



www.landuse.co.uk

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Norwich Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Plan

Prepared by LUC
June 2014

Project Title: SA Addendum for the Norwich Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Plan

Client: Norwich City Council

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by Principal
0_1	16/04/2014	Internal draft	Juliette Young	Jeremy Owen	Jeremy Owen
1.0	29/05/2014	1 st Draft to Client	Juliette Young	Jeremy Owen	Jeremy Owen
2.0	5/6/2014	2 nd Draft to Client	Juliette Young	Juliette Young	
3.0	11/6/2014	3 rd Draft for Issue to Inspector	Juliette Young	Juliette Young	



www.landuse.co.uk

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Norwich Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Plan

Prepared by LUC
June 2014

Planning & EIA
Design
Landscape Planning
Landscape Management
Ecology
Mapping & Visualisation

LUC LONDON
43 Chalton Street
London NW1 1JD
T 020 7383 5784
F 020 7383 4798
london@landuse.co.uk

Offices also in:
Bristol
Glasgow
Edinburgh



FS 566056
EMS 566057

Land Use Consultants Ltd
Registered in England
Registered number: 2549296
Registered Office:
43 Chalton Street
London NW1 1JD
LUC uses 100% recycled paper

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	The Norwich Site Allocations Plan	1
	SA work to date	2
	Purpose and approach of the SA Report Addendum	2
2	The Proposed Plan and Reasonable Alternatives	5
3	Baseline Characteristics and Plan and Programme Review	19
	Baseline Characteristics	19
	Policy, Plans and Programmes	20
4	SA of Changes Prior to Regulation 19 Consultation	21
5	SA of Changes in Response to SA Recommendations from the Regulation 19 SA Report	23
6	SA of Main Modifications to Regulation 19 Site Allocations plan	26
7	SA of Minor (Additional) Modifications to Regulation 19 Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Plan	99
8	Summary of Effects of Changes	104
	SA of Changes Prior to Regulation 19 Consultation	104
	SA of Changes in Response to SA Recommendations from the Regulation 19 SA Report	105
	SA of Main Modifications to Regulation 19 Site Allocations Plan	105
	SA of Minor Modifications to Regulation 19 Site Allocations Plan	110
9	Effects of Regulation 19 Plan including proposed Modifications and Reasonable Alternatives	111
10	Cumulative Effects	120
11	Conclusions	121

Tables

Table 1.1: SA Framework	2
Table 2.1: Sites Allocated in the Plan	5
Table 2.2: Reasonable Alternatives considered	15
Table 4.1: SA of Changes Prior to Regulation 19 Consultation	21
Table 6.1: Summary of Main Modifications and the Implications for the SA	27
Table 7.1: SA of Minor (Additional) Modifications	100
Table 8.1: SA Implications of Redefined Critical Drainage Catchments	107
Table 8.2: Site R32 Alternative Scenarios	108
Table 9.1: Summary of SA Scores for the sites allocated for Housing in the Site Allocations Plan	112
Table 9.2: Summary of SA scores for the sites allocated for Mixed Use in the Site Allocations Plan	115
Table 9.3: Summary of SA scores for the sites allocated for Employment in the Site Allocations Plan	117
Table 9.4: Summary of SA scores for the 'Reasonable Alternative' sites	118

1 Introduction

The Norwich Site Allocations Plan

- 1.1 The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for 'Greater Norwich', covering Broadlands, Norwich and South Norfolk districts, was adopted by the three councils in March 2011, with subsequent amendments following re-examination of part of its content incorporated and adopted in January 2014. The Joint Core Strategy forms part of the Local Plans for each district, containing strategic policies for the period 2008-2026.
- 1.2 To supplement the Joint Core Strategy, Norwich City Council (NCC)('the Council') is setting out local planning policies in two separate Local Plan documents:
 - The Development Management Policies DPD which sets out general policies to guide developments, which apply across the whole city.
 - The Site Allocations DPD which contains detailed, site specific policies and proposals for sites where a change of use is expected and is the subject of this SA Addendum.
- 1.3 The Site Allocations Plan sets out detailed policies and site allocations to meet the level of housing, employment and mixed use development required over the plan period. It also provides for sites where change of use is anticipated or proposed. The Plan allocates a total of 73¹ sites for development in the plan period for a mix of uses. Approximately 3,192 new units of housing and 7 hectares of land for employment and business use are proposed.
- 1.4 The Council has undertaken a range of consultation events into the Site Allocations Plan. The key stages are set out below:
 - Initial 'call for sites' and evidence gathering (February – April 2009).
 - First stage of public consultation on potential development sites (November 2009-February 2010).
 - Second stage of public consultation on preferred (or 'shortlisted') sites (January to March 2011).
 - Additional stage of consultation on preferred sites (July to September 2011).
 - Pre-submission consultation (August to October 2012).
- 1.5 Following this consultation, the Plan was amended and then submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in April 2013. The Inspector is now proposing 'Main Modifications' to the Plan i.e. changes required to make the Plan sound and/or legally compliant; these modifications will be published for consultation before the Plan is finalised and adopted. The Council is also proposing Minor Modifications, for example to improve clarity or correct factual errors. In line with suggestions made by the Inspector, all proposed modifications are with respect to the Regulation 19² version of the Plan.

¹ A number of sites have been removed from the Plan since the Regulation 19 Plan was published. The reasons for their removal are explained later in this document.

² ² The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. SI 2012 No. 767.

SA work to date

- 1.6 The first stage of the SA process, setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding the scope, was undertaken by the Council and the SA Scoping Report published for consultation in 2009.
- 1.7 Further SA Reports were completed by LUC to appraise the emerging Plan as follows:
- In December 2010 to accompany the Regulation 18 consultation on the Plan in January 2011.
 - In July 2011 to accompany a further consultation into the Plan.
 - In June 2012 to accompany the Regulation 19 consultation on the Plan in August 2012.
 - In March 2013 to accompany the Plan submitted under Regulation 22 to the Secretary of State in April 2013.

Purpose and approach of the SA Report Addendum

Purpose

- 1.8 Consultation on the Plan at this stage is restricted to the proposed modifications to the Plan. The primary purpose of this SA Report Addendum is therefore to inform the consultation by assessing the sustainability effects of the proposed modifications.

Approach

- 1.9 As noted above, the Inspector has requested that the Council use the Regulation 19 version of the Plan as the baseline against which to propose its modifications. This SA Report Addendum therefore appraises the sustainability of Plan changes made or proposed since preparation of the June 2012 SA Report prepared to accompany the Regulation 19 Plan and should be read alongside that report. However, for ease of reference the SA objectives that provide the framework for the June 2012 assessment and for this SA Addendum are reproduced in the Table below.

Table 1.1: SA Framework

SA objective
Environmental
ENV 1 – To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment
ENV 2 – To improve the quality of the water environment
ENV3 – To improve environmental amenity, including air quality
ENV4 – To maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity
ENV5 – To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment
ENV6 – To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change
ENV7 – To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk
ENV8 – To provide for sustainable use and sources of water supply
ENV9 – To make the best use of resources, including land and energy and to

minimise waste production
Social
SOC1 – To reduce poverty and social exclusion
SOC2 – To maintain and improve the health of the whole population and promote healthy lifestyles
SOC3 – To improve education and skills
SOC4 – To provide the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home
SOC5 – To build community identity, improve social welfare and reduce crime and anti-social activities
SOC6 – To offer more opportunities for rewarding and satisfying employment for all
SOC7 – To improve the quality of where people live
SOC8 – To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs
Economy
EC1 – To encourage sustained economic growth
EC2 – To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment
EC3 – To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth
EC4 – To improve social and environmental performance of the economy

1.10 The changes considered in this SA Addendum comprise four distinct sets of Plan changes:

- **Changes prior to Regulation 19 Consultation made by NCC members and in response to updates on the availability of sites:** After the SA Report on the Pre-submission DPD was prepared in June 2012 a number of changes were recommended to be made to the Plan to reflect changes to the status of sites (i.e. sites that were no longer available and hence were removed from the Plan) and in response to feedback from elected members at a NCC Cabinet meeting on 11th July 2012. The various changes made through the process of member consideration were consolidated into the version of the plan published for Regulation 19 consultation in August 2012. These changes and the SA of the changes are presented in **Chapter 4** of this SA Report Addendum.
- **Changes in response to SA Recommendations from the Regulation 19 SA:** the June 2012 SA Report made a number of recommendations. Some of the SA recommendations were accepted by NCC. The SA recommendations (and NCC's response to these) are presented in **Chapter 5** of this SA Report Addendum.
- **Proposed Main Modifications to the Regulation 19 Plan:** The SA of the proposed Main Modifications to the Plan use the Regulation 19 version as the baseline for the assessment. The proposed Main Modifications are required to make it sound and/or legally compliant. These proposed Main Modifications and the SA of the proposed Main Modifications are presented in **Chapter 6** of this SA Report Addendum.
- **Proposed Minor Modifications to the Regulation 19 Plan:** The Council is able to propose Minor Modifications to the Plan prior to adoption. These modifications are intended to correct minor errors or to add clarity to existing policies and are not subject to independent

examination. SA is only concerned with significant effects, which are unlikely to result from Minor Modifications. However, to check that this is the case, the Proposed Minor Modifications have been reviewed to consider the potential sustainability implications of the changes. This is considered in **Chapter 7** of this SA Report Addendum.

- 1.11 The SA Report Addendum also considers the 'cumulative effects' of all the changes (including the proposed Modifications) acting in combination with the Regulation Plan 19, on the assumption that the rest of the plan that remains unmodified is sound and will eventually be adopted.

2 The Proposed Plan and Reasonable Alternatives

- 2.1 The following table sets out the sites which are proposed for inclusion in the Site Allocations Plan. The table explains whether or not the sites were included in the Regulation 19 Plan and the proposed allocation (i.e. whether the site is being put forward for housing, employment, mixed use etc.). The site numbers do not follow on sequentially as some sites have been removed as allocations since earlier versions of the Plan were published; the original site numbers have been retained for ease of reference.

Table 2.1: Sites Allocated in the Plan

Proposed Site	Proposed Use	Dwelling Number	Included in Regulation 19 Plan?	Comments
CC1: 60-70 Ber Street	Mixed Use	20	Yes	Site was proposed as a mixed use allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC3: 147-153 Ber Street	Housing	20	Yes	Site was proposed as a housing allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC4: 10-24 Ber Street	Mixed Use	10	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan, however, 30 dwellings were proposed
CC5: Rose Lane/Mountergate	Mixed Use	300	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC6: Land at Greyfriars Road/Rose Lane	Housing	20	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC7: St Anne's Wharf and Adjoining Land	Mixed Use	300	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC8: Land at Hobrough Lane, King Street	Mixed Use	20	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC9: King Street Stores	Housing	20	Yes	Site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan

Proposed Site	Proposed Use	Dwelling Number	Included in Regulation 19 Plan?	Comments
CC10: 144-162 King Street	Mixed Use	15	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC11: Land at Garden Street	Mixed Use with potential for temporary primary school	100	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan – the potential for a temporary primary school on site is new and reflects issues raised by Norfolk County Council
CC12: Land at Argyle Street	Housing	12	Yes	Site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC13: Land at Wherry Road	Housing	65	Yes	Site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC14: Land at Lower Clarence Road	Housing	45	Yes	Site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC15: Bussey's Garage Site, Thorpe Road and Lower Clarence Road	Housing	25	Yes	Site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 SA
CC16: Norwich Mail Centre, 13-17 Thorpe Road	Mixed Use	150	Yes	Site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC17: Land adjoining Norwich City Football Club, Kerrison Road	Mixed Use	400	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC19a: Barrack Street	Mixed Use	200	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC19b: Whitefriars	Office Led Mixed Use	Housing not proposed	Yes	Site was proposed for office development in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC20: 140-154 Oak Street	Housing	10	Yes	Site was proposed for housing in the

Proposed Site	Proposed Use	Dwelling Number	Included in Regulation 19 Plan?	Comments
				Regulation 19 Plan
CC21: Furniture Store, 70-72 Sussex Street	Housing	15	Yes	Site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC22: Oak Street and Sussex Street commercial sites, 160-162 Oak Street	Housing	15	Yes	Site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC23: Duke's Wharf, Duke Street (Former EEB offices)	Mixed Use (D1 uses now also accepted)	30	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan (D1 uses were not specified at this stage)
CC24: Barn Road Car Park	Mixed Use	40	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC26: Pottergate Car Park	Mixed Use	20	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC27: Land to Rear of City Hall	Mixed Use	20	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC29: Chantry Car Park	Mixed Use	No housing proposed	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC30: Fomer Mecca Bingo, All Saints Green	Employment (offices)	No housing proposed	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC31: St Stephens Towers Street	Mixed Use	250	Yes	The site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC32: Land and buildings at the junction of St Stephens Street and Westlegate	Mixed Use	None proposed	Yes	The site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
CC34: Land at Queens Road and Surrey Street	Office Led Mixed Use	40	Yes	The site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation

Proposed Site	Proposed Use	Dwelling Number	Included in Regulation 19 Plan?	Comments
				19 Plan
CC35: Westwick Street Car Park	Housing	30	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R1: The Neatmarket, Hall Road	Employment	None proposed	Yes	The site was proposed for employment in the Regulation 19 Plan
R2: Norfolk Learning Difficulties Centre, Ipswich Road	Housing with care scheme and/or Community facilities or Housing development	Housing only (30)	Yes	The same range of uses was proposed in the Regulation 19 Plan
R3: Hall Road District Centre	Mixed Use District Centre (commercial, leisure and community)	Dwelling number not specified.	Yes	The site was proposed for a mix of uses in the Regulation 19 Plan. Housing was permitted provided it could be well integrated into the development
R4: Hewett Yard, Hall Road	Housing	20	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R5: Part of School Playing Field of Hewett School	Community Facility	None proposed	Yes	The site was proposed for a community facility in the Regulation 19 Plan
R7: 138a Hall Road and Land to the Rear	Housing	10	Yes	The site was proposed housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R8: John Youngs Ltd, City Road	Housing	45	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan. Housing figure is now a minimum to be provided

