



Anglia Square, Norwich

Supplementary Environmental Information (SEI)
Non-Technical Summary (NTS)

Iceni Projects on behalf of
Weston Homes Plc and
Columbia Threadneedle

September 2019

Introduction

- 1.1 Supplementary Environmental Information (SEI) was prepared by Icenj Projects on behalf of Weston Homes Plc and Columbia Threadneedle (hereafter referred to as the 'Applicant') in September 2018. It supplemented the original ES prepared in March 2018 ("the Original ES" hereafter).
- 1.2 An application for the redevelopment of Anglia Square (the 'Site') was submitted to Norwich City Council (NCC) in March 2018. Following the post submission consultation a number of amendments were made to the proposed scheme (the 'Amended Scheme'). The SEI was prepared to assess the impact of these amendments in relation to the environmental topics within the Original ES. The SEI set out the updated description of the development (the 'Proposed Development') and confirmed that the Amended Scheme does not alter the conclusions of the Original ES.
- 1.3 The Non-Technical Summary (NTS) comprises Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement (ES) and provided a summary (in non-technical terms) of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) which has been carried out in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The SEI did not provide a NTS as it was considered that the document itself was a succinct summary that provided clarification rather than any additional assessment. The SEI also confirmed that the findings of the Original ES remained valid, and on this basis an NTS was not required. However, following a request from the Planning Inspectorate, on behalf of the Secretary of State, an NTS of the SEI has been prepared.
- 1.4 This document comprises the NTS of the SEI dated September 2018. This NTS should be read in conjunction with the Original ES NTS.

Background

- 1.5 The planning application for the redevelopment of Anglia Square (application reference 18/00330/F) was submitted to NCC and validated in March 2018. Following the submission of the application, consultation with the local community, statutory consultees and other key stakeholders was undertaken by NCC, as well as further public consultation which was undertaken by the Applicant.
- 1.6 As a result of the comments received from the consultation of the original application, as well as subsequent discussions with NCC the following amendments to the Development are proposed:
 - Proposed Marker Building – reduction in height by 5 storeys, revisions to the building form, the internal layout, and updates to the proposed materials strategy and elevation design;
 - Block A – amendments to the elevation design and proposal materials, inclusion of public toilets and 'Changing Places' facilities;
 - Gildengate House – updated proposed illustrative dwelling mix;
 - Block E – updated proposed illustrative dwelling mix;

- Block D – part reduction to four storeys in height to provide roof for communal amenity;
- Landscape – updates to the landscape strategy, including St. George’s Square, Edward Street, Pitt Street and provision of a play trail;
- Public Realm – omission of swale and inclusion of Pitt Street cycle route;
- Flexible Commercial Floorspace – additional flexibility for the 5,430sqm ground floor flexible retail, services, food and drink and non-residential institutional floorspace (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/D1/Sui Generis (bookmakers and/or nail bars, up to 550sqm) within the outline element, as originally applied for, to also include B1 uses¹; and
- Highways Improvements:
 - Improvements to the Yellow Pedalway on Edward Street to the north of the Site;
 - Improvements to the alignment for cyclists through St. Georges Street;
 - Alternative cycle route provided on Pitt Street;
 - Reduction of the kerb radii at the Edward Street / New Botolph Street junction and an improved pedestrian and cycle crossing facility in this location across Edward Street;
 - Reduction in width of the vehicular entrance to the proposed multi-storey car park together with a raised table at this location on Edward Street; and
 - Introduction of laybys off the carriageway for 5 no. car club spaces and deliveries on Edward Street.

