

Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk



Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Potential Sites and Policies Sustainability Appraisal Addendum

(Draft Interim Report)

January 2024

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Background context and relationship to previous SA work	4
3.	Sustainability Appraisal Method	5
4.	The Council's Strategy for Assessing Potential Locations for Current and Future Gypsy and Traveller Provision	
5.	Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Proposed Policies	8
6.	Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Proposed Allocated Site Options	9
	Proposed Sites for Intensification	0
	Formalisation of existing pitches:1	8
	Newly proposed site allocations:2	20
	Travelling Showpeople proposed sites:2	21
	Proposed broad locations for growth / extension to existing sites	23
7.	Summary	26
8.	Next Steps2	26
9.	Appendices2	28
	Appendix A: Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives2	28
	Appendix B: Site Sustainability Factors	31
	Appendix C: Relationship between Site Sustainability Factors and Local Plan Review Sustainability	
	Appendix D: Scoring Criteria	34

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Addendum was published in January 2024 to support the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan examination (submitted March 2022), focusing on the assessment of potential Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (GTTS) sites and related local plan policies. It should be read alongside the King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), June 2023 (prepared by ORS on behalf of the Borough Council). The SA Scoping Report (2017), Scoping Report update (2020), SA Addendum and non-technical summary (2022) and the SA Incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) 2020¹ provide supporting context relating to the overall SA process. The SA 2020 with subsequent July 2022 updates sets out the background and process undertaken to produce the Sustainability Appraisal including SEA and the methodology.
- 1.2 The primary objective of the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum is to provide an objective and robust assessment of potential sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and evaluate their suitability across sustainability objectives, following production of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) (June 2023)². As this had initially been proposed as a joint piece of work outside the current Local Plan Review at the time of producing the main SA report, the GTTS requirement was not included within the assessment. The SA report submitted alongside the Local Plan was supported by the 2016 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment³, However, further to the Planning Inspector's request for more up to date evidence on GTTS need in the Borough, the GTAA was commissioned in January 2023.
- 1.3 Within this document, potential locations for GTTS sites have been considered against the criteria outlined in Appendix B (also detailed in the non-technical summary document⁴), which follow the methodology set for site allocations in the SA report (2020). The site sustainability factors consider access to services, community and social, economy (business and food production), flood risk, heritage, highways and transport, landscape and amenity, natural environment, infrastructure, pollution and waste and climate change. These are consistent with the site-specific criteria used for the main SA report.

norfolk.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/2579/gypsy and traveller accommodation assessment 2016.pdf

¹ <u>https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20079/planning_policy_and_local_plan/629/sustainability_appraisal</u> ² <u>https://www.west-</u>

norfolk.gov.uk/info/20185/planning_policy_research/523/gypsy_and_traveller_accommodation_assessment ³ <u>https://www.west-</u>

⁴ https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20079/planning_policy_and_local_plan/629/sustainability_appraisal

- 1.4 In addition, the deliverability of these potential sites has also been considered in relation to whether these sites will be developed in the first-five years of the Plan or beyond. This is closely linked to where the accommodation need is coming from and the likely reality of whether undeveloped alternative locations will actually be delivered.
- 1.5 The outcome of this report will inform the Council on the selection of the most sustainable and deliverable site allocations and contribute to meeting the 15-year requirement as set out in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). In addition, to help manage any speculative development that may occur throughout the Plan period, the Council has proposed a criteria-based policy which, in line with national planning policy, will enable any future development for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation to be delivered in an appropriate and sustainable manner.
- 1.6 The Council is consulting on the full list of sites and locations, identified as potentially suitable and deliverable for accommodating the required GTTS need. The consultation is seeking views on the proposed strategy for accommodating GTTS needs in the Borough, individual site proposals and supporting policies. The information contained in this report will be used to assess how the proposals contribute to the objective of achieving sustainable development.

2. Background context and relationship to previous SA work

- 2.1 As noted above, the Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Council (BCKLWN) is in the process of preparing the Local Plan review and have updated the supporting evidence on GTTS housing needs as part of the Plan's ongoing examination. The GTAA identifies the number of pitches/plots required from 2023-2039, based on need identified through surveys undertaken during January – May 2023.
- 2.2 Since the publication of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), an appeal decision for an existing site at Baldwin's Drove, Outwell and an appeal decision for land at Moyse's Bank, School Road, Marshland St. James has resulted in the number of pitches required over the plan period from 102 to 97 and within the first 5-years being reduced from and 76 to 71. There is also need for 5 plots for households that met the planning definition for Travelling Showpeople over the Plan period to 2039. To meet the need to allocate additional land, a call for sites was carried out in October 2023. The criteria for suitable sites, was set at a size between 0.2 and 3 hectares and situated in areas of lowest flood risk (flood zone 1). These sites are considered reasonable alternatives and were assessed as part of the wider Site Assessments for all existing Gypsy and Traveller Sites.

- 2.3 As outlined in the consultation report, existing unauthorised sites have also been considered as part of this process, to ascertain if they could be formalised through an allocation in the Local Plan. The GTAA notes the potential for intensification or extension of existing sites, which could also provide a more sustainable approach to meeting GTTS needs, especially because the majority of the accommodation need is arising from existing sites.
- 2.4 This report aims to assist the Council in the decision-making process to assess which sites are most appropriate within the available land in Kings Lynn and West Norfolk. The SA assessment presented within this report will inform and influence the preparation of the Local Plan to maximise sustainability value.

3. Sustainability Appraisal Method

- 3.1 The purpose of this addendum report is to provide an appraisal of the potential GTTS site proposals and related policies in line with the SEA regulations. Regulation 12 of the SEA Regulations⁵ states that the report "shall identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects of the environment of (a) implementing the plan or programme; and (b) reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme". The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives economic, social and environmental).
- 3.2 SA is a legal requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and this report meets the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations) which is set out in more detail in the overarching SA 2020. The methodology follows the Site Sustainability Appraisal as used in the SA incorporating SEA for the Local Plan Review 2020⁶. The 11 Site Sustainability Factors are considered to be more directly related to issues affecting the choices between one site and another, yet still relate to the updated 20 Local Plan Sustainability Objectives. The relationship between the two are set out Appendix C.