Proposed Site	Proposed Use	Dwelling Number	Included in Regulation 19 Plan?	Comments
R9: Aviva Car Park, Southwell Road/Brazen Gate	Housing	70	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R10: Deal Ground, Trowse	Residential led mixed use	600	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R11: Utilities Site, Cremorne Lane	Mixed Use	Minimum 100	Yes	The site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan (housing figure is now a minimum)
R12: Kerrison Road/Hardy Road, Gothic Works	Housing led mixed use	In the region of 400	Yes	The site was proposed for mixed use in the Regulation 19 Plan
R13: 233 261-277 Aylsham Road	Housing with potential for starter employment units	In the region of 50	Yes	The site was proposed for housing, in the region of 75 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Plan
R15: Gas Holder at Gas Hill	Housing	Minimum 15	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R16: Land east of Bishop Bridge Road	Housing	In the region of 50 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R17: Land at Ketts Hill / Bishop Bridge Road	Housing	In the region of 30	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R18: 126-128 Barrack Street	Housing	Minimum 15 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for housing, or a mix of housing and community uses in the Regulation 19 Plan. Minimum 30 dwellings or 15 if the former public house is retained for an

Proposed Site	Proposed Use	Dwelling Number	Included in Regulation 19 Plan?	Comments
				alternative use.
R19: Van Dal Shoes, Dibden Road	Housing	25 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R20: Former Start Rite Factory, 28 Mousehold Lane	Housing	40	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R21: Sprowston Road/Land north of Windmill Road	Housing	In the region of 10 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for mixed use (in the region of 25 dwellings) in the Regulation 19 Plan
R22: Starling Road	Housing	45	Yes	The site was proposed for housing (in the region of 45 dwellings) in the Regulation 19 Plan
R23: Land at Aylsham Road	Mixed Use	In the region of 100 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for mixed use (in the region of 100 dwellings)
R24: 165-187 Aylsham Road	Mixed Use	In the region of 20 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for mixed use (in the region of 20 dwellings) in the Regulation 19 Plan
R25: Former Pupil Referral Unit, Aylsham Road	Housing	Minimum 11 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R26: Land Adjoining Lime Kiln Mews	Housing development (in the region of 15 dwellings) or housing with care development	In the region of 15 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for housing development (in the region of 15 dwellings) or housing with care development in the Regulation 19 Plan
R27: 81-93 Drayton Road	Housing	In the region of 30 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for housing (in the region of 30 dwellings) in the Regulation 19 Plan

Proposed Site	Proposed Use	Dwelling Number	Included in Regulation 19 Plan?	Comments
R28: Site north of Raynham Street	Housing	40 dwellings minimum	Yes	The site was proposed for housing (40 dwellings minimum) in the Regulation 19 Plan
R29: Goldsmith Street	Housing	Approximately 100 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R30: 231-243 Heigham Street	Housing	In the region of 25 dwellings	Yes	The site was allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Plan
R31: Two Sites at Hurricane Way, Airport Industrial Estate	Two sites (A+B) allocated for light industrial development/and or small business use Housing development (30 dwellings) would be acceptable on the southern part of the site (site B)	30	Yes	The sites were allocated for light industrial development and/or for small business use in the Regulation 19 Plan
R32: The Paddocks, Holt Road	Airport Operational Use or Development for General Employment Purposes	None proposed	Yes	The site was allocated for airport operational use only in the Regulation 19 Plan
R33: Heigham Water Treatment Works, Waterworks Road	Housing led mixed use	150 minimum	Yes	The site was proposed for housing led mixed use (a minimum of 150 dwellings) in the Regulation 19 Plan
R35: 120-130 Northumberland Street	Housing	Approximately 30 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for housing (approximately 30 dwellings) in the Regulation 19 Plan
R36: Site at former Earl of Leicester Public House, 238	Housing	In the region of 12 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for housing (in the region of 12 dwellings) in the

Proposed Site	Proposed Use	Dwelling Number	Included in Regulation 19 Plan?	Comments
Dereham Road				Regulation 19 Plan
R37: Land adjacent to and including 349a – 349b Dereham Road	Housing	In the region of 24 dwellings	Yes	The site was proposed for housing (in the region of 24 dwellings) in the Regulation 19 Plan
R38: Land at Havers Road	Housing	In the region of 100	Yes	Site was proposed for housing, in the region of 100 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Plan
R39: Mile Cross Depot	Mixed Use	Minimum 75	Yes	Site was proposed for mixed use (minimum 75 dwellings) in the Regulation 19 Plan
R40: Part of Norwich Community Hospital, Bowthorpe Road	Housing	In the region of 80 dwellings	Yes	Site was proposed for housing (in the region of 80 dwellings) in the Regulation 19 Plan
R41: Three Score Bowthorpe	Sustainable Urban Extension (primarily for housing; no employment)	In the region of 1,200	Yes	Site was proposed for a sustainable urban extension in the Regulation 19 Plan
R42: Earlham Hall	Employment	None proposed	Yes	Site was proposed for business use in the Regulation 19 Plan in the Regulation 19 Plan
R43: Former Blackdale School, University of East Anglia	Campus extension for university related uses	None proposed	Yes	Site was proposed as a campus extension for university related uses in the Regulation 19 Plan
R44: Land Between Suffolk Walk and Bluebell Road, University of East Anglia	Employment Strategic reserve for a university campus extension	None proposed	Yes	Site was proposed as a campus extension for university related uses in the Regulation 19 Plan
Sites Removed Prior to Consultation on the Regulation 19 Plan following a Cabinet Meeting in July 2012				

Proposed Site	Proposed Use	Dwelling Number	Included in Regulation 19 Plan?	Comments
R6: Former Lakenham Sports and Leisure Centre, Cricket Ground Road	Housing	65	No	<p>Site was removed following a decision by Cabinet in July 2012.</p> <p>Site has subsequently been consented for housing on appeal (currently unimplemented) providing for 75 dwellings. Site still constitutes a reasonable alternative for the purposes of the SA.</p>
Proposed NEW allocation since Regulation 19 Plan				
R45: Land West of Bluebell Road	Housing scheme for the over 55s	In the region of 120 dwellings	No	<p>This site was removed from the Regulation 19 Plan as an allocation following a Cabinet Meeting in July 2012.</p> <p>The site was subsequently discussed at an examination session in March 2014. The inspector now proposes that it be brought back into the Site Allocations Plan as an allocation on the basis that the proposed modification is made without prejudice to his final conclusions on his report and all representations will be taken into account.</p> <p>Consequently a main modification is proposed to the Site Allocations Plan to allocate R45 which will be consulted upon in the forthcoming main modifications</p>

Proposed Site	Proposed Use	Dwelling Number	Included in Regulation 19 Plan?	Comments
				consultation.
Sites Removed or Discounted since Regulation 19 Plan				
CC2: 84-110 Ber Street	Mixed Use	120	Yes	Site is no longer available for development within the Plan period
CC18: Former Hunters Squash Club, Edward Street	Housing	20	Yes	Site is no longer available for allocation. The consented scheme (permission ref 04/01120F) is being built out in full
CC25: Norfolk House, Exchange Street	Mixed Use	20	Yes	Site is no longer available for development
CC28: Fire Station, Bethel Street	Mixed Use	15	Yes	Site is no longer available for allocation. It is currently being converted to a free school
CC33: Westlegate Tower	Mixed Use	30	Yes	Site is no longer available for allocation; it is currently undergoing redevelopment
R14: Chalk Hill Works	Housing	25	Yes	Site is no longer available for allocation. The consented scheme (permission 12/0155/F) is being built out in full
R46: Land at Pointers Field	Housing	10	Yes	Site is no longer available. Consented scheme is being built out in full

- 2.2 Table 2.2 below sets out the reasonable alternatives to the allocated sites and explains why these have not been allocated within the Plan. This remains the same as the list of alternatives which was included within the Regulation 19 Plan except for site N0R0128: RAF Officers Married Quarters, Dowding Road which has now been developed (and hence is no longer a reasonable alternative), site R45: Land West of Bluebell Road (following the examination into the Plan the Inspector proposed that this be brought back into the Plan as an allocation) and Site R6: Former Lakenham Sports and Leisure Centre (this site was recently consented on appeal, but as the

consent remains unimplemented it is still a potential reasonable alternative for housing in the Site Allocations Plan).

Table 2.2: Reasonable Alternatives considered

Reasonable Alternative	Proposed Use	Included as an alternative in Regulation 19 Plan	Reason for Discounting as a Reasonable Alternative	Reason Site is not included in the Plan
H004: Land to rear of 180 Earlham Road, Norwich	Housing	Yes	N/A	Major issue with highway access and safety which is not likely to be overcome. Width of access via Earlham Road is not adequate. Ownership issue is not likely to be resolved.
H008: Land at Northumberland Street	Housing	Yes	N/A	Site located within industrial area which is protected for employment use. Loss of small business units is not favoured. Development is piecemeal and not compatible with surrounding employment use.
H011: Land at Eaton Golf Club (part)	Housing	Yes	N/A	No identified access. Loss of urban green space and habitats is not justified. Adjacent County Wildlife Trust site.
M052: Colegate Car Park	Housing	Yes	N/A	Listed buildings and archaeological constraints make this site less likely to be viable.
NOR0005: Former Eaton Rise Service Station, Ipswich Road	Housing	Yes	N/A	The site is too small to allocate for housing development due to ground conditions and topography constraints restricting the amount of developable land.
M001: Gooseberry Gardens and access there via existing allotments, Cathedral Precinct	Mixed Use	Yes	N/A	Development would adversely affect: the setting of the cathedral and views of it both from close proximity and from the wooded ridge and Mousehold Heath: the setting of listed buildings in the vicinity; and the character of the city centre conservation area due to traffic impacts. Other

Reasonable Alternative	Proposed Use	Included as an alternative in Regulation 19 Plan	Reason for Discounting as a Reasonable Alternative	Reason Site is not included in the Plan
				constraints include being within Flood Zone 3 and loss of urban green space.
M0002: Land between Hooks Walk & Ferry Lane on west flank of Norwich School playing fields, Cathedral Precinct	Mixed Use	Yes	N/A	Development would adversely affect: views of the cathedral; the setting of this part of the city centre conservation area; and the setting of listed buildings in the vicinity. Other constraints include the site being within Flood Zone 3 and with significant mature trees.
M0003: Brownes Meadow Car Park and land to the rear of 20-24 The Close	Mixed Use	Yes	N/A	Development would adversely affect: the character of this part of the city centre conservation area; the setting of listed buildings; and the area to the east of 21 Ferry Lane which is of value in terms of amenity, biodiversity and climate change adaptation. Mature trees onsite also pose a significant constraint.
M0004: Land to the rear of 9-14a The Close and car park west of Horsefair House	Mixed Use	Yes	N/A	Development would adversely affect the setting of many highly-graded listed buildings in the vicinity. The sub-division of historic plots and loss of historic walls is not justifiable. Access to the site presents significant constraints. Mature trees on site also pose a significant constraint.
M0005: 10 Barnard Road	Mixed Use	Yes	N/A	Site is located in primary industrial area and is not suitable for hotel development.
M0008: Norfolk Tower, Surrey Street	Mixed Use	Yes	N/A	Loss of city centre office floor space is not justified.
M0009: Land West of Bluebell Road,	Mixed Use (mainly housing with	Yes	N/A	Development of this 11.11ha site, originally proposed for housing development and community facilities, would have a negative

Reasonable Alternative	Proposed Use	Included as an alternative in Regulation 19 Plan	Reason for Discounting as a Reasonable Alternative	Reason Site is not included in the Plan
Bartram Mowers	community facilities)			<p>impact on the setting of the Yare Valley. The site is poorly located in relation to other brownfield sites in the city and is not needed to meet JCS housing requirements.</p> <p>This represents the original proposed site allocation at the Bartram Mowers site (i.e. not the current allocation which forms part of the proposed modifications which are being consulted upon). This larger site is still deemed to constitute a reasonable alternative.</p>
M048: 1-6b Craft Workshops, Bowthorpe	Mixed Use	Yes	N/A	Development will lead to loss of functional workshop units; In addition, buildings are locally listed which makes development less likely to be viable.
M056: 38 Surrey Street, Saints Court and Land to the North of Surrey Grove	Mixed Use	Yes	N/A	<p>Land is not likely to be deliverable due to ownership issues.</p> <p>Loss of urban green space is not favoured.</p>
E002: Victoria House, Queens Road, Norwich	Retail led Mixed Use	Yes	N/A	Mainly town centre uses will not be acceptable as the site is outside city centre primary retail area.
E002: Victoria House, Queens Road, Norwich	Employment led Mixed Use	Yes	N/A	Mainly town centre uses will not be acceptable as the site is outside city centre primary retail area.
Reasonable Alternatives added since Regulation 19 SA dated June 2012				
Reasonable Alternative	Proposed Use	Included as an alternative in	Reason for Discounting as a Reasonable	Reason Site is not included in the Plan

Reasonable Alternative	Proposed Use	Included as an alternative in Regulation 19 Plan	Reason for Discounting as a Reasonable Alternative	Reason Site is not included in the Plan
		Regulation 19 Plan	Alternative	
R6: Former Lakenham Sports Centre	Housing	No	N/A	<p>Site was removed from the Regulation 19 Plan following a Cabinet meeting in July 2012, chiefly on grounds of loss of open space.</p> <p>Site now has planning permission for housing (unimplemented) and hence is included as a reasonable alternative in this SA Addendum</p>
Reasonable Alternatives discounted since Regulation 19 SA dated June 2012				
Reasonable Alternative	Proposed Use	Included as an alternative in Regulation 19 Plan	Reason for Discounting as a Reasonable Alternative	Reason Site is not included in the Plan
NOR0128: RAF Officers Married Quarters, Dowding Road	Housing	Yes	Site has now been developed	Site has now been developed and hence this is no longer a reasonable altetnative

3 Baseline Characteristics and Plan and Programme Review

- 3.1 The Regulation 19 SA Report (refer to **Chapter 4** and **Appendices 6 & 7**) provided a detailed review of the environmental, social and economic baseline characteristics and plans and programmes of most relevance to the Site Allocations Plan and is not repeated here.