1.7 Consequently, the description of development was revised to incorporate these changes as follows (hereafter referred to as the ‘Amended Scheme’)²:

*Hybrid (part full/part outline) application on site of 4.51 ha for demolition and clearance of all buildings and structures except Gildengate House and the phased, comprehensive redevelopment of the site with 7 buildings and refurbished Gildengate House for a maximum of 1,250 residential dwellings (Use Class C3); 11,350 sqm hotel (Use Class C1); 9,850 sqm ground floor flexible retail, services, food and drink, office, non-residential institution and other floorspace (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/**B1**/D1/Sui Generis (bookmakers and/or nail bars, up to 550 sqm and public conveniences)) ; 1,150 sq m ground floor flexible commercial floorspace (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1), service yards, cycle and refuse stores, plant rooms and other ancillary space; up to 3,400 sqm cinema (Use Class D2); 1,300 sqm place of worship*

¹ Policy justification for the B1 uses is provided within the Main Town Centre Uses Statement Rev. A which has been submitted as a standalone report. Further clarifications in respect of the flexible commercial floorspace, including how the Amended Scheme has responded to the matters raised during the consultation process are set out in the Retail Strategy Report (Revision A) and appended Response Note to Consultation Comments on commercial space prepared by Cushman & Wakefield.

² Emphasis has been added to highlight differences between this and the original description of development

(Use Class D1); and multi-storey car park (public element: 600 car spaces, 24 motorcycle spaces), with associated new and amended means of access, closure of existing means of access, widening of footways, formation of service/taxi/car club/bus stop laybys and other associated highway works on all boundaries, maximum of **940** car parking spaces for Use Classes C1 / C3 / B1 / D1, (of which maximum of 40 spaces for C1/B1/D1), hard and soft landscaping of public open spaces comprising 2 streets and 2 squares for pedestrians and cyclists, other landscaping including existing streets surrounding the site, service infrastructure and other associated work; (all floor areas given as maximum gross external area);

comprising;

Full planning permission on 1.78 ha of the site for demolition and clearance of all buildings and structures, **erection of 1 and part of a 2nd building for 393 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) (323 flats in Block A and 70 flats with cycle store in tower within Block E (tower only, 20 storeys))**, and, for 4,420 sqm ground floor flexible retail, services, food and drink, non-residential institution and other floorspace (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/D1/Sui Generis (bookmakers and/or nail bars, up to a maximum of 550 sqm within entire scheme, and public conveniences)), 380 sq m ground floor flexible commercial floorspace (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1), service yard, cycle and refuse stores, plant rooms, other ancillary space and multi-storey car park (public element: 600 car spaces, 24 motorcycle spaces), within Block A with associated new and amended means of access, closure of existing means of access, widening of footways, formation of service/taxi/car club/ laybys and other associated highway works on Edward Street, widened footway, bus stop layby and other **associated highway works on Magdalen Street**, 333 covered car parking spaces for Use Class C3, hard and soft landscaping of public open spaces comprising 2 streets and 2 squares for pedestrians and cyclists, other landscaping, service infrastructure and other associated works; (all floor areas given as maximum gross external area);

and

Outline planning permission on 2.73 ha of the site, with all matters reserved, for demolition and clearance of all buildings and structures except Gildengate House, **erection of 4 and part of 5th buildings (Blocks B and D – H, with Block E to incorporate tower with full planning permission)** and refurbishment and change of use from Use Class B1(a) to C3 of Gildengate House (Block J), **for a maximum of 857 residential dwellings (Use Class C3)**, 11,350 sqm hotel (Use Class C1), 5,430 sqm ground floor flexible retail, services, food and drink, office, non-residential institution and other floorspace (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/**B1**/D1/Sui Generis (bookmakers and/or nail bars, up to a maximum of 550 sqm within entire scheme)), 770 sq m ground floor flexible commercial floorspace (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1), service yard, cycle and refuse stores, plant rooms and other ancillary space; up to 3,400 sqm cinema (Use

*Class D2), with associated means of access, widening of footways, formation of service/taxi laybys and other associated highway works including shared cycle/pedestrian path on New Botolph Street, Pitt Street and St Crispins Road, **a maximum of 607 car parking spaces for C1 / C3 / B1 / D1 , of which circa 593 covered spaces (with a maximum of 40 for C1/B1/D1), and circa 14 open spaces for C3 (on west side of Edward Street for Block B), landscaping, service infrastructure and other associated works; and erection of building for 1,300 sqm place of worship (Use Class D1) (Block C), on north side of Edward Street with associated on-site car parking and landscaping; (all means of access reserved; all floor areas given as maximum gross external area).***

- 1.8 It is important to note that these amendments are limited in scope and have resulted in minimal alterations to the parameters of the development which were considered in the Original ES. The most substantial change relates to the reduction of the marker building by 5 storeys. The revised parameter plans appear at Appendix SEI 1.6. As the original EIA assessed a worst case / maximum development scenario, it is considered that the parameters of the Original ES allowed flexibility for alterations to the scheme and on this basis, this SEI demonstrates that the technical assessments of effects remain valid and unchanged for the Amended Scheme.

