineral locations avoided.
3. To limit water consumption to the capacity of natural processes and storage systems and to maintain and enhance water quality and quantity.	0	LT	P	All new development will have an impact on water consumption. The policy will have a long term impact on water supply as it allocates for growth and facilitates demand in an area of water stress. The locational strategy has been informed by Anglian Water resource capacity and the Water Resource Management Plan and seeks to direct the majority of growth to existing urban areas where there is existing head room. Although the management plan confirms there is sufficient resource to meet anticipated growth, the plan outlines that investment is required to ensure supply continues through the plan period. The specific impacts are dependent on a number of parameters, not least the effective use and management of available resources, WWT capacity, network capacity and associated investment and the requirement to upgrade wider facilities in some settlements in order to address environmental concerns. Site specific factors and the design and landscaping proposed will also be important in ensuring compatibility with this objective.
4. To continue to reduce contributions to climate change and mitigate and adapt against it and its effects.	+	LT	P	The locational strategy has been prepared with regard to a number of parameters and constraints including the SFRA incorporating climate change allowances and Anglian Water Management Plan. The majority of growth is directed at existing settlements and site selection directs preferred sites to areas of low risk from all sources of flooding. The main urban areas are the better connected in relation to public transport and as such, offers the best chance of promoting sustainable transport options and climate change resilience.
5. To minimise pollution and to remediate contaminated land.	+	MT	P	By directing growth to the main areas and supporting Infill development in the main the policy scores positively against this objective.
6. To protect and enhance the areas' biodiversity and	+	ST	P	Compatibility with this objective will be largely dependent on specific site

<p>geodiversity assets (protected and unprotected species and designated and non-designated sites).</p>				<p>allocations. However, the need to deliver a significant volume of dwellings to meet housing requirements, in accordance with the spatial strategy, will mean pressure on both urban brownfield sites and peripheral greenfield sites that have biodiversity value. The approach, however, concentrates the majority of new development in areas where there is already existing built form and as a result, less impacts are anticipated on the wider biodiversity of the district. Fewer and larger sites provide the opportunity for substantial on-site recreational provision, which will assist in minimising the impacts of growth on the coastal European sites.</p>
<p>7. To increase the provision of green infrastructure.</p>	+	MT	P	<p>By directing significant growth to larger sites and the fringes of larger settlements there is an increased opportunity to enhance and deliver new GI. The impact and contributions to GI provision of the other settlements will depend on the future identification of opportunities, and the scale of development.</p>
<p>8. To protect, manage and where possible enhance the special qualities of the areas' landscapes, townscapes and seascapes (designated and non-designated) and their settings, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.</p>	+	MT	P	<p>The locational strategy has been informed by the Landscape Character Assessment SPD (2018) and has taken into account the valued features of each landscape type. The two larger growth towns where the preferred option directs growth to, are identified as having greater capacity to accommodate growth without detrimental environmental impact. The policy approach also ensures that where sustainable growth options are available, major development will not be permitted within the AONB.</p>
<p>9. To protect, manage and where possible enhance the historic environment and their settings including addressing heritage at risk.</p>	+	MT	P	<p>The historic environment often includes the core areas of town centres and wider conservation areas, as well as many rural buildings such as churches. The approach directs growth mainly to the fringes of the larger settlements. Impacts on historic town centres and listed buildings are site specific and have been considered through undertaking Historic Impact assessments for each site allocation in order to reduce and mitigate any identified impact to the historic environment. This approach concludes that the majority of growth can be delivered without significant harm.</p>