Baseline Characteristics

- 3.2 The most significant change to the baseline since the Regulation 19 SA Report was prepared includes the publication of Census 2011 data. Although this could change many of the detailed statistics cited in the Regulation 19 SA Report the updated data is not considered to materially alter the baseline trends set out in **Appendix 6** of the Regulation 19 SA Report.
- 3.3 Of particular note, however, are the 2011 trends relating to household size³. Norwich has:
- The fourth lowest household size of all local authorities in the country (2.12 people per household) and
 - The 8th highest percentage of single person households in the country (38.2%), 23,000 households.
- 3.4 NCC also amended a number of local datasets used to support the updated policy proposals map for the Development Management Policies Plan (these changes form part of the Main Modifications to the Proposals Mapping which are currently being consulted on). The key changes of relevance to the SA of the Site Allocations Plan are listed below:
- Policy DM6 Natural Environmental Assets – change to Woodland notation at Rostwold Way.
 - Policy DM8: Open Space – correction of errors.
 - Policy DM9: Conservation Areas – new and amended boundaries at Bracondale, Heigham Grove and Bowthorpe.
 - Policy DM9: Scheduled Ancient Monuments – boundary corrections.
 - DM18/DM23: City Centre Leisure Area – reinstatement of omitted areas on Northern City Centre Area Action Plan area inset.
 - DM20: Primary Retail Frontage – presentational change at Castle Mall and Chapelfield for clarity.
 - DM28: Existing and Proposed Riverside Walks – updates and correction of errors.
 - DM18: District and Local Centres – boundary change to Sprowston Road Local Centre and change status to District Centre.
 - DM5: Critical Drainage Areas – Replacement with Critical Drainage Catchments.
 - DM8: Open Space – updating of areas at Hall Road (Hewett School) and Earlham Road (City Academy) to reflect the completion of new development in these locations.
- 3.5 These data have been used to inform an updated GIS analysis of all remaining allocated sites and reasonable alternatives in the Site Allocations Plan. The results are discussed in **Chapters 6, 7 and 8** of this SA Report.

³ http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171776_361923.pdf

- 3.6 Finally, the Council published a Viability Assessment of the Site Allocations Plan in 2013 which tested the viability of all the proposed allocations. The viability modelling shows that:
- The great majority of the residential and mixed use development is viable.
 - The viability of high density residential development in the city centre is more marginal. Small uplifts in sales values, which are likely in the near future, or a small reduction in the affordable housing requirement on such sites, would enable such development to be viable.
 - Employment development is currently unviable. This reflects the current national and regional picture. Likely market improvements should greatly improve the viability of employment development. The current lack of viability for employment development does not, however, undermine the major employment allocation in the Site Allocations Plan at Hall Road.
- 3.7 The viability study has shown that it can be reasonably assumed that the sites allocated in the Site Allocations Plan will be delivered within the plan period. It also shows that policies in the DM policies plan do not adversely affect the viability of development proposed in the Site Allocations Plan.

Policy, Plans and Programmes

- 3.8 The key change in respect of the plan and programme review relates to the formal adoption of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk: Broadland Part of the Norwich Policy Area Local Plan in March 2011, with subsequent amendments following re-examination of part of its content incorporated and adopted in January 2014. Other changes to the national and local policy context include:
- Publication of the **General Permitted Development Order 2013**. This introduced deregulation in a number of policy areas, principally permitted changes of use affecting office to residential conversions⁴, use of premises as state funded schools and provisions for prior approval for temporary flexible uses. The Permitted Development Rights changes informed Modifications to Policy DM19 and consequential changes to Policies DM12, DM20, DM21 and DM22.
 - Publication of **National Planning Practice Guidance** in April 2014. This clarified a number of issues and informed Modification to Policy DM13 on inclusion of residential institutional development, student accommodation and the housing land supply.

⁴ The Councils produced a research paper on the impact of these changes: *Norwich Local Plan evidence paper: Impact of the General Permitted Development Order 2013 on emerging policy for office development and office space protection in Norwich*, Norwich City Council, November 2013.

4 SA of Changes Prior to Regulation 19 Consultation

- 4.1 A number of changes were made to the Regulation 19 Plan prior to formal consultation in August 2012. These changes were not reflected in the Regulation 19 SA Report. The Inspector during the examination into the Site Allocations Plan asked for clarification on the sustainability implications of these changes. This was set out in NCC's 'Response to Matter SA3 Sustainability Appraisal' and discussed at an examination session on March 4th 2014.
- 4.2 For completeness, this information is included in this SA Addendum.
- 4.3 The key changes which were made prior to the formal Regulation 19 Consultation and the implications of the changes in sustainability terms are set out in the Table below.

Table 4.1: SA of Changes Prior to Regulation 19 Consultation

Change	Stage in Process	Implication of Change and Justification
Removal of Site R34: Land at Northumberland Street as the landowner no longer wishes to develop the site	Prior to Regulation 19 Consultation	<p>No significant adverse effects (--) were identified in respect of this site.</p> <p>A significant positive effect (++) was predicted in respect of the potential to restore the frontage to Northumberland Street and significantly improve the townscape of this residential area. (SA Objective ENV5).</p> <p>Removal of this site as an allocation reduces the potential for improvements to be made to the locality (through this proposed allocation).</p> <p>Removal of the site (which would have delivered 15 dwellings) would not affect NCC's ability to deliver their overall housing need.</p>
<p>Removal of Site R6: Former Lakenham Sports Centre, Cricket Ground Road.</p> <p>NCC decided to exclude this site chiefly on the grounds of loss of open space.</p>	Prior to Regulation 19 Consultation following a Cabinet meeting on 11 th July 2012	<p>No significant adverse effects (--) were identified in respect of this site.</p> <p>A significant positive (++) effect was predicted in respect of SA objective SOC5 which seeks to reduce crime and build community identity by providing the opportunity to develop the existing derelict site and improve the environment for existing residents.</p> <p>The removal of this proposed allocation from the Plan would reduce the potential for environmental improvements to be made at this site (through the specific allocation of the site in the Plan).</p> <p>An application for housing at this site (75 dwellings) was approved in October 2013 on appeal. As this permission has not yet been implemented this site remains as a 'reasonable alternative' site for the</p>

Change	Stage in Process	Implication of Change and Justification
		purposes of the SA.
<p>Removal of Site R45: Land West of Bluebell Road, Bartram Mowers</p> <p>NCC decided to exclude this site from the Regulation 19 Plan chiefly due to potential landscape impacts on the Yare Valley</p>	<p>Prior to Regulation 19 Consultation following a Cabinet meeting on 11th July 2012</p>	<p>No significant positive effects (++) were identified in respect of this site in the Regulation 19 SA Report.</p> <p>A significant adverse uncertain effect (--/?) was predicted in respect of potential landscape impacts on the Yare Valley (SA objective ENV 5).</p> <p>The removal of the proposed allocation from the Plan (prior to the formal Regulation 19 consultation) would reduce the potential for a significant adverse impact. This site was not required to meet NCC's general market housing target nor is there a specific target in the Joint Core Strategy for housing for the elderly (the scheme was originally put forward as a housing scheme for the elderly). However, removal of this proposed allocation would reduce the potential for certainty in the delivery of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>This site was subsequently discussed at an examination session in March 2014. The inspector now proposes that it be brought back into the Site Allocations Plan as an allocation on the basis that the proposed modification is made without prejudice to his final conclusions on his report and all representations will be taken into account. Consequently a main modification is proposed to the Site Allocations Plan to allocate R45 which will be consulted upon in the forthcoming main modifications consultation. This site is discussed in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 of this report.</p>
<p>Site CC9: King Street Stores were reduced in size prior to formal Regulation 19 consultation (the existing sports hall and car park on this site were removed from the area with potential for development due to concerns regarding the loss of sports facilities and associated car parking).</p>	<p>Regulation 19 Consultation following a Cabinet meeting on 11th July 2012</p>	<p>The larger site was appraised in the Regulation 19 SA Report and no significant adverse (--) effects were predicted. A significant positive (++) effect was predicted in respect of SA objective (SOC 5) through the potential to reduce crime and fear of crime and build community identity through redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>The site has been re-appraised taking account of the reduced site area. The significant positive effect (++) in respect of SOC5 is still likely. No new significant adverse effects are predicted. The updated GIS analysis did not record any changes in respect of this site.</p>

5 SA of Changes in Response to SA Recommendations from the Regulation 19 SA Report

- 5.1 The June 2012 SA Report made a number of recommendations in respect of the SA objectives. A summary of the main recommendations (and NCC's response to these) is provided below.

ENV1: To Reduce the Effect of Traffic on the Environment / ENV3: To Improve Environmental Amenity including Air Quality / ENV6: To Adapt to and Mitigate against the Impacts of Climate Change

- 5.2 In respect of these three SA objectives it was recommended that where sites are proposed to be car free, the intention to develop car free developments is stated specifically in the site policies. This would strengthen the likelihood of car free development occurring. It is recognised that Development Management Policy DM32 sets out criteria for residential development to be car free or acceptable as car free or low car housing which should help ensure positive effects associated with car free or low car development occur.
- 5.3 **NCC decided not to respond to this recommendation as policy DM32 is considered to provide sufficient certainty in respect of this issue.**
- 5.4 Consequently there was no change to the SA sustainability scores.

ENV4: To maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity

- 5.5 In order to strengthen the likelihood of positive effects on biodiversity, the SA recommended that where the intention to maintain, protect or enhance biodiversity is stated in the supporting text to a site policy, the policy itself makes this explicit. In particular, it was recommended that site Policy CC1: 60-70 Ber Street will be expanded to make reference to retaining and enhancing the wooded ridge which is located on part of the site and forms part of Richmond Hill. It was considered that all policies for development of sites on Greenfield land should be amended to include measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for the loss of biodiversity.
- 5.6 The site policy for CC1 (60-70 Ber St) was amended as recommended.
- 5.7 This did not result in any change to the score for site CC1 in respect of SA objective ENV4.

ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of the landscapes, townscapes and historic environment

- 5.8 A number of site specific recommendations were made in relation to this objective, which would involve adding text to the policy as follows:
- **CC12: Land at Argyle Street** – The need to respect the setting of neighbouring listed and locally listed buildings.
 - **CC5: Land at Rose Lane and Mountergate** – The need to respect the setting of onsite listed buildings.
 - **CC24: Barn Road Car Park** – The need to respect the setting of nearby listed and locally listed buildings and the City Wall.
 - **CC34: Land at Queen's Road and Surrey Street** – The need to respect the setting of nearby locally listed buildings and the line of the City Wall.
 - **R3: Hall Road District Centre** – The need for the development not to be dominated by car parking.

- **R13: 261-277 Aylsham Road** – The need to create a street frontage to Aylsham Road.
 - **R24: 165-187 Aylsham Road** –The need to create a street frontage to Aylsham Road.
- 5.9 NCC amended the text of the following site policies to respond to these SA recommendations: CC5, CC12, CC24, CC34, R3 and R24. Site R13 was not amended as the policy already includes reference to the need to develop an appropriate street frontage for the site.
- 5.10 The inclusion of changes to recommendations resulted in the following changes to the site scores in respect of SA objective *ENV5* (The scores in bold represent the revised score).
- CC5 Regulation 19 SA Score (+/?) **(+)**
 - CC12 Regulation 19 SA Score (+/?) **(+)**
 - CC24 Regulation 19 SA Score (+/?) **(+)**
 - CC34 Regulation 19 SA Score (+/?) **(+)**
 - R3 Regulation 19 SA Score (+/?) **(+)**
 - R24 Regulation 19 SA Score (+/?) **(+)**

ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of the landscapes, townscapes and historic environment

- 5.11 It was recommended that where sites are within close proximity to the Broads National Park relevant site policies or the supporting text to the policy should make reference to the need to protect the setting of the National Park.
- 5.12 NCC decided not to change any of the site policies or supporting text to the policies, but have amended Development Management Policy DM6: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment which may indirectly help to mitigate against adverse effects. Policy DM6 states *"...development will be expected to take all reasonable opportunities to avoid harm to and protect and enhance the natural environment of Norwich and its setting..., taking particular account of the need to avoid harm to the adjoining Broads Authority area and other identified areas of natural environmental value immediately adjoining the City."*
- 5.13 This modification has not resulted in any change to SA scores.

ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk

- 5.14 It was recommended that a commitment to mitigate flood risk at sites located in a Critical Drainage Area be included as a requirement in the relevant site policies.
- 5.15 NCC amended the policy text for the following sites: CC18: Former Hunters Squash Club; R22: Starling Road; and R46: Land at Pointers Field. NB, since the examination into the Site Allocations Plan both sites CC18 and R46 have been removed from the Plan.
- 5.16 Subsequent to the Regulation 19 consultation, updated data and consultation responses (specifically from the Environment Agency and Norfolk County Council as the lead local flood authority) redefined Critical Drainage Areas into wider Critical Drainage Catchments (the wider catchments now incorporate additional areas with potential to contribute to flood risk). The redefined Critical Drainage Catchments now incorporate a greater number of sites. This is discussed in **Chapter 6: SA of Main Modifications to Regulation 19 Plan**.