⁵ <u>https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2004/1633/regulation/12/made</u>

file:///C:/Users/p10442979/Downloads/3 BCKLWN Sustainability Appraisal Strategic Environmental A ssessment Report 2020%20(12).pdf

- 3.3 The scoring criteria is set out in Appendix D relating the significance to each of the site sustainability factors. It is important to appreciate that the scoring of options against these factors is intended to give only a broad indication of its performance: more detailed and qualitative judgements are a necessary part of the final site selection and/or decision-making process. Neither can the scoring against different factors be directly compared to one another. A certain score against flood vulnerability, for instance, cannot be said to be equivalent to the same score against, say, economic impact. Rather, the scoring helps identify advantages and disadvantages, and hence where different considerations are in alignment and where trade-offs must be (or have been) made.
- 3.4 The key for assessing the importance of potential sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople is shown below in Figure 1.

Categories	of Significance
Symbol	Meaning
++	Highly Positive
+	Positive
0	Neutral effect
+/x	Positive / Negative
?	Unknown
#	Dependent on implementation
X	Negative
XX	Highly Negative

Figure 1: Significance Key

4. The Council's Strategy for Assessing Potential Locations for Current and Future Gypsy and Traveller Provision

- 4.1 The majority of overall need (71 out of 97 pitches; 73%) is required within the next five years; i.e. by 2028). The Council anticipate that the majority of the first five-year requirements could be met on existing sites where needs are arising (subject to any identified planning constraints being suitably mitigated). This also works in the interests of making the most efficient use of existing sites and ensuring that need is genuinely met in the correct locations, which the Council believe to be the most sustainable and deliverable approach to development.
- 4.2 Any residual requirements are proposed to be met through new site allocations and/or identifying broad locations for growth in the Plan. Beyond the first five years, it is likely that the remaining need (26 pitches) will be delivered via the proposed criteria based policy, along with other relevant policies within the Local Plan.
- 4.3 To understand whether the identified needs can be met through the intensification of existing sites, the Council has undertaken a site assessment for all existing Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites/ yards across the Borough (ADD LINK). This has looked at all known planning constraints such as highways access, flood risk and access to local services. It has then identified whether sites are available, suitable and deliverable for further development. Due to the nature of these sites and because the needs are arising from existing individual sites/specific locations, the Council has included those sites for consultation, as exceptions that would normally be discounted on suitability grounds. The Council believes that where existing sites have an opportunity to meet these direct accommodation needs, then further investigation must be undertaken to identify whether constraints can be overcome through measures such as flood mitigation.
- 4.4 In cases where there is little likelihood that constraints can be suitably mitigated, then alternative locations (Broad Locations) will be put forward as allocations. The Council are also consulting on these broad locations (or extensions) as well as the potential sites.
- 4.5 The Council have assessed all existing Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople's sites and have shortlisted and discounted 46 sites from future development at this time. The reasons why sites have been discounted are set out in the Site

Assessment Document, but it is largely due to the availability, suitability or deliverability of these sites, that do not present the possibility of mitigating constraints.

4.6 In terms of the general locations for Gypsy and Travellers, the majority of existing sites are mostly situated in countryside/ rural locations and away from services and facilities. Where sites are made available within or close to existing settlements, then these have been taken forward. However, due to the limited number of such sites, a large majority of potential locations for accommodating the current and future needs are on more isolated existing sites.

5. Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Proposed Policies

Policy /								Su	stainabili	ty Object	ives (see	Appendix	A)										
Resonable Alternative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total +	Total -	Overall
Policy A	+/-	0	+	0	0	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	++	0	o	#	++	++	+	+	0	10	0	Likely positive effect +10
Criteria based policy without allocating sites	+/-	0	+	0	0	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	++	0	0	x	x	x	x	x	0	4	5	Likely negative effect -1
No Policy	x	ο	ο	0	ο	0	0	х	0	ο	0	x	х	0	x	х	x	x	x	ο	0	9	Likely negative effect -9

5.1 In the following section the proposed GTTS policies are assessed alongside reasonable alternatives, using the assessment framework outlined at Appendix A. The site allocations are considered separately in the next section.

5.2 GTTS proposed Policy A, sets out the potential allocations but also includes a criteria-based policy on requirements for acceptable development. This sets out requirements on allocated sites as well as any speculative applications and will also seek to address the identified GTTS need beyond 2028, when the GTAA is then expected to be reviewed and updated. The reasonable alternatives considered are a criteria-based policy that doesn't allocate sites or no policy. As scored above, Policy A has an overall positive effect of +10 and the other reasonable alternatives have negative overall impact.

Policy /								Su	stainabili	ty Object	ives (see	Appendix	A)										
Resonable Alternative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total +	Total -	Overall
Policy B	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	7	0	Likely positive effect +7
No Policy	0	0	0	#/x	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Likely negative effect -1

5.3 Proposed Policy B responds to the need to accommodate households that do not meet the planning definition or are classified as undetermined for GTTS. The reasonable alternative is the exclusion of a policy for caravans, park homes and house boats. As noted in the assessment, proposed Policy B has an overall likely impact of +7 and no policy -1.

6. Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Proposed Allocated Site Options

6.1 The Council has taken a pragmatic approach to the process of assessing land for GTTS accommodation. The following section presents each of the potential sites put forward as allocations. This document does not consider sites that have been previously discounted by the Site Assessment Document, although the latter will be subject to consultation alongside the Potential Sites and Policy Consultation Document and this interim SA report. Although noted in the comments that mitigation is possible, at this stage the details of proposed mitigation hasn't been provided in most cases so the score is based on the baseline assessment. As also noted in the consultation, the proposed number of pitches is indicative at this stage.