10. To maintain and improve the quality of where people live and the quality of life of the population by promoting healthy lifestyles and access to services, facilities and opportunities that promote engagement and a healthy lifestyle (including open space), including reducing deprivation and inequality.	+	LT	P	The policy approach sees the main growth directed towards the most sustainable locations in terms of access to services and as such, provides the opportunity to support and enhance service provision. At the same time it seeks to provide for proportionate small scale growth in small growth villages reflecting the rural nature of the District.
11. To reduce crime and the fear of crime.	0	ST-LT	P	Such design requirements will need to be assessed through the planning application process.
12. To ensure that everyone has the opportunity of a good quality, suitable and affordable home to meet their needs.	+	ST	P	The policy seeks to provide new housing across the district in the most sustainable locations. The approach includes allocation of sites in small growth villages of high enough numbers to enable a proportion of affordable housing to be provided on site in each location.
13. To encourage sustainable economic development and education/skills training covering a range of sectors and skill levels to improve employment opportunities for residents.	+	MT	P	By directing all growth and addressing the identified needs, the approach seeks to provide for the residential needs of the district. By locating growth in the larger towns and seeking small scale growth in the settlements with small scale services the approach is supportive of employment development and provides easy access to education – secondary in the first two tiers and primary in the majority of the large and small growth villages.
14. To encourage investment.	+	ST	P	The policy approach directs growth and hence investment into selected settlements. As such, it encourages more sustained investment into the larger towns in order to provide infrastructure improvements and support local services.
15. To maintain and enhance town centres.	++	MT	P	The approach is based on service provision. By directing growth to the larger towns the approach is seeking to support the town centres. Smaller scale growth directed at locations with services helps sustain local services.
16. To reduce the need to travel and to promote the use of sustainable transport.	+	MT	P	The policy directs significant growth to the settlements that support public transport. Growth in the lower order settlements is less served by public transport and combined with the rural locations will lead to more reliance on the private car. The effect however remains positive as the substantial

				growth will support the existing public transport routes.
Potential Mitigation Measures: The policy approach scores well against the relevant criteria. As such, no mitigation measures are identified.				

Draft Policy HOU 5 Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople's Accommodation

	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16
Policy Approach HOU 5 (with updated evidence and supporting text)	-	n/a	0	0	?	?	n/a	+	?	+	+	+	n/a	+	n/a	0
Policy Approach HOU 5 (Regulation 19)	-	n/a	0	0	?	?	n/a	+	?	+	+	+	n/a	+	n/a	0

Comment: The policy approach scores well against the relevant social objectives. The updated approach is informed by the revised evidence of the North Norfolk Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople's Accommodation Needs Assessment (September 2024), which identifies a need for a total of 11 pitches over the revised plan period. This along with the use of a criteria base for the assessment of applications, provides the necessary flexibility for families and remains appropriate to address the identified needs in North Norfolk. In addition, the updated criteria ensures that any sites are well related to services and proposals minimise adverse effects and that the potential loss of existing sites would need to be appropriately justified.

SA objective	Effect	Timescale ST/MT/LT	Permanence T/P	Comments
1. To promote the efficient use of land, minimise the loss of undeveloped land, optimise the use of previously developed land (PDL), buildings and existing infrastructure and protect the most valuable agricultural land.	-	ST	P	The draft policy directs growth to sites outside settlement boundaries. These will principally be greenfield in nature.
2. To minimise waste generation and avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources.	N/A	N/A	N/A	
3. To limit water consumption to the capacity of natural processes and storage systems and to maintain and enhance water quality and quantity.	0	MT	P	The location and type of site, whether it be for an individual family or a transit use will be specific to each application.
4. To continue to reduce contributions to climate change and mitigate and adapt against it and its effects.	0	N/A	N/A	Compatibility with this objective will depend on location. New sites on the edge of settlements are likely to increase reliance on cars and greenfield gas emissions. The level of impact will depend on the number of sites and locations.
5. To minimise pollution and to remediate contaminated land.	?	MT	P	All new sites will create some pollution. The policy allows development on PDL as well as greenfield. The effects are uncertain.