SOC 7: To improve the quality of where people live

- 5.17 It was considered that where noise has been identified as a potential issue, the requirement for a noise assessment and appropriate mitigation should be set out in the site policy.
- 5.18 Norwich City Council amended the policy text for the following sites: CC5: Land at Rose Lane and Mountersgate; CC6: Land at Greyfriar Road/Rose Lane; CC10: 144-162 King Street; CC14: Land at Lower Clarence Road; CC15: Bussey's Garage Site, Thorpe Road and Lower Clarence Road; CC16: Norwich Mail Centre 13-17 Thorpe Road; CC17: Land Adjoining Norwich City Football Club, Kerrison Road; CC24: Barn Road Car Park; CC34: Land at Queen's Road and

Surrey Street, CC35: Westwick Street Car Park; R11: Utilities Site, Cremorne Lane; R12: Kerrison Road/Hardy Road, Gothic Works; R16: Land East of Bishop Bridge Road; R20: Former Start Rite Factory Site, 28 Mousehold Lane; R21: Land North of Windmill Road (NB, this clause has now been removed from the site policy as this mitigation is no longer necessary due to reduction in the site area); R23: Land at Aylsham Road; R31: Two Sites at Hurricane Way, Airport Industrial Estate; and R39: Mile Cross Depot.

- 5.19 The inclusion of changes to the Regulation 19 Plan to reflect the SA recommendations resulted in the following changes to the site scores in respect of SA objective *SOC7* (The scores in bold represent the revised score).
- CC5 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - CC6 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - CC10 **(+)** – no change
 - CC14 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - CC15 **(+)** – no change
 - CC16 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - CC17 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - CC24 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - CC34 **(+/-/?)** – no change
 - CC35 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - R11 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - R12 **(+/-?)** – no change
 - R16 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - R20 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - R21 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - R23 (+/-/? **(+/?)**)
 - R31 **(+/-/?)** – no change
 - R39 **(+/-/?)** – no change
- 5.20 Other site policies (R1, R2, R4, R10, R18, R22, R24, R25, R28, R30, R32 and R36) were not amended as the Council considered that the site policies already contained appropriate wording.
- 5.21 No other substantial recommendations were put forward in the Regulation 19 SA Report.

6 SA of Main Modifications to Regulation 19 Site Allocations plan

- 6.1 This chapter assesses the proposed Main Modifications to the Regulation 19 Plan.
- 6.2 The detailed schedule of Main Modifications is provided separately as part of the consultation process. Table 6.1 below sets out the main changes and summarises the SA implications of each.

Table 6.1: Summary of Main Modifications and the Implications for the SA

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
<i>A number of sites have been deleted from the Plan since the Regulation 19 Consultation:</i>	<i>See specific reasoning below</i>	Collectively the sites would have resulted in delivery of 240 dwellings as a well as a range of mixed uses. The removal of these sites from the Plan will not materially affect delivery of the City Council's overall housing figure of 3,000 dwellings as this can still be met through the remaining allocations in the Plan.	No
CC2: 84-110 Ber Street	<i>(site is no longer available for development)</i>	Site CC2 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for housing led mixed use development (a minimum of 120 dwellings with potential for ancillary office led development). No significant adverse effects were predicted in respect of this allocation. Significant positive effects were predicted in relation to the following SA objectives: <i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment (++/?)</i> <i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment (++)</i> <i>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change (++/?)</i> In the absence of this allocation, the potential for these significant effects to arise is reduced.	Yes, the potential for significant positive effects which were previously identified (see below) is reduced as this site is no longer allocated. ENV1 (++/?) ENV5 (++) ENV6 (++/?)
CC18: Former Hunters Squash Club	<i>(site is no longer available, consented scheme is being built out in full)</i>	Site CC18 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for housing (a minimum of 20 dwellings). A significant adverse uncertain effect (--/?) was predicted in the Regulation 19 SA Report in respect of SA objective <i>ENV 7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk</i> . Significant positive, uncertain effects (++/?) were predicted in respect of ENV1 and ENV6. Deletion of this site would reduce the potential for this significant adverse effect through	Yes, the potential for significant adverse and positive effects where were previously identified (see below) is reduced as the site is no longer allocated. ENV7 (--/?) ENV1 (++/?)

⁵ The changes to significant effects are assessed relative to the SA scores identified for the allocations in the Draft Regulation 19 Plan i.e. how do the proposed modifications change the significant effects which were previously identified in the Regulation 19 SA?

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		allocation in the Plan.	ENV6 (++)
CC25: Norfolk House, Exchange Street	<i>(site is no longer available for development)</i>	<p>Site CC25 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for mixed use development to include (retail/leisure/office uses on the ground floor and a mix of residential, including a minimum of 20 dwellings and offices on upper floors).</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Report did not identify any significant adverse effects in respect of this allocation.</p> <p>Significant positive effects were identified in respect of:</p> <p><i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment and</i></p> <p><i>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change</i></p> <p>Deletion of this site would reduce the potential for these significant positive effects to arise via allocation in the Plan.</p>	<p>Yes, the potential for significant positive effects previously identified (see below) is reduced as the site is no longer allocated.</p> <p>ENV1 (++)</p> <p>ENV6 (++)</p>
CC28: Fire Station, Bethel Street	<i>(site is no longer available for allocation; is currently being converted to a free school)</i>	<p>Site CC28 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for mixed use development. A minimum of 15 dwellings will be provided and town centre and other commercial uses will be acceptable on the ground floor including retail, office, community and leisure uses.</p> <p>No significant adverse effects were predicted in respect of this allocation in the Regulation 19 SA Report.</p> <p>Significant positive uncertain effects (++) were predicted in respect of:</p> <p><i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment and</i></p> <p><i>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate.</i></p> <p>Deletion of this site would reduce the potential for these significant positive effects to arise via allocation in the Plan.</p>	<p>Yes, the potential for significant positive effects previously identified (see below) is reduced as the site is no longer allocated.</p> <p>ENV1 (++)</p> <p>ENV6 (++)</p>
CC33: Westlegate Tower	<i>(site is no longer available for allocation; it is currently undergoing redevelopment)</i>	<p>Site CC33 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for mixed use development, primarily for retail uses at ground floor level, with residential units (a minimum of 30 dwellings) and offices on upper floors.</p> <p>No significant adverse effects were predicted in respect of this allocation in the Regulation</p>	<p>Yes, the potential for significant positive effects previously identified (see below) is reduced as the site is no longer allocated.</p>

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>19 SA Report.</p> <p>Significant positive effects were predicted in respect of:</p> <p><i>ENV1 (++):</i> To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</p> <p><i>ENV5 (++):</i> To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</p> <p><i>ENV6 (++):</i> To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate.</p> <p><i>SOC5 (++):</i> To build community identity, improve social welfare and reduce crime and antisocial activity</p> <p><i>SOC8 (++):</i> To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs</p> <p><i>EC3 (++):</i> To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</p> <p>Deletion of this site would reduce the potential for these significant positive effects to arise via allocation in the Plan.</p>	<p>ENV1 (++)</p> <p>ENV5 (++)</p> <p>ENV6 (++)</p> <p>SOC5 (++)</p> <p>SOC8 (++)</p> <p>EC3 (++)</p>
R14: Chalk Hill Works, Rosary Road	<i>(the site is no longer available for allocation; the consented scheme is being built out in full)</i>	<p>Site R14 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for housing development, providing in the region of 25 dwellings.</p> <p>No significant positive or negative effects were predicted in respect of this allocation in the Regulation 19 SA Report. Consequently, deletion of this site will not materially affect the conclusions of the SA.</p>	No
R46: Land at Pointers Field	<i>(the site is no longer available; the consented scheme is being built out in full)</i>	<p>Site R46 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for housing (to provide in the region of 10 dwellings).</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Report reported potential significant adverse effects in relation to the following SA objectives:</p> <p><i>ENV 7 (--):</i> To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk and</p> <p><i>ENV 9 (--):</i> To make the best use of resources, including land and energy and to minimise waste production.</p> <p>A significant positive effect (++) was recorded in respect of SA objective <i>SOC5: To build</i></p>	<p>Yes, the potential significant adverse and positive effects previously identified (see below) is reduced as the site is no longer allocated.</p> <p>ENV7 (--)</p> <p>ENV9 (--)</p> <p>SOC5 (++)</p>

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p><i>community identity, improve social welfare and reduce crime and antisocial activity.</i></p> <p>Removal of this allocation would reduce the potential for these significant negative and significant positive effects to arise via allocation of this site in the Plan.</p>	
<p>Reference to supporting text of site policies to note that they fall within a Critical Drainage Catchment</p> <p>CC24: Barn Road Car Park</p> <p>CC26: Pottergate Car Park</p> <p>CC35: Westwick Car Park</p> <p>R13: 261-277 Aylsham Road</p> <p>R19: Van Dal Shoes, Dibden Road</p> <p>R20: Former Start Rite Factory Site, 28 Mousehold Lane</p> <p>R21: Land North of Windmill Road</p> <p>R22: Starling Road</p>	<p>To reflect concerns raised by the EA and Norfolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority. The changes reflect the emergence of additional evidence to define larger Critical Drainage Catchments which supplement the evidence in the Norwich Area Surface Water Management Plan.</p>	<p>This main modification is discussed in respect of each of the sites individually.</p>	<p>Refer to commentary provided in respect of each site allocation.</p>

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
R23: Land at Aylsham Road R24: 165-1876 Aylsham Road R25: Former Pupil Referral Unit, Aylsham Road R28: Site North of Rayham Street R29: Goldsmith Street R31: Two Sites at Hurricane Way, Airport Industrial Street			
The Sites discussed below are all Allocations in the Plan			
CC1: 60-70 Ber Street	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications identified in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis identified a change in respect of sub-question 14b (is the site more than 250m from a Scheduled Monument?). Previously the analysis identified that the site was not more than 250m from a Scheduled Monument; the updated data confirms that the site is further than 250m away.</p> <p>The SA objectives which are of relevance to this sub-question are: <i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment and EC4: to improve the social and environmental performance of the economy.</i></p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Report recorded the score for <i>ENV5</i> as (++). The change to this sub-question will not change this overall score which is primarily related to the</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>contribution that redevelopment of the site would have on improving townscape.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Report recorded the score for <i>EC4</i> as (+/-/?). The objective is underpinned by a number of factors including biodiversity as well as townscape, flood risk etc. As such, the change to this sub-question is not considered to materially affect this score and no change is predicted.</p>	
CC3: 147-153 Ber Street	N/A	<p>No main modifications are identified in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	No
<p>CC4:10-14 Ber Street</p> <p>Site Size Reduced (0.25ha to 0.1 ha)</p> <p>Dwelling number reduced 30 to 10 dwellings)</p> <p>Minor changes to policy and supporting text</p>	Part of the site has changed ownership and is no longer available for development	<p>Site CC4 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for mixed use development (retail or complementary uses at ground floor level; office development; residential uses on upper floors to a minimum of 30 dwellings).</p> <p>The site was subsequently reduced in size from 0.25 to 0.1 ha as part of the site has changed ownership and is no longer available for development.</p> <p>The requirement for access to be located as close to the southern boundary of the site as possible has been reinserted: <i>"...with a vehicular access to be provided across the site to join with the site to the rear of 6-8 Ber Street..."</i></p> <p>The number of dwellings to be provided has been reduced from 30 to 10.</p> <p>The supporting text to the policy has been amended in a number of locations. This includes the need for development of the site to address a number of constraints including <i>"...possible contamination"</i>.</p> <p>As the site has reduced in size, it has been re-analysed using GIS. No changes to the GIS scoring have been noted.</p> <p>The reduction in the number of dwellings from 30 to 10 is not considered to affect any of the SA Scores. The key SA objective of relevance is <i>SOC4: To provide the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</i>. The Regulation 19 SA Report provided a (+) score in respect of this objective, which is still relevant, despite the reduction in the number of dwellings.</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>No changes to SA scores are considered necessary in respect of the additional reference to "contamination..."</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	
CC5: Land at Rose Lane and Mountergate	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis identified a change in respect of sub-question 4 (Is site within 600m of an identified retail centre?). The site was previously identified as falling within this buffer, however, the updated analysis indicates that this is now not the case. This question forms part of the assessment of the following SA objectives: <i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment; ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change; SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs; EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth and EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth.</i></p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Report provided the following score for ENV1: (+/?). This is not anticipated to change as the site is proximate to a number of other facilities/features including open space/riverside walk and public transport nodes. Furthermore the policy seeks to promote enhanced pedestrian/cycle access to the riverside walk.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Score (+/?) reported for ENV6 is expected to remain the same, for similar reasons to those set out in respect of ENV1 above.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Score (+) for SOC8 is also predicted to stay the same.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Score (+/-/?) for EC1 is still considered appropriate despite the change in relation to sub-question 4.</p> <p>Similarly, no change is anticipated to the SA score reported for EC3 (+).</p>	No
CC6: Land at Greyfriars Road/ Rose Lane	N/A	<p>No main modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis identified a change in respect of sub-question 4 (Is site within</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>600m of an identified retail centre?). The site was previously identified as falling within this buffer, however, the updated analysis indicates that this is now not the case. This question forms part of the assessment of the following SA objectives: <i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment; ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change; SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs; EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth and EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth.</i></p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Report recorded a (+) score for ENV1. This reflects the proximity of the site to a number of facilities/features including accessible open/green space; river valley/woodland/riverside walk and public transport nodes. As such, the change to sub-question 4 is not expected to change the overall score.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA also recorded a positive (+) score in respect of ENV6. Similar to ENV1, this objective is also underpinned by proximity to a number of features and as such no change is anticipated to the overall score.</p> <p>The same is true for objective SOC8 for which a positive (+) score was recorded in the Regulation 19 SA Report.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA recorded a positive (+) score in respect of objective EC1. This is still considered appropriate given the overall aim of the policy to redevelop a site in the City Centre.</p> <p>A positive score (+) was also identified in respect of objective EC3. Again this is unlikely to change despite the change to sub-question 4 as the objective score reflects proximity to a range of facilities/features.</p>	
CC7: St Annes Wharf and adjoining land	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis identified a change in respect of sub-question 14b (Is the site more than 250m from a Scheduled Monument?). The previous analysis identified this site as falling out with this buffer; however, updated data indicates that the site is now within 250m of a Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>The key SA objectives which would be affected include <i>ENV5: to maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment and EC4: To improve the</i></p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p><i>social and environmental performance of the economy.</i></p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Report identified a significant positive (++) score in respect of ENV5. This primarily reflects the potential for redevelopment of this site to significantly enhance the townscape, including restoration of a listed building and improving the setting of neighbouring listed and locally listed buildings. The overall score is not considered to change in response to the updated GIS analysis.</p> <p>In respect of objective EC4 a mixed score (+/-/?) was identified in the Regulation 19 SA Report. This objective is underpinned by a number of factors including flood risk, proximity to nature conservation designations etc. and as such the overall score is not considered to change in response to the updated GIS analysis.</p>	
CC8: Land at Hobrough Lane / King Street	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	No
CC9: King Street Stores	N/A	<p>No Main modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	No
CC10: 144-162 King Street	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	No
CC11: Garden Street Potential for temporary school site introduced at site	To respond to the concerns of the Inspector at examination in relation to the potential soundness of allocation policy CC11	<p>Site CC11 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for mixed use development (in the region of 100 dwellings and an element of small scale office/ business units to cater for small businesses).</p> <p>The proposed main modification to this site policy seeks to make provision for the potential for development of the site for a primary school (subject to a detailed study by Norfolk County Council).</p>	Yes – there is now potential for the site to be used as a primary school. This could result in a new significant positive, uncertain (++) effect in respect of SA objective SOC3: <i>To improve education and skills</i>