Background to the Environmental Statement

- 1.9 An Environmental Statement (ES) sets out the findings of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The purpose of the EIA is to identify the likely significance of environmental effects (beneficial or adverse) arising from a proposal by comparing the existing situation at the start of the work (baseline) with the situation once the proposals are in place, whilst also assessing the construction phase, and in all stages considering the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development and other committed developments in the agreed area of impact.
- 1.10 The statutory requirements for carrying out an EIA, the contents of the ES and the procedures for determining planning applications for 'EIA Development' are set out within the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the "EIA Regulations"). The undertaking of an EIA and the preparation of an ES is required in order to accord with these Regulations. The Proposed Development falls within the category of "Infrastructure Projects" (Schedule 2, 10, (b)) as described in the Regulations. This ES has been prepared to satisfy the requirements of the EIA Regulations.

Structure of the ES

- 1.11 The format and structure of the ES is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the Regulations and best practice guidance.
- 1.12 The ES comprises three volumes:

- Volume 1: Non-Technical Summary (NTS) (This document comprises the NTS);
 - Volume 2: Environmental Statement – Main Text; and
 - Volume 3: Environmental Statement – Technical Appendices.
- 1.13 In addition, the SEI supplements the above ES Volumes. This document comprises the NTS for the SEI.
- 1.14 The main text of the ES, Volume 2, is structured as follows:
- Chapter 1 – Introduction – Sets out the structure to the ES and provides a summary of the process of identifying environmental matters and effects to be evaluated in the ES;
 - Chapter 2 – EIA Methodology – Describes the approach taken to the assessment of significant environmental effects, including any assumptions, and the approach taken to the establishment of the EIA scope;
 - Chapter 3 – Description of the Site and Surroundings and Background – Describes the Site and surroundings, including any planning history associated with the Site;
 - Chapter 4 – Proposed Development and Alternatives – Description of the Site, Proposed Development and alternatives;
 - Chapter 5 – Construction Methodology and Programme – Describes demolition and construction plan and programme;
 - Chapter 6 – Highways, Traffic and Transport – Assesses the impact of the Development on the road network and key junctions and predicts the possible effects on sensitive receptors in the area;
 - Chapter 7 – Built Heritage – Assesses the impact of the Development upon heritage assets within the surrounding area;
 - Chapter 8 – Archaeology – Considers the impact of the Development on archaeological assets of surrounding area during construction;
 - Chapter 9 – Noise – Considers the impact of noise and vibration to be generated during the construction and operational phases of the Development;
 - Chapter 10 – Air Quality – assesses the impact the Development will have on the air quality during construction and operation;
 - Chapter 11 – Socio-Economics – Assesses the impact the Development will have on existing and future residents against key socio-demographic measures;
 - Chapter 12 – Ecology – Assesses the impacts of the Development on the European protected sites within radius of the Site during construction and operation;
 - Chapter 13 – Townscape and Visual – Considers the impact of the Development on the immediate and surrounding townscape during operation; and
 - Chapter 14 – Cumulative Effects, Impacts and Mitigation – Provides an appraisal of the potential cumulative effects of the Development with other committed developments, and considers any forms of mitigation that may be required.

1.15 All technical background information (plans and technical reports) is included in the Appendices at Volume 3.

1.16 Copies of the Original ES and this SEI are available to view at NCC's offices. Alternatively, Icen Projects will be able to assist and can be contacted as follows:

Eilish Smeaton
Da Vinci House,
44 Saffron Hill,
London,
EC1N 8FH
Telephone 020 3640 1033
Email: Esmeaton@iceniprojects.com

1.17 A fee of £100 will be charged for each hard copy provided or £35 per CD copy.

1.18 The following sections of this SEI follow the same format of the Original ES as follows. As this is supplementary information to the original ES, both should be read in tandem.