Proposed Sites for Intensification

					SITE	GT05					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	19-121 M	agdalen Road, ⁻	Tilney Street, La	wrence					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	+/x	+	0	0	xx	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	terms of accer The site lies w assessment, t mitigation and there is existin heritage asset	ss to services. T vithin flood risk a he impacts are I impacts should ng Gypsy and T ts therefore ther	There is existing zone 2 and 3, th scored as highly d be minimal, de raveller resident	vehicle access erefore poses s / negative. This pendent on imp s). Neutral imports fect. The natura	onto the highw ignificant negat also has influer plementation of act is likely on e al environment	ay and the prop tive impact. Suit nce on the clima suitable mitigat economy and la will depend on l	posed developm table mitigation ate scoring; how tion. Developme ndscape and an how the site is ir	nent of one pitc is proposed; ho vever, approval ent of this site is nenity. The site	h does not have owever in terms will not be gran likely to have p is not within a c	gative score has significant impa- of this sustainabi ted without suffic ositive communit conservation area proposed suppor	ct overall. ility cient ty impact (as or near

					SITE	GT11					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
ŀ	lomefields (We	stern Side, Goo	se Lane), Walp	ole, St Andrew					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	+/x	+	Ο	0	ХХ	Ο	Ο	Ο	#	o/#	?/#

Summary The site is located within 1200m from the nearest services although there is no public transport or walking/cycling provision for most of the route a positive/negative score has been given in terms of access to services. There is existing vehicle access onto the highway and the proposed development of one pitch should not have significant impact overall. The site lies within flood risk zone 2 and 3, therefore poses significant negative impact. Suitable mitigation is proposed; however in terms of this sustainability assessment, the impacts are scored as highly negative. This also has influence on the climate scoring; however, approval will not be granted without sufficient mitigation and impacts should be minimal, dependent on implementation of suitable flood mitigation. Development of this site is likely to have positive community impact to meet housing need (and there is existing Gypsy and Traveller residents). Neutral impact is likely on economy and landscape and amenity. The site is not within a conservation area or near heritage assets therefore there is a neutral effect. The natural environment will depend on how the site is implemented; for example, the proposed supporting policy seeks to address boundary treatment and screening, which is sympathetic to the existing character.

					SITE	GT17					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Lanc	l at the Lodge, S	Small Lode, Upv	well					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+	О	0	0	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	access to servise is existing veh Neutral impact a neutral effect	vices. The impa- nicle access onto t is likely on ecc ct. The natural e	ct is not conside o the highway. I onomy, flood ris nvironment and	ered to be major Development of k (level 1), and	r because there this site is likely landscape and e impact will de	is an existing (y to have positiv amenity. The si pend on how th	Gypsy and Trave ve impact on co ite is not within a	eller site and po mmunity (as the a conservation a	etential agricultu ere is an existing area or near her	e has been giver iral employment g Gypsy and Trav itage assets ther sed policy seeks	nearby. There veller site). refore there is

					SITE	GT18					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Land at	2 Primrose Farr	n, Small Lode, I	Upwell					5		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+	Ο	?	xx	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	access to serv is existing veh proposed; how approval will r site is likely to agricultural gr effect. The nat	vices. The impar- icle access onto vever in terms of not be granted v have positive in ade 1 and there tural environme	ct is not conside o the highway. To of this sustainab vithout sufficien npact on comme fore could have nt impact will do	ered to be major The site lies pre ility assessmen t mitigation and nunity (as there e impact on eco	r because there dominately with t, the impacts a impacts should is an existing G nomy B factor. he site is impler	is an existing C in flood risk zor re scored as hig be minimal, de ypsy and Trave The site is not v	Gypsy and Trave ne 2 and 3, there ghly negative. his ependent on imp ller site), busine within a conserv	eller site and po efore poses sig is also has influ- blementation of iss economy an ation area or ne	ntential agricultu nificant negative ence on the clin suitable flood n d landscape an ear heritage ass	e has been given ral employment i e impact. Suitable nate scoring; how nitigation. Develo d amenity. The s ets therefore the address bounda	nearby. There e mitigation is vever, pment of this ite is re is a neutral

					SITE	GT20					
		Loca	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
		Land at Bo	otany Bay						1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	+	+	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	0	Ο	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	Development water supply i impact will de	of this site is lik network. The sit	ely to have neu e is not within a e site is implem	tral impact on flo conservation a	ood risk (level 1 rea or near her), economy, lar itage assets the	ndscape and am erefore there is a	enity and infrast neutral effect.	structure and wa The natural env	re is existing high ater as it has acc vironment and cli planting to preser	ess to the mate change

					SITE	GT21					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Lan	d at Four Acres	, March Riversi	de					5		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	#	0	0	х	0	о	#	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	transport acce accommodation of existing occur risk (zones 2 a and has its ow	ess is also appro on; however the cupiers on the s and 3); however /n septic tank of supporting poli	ox. 1700m away site assessmen ite or those nea , measures cou r package treatr	r, providing bus nt has identified rby needs to be Id be taken to n nent plant. The	services to Dov potential confli considered. Th nitigate this risk natural environ	wham Market, cts with neighb nere is existing and a flood risl ment and clima	Three Holes an ouring uses and vehicle access assessment with te change impa	d Wisbech. The I therefore suita onto the highwa Ill be required. ct will depend o	e site has existin ble mitigation re ay. The site is pa The site has acc on how the site i	ycling provision. g Gypsy and Tra egarding the priv artially constraine cess to a water su s implemented; f nitigation will hav	veller ate amenity ed by flood upply network for example,

					SITE	GT28					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	I No Pitches		
	Many Acre	es, (Smithy's Fie	eld), Small Lode	, Upwell					2		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+	0	0	0	0	О	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	access to servise is existing vehics of the second service of the second service of the second secon	vices. The impa nicle access ont aveller site). Ne pre there is a ne	ct is not conside o the highway. I utral impact is li utral effect. The	ered to be majo Development of kely on econom natural enviror	r because there this site is likely ny, flood risk (le ment and clima	is an existing (to have positive vel 1), and land ate change impa	Gypsy and Trave ve impact on co scape and ame	eller site and po mmunity to me nity. The site is on how the site	otential agricultu et housing need not within a cor	e has been given i iral employment n I (and there is an iservation area or I; for example, the	earby. There existing near heritage

					SITE	GT34					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
I	and at Creaks	/ille, The Comm	on, South Crea	ke, Fakenham					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	XX	#	0	Ο	0	0	o/#	#	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	services. There existing Gyps private amening landscape and change impact	e is an existing y and Traveller ty of existing oc d amenity. The s	access, which i site; however th cupiers on the s site is not within n how the site is	may require mit e site assessme site or those nea a conservation	gation; howeve ent has identifie arby needs to be area or near he	r, the developm d potential conf e considered. T eritage assets th	nent of one addi flicts with neight here is likely to nerefore there is	tional pitch may pouring uses ar be neutral imp a neutral effect	y not have signif nd therefore suit act on economy st. The natural e	given in terms of ficant impact. The able mitigation re r, flood risk (level nvironment and o nd tree planting t	ere is an egarding the 1), and climate