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
	and its supporting text.	<p>The Regulation 19 SA Report predicted a single significant positive effect in respect of this site. This related to SA objective <i>ENV 5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</i> – redevelopment of the site for housing and business use was considered to have potential to improve the local townscape, establishing frontages to Rouen Road and Thorn Lane.</p> <p>No significant adverse effects were predicted.</p> <p>Implication of the Proposed Modification</p> <p>If a primary school were to be developed at the site, it is assumed that the redevelopment would still have potential to result in a significant positive (++) effect on SA objective <i>ENV5: To Maintain and Enhance the Quality of Landscapes, Townscapes and the Historic Environment</i>.</p> <p>The following changes to SA Objectives scores are predicted:</p> <p><i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 SA Score (+)</p> <p>Proposed new SA score (+/-/?)</p> <p>Reasons: Development of a school has potential to increase traffic levels particularly during peak periods. Positive effects are still likely due to the site's location in proximity to a range of range of services and facilities within walking distance.</p> <p>The potential for adverse effects is, however, uncertain, as the site may not be developed for a school.</p> <p><i>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+)</p> <p>Proposed new score (+/-/?)</p> <p>Reasons: Refer to reasons provided in respect of SA Objective ENV1 above.</p> <p><i>SOC3: To improve education and skills</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+/?)</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>Proposed new score (++)</p> <p>Reasons: Provision of a new primary school at this school could contribute significantly positively to this objective. The outcome is, however, uncertain as the site may still come forward for mixed use.</p> <p><i>SOC4: To provide the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+)</p> <p>Proposed new score (++)</p> <p>Reasons: If a new school comes forward at this site, then no housing would be provided (the original allocation sought to deliver 100 dwellings at this site). However, provision of the school is dependent on further assessment work.</p> <p>It is assumed that if housing does not come forward at this site this would not materially affect the delivery of the overall housing numbers for NCC.</p> <p>No changes are proposed to the employment/economic growth objectives (e.g. SOC6; EC1 and EC2) as development of a school is still considered to provide employment opportunities which could contribute positively to these objectives.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis recorded a change in respect of question 14b (is site more than 250m from a Scheduled Monument?). Previously this site was assessed as being more than 250m from a Scheduled Monument, but this is no longer the case. This affects SA Objective ENV 5: <i>To Maintain and Enhance the Quality of Landscapes, Townscapes and the Historic Environment</i> and EC4: <i>To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</i>.</p> <p>The site is already identified as being located within the City Centre Conservation Area, close to Listed Buildings and within an area of archaeological interest and the policy recognises that development must address these constraints. Furthermore, development is considered to offer an opportunity to improve the townscape of Rouen Road. Consequently no change is predicted to the Regulation 19 Score for ENV 5 (++) as the potential for improvements to townscape remains. Similarly, no change is predicted to the Regulation 19 score for EC4 (+/-) as the score for this objective is made up a</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		number of different factors, of which proximity to Scheduled Monuments is just one.	
CC12: Land at Argyle Street	N/A	No Main Modifications are identified in respect of this site. Updated GIS Analysis No changes were recorded in respect of this site.	No
CC13: Land at Wherry Road	N/A	No Main Modifications are identified in respect of this site. Updated GIS Analysis No changes were recorded in respect of this site.	No
CC14: Land at Lower Clarence Road	N/A	No Main Modifications are identified in respect of this site. Updated GIS Analysis The updated GIS analysis recorded a change in respect of sub-question 4 (Is site within 600m of an identified retail centre?). The previous analysis identified the site as being within 600m of such a centre, however, the updated analysis has identified that this is now not the case. This sub-question underpins the following SA objectives: <i>ENV1: to reduce the effect of traffic on the environment; ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change; SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs; EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth and EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</i> The Regulation 19 SA score for ENV1 (++/?) reflects the proximity of the site to a number of facilities and features including a primary school, open/green space, riverside walk and public transport nodes. As such, the change to sub-question 4 is not considered to affect this overall score. The Regulation 19 Score for ENV6 (++/?) is also underpinned by proximity to a number of facilities and features and the overall score is also unlikely to change as a result of the change to sub-question 4. A positive (+) score is identified for SOC8 which again reflects access to a range of	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>services and is unlikely to change on account of the change to sub-question 4.</p> <p>In respect of objective EC1 a positive, uncertain (+/?) was identified in the Regulation 19 SA Report. Although the site is no longer within 600m of a retail centre, the development of this site in the City Centre should still contribute positively to this objective.</p> <p>Finally, the positive (+) effect identified for EC3 in the Regulation 19 SA is unlikely to change as other factors contribute positively to this score including proximity to an Employment Area and public transport node.</p>	
CC15: Busseys Garage Site, Thorpe Road and Lower Clarence Road	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis recorded a change in respect of sub-question 4 (Is site within 600m of an identified retail centre?). The previous analysis identified the site as being within 600m of such a centre, however, the updated analysis has identified that this is now not the case.</p> <p>This sub-question underpins the following SA objectives: <i>ENV1: to reduce the effect of traffic on the environment; ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change; SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs; EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth and EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</i></p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Score for ENV1 (++/?) reflects the proximity of the site to a number of facilities/features including a primary school, open space/green space and a public transport mode. Furthermore, the policy seeks to provide a new pedestrian and cycle link between Lower Clarence Road and Thorpe Road. As such, the change to sub-question 4 is not considered to affect this overall score.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Score for ENV6 (++/?) is also underpinned a number of accessibility sub-questions and the change to sub-question 4 is not anticipated to change this overall score.</p> <p>In respect of SOC8, a positive (+) score was identified in the Regulation 19 SA. This objective is also underpinned by a number of accessibility sub-questions and the change to sub-question 4 is not likely to change the overall positive score.</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>The Regulation 19 SA identified a mixed score (+/-/?) in respect of objective EC1. Although the site is no longer within 600m of a retail centre, the contribution of this development in the City Centre to economic growth is still likely to have positive effects.</p> <p>Finally in respect of SA objective EC3, the positive (+) score which was in the Regulation 19 SA Report is unlikely to change due to the other accessibility factors which apply here.</p>	
CC16: Norwich Mail Centre 13-17 Thorpe Road	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis recorded a change in respect of sub-question 4 (Is site within 600m of an identified retail centre?). The previous analysis identified the site as being within 600m of such a centre, however, the updated analysis has identified that this is now not the case.</p> <p>This sub-question underpins the following SA objectives: <i>ENV1: to reduce the effect of traffic on the environment; ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change; SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs; EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth and EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</i></p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Score for ENV1 (+) reflects the proximity of the site to a range of services and facilities including a primary school, open/green space, river valley/woodland/riverside walk and public transport nodes as well as the requirement in policy to improve pedestrian and cycle links through the site. Consequently, the change to sub-question 4 is not likely to change the overall score.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 Score for ENV6 (+) is also underpinned by a number of accessibility criteria and the overall score is not expected to change on account of the change to sub-question 4.</p> <p>The same is true for SOC8 (for which a [+] score was recorded in the Regulation 19 SA Report).</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Report recorded a positive (+) score for EC1. This reflects proximity to a Core Strategy Designated Centre, a Housing Renewal/Regeneration Area and an 'Employment Area'. With the change to sub-question 4, the site is only with 600m of an Employment Area. However, as the site is within a City Centre location,</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>redevelopment of a mixed use site is still anticipated to contribute positively to this objective.</p> <p>In respect of EC3, this objective is also underpinned by a number of accessibility criteria and the positive score (+) recorded during the Regulation 19 SA is likely to be maintained.</p>	
CC17: Land Adjoining Norwich Football Club, Kerrison Road	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	No
CC19a/Barrack Street Hotel only <i>provided subject to viability.</i>	For clarification	<p>Site CC19a was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for a mix of uses which included provision for development of a hotel.</p> <p>The proposed modification amends delivery of the hotel use on site to be subject to viability.</p> <p>No changes to SA scores (previously identified in the Regulation 19 SA Report) are predicted in respect of this amendment to the site policy.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	No
CC19b/Whitefriars Site allocated for office-led <i>mixed use development.</i>	For clarification.	<p>Site CC19b was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for office development.</p> <p>The site was appraised as an 'employment-site' in the Regulation 19 SA Report.</p> <p>No changes to SA scores (previously identified in the Regulation 19 SA Report) are predicted in respect of this amendment to the site policy.</p> <p>The proposed modification does not clarify what 'mix of uses' would be supported, however it is understood that this would not include residential development. As such, a negligible score (0) is relevant in respect of SA Objective <i>SOC4: To provide the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</i></p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
CC20: 140-154 Oak Street	N/A	No Main Modifications were proposed in respect of this site. Updated GIS Analysis No changes are anticipated in respect of this site.	No
CC21: Furniture Store, 70-72 Sussex Street	N/A	No Main Modifications were proposed in respect of this site. Updated GIS Analysis No changes are anticipated in respect of this site.	No
CC22: Oak Street and Sussex Street Commercial Sites, 160-162 Oak Street	N/A	No Main Modifications were proposed in respect of this site. Updated GIS Analysis No changes are anticipated in respect of this site.	No
CC23/Duke's Wharf, Duke's Street <i>"Uses falling within Class D1 (non-residential institutions) and hotel use may also be acceptable on this site..."</i> <i>"..Development proposals that retain and convert the building on the Duke Street</i>	The change is made in response to an objection (ref 6443-1) and acknowledges that class D1 uses, in particular the expansion of schools and further education and training, are strongly supported by the NPPF and JCS. The other changes are primarily for clarification.	Site CC23 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for mixed use development. The main proposed modification seeks to provide support for non-residential institutions (which could include a range of facilities such as clinics, health centres, crèche/nursery, schools, art galleries and education and training centres) as well as a hotel. The following changes to SA scores are anticipated as a result of this change: <i>SOC3: To improve education and skills</i> Regulation 19 Score: (?) Proposed new score: (+) Reasons: The proposed modification includes support for 'D1' uses which could include schools and education and training centres. No other changes are anticipated. Updated GIS Analysis No changes were recorded in respect of this site.	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
<p><i>Frontage will be given favourable consideration."</i></p> <p><i>"This site lies adjacent to the River Wensum. A written consent from the Environment Agency is required for proposed works or structures, in, under, or within 9 metres of the top of the bank of a designated 'main river'. It is recommended that developers engage in early discussions with the Environment Agency.." "Part of the site falls within flood zones 2 and 3."</i></p>			
<p>CC24: Barn Road Car Park</p> <p>New reference at end of policy to recognise that the site lies within a</p>	<p>To reflect concerns raised by the Environment Agency and Norfolk County Council as lead flood authority. The</p>	<p>Proposed Main Modification</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (CC24 is under 1ha).</p> <p>The following explanatory text would be added: <i>"The site lies within a critical drainage</i></p>	<p>No</p>