Description of the Site and Background

1.19 Chapter 3 of the Original ES set out a summary of the existing Site which provides a background and context for evaluating the existing environmental conditions (i.e. baseline conditions). The amendments to the Proposed Development which comprise the Amended Scheme do not alter this chapter, and therefore the description of the Site and background set out in Chapter 3 of the Original ES remains valid.

The Proposed Development and Alternatives

1.20 Since the Original ES was submitted, the Applicant has undertaken further consultation and held further discussions with NCC regarding the design of the Proposed Development. The feedback from this consultation period has resulted in a number of amendments to the Proposed Development, resulting in an 'Amended Scheme'.

1.21 A summary of the changes to the Proposed Development which have occurred since the Original ES was submitted are set out below (hereafter referred to as the 'Amended Scheme'):

- Proposed Marker Building – reduction in height by 5 storeys, revisions to the building form, the internal layout, and updates to the proposed materials strategy and elevation design;
- Block A – amendments to the elevation design and proposal materials, inclusion of public toilets and 'Changing Places' facilities;

- Gildengate House – updated proposed illustrative dwelling mix;
- Block E – updated proposed illustrative dwelling mix;
- Block D – part reduction to four storeys in height to provide roof for communal amenity;
- Landscape – updates to the landscape strategy, including St. George’s Square, Edward Street, Pitt Street and provision of a play trail;
- Public Realm – omission of swale and inclusion of Pitt Street cycle route;
- Flexible Commercial Floorspace – additional flexibility for the 5,430sqm ground floor flexible retail, services, food and drink and non-residential institutional floorspace (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/D1/Sui Generis (bookmakers and/or nail bars, up to 550sqm) within the outline element, as originally applied for, to also include B1 uses³; and
- Highways Improvements:
 - Improvements to the Yellow Pedalway on Edward Street to the north of the Site;
 - Improvements to the alignment for cyclists through St. Georges Street;
 - Alternative cycle route provided on Pitt Street;
 - Reduction of the kerb radii at the Edward Street / New Botolph Street junction and an improved pedestrian crossing facility in this location across Edward Street;
 - Reduction in width of the vehicular entrance to the proposed multi-storey car park together with a raised table at this location on Edward Street; and
 - Introduction of laybys off the carriageway for 5 no. car club spaces and deliveries on Edward Street.

Alternatives

- 1.22 In accordance with Schedule 4 of the Regulations the SEI outlines the alternatives considered to deliver the Amended Scheme at Anglia Square, Norwich.

Alternative Scenarios

- 1.23 Chapter 4 of the Original ES set out the main alternatives considered by the Applicant which were as follows:

³ Policy justification for the B1 uses is provided within the Main Town Centre Uses Statement Rev. A which has been submitted as a standalone report. Further clarifications in respect of the flexible commercial floorspace, including how the Amended Scheme has responded to the matters raised during the consultation process are set out in the Retail Strategy Report (Revision A) and appended Response Note to Consultation Comments on commercial space prepared by Cushman & Wakefield.

- **Original ES Option 1:** The ‘do nothing’ alternative (i.e. where the Proposed Development is not progressed); and
- **Original ES Option 2:** Alternative Designs:
 - Previously consented schemes; and
 - Alternative designs (iterations preceding the Proposed Development).

1.24 A number of changes have occurred over the course of the design evolution, following the consultation process. These are set out within **Chapter 4: Proposed Development and Alternatives** of the Original ES. The assessment of the alternatives presented within the Original ES remain valid for the Amended Scheme.

1.25 Following the post-submission consultation process the SEI considered further alternative options for the Site, and these are set out in the Table below.