					SITE	GT35					
		Loca	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
		Land at Gre	een Acres						2		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	access to servise to servise existing vehics of the servise of the	vices. The impa nicle access ont aveller site). Ne ts therefore the	ct is not conside o the highway. I utral impact is li re is a neutral et	ered to be majo Development of kely on econom ffect. The natura	r because there this site is likely ny, flood risk (lev al environment a	is an existing (y to have positivel 1), and land and climate cha	Gypsy and Trave ve impact on co Iscape and ame	eller site and po mmunity, delive nity. The site is depend on how	otential agricultu ering housing ne not within a con v the site is impl	e has been given iral employment eed (and there is iservation area o emented; for exa	nearby. There an existing r near

					SITE	GT39					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
L	and at Oak Tre	e Caravan Park	, The Common,	South Creake					3		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	ХХ	+	0	0	0	Ο	0	#	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	services. Ther housing need. heritage asset	re is existing hig . There is likely ts therefore ther	hways access. to be neutral im re is a neutral ef	There is also ex pact on econon fect. The natura	isting Gypsy an ny, flood risk (le al environment a	nd Traveller occ evel 1), and land and climate cha	cupation, which which which which which which which we have a set of the set	will contribute to nity. The site is depend on how	o a positive imp not within a cor v the site is impl	given in terms of act in terms of de nservation area o emented; for exa	elivering r near

					SITE	GT42					
		Locat	ion					Proposed	I No Pitches		
	Land at Red E	Barn, Cowles Dr	ove, Hockwold	cum Wilton					3		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	XX	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	been given in positive impac The site is not	terms of access of in terms of de t within a conse	s to services. Th livering housing rvation area or r	ere is an existir need. Develop near heritage as	ng access to the oment of this site ssets therefore t	e highway. Ther e is likely to hav here is a neutra	e is also existing re neutral impac al effect. The na	g Gypsy and Tr t on economy, tural environme	aveller occupati flood risk (zone	highly negative s on, which will cor 1) and landscape on how the site is aracter.	ntribute to a a and amenity.

					SITE	GT54						
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches			
		Land at the Pine	es, Whittington			1						
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage					Climate Change	
Score	xx	+	0	0	0	О	0	0	#	o/#	?/#	
Summary	away; therefo impact in tern site is not with	XX+OOOOOØØ <th< th=""></th<>										

					SITE	GT55						
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches			
		Land at Vict	oria Barns						1			
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritade					Climate Change	
Score	+/x	+	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	О	o/#	?/#	
Summary	access to servin terms of de within a conse	+/x+OOOOOOOO/#?/#The site is located within 1200m from the nearest services; however, there is no walking/cycling provision and a positive/negative score has been given in terms of access to services. There is existing vehicle access onto the highway. There is also existing Gypsy and Traveller occupation, which will contribute to a positive impact in terms of delivering housing need. Development of this site is likely to have neutral impact economy, flood risk (zone 1) and landscape and amenity. The site is not within a conservation area or near heritage assets therefore there is a neutral effect. The natural environment will depend on how the site is implemented; for example, he proposed supporting policy seeks to address boundary treatment and screening, which is sympathetic to the existing character.000<										

	SITE GT56													
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches					
	Wheatley Bank,	Walsoken (Sou	ith of Worzals p	aralell to A47)		9								
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change			
Score	х	+	0	0	XX	0	0	0	О	o/#	?/#			
Summary	access to serv There is existi however in ter implementation within a conserver	vices. This is les ng vehicle acce rms of this susta on of suitable mi ervation area or	s significant as ss onto the high ainability assess tigation. Develo near heritage a	there is existing nway. The site li ment, the impac pment of this si ssets therefore	Gypsy and Tra ies within flood cts are scored a te is likely to ha there is a neutr	iveller commun risk zone 2, the as highly negativ ve neutral impa al effect. The na	ity, which also c refore poses sig ve. This also has act on communit	ontributes to a inificant negatives influence on the y, economy an ent impact will o	positive score in ve impact. Suital he climate scori d landscape and depend on how	as been given in n providing housi ble mitigation is p ng, which is depo d amenity. The si the site is implen cter.	ing need. proposed; endent on te is not			

					SITE	GT59						
		Locat	ion					Proposed	I No Pitches			
	Land at Sprig	ggs Hollow, Wig	genhall St Mary	Magdalen					4			
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change	
Score	xx	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#	
Summary	been given in contribute to a landscape and impacts will de	XX+OOOOOP/#o/#?/#The site is located more than 1200m from the nearest services, with no public transport or walking/cycling provision available, therefore a highly negative score has been given in terms of access to services. There is existing vehicle access on to the highway. There is also existing Gypsy and Traveller occupation, which will contribute to a positive impact in terms of delivering housing need. Development of this site is likely to have neutral impact on economy, flood risk (zone 1) and landscape and amenity. The site is not within a conservation area or near heritage assets therefore there is a neutral effect. The natural environment and climate impacts will depend on how the site is implemented; for example, the proposed supporting policy seeks to address boundary treatment and screening, which is sympathetic to the existing character.										

	SITE GT66												
		Loca	tion					Proposed	No Pitches				
	La	nd at Brandon	Road, Methwold	1					1				
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change		
Score	xx	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#		
Summary	been given in additional pitc housing need area or near h the proposed	terms of access h is likely to hav Development of eritage assets t supporting poli	s to services. The ve minimal impact of this site is like herefore there in cy seeks to add	ne site is remote act. There is also aly to have neutronic and the second is a neutral effection of the second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second sec	and located or existing Gyps al impact on ec ct. The natural e reatment and s	n a fast B road; y and Traveller conomy, flood r environment an creening, which	however, there i occupation, whi isk (zone 1) and d climate impacent is sympathetic	is an existing a ch will contribu landscape and ts will depend o	ccess and prope te to a positive i amenity. The s on how the site i	a highly negative osed development impact in terms of ite is not within a is implemented; f site is located with	nt of an of delivering conservation for example,		

Formalisation of existing pitches:

					SITE	GT09					
		Locat	ion					Proposed	I No Pitches		
	Tł	ne Stables, Wal	oole St Andrew						1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	+/x	+	Ο	0	xx	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	score has bee contribute to a mitigation is p however, app this site is like neutral effect.	en given in term a positive impact roposed; howev roval will not be ly to have neutr The natural env	s of access to se t in terms of del ver in terms of th granted withou al impact on eco	ervices. There livering housing his sustainabilit t sufficient mitig onomy and land epend on how	is existing vehic g need. The site y assessment, tl gation and impa dscape and ame the site is imple	le access onto the lies within flood in the impacts are set of the should be menity. The site is the s	the highway. Th d risk zone 2/3, f scored as highly ninimal, depend s not within a co	ere is also exist therefore poses y negative. This ent on impleme nservation area	ting Gypsy and s significant nega also has influer entation of suitab or near heritag	ne route a positive Traveller occupat ative impact. Suitance on the climate ole mitigation. Dev e assets therefore address boundar	ion, which will able e scoring; velopment of e there is a

					SITE	GT33							
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches				
	Land Nex	t to Clydesdale	, Biggs Road, W	alsoken					1				
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change		
Score	xx	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	o/#	?/#		
Summary	terms of acce impact in term site is not with	XX+OOOOOOOO/#?/#As the site is in quite a remote location, away from the key services with no public transport or walking/cycling provision a highly negative score has been given in erms of access to services. There is an existing access onto the highway. There is also existing Gypsy and Traveller occupation, which will contribute to a positive mpact in terms of delivering housing need. Development of this site is likely to have neutral impact on economy, flood risk (zone 1) and landscape and amenity. The site is not within a conservation area or near heritage assets therefore there is a neutral effect. The natural environment will depend on how the site is implemented, nowever there is an existing strong boundary of trees to screen any further development on the site.OOOO/#?/#											

					SITE	GT43					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Homefield	l, Common Rd	South, Walton H	lighway					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	+/x	+	Ο	0	XX	0	О	#/o	Ο	o/#	x/#
Summary	score has bee will contribute mitigation is p however, appr this site is like neutral effect.	n given in term to a positive im roposed; howev oval will not be ly to have neutr The natural env	s of access to s pact in terms o ver in terms of t granted withou al impact on ec vironment will d	ervices. There i f delivering hou his sustainability t sufficient mitig onomy and land	s existing vehic sing need. The / assessment, th ation and impa lscape and ame he site is impler	le access onto t site lies within f ne impacts are s cts should be m enity. The site is	he highway. Th lood risk zone 2 scored as highly ninimal, depend not within a co	ere is also exist 2/3, therefore po 7 negative. This ent on impleme nservation area	ing Gypsy and oses significant also has influer ntation of suitat or near heritag	he route a positiv Traveller occupa negative impact. Ince on the climat ole mitigation. De e assets therefor address bounda	tion, which Suitable e scoring; evelopment of re there is a

					SITE	GT59					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Spriggs	Hollow, Wiggen	hall St Mary Ma	igdalen					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage					Climate Change
Score	XX	+	0	О	0	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	been given in contribute to a landscape and impacts will de	terms of access a positive impac d amenity. The s	s to services. Th t in terms of de site is not within he site is impler	here is existing v livering housing a conservation	vehicle access of need. Develop area or near he	onto the highwa ment of this site eritage assets the	ay. There is also e is likely to have herefore there is	existing Gypsy e neutral impaces a neutral effect	and Traveller o t on economy, f t. The natural e	a highly negative ccupation, which lood risk (zone 1 nvironment and o nd screening, wh	ı will) and climate

Newly proposed site allocations:

					SITE G	ΓRA(B)					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Lan	d at Station Roa	d, West Dareha	ım					10		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+/#	О	0	О	0	O/#	#	#	xx	?/#
Summary	services and o saturation leve identified pote needs to be co assessment is	does not suppor els of the land a ential conflicts w onsidered. With required to det	t walking or cyon nd the safe and vith neighbourin effective mitigatermine impacts	cling. Access to effective use or g uses and ther ation, there shou and suitable m	the highway is f a septic tank, t efore suitable n uld be limited ha itigation. Lands	possible with cl therefore infrast nitigation regarc arm to wildlife; h cape and amen	earing existing tructure and wa ding the private nowever, given t ity, natural envi	vegetation. The ste is scored hi amenity of exis the potential im ronment, and c	site also present ghly negative. T ting occupiers of pacts on protect limate impacts of	note location fror nts challenges in he site assessme on the site or thos ted species furth will depend on ho the existing chara	terms of ent has se nearby er ecological ow the site is

					SITE G	ſRA(C)						
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches			
Land to	the West of Co	untry Park Trav	ellers Site Whe	atley Bank, Wal	soken				1			
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change	
Score	х											
Summary	access to serv is proposed; h approval will r identified pote needs to be co near heritage	vices. There is e nowever in term not be granted v ential conflicts w onsidered. Deve assets therefore	existing vehicle s of this sustain vithout sufficien vith neighbourin elopment of this e there is a neu	access to the hi ability assessme t mitigation and g uses and ther site is likely to tral effect. The r	ghway. The site ent, the impacts impacts should efore suitable n have neutral im natural environn	e lies within floor are scored as l be minimal, de nitigation regard pact on econom nent impact will	d risk zone 2, th highly negative. ependent on imp ding the private ny and landscap	erefore poses s This also has i blementation of amenity of exis be and amenity. v the site is imp	significant negat nfluence on the suitable mitigat ting occupiers o The site is not	as been given in ive impact. Suita climate scoring; ion. The site asse on the site or thos within a conserva kample, the prop	ble mitigation however, essment has se nearby ation area or	

Travelling Showpeople proposed sites:

					SITE	GT25					
		Loca	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Land at	the Oaks, Mill [Drove, Northwol	d TSP					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	o/#	?/#
Summary	away and the Traveller hous landscape and	route isn't supp sing is consider d amenity. The	orted for walkin ed as having a p site is not within	g or cycling. Th positive impact of a conservation	ere is existing von community. I area or near he	vehicle access t Development o eritage assets t	to the highway. f this site is likel herefore there is	The potential fo y to have neutra s a neutral effect	or the site to pro al impact on ecc ct. The natural e	services are over vide required Gy pnomy, flood risk nvironment will d sympathetic to th	psy and (zone 1) and epend on