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
Critical Drainage Catchment	changes reflect the emergence of additional evidence to define larger Critical Drainage Catchments which supplement the evidence in the Norwich Area Surface Water Management Plan.	<p><i>catchment as identified on the Policies Map. Therefore development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional areas of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>The following policy text would be added: "A surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and (b) Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area." <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The key change relates to sub-question 11b (Is site outside of a critical drainage area?). During the Regulation 19 SA the site was identified as falling out with a critical drainage area. However, the updated analysis indicates the site now falls within the wider Critical Drainage Catchment.</p> <p>This output from this question underpins the following SA objective: ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk. The Regulation 19 SA Report recorded a score of (0) against this objective.</p> <p>In order to reflect the revised location of the site within a critical drainage catchment, a revised score of (-/?) is appropriate. This reflects the potential for new development to contribute to flood risk in the wider catchment, and takes account of the proposed policy modification which should ensure effects are mitigated to some extent.</p>	
CC26: Pottergate Car Park New reference at end of policy to recognise that the site lies within a Critical Drainage	To reflect concerns raised by the Environment Agency and Norfolk County Council as lead flood authority. The changes reflect the emergence of	<p>Proposed Main Modification</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (CC26 is under 1ha).</p> <p>The following explanatory text would be added: "<i>The site lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map. Therefore development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional areas of hard surfacing should ensure that</i></p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
Catchment	additional evidence to define larger Critical Drainage Catchments which supplement the evidence in the Norwich Area Surface Water Management Plan.	<p><i>adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>The following policy text would be added: "A surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <i>Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i> (b) <i>Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area."</i> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis identifies changes in respect of two sub-questions – 11b (Is site outside of a critical drainage area?) and 14b (Is the site more than 250m from a Scheduled Monument?). The previous answer to both questions was 'Y', however, on account of updated GIS data the response to questions has now changed to 'N'.</p> <p>The following SA objectives are underpinned by these questions:</p> <p><i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment; ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk and EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy.</i></p> <p>The Regulation 19 Score for ENV 5 was positive (+). It was acknowledged that the site is within close proximity to a number of historic designations including listed buildings and an Area of Main Archaeological Interest. This site is also within a Conservation Area. However, the positive score primarily reflects the requirement for development to enhance the setting of neighbouring listed buildings and contribute to the enhancement of the Conservation Area. As such, the fact that the site is now closer to a Scheduled Monument is not considered to materially change this score.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 Score for ENV 7 was neutral (0). As the site is now within a Critical Drainage Catchment a negative, uncertain (-/?) score is appropriate, reflecting the potential for new development to contribute to flood risk in the wider catchment. The proposed modification should ensure potential effects are mitigated to some extent.</p> <p>Objective EC4 is underpinned by a number of sub-questions which relate to a range of</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		environmental factors including proximity to nature conservation designations and public transport nodes. As such, the previously identified score of (+/?) is not considered to be materially affected by the change to sub-question 14b.	
CC27: Land to the rear of City Hall	N/A	No Main Modifications are proposed in relation to this site. Updated GIS Analysis No changes were recorded in respect of this site.	No
CC29: Chantry Car Park	N/A	No Main Modifications are proposed in relation to this site. Updated GIS Analysis No changes were recorded in respect of this site.	No
CC30: Former Mecca Bingo, All Saints Green	N/A	No Main Modifications are proposed in relation to this site. Updated GIS Analysis No changes were recorded in respect of this site.	
CC31: St Stephen's Street <i>Policy and explanatory text deleted and substantially rewritten</i>	The change is proposed in response to an objection and has been agreed in discussion with the objector. The policy as modified acknowledges that the precise content of a deliverable scheme for this site must be subject to viability and clarifies the approach to be taken in the event that a	Proposed Main Modification Site CC31 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for a comprehensive mixed use development (including provision of a minimum of 250 dwellings). The proposed modification seeks to ensure that the regeneration of the site is subject to viability and clarifies what development will come forward if the comprehensive mixed use development is considered to be unviable. The following changes to SA scores are anticipated as a result of this modification: <i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes, and the historic environment</i> Regulation 19 Score: (++) Proposed new score: (++) Reasons: The proposed modification recognises that a comprehensive mixed use	Yes, the potential significant positive effects identified in respect of ENV 5 and SOC8 change to significant mixed uncertain (++) and significant positive uncertain effects (++) respectively recognising that the comprehensive mixed use development is dependent on viability.