6. To protect and enhance the areas' biodiversity and geodiversity assets (protected and unprotected species and designated and non-designated sites).	?	N/A	P	The exact impact depends on the location of any new site. The proposed policy does not make specific reference to biodiversity or geodiversity considerations and as such, the impacts are uncertain.
7. To increase the provision of green infrastructure.	N/A	N/A	N/A	
8. To protect, manage and where possible enhance the special qualities of the areas' landscapes, townscapes and seascapes (designated and non-designated) and their settings, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.	+	MT	P	The policy refers to the need to minimise landscape impacts. The impact will be site specific.
9. To protect, manage and where possible enhance the historic environment and their settings including addressing heritage at risk.	?	MT	P	The policy approach makes no reference to the consideration of historic environment.
10. To maintain and improve the quality of where people live and the quality of life of the population by promoting healthy lifestyles and access to services, facilities and opportunities that promote engagement and a healthy lifestyle (including open space), including reducing deprivation and inequality.	+	ST-MT	P	The draft policy sets a specific need of at least 11 pitches to address the specific needs of Gypsies and Travellers within the district, as well as including a criteria base to ensure planning applications considered on a case by case basis. The approach supports the consideration of neighbours and amenity.
11. To reduce crime and the fear of crime.	+	MT	P	Providing for adequate provision of sites should limit the need and occurrence of unauthorised encampments. As such the policy scores positive against this objective.
12. To ensure that everyone has the opportunity of a good quality, suitable and affordable home to meet their needs.	+	MT	P	The policy is supportive of applicants seeking to address their own needs through the application process. As such a clear policy direction is provided to ensure all groups have access to appropriate housing to meet their needs. The approach allows for the expansion of existing sites and or modest growth to address newly arising needs at a point in time.
13. To encourage sustainable economic development and education/skills training covering a range of sectors and skill levels to improve	N/A	N/A	N/A	

employment opportunities for residents.				
14. To encourage investment.	+	MT	P	The policy approach provides the framework for appropriate investment.
15. To maintain and enhance town centres.	N/A	N/A	N/A	
16. To reduce the need to travel and to promote the use of sustainable transport.	0	N/A	N/A	The policy steers appropriate development to locations outside, but closely related to settlements, and as such is likely to encourage reliance on private vehicle use. The effects are likely to be neutral given the nomadic preferences of this group.
<p>Potential Mitigation Measures: The policy approach scores well against the relevant social objectives and as such, there is no requirement for any mitigation. The approach takes into consideration local circumstances and the nature and specific minimum level of need over the plan period, while allowing flexibility for more proposals to come forward and by setting a criteria based approach for the assessment of applications ensuring that sites are identified in sustainable locations that are related to services and that proposals minimise adverse highway and landscape impacts.</p>				

Appendix B - Appraisal of Draft Additional Site Proposals – Preferred Options

Blakeney

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
BLA01/B	Blakeney	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	0	-	0	+	+	++	0	0	+	0
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as neutral</p> <p>Environmental – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, not considered at risk of SWF (CC). Potential negative biodiversity impact; immediately adjacent SSSI (Wiveton Downs), close proximity to SSSI, SPA, SAC & RAMSAR (North Norfolk Coast), National Nature Reserve (Blakeney) and local geodiversity sites (North Norfolk Coast & Wiveton Downs), within Norfolk Coast National Landscape arable land with mature hedgerow / trees to majority of boundaries. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to local healthcare service and primary education facilities, limited leisure and cultural opportunities, public transport links mainly rely on Coastal Hopper.</p> <p>Economic – Scores neutral; edge of settlement, some access to employment, educational facilities, services / facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity, limited transport links. Could support local services.</p>																	

Briston

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
BRI02/C	Briston	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	0	-	0	+	+	++	0	0	+	+
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, not considered at risk of SWF (CC). Potential negative biodiversity impact; close proximity CWS (Briston Gorse), arable land, surrounded by mature hedgerow / trees. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to local healthcare service, primary education facilities, peak time public transport links and limited leisure and cultural opportunities.</p> <p>Economic – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, some access to employment, educational facilities, transport links and services / facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity. Could support local services.</p>																	