Table 1: Summary of Alternative Scenarios Considered within the SEI

Alternative Scenarios	Consideration
SEI Option 1: Do Nothing	<p>This option was considered within Chapter 4: Proposed Development and Alternatives of the Original ES, the conclusions of which remain valid. Further consideration of this option with reference to the Amended Scheme concluded that the existing multi-storey car park (MSCP) is structurally unsound and unsustainable in its current condition.</p> <p>The ‘Do Nothing’ option would not deliver the environmental and social benefits of the Amended Scheme and therefore was not considered further by the Applicant.</p>
SEI Option 2: Do Minimum - investment in the existing Shopping Centre and surface level car parks	<p>This option reflects the ‘Do Nothing’ described above with additional investment in the existing Shopping Centre and surface level car parks. This option was considered by Columbia Threadneedle in 2017 (application ref. 17/00386) but not pursued due to issues regarding viability and deliverability.</p> <p>Whilst this option would deliver some environmental benefits through improvements to the Shopping Centre, the wider physical environment, including the unsound MSCP, poor quality open space and limited pedestrian and cyclist connectivity would remain.</p>

Alternative Scenarios	Consideration
<p>SEI Option 3: Do Minimum and Demolish – SEI Option 2 plus removal of the MSCP to podium level</p>	<p>This alternative option reflects SEI Option 2 set out above, with the demolition of the MSCP to podium level.</p> <p>Whilst the removal of the MSCP would improve views to the north from the Anglia Square Shopping Centre, the streetscape would remain unattractive with a lack of active frontage with limited pedestrian or cyclist connectivity.</p>
<p>SEI Option 4: Do Minimum, Demolish and Convert – SEI Option 3 plus residential conversion of Gildengate House and Sovereign House</p>	<p>This option reflects SEI Option 3 with the residential conversion of Gildengate House and Sovereign House, including external works to improve the visual appearance of these buildings.</p> <p>Anglia Square is not considered to contain any positive landmarks and is identified as having a negative impact on the character and appearance of the wider Conservation Area.</p> <p>The recladding of Gildengate House and Sovereign House would address this to a degree, however the retention of these buildings would not deliver wider regeneration of the physical environment. Furthermore, the deliverability of the residential units would be limited by the buildings' layout, thereby not creating an efficient use of space.</p>
<p>SEI Option 5: Columbia Threadneedle Pre-Application Alternative – comprehensive scheme including the conversion of Gildengate House and Sovereign House to provide c.550 residential units</p>	<p>In 2015 Columbia Threadneedle considered an alternative scheme for Anglia Square for the redevelopment and refurbishment of the Site for approximately 550 homes and employment floorspace, with the proposed retention of all buildings except the MSCP.</p> <p>Pre-application discussions with NCC indicated that the Council would prefer alternative options to be considered, notably involving the demolition of Sovereign House. The NCC Conservation Area Appraisal indicates that the majority of the buildings associated with Anglia Square have a negative impact on the setting of the Conservation Area. This option would also not deliver wider landscape and transport improvements.</p>

Alternative Scenarios	Consideration
SEI Option 6: CMSA Vision (i.e. lower density alternative)	<p>This option would also provide a comprehensive redevelopment of the Site (including demolition of existing buildings) but with fewer residential dwellings.</p> <p>This redevelopment proposal would not deliver the same level of benefits to the community as the Amended Scheme, including the flexible Class D1 space and employment opportunities sought by the community.</p>

- 1.26 It is considered that the Amended Scheme is more beneficial for the regeneration of Anglia Square than the alternative options proposed. The Amended Scheme will deliver a comprehensive redevelopment of a key site in Norwich City Centre to provide residential accommodation (including affordable homes), employment opportunities associated with the commercial floorspace as well as provision of community and leisure facilities (including open space) for local residents. The Amended Scheme represents an opportunity to provide a development of a high-quality design, with environmental benefits which responds to the widely acknowledged need to redevelop the present Anglia Square.