					SITE	GT62					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Land at Redgat	e Farm, Magdel	an Road, Tilney	St Lawrence					2		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	xx	+	0	Ο	xx	0	0	0	#	o/#	x/#
Summary	walking/cyclin risk zone 2/3, scored as higl minimal, depe positive impac area or near h	g provision so a and therefore p hly negative. Th endent on imple of on community heritage assets t	a negative score oses significant is also has influ mentation of su /. Development herefore there	has been giver negative impac- ence on the clin table mitigation of this site is lik s a neutral effect	n in terms of ac t. Suitable mitig nate scoring; ho . The potential f ely to have neu ct. The natural e	cess to services gation is propos owever, approva for the site to pr tral impact on e environment wil	s. There is existi ed; however in al will not be gra rovide required economy and lar	ng vehicle acce terms of this su nted without su Gypsy and Trav ndscape and an v the site is imp	ess onto the hig stainability asse ifficient mitigatio veller housing is nenity. The site	hough there is no hway. The site lie essment, the impa- ton and impacts s considered as h is not within a co xample, the prop	es within flood acts are hould be aving a nservation

					SITE	GT67					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Land at Llam	edos - Sydersto	one Travelling S	howpeople					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+/#	О	0	О	0	О	0	О	o/#	?/#
Summary	Fakenham, an site has existin mitigation reg impact on ecc The natural er	d approx 1000r ng Gypsy and T arding the priva nomy, flood risl nvironment will o	n away, bus ser raveller accomm te amenity of ex k (zone 1) and la	vices are also a nodation; howe kisting occupier andscape and a the site is imple	available to Well ver the site asso s on the site or amenity. The site	s-next-the-Sea essment has ide those nearby n e is not within a	and Wicken Gre entified potentia eeds to be cons conservation ar	een. There is e l conflicts with idered. Develo rea or near heri	kisting vehicle a neighbouring us oment of this sit tage assets the	the site, providin ccess onto the hi les and therefore e is likely to have refore there is a r dary treatment a	ghway. The suitable neutral neutral effect.

Proposed broad	locations for growth	/ extension to existing sites

					SITE	GT17					
		Loca	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Land to the	e rear of The Lo	dge, Small Lod	e, Upwell					13		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+	0	О	0	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	access to serv is existing veh Traveller site). therefore there	vices. The impa- icle access ont There is likely e is a neutral ef	ct is not conside o the highway. I neutral impact o fect. The natura	ered to be major Development of on flood risk (lev Il environment a	r because there this site is likely vel 1), and lands nd climate cha	is an existing C to have positive scape and ame inge impact will	Gypsy and Trave ve impact on co nity. The site is r	eller site and po mmunity to me not within a cor the site is impl	otential agricultu et housing need servation area	e has been given iral employment I (and the existin or near heritage ample, the propo	nearby. There g Gypsy and assets

					SITE	GT18					
		Locat	ion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Land to the re	ar of 2 Primros	e Farm, Small L	ode, Upwell					8		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+	0	0	xx	0	0	0	#	o/#	x/#
Summary	access to serv is existing veh proposed; how approval will n likely to have p and landscape	vices. The impacticle access onto vever in terms of too be granted v positive impact and amenity. To how the site is	ct is not conside to the highway. To f this sustainab vithout sufficien on community, The site is not w	ered to be majo The site lies pre ility assessmen t mitigation and delivering hous rithin a conserva	r because there dominantly with t, the impacts a impacts should ing need (and t ation area or ne	is an existing C nin flood risk zor re scored as hig be minimal, de here is an existi ar heritage asse	Gypsy and Trave ne 2 and 3, ther ghly negative. T ependent on imp ng Gypsy and T ets therefore the	eller site and po efore poses sig his also has infl blementation of raveller site). Nere is a neutral	otential agricultu nificant negative uence on the cl suitable mitigat leutral impact is effect. The natu	has been given ral employment r impact. Suitable mate scoring; ho ion. Developmen likely on busines ral environment a to preserve the s	nearby. There e mitigation is owever, t of this site is ss economy and impact

					SITE	GT21					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Lan	d at Four Acres	, March Riversi	de					5		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	#	0	0	х	0	Ο	#	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	transport acce accommodation of existing occ risk (zones 2 a and has its ow	ess is also appro on; however the cupiers on the s and 3); however /n septic tank of supporting poli	bx. 1700m away site assessmen ite or those nea , measures cou r package treatr	y, providing bus nt has identified Irby needs to be Id be taken to n nent plant. The	services to Dow potential confli considered. Th nitigate this risk natural environ	wham Market, cts with neighb here is existing and a flood risl ment and clima	Three Holes an ouring uses and vehicle access k assessment w tte change impa	d Wisbech. The I therefore suita onto the highwa ill be required. ct will depend o	e site has existin ble mitigation re ay. The site is pa The site has acc on how the site i	ycling provision. g Gypsy and Tra egarding the priv artially constraine cess to a water su is implemented; f nitigation will hav	veller rate amenity ed by flood upply network for example,

					SITE	GT37					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	I No Pitches		
	Land to the	rear of Green A	Acres, Small Loc	le, Upwell					7		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+	О	0	0	0	o/#	o/#	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	access to servise is existing veh as this has po site is not with	vices. The impa nicle access ont tential to meet l nin a conservation	ct is not conside o the highway fr housing need ac on area or near	ered to be majo om adjacent la ljacent to existi heritage assets	r because there nd, approval wil ng Gypsy and T therefore there	is an existing (I need to be ag raveller occupa is a neutral effo	Gypsy and Trave reed. Developm ants. Neutral imp ect. The natural	eller site and po ent of this site i pact is likely on environment a	otential agricultu s likely to have economy, flood nd climate chan	has been given i ral employment n positive impact or risk (level 1) and ge impact will dep ounding characte	earby. There n community amenity. The pend on how

					SITE	GT38					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Land to the	rear of Green A	Acres, Small Loo	de, Upwell					10		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	Х	+	О	0	0	0	o/#	o/#	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	access to servively also control from adjacent not within a control of the service of the servic	vices. The impacibute to a positive land, approval bonservation area	ct is not conside ve impact in terr will need to be a a or near heritag	ered to be major ms of delivering agreed. Develop ge assets theref	because there housing need i oment of this sit	is an existing (in close proxim e is likely to ha eutral effect. Th	Gypsy and Trave ity to existing oc ve neutral impac ne natural enviro	eller site and po cupants. Ther of on economy, nment and clin	tential agricultu e is existing veh flood risk (level nate change imp	e has been given ral employment i iicle access onto 1) and amenity. pact will depend o ding character o	hearby. This the highway The site is on how the