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
	comprehensive scheme cannot be achieved	<p>development (and the significant improvements attached to this) will be dependent on viability. If such a scheme is demonstrated to be unviable then the reuse and redevelopment of the existing buildings on the site will be acceptable. This is unlikely to confer the same benefits to townscape and the local environment, particularly as the two onsite tower blocks would be retained. Consequently there is uncertainty in the appraisal and the potential for a minor adverse effect to arise.</p> <p><i>SOC4: To provide the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score: (+)</p> <p>Proposed new score: (+/?)</p> <p>Reasons: If the comprehensive mixed use development is demonstrated to be unviable, then there is significant uncertainty in the delivery of housing development.</p> <p>It is assumed that if housing does not come forward at this site (specifically the 250 dwellings associated with the mixed use development) that this would not materially affect the delivery of the overall housing numbers for Norwich City Council.</p> <p><i>SOC5: To build community identity, improve social welfare and reduce crime and antisocial activity</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (+)</p> <p>Proposed new score (+/?)</p> <p>The change to the score reflects the uncertainty in delivery of the comprehensive mixed use regeneration at this site.</p> <p><i>SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (+)</p> <p>Proposed new score (+/?)</p> <p>Reasons: If the major mixed use development at the site proves to be unviable, then the existing tower blocks at the site would be retained for reuse and refurbishment. As these buildings are identified in the City Centre Conservation Appraisal as 'negative buildings' there is uncertainty in the potential for the proposed modification to positively contribute to this objective.</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p><i>SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (++)</p> <p>Proposed new score (++/?)</p> <p>Reasons: Recognising that the comprehensive redevelopment of this site may prove unviable, there is uncertainty in the potential for significant positive effects against this objective.</p> <p><i>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (+)</p> <p>Proposed new score (+/?)</p> <p>Reasons: Recognising that the comprehensive redevelopment of this site may prove unviable, there is uncertainty in the potential for positive effects against this objective.</p> <p><i>EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+/?)</p> <p>Proposed new score: No change.</p> <p><i>EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (+)</p> <p>Proposed new score (+/?)</p> <p>Reasons: Recognising that the comprehensive redevelopment of this site may prove unviable, there is uncertainty in the potential for positive effects against this objective</p> <p>A number of other scores remain unchanged as there was already uncertainty (?) built into the appraisal.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	
CC32: Land and Buildings at the	N/A	No Main Modifications were proposed in respect of this site.	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
junction of St Stephens Street and Westlegate		Updated GIS Analysis No changes were recorded in respect of this site.	
CC34: Land at Queens Road and Surrey Street	NA	No Main Modifications were proposed in respect of this site. Updated GIS Analysis The updated GIS analysis identified a change in respect of sub-question 14b (Is site more than 250m from a Scheduled Ancient Monument?). The previous analysis identified the site as falling within this 250m buffer; however, the updated GIS data indicates that the site is further than this. This sub-question underpins the following SA objectives: <i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment and EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy.</i> The Regulation 19 SA Report identified a positive, uncertain (+/?) score in respect of ENV5. This site is in close proximity or within a number of heritage designations including listed buildings and a Conservation Area. The site is very close to the City Wall (a Scheduled Monument), although now falls just outwith the 250m buffer zone. The positive score recognised the requirement in policy to respect the setting of nearby listed buildings and the line of the City Wall. Consequently, the change to sub-question 14b is not anticipated to change this score. The previous score recorded for EC4 (+/-/?) reflects a range of sub-criteria including proximity to designated nature conservation sites, public transport nodes etc. As such, the change to sub-question 14b is not anticipated to change this overall score.	No
CC35: Westwick Street Car Park New reference at end of policy to recognise that the site lies within a Critical Drainage	To reflect concerns raised by the Environment Agency and Norfolk County Council as lead flood authority. The changes reflect the	Proposed Main Modification The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (CC35 is under 1ha). The following explanatory text would be added: <i>"The site lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map. Therefore development proposals involving</i>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
Catchment	emergence of additional evidence to define larger Critical Drainage Catchments which supplement the evidence in the Norwich Area Surface Water Management Plan.	<p><i>new buildings, extensions and additional areas of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>The following policy text would be added: "A surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</p> <p>(a) <i>Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area."</i></p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis recorded a change in respect of question 11b (Is site outside a critical drainage area?). Previously, the site was recorded as falling out with a critical drainage area; however, it is now within the larger critical drainage catchment.</p> <p>The key SA objective of relevance is <i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk</i>. The Regulation 19 SA Report recorded a (-/?) score in respect of this objective as the site is also within a flood zone. The site now also falls within a Critical Drainage Catchment, however an adverse uncertain (-/?) score is still considered appropriate. This reflects the potential for new development to contribute to flood risk in the wider catchment, whilst recognising that the proposed main modification seeks to manage this risk and mitigate potential effects to some extent.</p>	
R1: The Neatmarket, Hall Road	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	No
R2/Norfolk Learning Difficulties Centre Deleted	The change is proposed in response to an objection and acknowledges that the garage site to the	<p>Proposed Main Modification</p> <p>Site R2 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for development of a housing with care scheme and/or community facilities or housing development (in the region of 30 dwellings).</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
"Developers should investigate the potential for developing the site, together with the former garage site to the north to enable a more comprehensive, coordinated scheme..."	north of this site is under a different ownership and is separated from it by a public footpath. The modification has been agreed with the objector.	<p>The proposed modification removes the potential for developing the site together with the former garage site to the north to enable a more comprehensive, co-ordinated scheme recognising that the garage site is under different ownership.</p> <p>This modification is not considered to change any of the scores identified in the Regulation 19 SA Report.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	
R3: Hall Road District Centre	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications were proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	No
<p>R4: Hewett Yard, Hall Yard</p> <p>Policy updated to reflect the fact that it is now locally listed for heritage interest (rather than having potential for this).</p>	Hewett Yard is included on the extended local list adopted by resolution of the council's cabinet on 15 th January 2014.	<p>Proposed Main Modification</p> <p>Site R4 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for housing development (in the region of 20 dwellings were proposed to be provided).</p> <p>The proposed modification recognises the adoption of the local heritage list (which includes Hewett Yard).</p> <p>The key SA objective of relevance to this proposed modification is <i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (+/-)</p> <p>No change is proposed to this score.</p> <p>The previous score recognised that the onsite buildings were proposed for inclusion on the local list due to their heritage status. The only change now is that the Local Heritage List has been adopted and as such the potential adverse effect (-) is still appropriate. As locally listed buildings would be lost to development in this instance, DM policy 9 would</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>apply.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis identified a change in respect of question 8b (is site within 600m of a river valley, woodland, Riverside walk?). Previously the site was recorded as falling within 600m of these features. The updated GIS analysis records the site as falling out with this buffer zone. This question is considered in respect of SA objectives: <i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment; ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change; SOC2: To maintain and improve the health of the whole population and promote healthy lifestyles; SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live and SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs.</i></p> <p>The change to this sub-question is not predicted to change the Regulation 19 Score for SA objectives ENV1 (+) or ENV 6 (+) as the site is proximate to a number of other features including schools, healthcare facilities, open/green space etc.</p> <p>Similarly, no changes are predicted to the scores for SOC2 (+) or SOC8 (+) for the same reasons.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 score for SOC7 was (+/-/?) is not predicted to change on account of the change to this sub-question.</p>	
R5: Part of school playing field, Hewett School	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications were proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis recorded a change in respect of question 8b (Is site within 600m of a river valley, woodland, riverside walk?). This sub-question underpins the following objectives: <i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment; ENV6: To adapt to an mitigate against the impacts of climate change; SOC2: To maintain and improve the health of the whole population and promote healthy lifestyles; SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live and SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs.</i></p> <p>The Regulation 19 Score for ENV1 (+) reflects the proximity of the site to a range of facilities and features including schools, healthcare facilities, public transport nodes etc. As such, the change to sub-question 8b is not considered to change this overall score.</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>The same is true for ENV6 for which as positive score (+) was previously recorded and is likely to be maintained.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA recorded a score of (++) in respect of SOC2. The adverse score reflected partial loss of school playing fields and positive scores reflected the accessibility of the site. Similar to the other SA objectives, the change to sub-question 8b is unlikely to materially change the overall score.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA recorded a score of (++) in respect of SOC7. The adverse score primarily reflected the partial loss of open space. The change to this sub-objective is not considered to materially alter this overall score.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA recorded a positive score (+) in respect of SOC8, again this reflects a number of accessibility criteria and as the site is within 600m of a number of features/facilities, the change to sub-question SOC8 is not expected to affect to change the overall score.</p>	
R7: 138 Hall Road and land to rear	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications were proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	No
R8: John Youngs Limited, 24 City Road	<p>Clarifications agreed following representations from the site owner.</p> <p>Dwellings now a <i>minimum of 45</i> rather than an approximate.</p> <p>Option of residential conversion is retained in policy albeit no longer an explicit requirement.</p>	<p>Proposed Main Modification</p> <p>Site R8 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for housing development (in the region of 45 dwellings would be provided).</p> <p>The following changes to SA scores are anticipated as a result of this modification:</p> <p><i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (+)</p> <p>Proposed new score (+/?)</p> <p>Reasons: The proposed modification states that "<i>Consideration should be given to retaining and converting the Victorian building in the north-east corner of the site for residential uses as part of the comprehensive development of the site, <u>subject to</u></i></p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p><i>viability...</i>" Consequently, the proposed benefit from retention and conversion of the onsite Victorian building is uncertain.</p> <p>No other SA scores are likely to change.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	
R9: Aviva Car Park, Southwell Road/Brazen Gate	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	No
R10/Deal Ground	To respond to the concerns of the Inspector at examination in relation to the potential soundness of site allocation policy R10 and its supporting text. Both the City Council and the objector have put forward preferred policy wordings and the resulting modification is proposed by the Inspector. The modified policy clarifies that the design and layout of the development will reflect the findings of	<p>Proposed Main Modification</p> <p>Amend policy and supporting text as follows:</p> <p>Explanatory text (Bullet 4): Need to address and mitigate potential environmental impacts from adjacent uses and activities and ensure that new development will not prejudice or <u>place unreasonable restrictions</u> on their continued operation. Relevant issues include the impact of noise from the railway, <u>asphalt plant, and railhead, especially where this may occur at any time</u>, dust from the minerals operations and odour nuisance from the <u>asphalt plant</u>, Britvic factory to the west and the sewage treatment works to the east. <u>The findings of noise, dust and odour assessments will inform the detailed layout and design of the development, and consider whether physical separation of housing from the adjoining industrial uses is required to appropriately mitigate potential environmental impacts.</u></p> <p>Policy:</p> <p>Bullet 6: <u>Noise, dust and odour assessments</u> will be required. The development must be designed to <u>reflect the findings of these assessments</u>, to mitigate and protect <u>potential residents</u> against potential sources of pollution from adjoining uses, including the industrial and minerals processing uses to the west, <u>and to ensure that the continued operations of adjoining uses are not prejudiced or subject to unreasonable restrictions as a result of the proposed housing, recognising that the potential exists that it may only be</u></p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
<p><i>required to appropriately mitigate potential environmental impacts...</i>"</p> <p>See also points made in Minor Modifications document in respect of this policy (e.g. site is in a SPZ)</p>	<p>noise and other assessments, and will seek to ensure that existing uses will be not prejudiced as a result of the proposed development as well as protecting future users from potential sources of pollution.</p>	<p><u>possible to mitigate impacts to acceptable levels through physical separation.</u></p> <p>The key SA objectives (Regulation 19 SA Scores are provided in brackets) which are relevant to these changes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV3: To improve environmental amenity including air quality (?) • SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live (+/-/?) <p><i>ENV3: To improve environmental amenity including air quality</i></p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA recognised that dust and odour issues could have an adverse effect, but recognised the potential for mitigation. Now, that dust and odour issues are explicitly set out in the policy and the recognition that physical separation (between new residents and existing development) may be necessary to mitigate impacts, it is assumed that impacts can be reduced to an acceptable level and as such a revised negligible (0) score is proposed.</p> <p><i>SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live</i></p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA recorded a mixed effect in respect of this objective. The positive score recognised the proximity of the site to open space/green space and other areas with potential for recreation. The negative uncertain (-/?) effect recognised the potential for noise and odour issues from existing uses (e.g. industry and the railway) close to the site. As the policy now explicitly states that development design must reflect the findings of noise, dust and odour assessments in order to protect potential residents (including a physical separation between new housing and existing industrial/rail uses if necessary), it is assumed that the potential adverse effects can be appropriately mitigated and/or avoided. As such, a revised minor positive (+) score is proposed.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis recognised two changes in respect of this site. These relate to sub-questions 4 (<i>Is site within 600m of an Identified Retail Centre?</i>) and 14b (<i>Is site more than 250m from a Scheduled Ancient Monument?</i>). The previous answer to both these questions was 'Y'; however, the updated data indicates that the answer is now 'N'.</p> <p>Sub-question 4 underpins the following SA objectives (Regulation 19 scores are given in brackets): <i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment (++)</i>; <i>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change (++)</i>; <i>SOC8: To improve</i></p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p><i>accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs (+/?); EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth (+); and EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth (+/?).</i></p> <p>No changes are proposed to any of these scores, as the site is within 600m of a number of other facilities and features and the policy seeks to deliver new cycle routes, a new bus route(s) and walkable pedestrian routes.</p> <p>Sub-question 14b underpins the following SA objectives (Regulation 19 Score is given in brackets): <i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment (++) and EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy (+/-/?).</i></p> <p>No change is proposed to objective ENV5 - the site is recognised as following within the buffer zones of a number of designated heritage features (including a Historic Park and Garden, Listed Building and Conservation Area), however the policy seeks to establish a strong frontage to the northern edge of the site alongside the River Wensum; retain listed buildings and provide heritage interpretation as well as preserving the open character of the Yare Valley and fringe of the Broads. As such it has potential to contribute significantly positively to this objective.</p> <p>No change is proposed to objective EC4. This objective is scored on the basis of proximity to a range of designated features, potential flood risk issues etc. The change to sub-question 14b will not materially change this.</p>	
<p>R11/Utilities Site</p> <p>Dwellings now a <i>minimum</i> of 100.</p> <p>Policy amended to reflect the fact that site is in SPZ</p> <p>Reference to permitting regime for developments within or close to</p>	<p>A minimum figure is necessary to enable the contribution of the site to the JCS housing target to be quantified.</p>	<p>Proposed Main Modification</p> <p>Site R11 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for a major mixed use development.</p> <p>The proposed modifications include specifying the requirement for a minimum of 100 houses (the Regulation 19 policy sought to delivery in the region of 100 dwellings); clarifying reference to public/private moorings serving new residential development as oppose to 'residential moorings'; clarification in the explanatory text to the policy to recognise the site falls within Source Protection Zone 1(SPZ) (designated to protect water supplies); clarifying that a permit is required for the power generation element of the policy and clarifying that the site lies adjacent to the River Wensum (and consequently, a written consent form the Environment Agency is required for proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9 metres of the top of a bank of a designated 'main</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
main river.		<p>river’).</p> <p>The following changes to SA scores are anticipated as a result of this modification:</p> <p><i>ENV2: To improve the quality of the water environment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+/-/?)</p> <p>Proposed new score (+/?)</p> <p>Reasons: the Regulation 19 assessment identified the site’s proximity to the River Wensum and hence the potential for adverse effects on water quality. The proposed modification notes that the site lies within the SPZ 1, recognises that the water environment is particularly vulnerable in this location and specifies that detailed discussions will be required with the Environment Agency (EA) to ensure that proposals are appropriate for the site and that the site is developed in a manner which protects the water environment. This clarification should ensure that water quality is adequately protected. This would be supported by the EA permitting regime (e.g. for works within or close to main river).</p> <p>No other SA scores are likely to change.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis recorded one change in respect of sub-question 4 (<i>Is site within 600m of an identified retail centre?</i>). Previously the answer to this question was ‘Y’; however the updated GIS analysis indicates that this is no longer the case. The sub-question underpins the following SA objectives (the Regulation 19 score is given in brackets): <i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</i> (++)/?); <i>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change</i> (++)/?); <i>SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs</i> (+/?); <i>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth</i> (+) and <i>EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</i> (+/?).</p> <p>No changes are proposed to the scores for these SA objectives on account of the change to the sub-question 4. This recognises the fact that the site lies within close proximity to a number of facilities and features and the policy proposals including the need to resolve access including access to public transport; provision of a new section of riverside walk along the site frontage and a new vehicular/pedestrian/cycle bridge over the River</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		Wensum.	
<p>R12: Kerrison Road/Hardy Road, Gothic Works</p> <p>Modification to reflect the fact that the site lies adjacent to the River Wensum and written consent would be required for works close to or within the main River.</p> <p>Policy amended to reflect the fact that site is in SPZ 1.</p> <p>Other modifications mainly provide simple clarification.</p>	For clarification	<p>Proposed Main Modification</p> <p>Site R12 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for housing-led mixed use development.</p> <p>The key modifications include reference to the proposed site as being located within SPZ 1 and the need for a permit from the EA if works are required within or close to main river.</p> <p>The following changes to SA scores are anticipated as a result of this modification:</p> <p><i>ENV2: To improve the quality of the water environment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+/-/?)</p> <p>Proposed new score (+/?)</p> <p>Reasons: the Regulation 19 assessment identified the site's proximity to the River Wensum and hence the potential for adverse effects on water quality. The proposed modification notes that the site lies within the SPZ 1, recognises that the water environment is particularly vulnerable in this location and specifies that detailed discussions will be required with the Environment Agency (EA) to ensure that proposals are appropriate for the site and that the site is developed in a manner which protects the water environment. This clarification should ensure that water quality is adequately protected. This would be supported by the EA permitting regime (e.g. for works within or close to main river).</p> <p>No other SA scores are likely to change.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis identified a score in respect of sub-question 4 (Is site within 600m of an identified retail centre?). This question is considered in respect of a number of SA objectives: <i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment; ENV6: To adapt to an mitigate against the impacts of climate change; SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs; EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth and EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth.</i></p> <p>SA Objective <i>ENV1</i> – Regulation 19 Score (+/?). No changes are predicted to this</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>objective. The overriding factors contributing to this score include the requirement in policy for this site to be designed to provide accessibility to public transport; to be designed for limited car ownership and to provide public access to the river and a riverside walk/cycle link.</p> <p>SA Objective ENV6 – Regulation 19 Score (+/?). No changes are predicted to this objective for the reasons stated in respect of ENV1 above.</p> <p>SA Objective SOC8 – Regulation 19 Score (+). No changes are predicted to this objective for the reasons stated in respect of ENV 1 above.</p> <p>The change to sub-question is not considered to materially affect the predicted to the score for EC1 – Regulation 19 Score (+/-/?).</p> <p>SA Objective EC3 – Regulation 19 score (+). No changes are predicted to the score for EC3 for similar reasons to those stated in respect of objective ENV1 above.</p>	
<p>R13/233-277 Aylsham Road</p> <p>Site size reduced (1.49ha – 1ha)</p> <p>Dwelling number reduced (75 – 50)</p> <p>Reflect need for noise mitigation from adjacent businesses and taking account of possible contamination at the site.</p> <p>Modification to reference Critical Drainage</p>	<p>For clarification</p> <p>In respect of Critical Drainage Catchments, the modification is required to reflect concerns raised by the Environment Agency and Norfolk County Council as lead local flood authority. The changes reflect the emergence of additional evidence to define larger Critical Drainage Catchments which supplement the evidence of the Norwich Area Surface Water Management</p>	<p>Proposed Main Modifications</p> <p>Site R13 was originally allocated for housing (to provide in the region of 75 dwellings) with potential for inclusion of starter employment units. The site originally covered 1.49 ha.</p> <p>The site area of this policy has been reduced from 1.49 to 1ha and the number of proposed dwellings has reduced from 75 to 50.</p> <p>The reference to the potential noise impact has been expanded to state that... <i>"The design should mitigate the noise impact from Aylsham Road and adjacent existing businesses..."</i></p> <p>Critical Drainage Catchments</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (R13 is 1ha). Explanatory text: <i>'Since the site is over 1 ha a flood risk assessment is required and appropriate mitigation measures shall be provided as part of the development. As the site also lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map, a surface water management assessment should be included in the flood risk assessment.'</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional area of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to</i></p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
Catchments	Plan.	<p><i>mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>Policy: 'A flood risk assessment including surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <i>Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i> (b) <i>Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area.'</i> <p>The proposed modification seeks to manage the potential risk of surface water flooding at this location. However, as the site is now located within the redefined Critical Drainage Catchment area, with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk, a minor adverse, uncertain (-/?) is considered appropriate in respect of SA objective ENV7: <i>To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk.</i></p> <p>Reduction in Site Area</p> <p>As the site area has been reduced, the site has been re-analysed using GIS. The updated analysis (including re-analysis to reflect updated GIS datasets) is discussed further below.</p> <p>Reduction in the Number of Dwellings</p> <p>The key SA objective of relevance to this proposed modification is SOC4: <i>To provide the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home.</i> The Regulation 19 SA Report provided a positive score (+) against this objective. The reduction in the number of dwellings from 75 to 50 is unlikely to change this score.</p> <p>Expanded reference to Noise Impacts</p> <p>The key SA objective of relevance to this proposed modification is SOC7: <i>To improve the quality of where people live.</i> The Regulation 19 SA Report provided a mixed score (+/-/?) against this objective recognising the potential for adverse impacts in terms of noise and traffic. Whilst this specifically relates to the potential for noise from the Aylsham Road, the addition of potential for noise from adjacent existing businesses is unlikely to change the identified score. Furthermore, the proposed modification makes provision for noise mitigation.</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>Reference for Development to take account of possible contamination at the site</p> <p>No changes to SA scores are considered necessary in respect of the additional reference to "contamination..."</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>Two changes were identified. The first change related to SA Objective: <i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk</i>. The site is now identified as falling within the wider Critical Drainage Catchment.</p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (0)</p> <p>Proposed new score (-/?)</p> <p>Reasons: The site now falls within the redefined Critical Drainage Catchment with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk.</p> <p>The second change relates to sub-question 8b (is site within 600m of a river valley, woodland or riverside walk?). Previously the site was recorded as falling within 600m of these features. The updated GIS analysis records the site as falling out with this buffer zone. This question is considered in respect of SA objectives: <i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment; ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change; SOC2: To maintain and improve the health of the whole population and promote healthy lifestyles; SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live and SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs</i>.</p> <p>SA Objective ENV1 – Regulation 19 Score (+). No change is proposed to this score as the site is proximate to a number of other features including a healthcare facility, public transport node etc.</p> <p>SA Objective ENV6 – Regulation 19 Score (+). No change is proposed to this score for the same reasons as recorded in respect of ENV1.</p> <p>SA Objective SOC2 – Regulation 19 Score (+). No change is proposed to this score for the same reasons as recorded in respect of ENV1.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA score for SOC7 was (+/-/?) which is not predicted to change on account of the change to this sub-question.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA score for SOC8 was (+). This is not predicted to change for the</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		same reasons as recorded in respect of ENV1.	
<p>R15/Gas Holder at Gas Hill</p> <p><i>"Design of development must reflect its location adjacent to the Thorpe Wooded ridge and must protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity."</i></p> <p>Note that site is in SPZ 1 and need to protect water environment.</p> <p>Further clarification provided to mitigate potential impact on geodiversity and views. This includes the following text "... As a minimum, protection and enhancement of geodiversity will include recording of geological</p>	<p>The references to geodiversity are proposed in response to an objection and acknowledge the site's location on the chalk scarp face and the need to enhance geodiversity.</p> <p>Reference to the site falling within SPZ 1 is provided for clarification.</p>	<p>Site R15 was originally allocated for housing development (a minimum of 15 dwellings would be provided).</p> <p>The proposed modifications include a number of changes to reflect the geodiversity interest at the site and how this should be mitigated. The site also falls within SPZ 1 and this is referenced.</p> <p>Proposed Modification – Geodiversity</p> <p>The key SA objective which relates to this modification is <i>ENV4: To maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</i>. The Regulation 19 SA Report recognised the sites' proximity to the Thorpe Wooded Ridge (although it was not specifically considered in respect of its geodiversity interest). This additional policy detail is likely to contribute positively to this objective. However, the potential for adverse effects remains.</p> <p>As such, the previous Regulation 19 Score (+/-/?) is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Proposed Modification – Source Protection Zone</p> <p>The key SA objective which relates to this modification is <i>ENV2: To improve the quality of the water environment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+/-)</p> <p>Proposed new score (+/?)</p> <p>Reasons: the Regulation 19 assessment identified the site's proximity to the River Wensum and hence the potential for adverse effects on water quality. The proposed modification notes that the site lies within the SPZ 1, recognises that the water environment is particularly vulnerable in this location and specifies that detailed discussions will be required with the Environment Agency (EA) to ensure that proposals are appropriate for the site and that the site is developed in a manner which protects the water environment. This clarification should ensure that water quality is adequately protected.</p> <p>No other SA scores are likely to change.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
<i>features on site."</i>		No changes were recorded in respect of this site.	
<p>R16: Land East of Bishop Bridge Road</p> <p>Design of the development must reflect its location adjacent to the Thorpe wooded ridge and protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity.</p> <p>Note that site is in a SPZ and need to protect water environment.</p> <p>Further clarification provided to mitigate potential impact on geodiversity and views.</p> <p>Reflects fact that southern part of the site would need to be successfully decommissioned by the existing</p>	<p>For clarification and in respond to an objection from the Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership.</p> <p>Other points are for clarification.</p>	<p>Site R16 was originally allocated for housing development (to provide in the region of 50 dwellings).</p> <p>The proposed modifications include a number of changes to reflect the geodiversity interest at the site and how this should be mitigated. The site also falls within SPZ 1 and this is referenced. Further clarification is also provided to recognise that the site is covered by the Health and Safety Executive consultation zone for the gas holder and that development of the southern part of the site will depend on the successful decommissioning of the gas holder and revocation or surrender of its hazardous substance consent.</p> <p>Proposed Modification – Geodiversity</p> <p>The key SA objective which relates to this modification is <i>ENV4: To maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</i>. The Regulation 19 SA Report recognised the sites' proximity to a number of designated features including the St James' Pit SSSI (although it was not specifically considered in respect of its geodiversity interest). This additional policy detail is likely to contribute positively to this objective. However, the potential for adverse effects remains.</p> <p>As such, the previous Regulation 19 Score (+/-/?) is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Proposed Modification – Source Protection Zone</p> <p>The key SA objective which relates to this modification is <i>ENV2: To improve the quality of the water environment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+/-)</p> <p>Proposed new score (+/?)</p> <p>Reasons: the Regulation 19 assessment identified the site's proximity to the River Wensum and hence the potential for adverse effects on water quality. The proposed modification notes that the site lies within the SPZ 1, recognises that the water environment is particularly vulnerable in this location and specifies that detailed discussions will be required with the Environment Agency (EA) to ensure that proposals are appropriate for the site and that the site is developed in a manner which protects the</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
gas holder.		<p>water environment. This clarification should ensure that water quality is adequately protected.</p> <p>No other SA scores are likely to change.</p> <p>Proposed Modification – Decommissioning of Gas Holder/Revocation of Hazardous Substance Consent</p> <p>These proposed modifications clarify that the gas holder will require decommissioning and revocation of existing consents at the site prior to redevelopment. These are points of fact and unlikely to affect the SA.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	
<p>R17: Land at Ketts Hill/Bishop Bridge Road</p> <p>Changes made to reflect geodiversity and SPZ</p>	For clarification and in response to an objection from the Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership.	<p>Site R17 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for housing (in the region of 30 dwellings to be provided).</p> <p>The proposed modifications include a number of changes to reflect the geodiversity interest at the site and how this should be mitigated. The site also falls within SPZ 1 and this is referenced.</p> <p>Proposed Modification – Geodiversity</p> <p>The key SA objective which relates to this modification is <i>ENV4: To maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</i>. The Regulation 19 SA Report recognised the sites' proximity to a number of designated features including the St James' Pit SSSI and Mousehold Heath Local Nature Reserve and Thorpe Wooded Ridge (although these sites were not specifically considered in respect of their geodiversity interest). This additional policy detail is likely to contribute positively to this objective. However, the potential for adverse effects remains.</p> <p>As such, the previous Regulation 19 Score (+/-/?) is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Proposed Modification – Source Protection Zone</p> <p>The key SA objective which relates to this modification is <i>ENV2: To improve the quality of the water environment</i></p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>Regulation 19 Score (-/?)</p> <p>Proposed new score (+/?)</p> <p>Reasons: the Regulation 19 assessment identified the site's proximity to the River Wensum and a number of designated sites and hence the potential for adverse effects on water quality. The proposed modification notes that the site lies within the SPZ 1, recognises that the water environment is particularly vulnerable in this location and specifies that detailed discussions will be required with the Environment Agency (EA) to ensure that proposals are appropriate for the site and that the site is developed in a manner which protects the water environment. This clarification should ensure that water quality is adequately protected.</p> <p>No other SA scores are likely to change.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were recorded in respect of this site.</p>	
<p>R18: Land at 126-128 Barrack Street</p> <p>Site area reduced (0.23 to 0.1 ha).</p> <p>Number of dwellings reduced (30 to 15).</p> <p>Pub not part of site (this is now a dental surgery) and is proposed for inclusion on the local list.</p>	<p>The landowner for part of the site has stated that their portion of the site will not be available for development in the plan period. In addition, this also corrects an error: reference to the need for a noise assessment was included in the Regulation 19 plan and should not be an addition as shown in deleted main mod SA-MM20.</p>	<p>Site R18 was allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for housing or a mix of housing and community uses (a minimum of 30 dwellings would be provided).</p> <p>The proposed modifications include a reduction in the overall site area, a reduction in the number of proposed dwellings at the site; and clarifications in respect of the surrounding site uses and their heritage interest.</p> <p>Reduction in Site Area</p> <p>As the site area has been reduced, the site has been re-analysed using GIS. No changes were identified as a result of this change and hence no changes to site scores are required.</p> <p>Reduction in the Number of Dwellings</p> <p>The key SA objective of relevance to this proposed modification is <i>SOC4: To provide the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</i>. The Regulation 19 SA Report provided a positive score (+) against this objective. The reduction in the number of dwellings from 30 to 15 is unlikely to change this score.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		No changes were recorded in respect of this site.	
<p>R19/Van Dal, Dibden Road</p> <p>Reflects the fact that sites are no longer proposed for inclusion on the local list but are listed.</p> <p>New reference at end of policy to recognise that the site lies within a Critical Drainage Catchment</p>	<p>The Van Dal shoe factory is included on the extended local list adopted by resolution of the council's cabinet on 15 January 2014.</p> <p>To reflect concerns raised by the Environment Agency and Norfolk County Council as lead flood authority. The changes reflect the emergence of additional evidence to define larger Critical Drainage Catchments which supplement the evidence in the Norwich Area Surface Water Management Plan.</p>	<p>Site R19 was allocated for housing development in the Regulation 19 SA Report for housing (in the region of 20 to 25 dwellings would be supported).</p> <p>Proposed Modifications</p> <p>Adoption of Local Heritage List</p> <p>The proposed modification acknowledges the adoption of the local heritage list (which includes the Van Dal Shoe Factory).</p> <p>The key SA objective of relevance to this proposed modification is <i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (+/-)</p> <p>No change is proposed to this score.</p> <p>The previous score recognised that the factory site includes some historic buildings proposed for local listing. The only change now is that the Local Heritage List has been adopted. There remains potential for an adverse effect (-) as there may be loss of all or part of the factory site dependent on how suitable the existing buildings are for conversion.</p> <p>Critical Drainage Catchments</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (R19 is under 1ha).</p> <p>The following explanatory text would be added: "<i>The site lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map. Therefore development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional areas of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i>"</p> <p>The following policy text would be added: "<i>A surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</i>"</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>(a) <i>Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area."</i></p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis resulted in one change in respect of this site, which relates to SA Objective ENV7: <i>To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk.</i> The site was previously identified as being outwith a Critical Drainage Area; however, it is now within the larger, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment.</p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (0)</p> <p>Proposed new score (-/?)</p> <p>Reasoning: The site now falls within a Critical Drainage Catchment with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk. This reflects the proposed policy which should mitigate potential effects to some extent.</p>	
<p>R20 Former Start Rite Factory Site, 28 Mousehold Lane</p> <p>New reference at end of policy to recognise that the site lies within a Critical Drainage Catchment</p>	<p>To reflect concerns raised by the Environment Agency and Norfolk County Council as lead flood authority. The changes reflect the emergence of additional evidence to define larger Critical Drainage Catchments which supplement the evidence in the Norwich Area Surface Water Management Plan.</p>	<p>Proposed Main Modification</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (R20 is under 1ha).</p> <p>The following explanatory text would be added: <i>"The site lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map. Therefore development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional areas of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>The following policy text would be added: <i>"A surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water</i></p>	<p>No</p>