Approach to EIA and Methodology

- 1.27 Chapter 2 of the Original ES set out the methodology used in undertaking the EIA. Notwithstanding the amendments made to the layout and design of the Proposed Development which comprise the Amended Scheme, the methodology presented in **Chapter 2: EIA Methodology** of the Original ES remains valid.
- 1.28 The Original ES set out the maximum assessment parameters which exceed the proposal for which permission is sought, to enable a worst-case assessment to be undertaken. The Amended Scheme remains within those parameters as the proposed amendments reduce the quantum of development. Therefore, as the EIA has tested a worst-case scenario (i.e. a higher quantum of development) and the Amended Scheme remains within the parameters previously assessed, and therefore the methodology presented within the Original ES remains valid.
- 1.29 Table 2.1 of the SEI sets out a list of the revised parameter plans for the Amended Scheme submitted as part of this planning application.

- 1.30 The Phasing Plan set out in **Appendix 5.1** of the Original ES remains valid and has not been altered as a result of the Amended Scheme. The details presented in **Chapter 5: Development Programme, Demolition and Construction** of the Original ES also remain valid.

Impacts of the Amended Scheme

- 1.31 The SEI considers the environmental impacts of the Amended Scheme on a topic-by-topic basis and determines whether the conclusions presented within the Original ES remain valid. The SEI should be read in conjunction with the Original ES.
- 1.32 It should be noted that many of these amendments are limited in scope and have therefore resulted in minimal alterations to the parameters of the Proposed Development considered within the Original ES. It is considered that the parameters set out within the Original ES allowed sufficient flexibility for alterations such that the technical assessment of effects remains unchanged and valid.
- 1.33 A summary of the impacts of the Amended Scheme are set out in **Table 2** below. Where differences in likely significant effects (LSE) have occurred, these are discussed in more detail under the corresponding topic headings.
- 1.34 The most significant changes which are relevant to the assessment comprise:
- Reduction of the tower element from 25 to 20 storeys in height;
 - Alterations to the design of the tower element; and
 - Alterations to the design and materials of Block A.

Table 2: Summary of Alternative Scenarios Considered within the SEI

ES Topic	Change in LSE?	Justification
Highways, Traffic and Transport	No	The amendments to the Proposed Development have been considered with regard to the conclusions presented within the Transport Assessment. The Transport Assessment is based on a more onerous development than the Amended Scheme and therefore the residual cumulative impact of the Amended Scheme would still be acceptable. A Transport Assessment Addendum is submitted as Appendix SEI 6.2 which confirms that the conclusions set out within the Original ES in relation to highways, traffic and transport remain valid.
Built Heritage	Yes	Please refer to the 'Built Heritage' section below for further details
Archaeology	No	There are no proposed changes to the construction methodology as a result of the Amended Scheme and consequently the conclusions set out in the Original ES in relation to construction phase impacts, on designated archaeological assets and their settings (i.e. no impacts anticipated) remain valid. No impacts on designated or non-designated archaeological assets are identified once the Amended Scheme is operational, which is consistent with the conclusions presented within the Original ES.
Noise	No	It is considered that the results of the assessment of the Amended Scheme are consistent with the findings of the assessment set out within the Original ES, and that no significant adverse noise effects will occur during either the construction or operational phases of the Amended Scheme. Consequently, the conclusions presented within the Original ES in relation to noise remain valid.

ES Topic	Change in LSE?	Justification
Air Quality	No	The revised Air Quality Assessment concludes that the proposed mitigation and possible controls via planning conditions are acceptable in terms of air quality impacts during the construction and operational phases, and no significant adverse impacts are identified. Consequently, the revised Air Quality Assessment which assessed the Amended Scheme does not alter the conclusions presented in the Original ES in relation to air quality which therefore remain valid.
Socio-Economic	No	The Amended Scheme does not propose any material changes to the construction phasing and timescales, and consequently the construction employment effects (both direct and indirect) remain consistent with those presented in the Original ES (i.e. moderate beneficial). The Amended Scheme still proposes to deliver up to 1,250 new residential dwellings and the anticipated population of the development is consistent with that presented in the Original ES, and therefore impacts in relation to population, education and healthcare are all considered to be negligible. Whilst the Amended Scheme proposes additional flexibility of up to 6,580sqm of commercial floorspace which results in an increase in job opportunities once operational (between 536 and 763 jobs) the effect of the local and wider impacts remain consistent with that presented in the Original ES.
Ecology	No	It is considered that the Amended Scheme will result in negligible impacts on ecological sites (SSSI and European designated sites) and species (birds, reptiles and amphibians) during both the construction and operational phases, which is consistent with the conclusions presented in the Original ES in relation to ecology.
Townscape and Visual	Yes	Please refer to the 'Townscape and Visual' section below for further details