					SITE	F3.1					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Land at	Wisbech Fring	e Strategic Allo	cation					10		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	++	+/-	0	xx	0	0	#	#	0	o/#	?/#
Summary	south of Walso impact. Access create good lii isn't known at community. In	oken. The site is s to the site is p nkages to key s this stage so w nplementation,	s currently in us proposed to the ervices support alking distances based on the m	e for agriculture east (via Broad ing active trave cannot be dete	and therefore End Road), whi I and public trar ermined. Develo company the str	would have neg ch will require i sport accessib opment of this s	gative impact in improvements to ility. The specifi ite is likely to ha	terms of the los o A47 junction. c location of the ive neutral impa	ss off land and th Further access e GT pitches wit act on flood risk	ccess to services herefore related to the north and hin the wider site (level 1), heritag landscape and a	economic west will e boundary e and

7. Summary

- 7.1 Overall, negative scorings are generally a result of the remote location of the proposed GTTS sites and therefore access to services; however, as noted earlier in the report, the Council have considered potentially suitable sites based on supply aligning to demand and meeting the needs of the community. By necessity this differs from general housing need, given the status of Gypsies and Travellers as having protected characteristics under the 2010 Equality Act. The draft consultation document was also subject to a full Equalities Impact Assessment⁷, to ensure the legal requirements of the Equality Act are correctly met.
- 7.2 Highways access has also scored negatively on some proposed sites; however, mitigation is suggested and therefore that would improve the outcome if successfully implemented. Lastly, several sites have scored negatively due to some of all of the land being within Flood Zone 2 and/or 3. At the time of assessment mitigation has already been established on some of the sites through previous planning permissions. The Council has produced a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Level 2 for each of the sites concerned. This identifies the risk from flooding and what, if any, mitigation measures are needed to enable safe development of the site in the future. This document and proposed mitigation measures are subject to consultation (alongside this interim SA report); therefore, the assessment scoring could be reviewed at the next stage of the process if confirmation of suitable mitigation is provided.
- 7.3 As the list of sites assessed are subject to consultation and preferred options have not been selected at this stage, the cumulative impacts have not been determined.

8. Next Steps

8.1 This SA Report has been prepared as an addendum to the previously published SA Scoping Report (2017), Scoping Report update (2020), SA Addendum and non-technical summary (2022), and will undergo a 6-week public consultation period

⁷ (Public Pack)Agenda Document for Local Plan Task Group, 08/01/2024 09:30 (west-norfolk.gov.uk) (p19-30)

between January and March 2024. This SA Report will undergo a focused consultation alongside the 'Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Potential Sites and Policy Consultation' document.

8.2 Following the consultation period, responses will be considered by the Council to inform the emerging Local Plan as the examination stage progresses.

9. Appendices

Appendix A: Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives

Topics	Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives	SEA Environmental Effect 'Issues'
Land and Water Resources	 Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped Greenfield land, agricultural (Best Most Versatile 1- 3) land and productive agricultural holdings Limit water consumption to levels supportable by natural processes and storage systems 	 Soil Water Material assets Landscape
Biodiversity and Geodiversity	 Maintain, restore and enhance the natural environment and sites designated for biological and geological interest Maintain and enhance the range, functionality and connectivity of characteristic habitats and species 	 Biodiversity Fauna Flora Soil Water Landscape

Topics	Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives	SEA Environmental Effect 'Issues'
Landscape and Townscape	 Avoid damage to protected sites and historic buildings Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good. 	 Material assets Cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage Landscape
Climate Change and Pollution (continued)	 8. Reduce pollution and GHG emissions that affects the quality of land, air, water or soils in the Borough including: noise, light, vibrations. Mitigate GHG emissions by moving towards sustainable transport systems and reducing the reliance on fossil fuel-based vehicles. 9. Minimise waste production, reduce the use of non-renewable energy sources and support the recycling of waste products 10. Minimise vulnerability and provide resilience and adaptation to climate change, taking account of flood risk and coastal change 11. New development should be designed to be better adapted to climate change and flood risk 	 Soil Water Climatic factors Material assets Coastal erosion/ Flood risk Energy High GHG emissions Design & quality Transport
Healthy Communities	 Maintain and enhance human health Reduce and prevent crime, and reduce the fear of crime Improve the quantity and quality of Green Infrastructure, publicly accessible open space, Public Rights of Way and access 	 Population Human health (There are also links to Biodiversity, Flora and fauna, Soil and Water)

Topics	Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives	SEA Environmental Effect 'Issues'
Inclusive Communities	 15. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities) 16. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income 17. Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing 18. Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in 	• Population
	18. Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities	
Economic Activity	19. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	PopulationMaterial assets
	20. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy	

Appendix B: Site Sustainability Factors

Objective	Site Sustainability Factor	Includes positive and negative anticipated results in terms of, for example:
Α	Access to Services	Proximity to services; development providing supporting local services; availability of public transport to towns and such major service centres
В	Community and Social	Local community support for proposals; provision of community facilities; provision of housing, especially types/tenures/mixes that meet community needs; neighbourhood plan promoted development; development contributing to healthy lifestyles
С	Economy A: Business	Promotes economic development; creates supports employment
D	Economy B: Food Production	Use of higher or lower grade agricultural land; development that involves/supports food production
Е	Flood Risk	Development of land at different levels of flood risk; development type sensitivities
F	Heritage	Conservation or enhancement of cultural heritage, including listed and other historic buildings, conservation areas and others of local distinction, archaeology, etc.
G	Highways and Transport	Relationship of development to transport networks, especially public transport; safety, free flow and efficiency of use of highway and other transport networks; transport infrastructure improvements and extensions; cycle and footway provision/availability for practical access and reduction of car use
Η	Landscape and Amenity	Conservation and enhancement of designated Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and other distinctive landscapes; protection and improvement of local amenity (including visual/aural/olfactory)
1	Natural Environment	Biodiversity and geodiversity
J	Infrastructure, Pollution and Waste	Provision, protection and best use of infrastructure; avoidance of waste and pollution
К	Climate Change	Quality of design of new development adapting to climate change/flood risk, avoidance of adding to higher GHG emissions and adding towards minimizing the vulnerability of climate change