Cromer

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
C10/1	Cromer	Residential	-	++	++	++	0	-	?	-	0	+	+	++	+	0	++	+
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, small area potentially susceptible to SWF (CC). Potential negative biodiversity impact; adjacent AONB, close proximity CWSs (Cromer Sea Front, Hall Wood & Cromer Old Cemetery), SSSI & local geodiversity site (East Runton Cliffs), scrub, dry grassland. Localised potential to contribute to and / or impact on GI network. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to peak time public transport links, leisure and cultural opportunities, access to local healthcare service, education facilities.</p> <p>Economic – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to employment, services / facilities, transport links, access to educational facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity. Town centre easily accessible from the site.</p>																	

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
C22/4	Cromer	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	?	--	-	+	+	++	+	0	++	+
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall, the site scores as negative and positive</p> <p>Environmental - Scores mixed; edge of settlement, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, not considered at risk of SWF (CC). Potential to affect setting of Grade II Listed Building (Pine Tree Farmhouse). Potential for remediation of contamination. Potential negative biodiversity impact; within National Landscape, arable, mature trees / hedgerow to boundaries, adjacent woodland. Localised potential to contribute to and / or impact on GI network. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to local healthcare service, education facilities, peak time public transport links, access to leisure and cultural opportunities.</p> <p>Economic – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to educational facilities, transport links, access to employment, services / facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity. Town centre accessible from the site.</p>																	

Hoveton

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
HV01/C	Hoveton	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	?	?	-	0	++	+	++	++	0	++	++
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores neutral; edge of settlement, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, not considered at risk of SWF (CC). Biodiversity impact uncertain; arable, mature hedgerow / trees to majority of boundary. Localised potential to contribute to and / or impact on GI network. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to local healthcare service, education facilities, peak time public transport links, leisure and cultural opportunities.</p> <p>Economic – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to employment, educational facilities, transport links and services / facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity. Town centre easily accessible from the site.</p>																	

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
HV06/A	Hoveton	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	?	0	-	0	++	+	++	++	0	++	++
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, insignificant area potentially susceptible to SWF (CC). Biodiversity impact uncertain; arable, part of boundary comprised of mature hedgerow / trees. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to local healthcare service, education facilities, peak time public transport links, leisure and cultural opportunities.</p> <p>Economic – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to employment, educational facilities, transport links and services / facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity. Town centre easily accessible from the site.</p>																	

Ludham

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
LUD01/C	Ludham	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	?	0	-	0	0	+	++	0	0	+	0
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as negative and positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, mostly within FZ1, FZ2 touches part east boundary, low susceptibility GWF, not considered at risk of SWF (CC). Potential negative biodiversity impact; close proximity The Broads, arable, mature hedgerow / trees to some boundaries. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores neutral; edge of settlement, good access to local healthcare service and primary education facilities, limited leisure and cultural opportunities and limited peak time public transport links.</p> <p>Economic – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, good access to services / facilities, some access to employment, educational facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity, limited transport links. Could support local services.</p>																	

Mundesley

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
MUN03/A	Mundesley	Residential	-	++	~	~	+	-	0	-	-	~	+	++	+	0	+	+
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as negative and positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, small area potentially susceptible to SWF (CC). Adjacent CERZ (northern boundary). Potential to affect setting of Grade II Listed Building (Church of All Saints) and CA. Potential for remediation of contamination. Potential negative biodiversity impact; close proximity CWS (Mundesley Cliffs), arable / grazing land, part of boundary comprised of mature hedgerow / trees. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, good access to peak time public transport links, local healthcare service, education facilities, some leisure and cultural opportunities. Could result in loss of designated open land area.</p> <p>Economic – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to employment and transport links and to some educational facilities and other services / facilities. Access to high speed broadband uncertain. Could support local services.</p>																	