ES Topic	Change in LSE?	Justification
Cumulative Effects, Impacts and Mitigation	No	No further major developments have come forward since the Original ES was submitted. Therefore, the cumulative schemes considered within the Original ES remain valid in the context of the Amended Scheme. As such, the assessment of cumulative effects for the Amended Scheme is consistent with those presented within the Original ES.

Built Heritage

- 1.42 Following the submission of the Original ES, further consultation with NCC and other consultees resulted in two additional heritage assets (Church of St. Helen (Grade I listed) and Waterloo Park (Grade II* Registered Park and Garden)) and 15 additional viewpoints being identified for consideration.
- 1.43 There are no proposed changes to the construction programme, phasing or methodology as a result of the Amended Scheme. Consequently, the conclusions set out within the Original ES in relation to construction phase effects on heritage assets remain valid. Construction related impacts on the Church of St. Helen and Waterloo Park were considered to be not significant.
- 1.44 Once the Amended Scheme is complete, the reduction in height and enhanced design of the tower element, alongside the amendments to the design of Block A would reduce the visibility of the scheme in longer distance views and also enhance the quality of those views that remain. The detailed findings of the impacts of the Amended Scheme in relation to Built Heritage assets are presented in **SEI Appendix 7.3** and **SEI Appendix 7.4**.
- 1.45 As a result of the Amended Scheme, significant effects are no longer anticipated on 2-9 Octagon Court (Grade II*) during the operational phase. Minor adverse impacts are identified in relation to the two additional assets of the Church of St. Helen and Waterloo Park, which are not significant. Impacts in relation to all other designated heritage assets are consistent with those presented in the Original ES.

Townscape and Visual

- 1.46 As a result of the amendments to the Proposed Development and further consultation with both NCC and Historic England following the submission of the Original ES, a supplementary Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA) is submitted as **Appendix SEI 13.2**.
- 1.47 Where the assessment of the Amended Scheme remains consistent with that presented in the Original ES (18 viewpoints) these were omitted from consideration within the TVIA Addendum. Consequently, this document comprises a review of 29 of the original viewpoints submitted and the survey and assessment of 15 additional viewpoint locations as agreed with NCC.
- 1.48 As no changes to the construction programme, phasing or methodology are proposed as part of the Amended Scheme, townscape and visual impacts during the construction phase are consistent with those presented within the Original ES.
- 1.49 The reduction in the height and modifications to the design of the tower element and Block A would materially enhance the townscape environment and visual impacts of the Proposed Development through reduced visibility in both nearby and longer distance views.

- 1.50 Although there were revisions to the residual impacts of five of the views assessed within the Original ES, the design changes which comprise the Amended Scheme do not result in any additional significant effects (positive or negative). Of the additional 15 viewpoints considered no negative impacts were identified, with 12 identified as experiencing negligible, neutral or no effect. A major beneficial impact was identified from the Norwich Castle Battlements, with moderate beneficial effects identified from Rosemary Lane and Aylsham Road.

Summary and Conclusion

- 1.51 The SEI presents a comprehensive and robust assessment of the Amended Scheme in relation to each of the topics included within the EIA. In general, the conclusions presented within the Original ES remain consistent and valid in the context of the Amended Scheme.
- 1.52 The most substantial changes are in relation to the revisions to the height and design of the tower element, with potential impacts on the Built Heritage and Townscape and Visual Impact Assessments. However, although the impacts in relation to these topics have been amended, no additional negative significant effects have been identified.
- 1.53 Overall, the significant adverse environmental effects associated with the Amended Scheme can be minimised to an acceptable level by the application of appropriate mitigation measures and the conclusions presented within the SEI are broadly consistent with those set out in the Original ES.