Appendix C: Relationship between Site Sustainability Factors and Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives

		Site Sustainability Factor											
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	н	1	J	к	
Loca	Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives		Communit y and social	Economy A: Business	Economy B: Food production	Flood risk	Heritage	Highway s and Transpor t	Landscape and Amenity	Natural Environ ment	Infrastruct ure, Pollution & Waste	Climate Change	
1	Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped Greenfield land, agricultural (Best Most Versatile 1- 3) land and productive agricultural holdings				Strong		Moderate		Strong	Strong		Moderate	
2	Limit water consumption to levels supportable by natural processes and storage systems					Moderate				Strong	Strong	Moderate	
3	Maintain, restore and enhance the natural environment and sites designated for biologica I and geological interest								Moderate	Strong		Moderate	
4	Maintain and enhance the range, functionality and connectivity of characteristic habitats and species								Moderate	Strong			
5	Avoid damage to protected sites and historic buildings			Moderate			Strong		Moderate				
6	Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinct iveness of landscape and townscape character						Strong		Strong	Moderate			
7	Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate		Moderate	Moderate	
8	Reduce pollution and GHG emissions that affects the quality of land, air, water or soils in the Borough including: noise, light, vibrations. Mitigate GHG emissions by moving towards sustainable transport systems and reducing the reliance on fossil fuel-based vehicles	Moderate						Moderate /Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	

_											
9	Minimise waste production, reduce the use of non-renewable energy sources and support	Moderate							Moderate	Strong	Strong
	the recycling of waste products										
10	Minimise vulnerability and provide resilience a nd adaptation to climate change, taking accou nt of flood risk and coastal change		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Strong	Moderate			Moderate	Strong
11	New development should be designed to be better adapted to climate change and flood risk		Moderate	Moderate		Strong		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Strong
12	Maintain and enhance human health		Strong								Moderate
13	Reduce and prevent crime, and reduce the fea r of crime		Strong								
14	Improve the quantity and quality of Green Infrastructure, publicly accessible open space, Public Rights of Way and access	Strong	Strong					Strong			Strong
15	Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities)	Strong		Moderate							Moderate
16	Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	Strong	Strong								
17	Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	Moderate	Strong					Strong			Moderate
18	Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities		Strong								Moderate
19	Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place o f residence		Strong	Strong							
20	Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy			Strong							

Appendix D: Scoring Criteria

	Site Sustainability Factor											
Sustainability Impact Score	Access to services	Community and social	Economy A: Business	Economy B: Food production	Flood risk	Heritage	Highways and Transport	Landscape and Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure, Pollution & Waste	Climate Change	
Highly Positive ++	Top scoring in assessment – good access to a wide range of services	Strong community support. The community benefits from the site i.e. housing/mixed communities/ equality/ facilities	Highly positive permanent contribution to the economy, jobs, business opportunities				Site would deliver better transport links for the community		Improves natural environment	Site is for local or national infrastructure	Strong emphasis on green design and proof of new development taking a strong lead in adapting and mitigating climatic impacts	
Positive +	Mid scoring in assessment – good access to a range of services	Overall favourable community support or, if no comments received – the community benefits from the site i.e. housing/mixed communities/ equality/ facilities	Overall positive contribution to the economy, jobs, business opportunities	Grade 6 Urban / Previously developed land / Non- agricultural	Flood Zone 1	Proven to enhance heritage	Identifiable access, NCC Highways Authority preferred site(s) for settlement	Site will improve the landscape / townscape / amenity e.g. replacing an eyesore	Contributes to natural environment		Positive contribution to new development taking place on brownfield sites, implementing high quality/green design which will help reduce GHG emissions	
Neutral O		No comments received. Site would deliver minimal benefits to the community	Site would deliver minimal/no real benefit to the economy	Grade 4 or 5		No heritage impact		Site is unlikely to have either an overall positive or overall negative on the landscape / townscape – it will fit in with surrounding development	No impact		Site would deliver minimal requirements on addressing climate change	

Positive/ Negative +/x		Strong community objection but site could deliver benefits i.e. housing/mixed communities/ equality/ facilities		Part of the site Grade 4 or 5 and part of the site Grade 3	Part Flood Zone 1 and part Flood Zone 2 or3						Strong community/political objection but the site shows a strong emphasis on green design and reducing climatic issues
Unknown ?		Unknown Impact	Unknown Impact	Unknown grade	Unknown zone	Unknown impact	Unknown if access can be achieved	Unknown Impact	Unknown Impact	Unknown Impact	Unknown impact on climate change and reducing the boroughs current emissions
Dependant on Implementation #	Development is of a scale that could deliver a greater range of service	Site details negotiable - may deliver some community benefits	Site details still negotiable, may deliver some employment mixed/uses			Within or immediately adjacent to Conservation Area	Site suitable subject to safe access etc.(NCC Highways Authority)	Potential negative impacts but this could mitigated through the design of the scheme	Potential negative impact which could be mitigated	Some minor issues identified but also solutions provided	Site details still negotiable. Potential positive or negative impact on reducing climatic impact within the borough
Negative X	Poor scoring in assessment – poor access to a range of services	Some community objection – the scheme delivers minimal benefits	Overall negative impact to the economy, jobs, business opportunities	Grade 3	Flood Zone 2		Inadequate footpath to the school/general y disliked by NCC Highways Authority	Site likely to have a negative impact on the landscape/ townscape/ Amenity	Likely negative impact on species/ biodiversity	Generally negative comments from infrastructure providers	Likely to have a negative impact on dropping the borough GHG emissions and contributing to reducing climate change issues such as flood risk
Highly Negative XX	No walking / cycling access to services	Strong community objection – the scheme will not deliver wider benefits to the community	Highly negative permanent contribution to the economy, jobs, business opportunities	Grade 1 or Grade 2	Flood one 3/ Tidal Hazard Zone	Irreversible loss of heritage asset or permanent negative impact on setting	Problems with access cannot be overcome	Site likely to have a significant impact on the landscape / townscape which is virtually impossible to avoid	Significant adverse impact on major designation	Significant constraints to delivery identified by infrastructure providers	Significant adverse impacts on climate change which will not contribute to adapting or mitigating GHG emissions. Flood risks issues or improving the boroughs sustainability