North Walsham

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
NW16	North Walsham	Residential	-	++	~	++	0	-	?	-	-	++	+	++	+	0	++	+
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as negative and positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, FZ1, low / low to moderate susceptibility GWF, small area potentially susceptible to SWF (CC). Potential to affect setting of Grade II Listed Building (The Thatched Cottage). Potential negative biodiversity impact; includes a short section of CWS (Paston Way & Knapton Cutting), arable, mature trees / hedgerow to majority of boundary. Localised potential to contribute to and / or impact on GI network. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to local healthcare service, education facilities, peak time public transport links, leisure and cultural opportunities.</p> <p>Economic – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to employment, services / facilities, transport links, access to educational facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity. Town centre easily accessible from the site.</p>																	

Stalham

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
ST04/A	Stalham	Residential	-	++	~	~	0	?	0	-	0	++	+	++	+	0	++	++
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores neutral; edge of settlement, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, approximately 1/6 of site potentially susceptible to SWF (CC). Biodiversity impact uncertain; arable land, part of boundary comprised of mature hedgerow / trees. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to peak time public transport links, local healthcare service, education facilities, leisure and cultural opportunities.</p> <p>Economic – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to employment, educational facilities, transport links and services / facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity. Town centre easily accessible from the site.</p>																	

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
ST19/B	Stalham	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	?	?	-	0	++	+	++	+	0	++	++
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, not considered at risk of SWF (CC). Biodiversity impact uncertain; arable land, surrounded by mature hedgerow / trees. Localised potential to contribute to and / or impact on GI network. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to peak time public transport links, local healthcare service, education facilities, leisure and cultural opportunities.</p> <p>Economic – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to employment, educational facilities, transport links and services / facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity. Town centre easily accessible from the site.</p>																	

Appendix C - Appraisal of Alternative Site Options

Cromer

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
C19/2	Cromer	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	?	-	0	+	+	++	+	0	++	+
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, not considered at risk of SWF (CC). Potential negative biodiversity impact; within Norfolk Coast National Landscape, arable, mature trees / hedgerow to boundaries, adjacent woodland. Localised potential to contribute to and / or impact on GI network. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to education facilities, peak time public transport links, access to local healthcare service, leisure and cultural opportunities.</p> <p>Economic – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to educational facilities, transport links, access to employment, services / facilities. Access to high speed broadband uncertain. Town centre accessible from the site.</p>																	

Fakenham

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
F05	Fakenham	Residential	++	++	+	++	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	++	++	0	++	++
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores positively; within settlement, PDL, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, insignificant area potentially susceptible to SWF (CC). Potential for remediation of contamination (PDL). Potential townscape enhancement. Limited biodiversity impact; PDL mature trees / hedgerow to parts of boundary. No loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; within settlement, good access to peak time public transport links, local healthcare service, education facilities, leisure and cultural opportunities.</p> <p>Economic – Scores positively; within settlement, good access to employment, educational facilities, transport links and services / facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity. Town centre easily accessible from the site.</p>																	

Hoveton

Site Ref	Settlement	Use	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16
HV05	Hoveton	Residential	-	++	+	++	0	-	+	-	-	++	+	++	++	0	++	++
Overall Conclusion	<p>Overall the site scores as positive</p> <p>Environmental – Scores mixed; edge of settlement, FZ1, low susceptibility GWF, not considered at risk of SWF (CC). Potential to affect setting of Grade II* Listed Building (Church of St John). Potential negative biodiversity impact; adjacent The Broads, arable surrounded by mature hedgerow / trees. Localised potential to contribute to GI network. Loss of agricultural (1-3) land.</p> <p>Social – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to local healthcare service, education facilities, peak time public transport links, leisure and cultural opportunities.</p> <p>Economic – Scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to employment, educational facilities, transport links and services / facilities. High speed broadband in vicinity. Town centre easily accessible from the site.</p>																	