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p><i>flooding in the wider area."</i></p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis resulted in one change in respect of this site, which relates to SA Objective ENV7: <i>To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk.</i> The site was previously identified as being outwith a Critical Drainage Area; however, it is now within the larger, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment.</p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (0)</p> <p>Proposed new score (-/?)</p> <p>Reasoning: The site now falls within a Critical Drainage Catchment with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk. This reflects the proposed policy which should mitigate potential effects to some extent.</p>	
<p>R21 Land north of Windmill Road</p> <p>Allocation changed from mixed use to housing only.</p> <p>Site area reduced from 1.02 ha to 0.18 ha.</p> <p>Dwellings numbers reduced from 25 to 10 dwellings.</p> <p>Updates made to reflect access road being provided on site.</p> <p>The site is within</p>	<p>The majority of the changes reflect the fact that part of the site is no longer available as it has been developed for retail purposes.</p> <p>Another modification relates to the redefinition of Critical Drainage Catchments which is required to reflect the concerns of the Environment Agency and Norfolk County Council as the local lead flood authority.</p>	<p>Proposed Main Modifications</p> <p>Policy name is changed to: Land north of Windmill Road.</p> <p>The land at Windmill Road is allocated for housing in the region of 10 dwellings.</p> <p>Development will be designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide pedestrian <u>access through the site to link Templemere with Windmill Road</u> and vehicular access arrangements to serve the site <u>by linking in to the new access provided through the development of the adjacent site for retailing;</u> • Ensure a high standard of amenity for residents • Protect and/or replace on site trees and provide a landscaping scheme to enhance site linkages <p>The supporting text is changed to reflect the change in site size.</p> <p>Changes to explanatory text include:</p> <p>New paragraph: <i>"The site is close to a district centre with excellent public transport links. The mixed use development to the south of Windmill has recently seen completion of a foodstore and works have commenced on site to provide a small number of housing units".</i></p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
<p>the wider Critical Drainage Catchment and a flood risk/surface water management assessment should be submitted with the application.</p>		<p>Reference to the food store is noted as being on the <u>adjacent site</u> – it was previously part of the original allocation.</p> <p>The paragraphs on the access are replaced with the following: "<u>A new access to Sprowston Road is being created as a result of the implemented permission on the adjacent site. Linking in to this new access would enable Windmill Road to be retained as an un-surfaced track offering pedestrian and cycle friendly links to Anthony Drive and Templemere.</u>"</p> <p>Text is amended to reflect the fact that this new site is in single ownership.</p> <p>Critical Drainage Catchments</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (R21 is under 1ha).</p> <p>The following explanatory text would be added: "<i>The site lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map. Therefore development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional areas of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>The following policy text would be added: "<i>A surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i> <i>(b) Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area."</i> <p>Implications for the SA</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Report did not identify any significant positive or significant negative effects in respect of the previous allocation for mixed uses (a retail food store and housing).</p> <p>As the retail food store has now been permitted, the allocation is for housing only.</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>The proposed modifications are unlikely to materially change the assessment. The reduction in housing numbers will not change the score for <i>SOC4: To provide the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</i> (+).</p> <p>SA Objective <i>SOC7</i> (Regulation 19 score in brackets): <i>To improve the quality of where people live</i> (+/-/?), reflected the potential for noise (including road traffic noise) to impact on new residents (this was previously referred to in the policy supporting text, although it is now removed). The site is now substantially reduced in size and the previous retail element of the allocation has been delivered. It is understood from NCC that noise mitigation is no longer necessary and hence a negligible score (0) is appropriate in respect of this objective.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>An updated GIS analysis of the site reflected the reduction in the site area, its allocation for housing only and the new data received.</p> <p>Changes are noted in respect of sub-questions 11b (<i>Is site outside a Critical Drainage Area?</i>) and 15c (<i>Is the site more than 250m from a Local Nature Reserve or County Wildlife Site?</i>). Previously the answers to these questions were 'Y' and 'N' respectively. The updated data indicates that the answers are now 'N' and 'Y'.</p> <p>The key SA objective for sub-question 11b (Regulation 19 score is provided in brackets) is <i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk</i> (0). The revised score is (-/?). This reflects the location of the site in the larger, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk, while recognising the potential for the proposed Main Modification to mitigate effects.</p> <p>The key SA objectives of relevant to sub-question 15c (previous scores are given in brackets) are: <i>ENV4: To maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</i> (+/-/?) and <i>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</i> (+/-/?). The updated GIS analysis indicates that the site is now outwith the buffer for County Wildlife Sites/Local Nature Reserves (this reflects the change to the site boundary). However, no change is proposed to either score as there is still potential for new residents to access this local designation and result in indirect adverse effects (e.g. increased recreational pressure) – i.e. this change reflects the reduced site boundary which means the site is only marginally further away.</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
R22/Starling Road Further clarification provided in respect of critical drainage catchments.	To reflect concerns raised by the EA and Norfolk County Council as lead local flood authority.	<p>Site R22 was originally allocated in the Regulation 19 Plan for housing (in the region of 45 dwellings).</p> <p>Proposed Modification</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (R22 is under 1ha).</p> <p>The following explanatory text would be added: <i>"The site lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map. Therefore development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional areas of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>The following policy text would be added: <i>"A surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i> <i>(b) Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area."</i> <p>The relevant SA objective is <i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk.</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (--/?)</p> <p>Proposed new score (-/?)</p> <p>Reasoning: The proposed modification should ensure that the proposed risk of surface water flooding is appropriately managed (this was not proposed at Regulation 19 stage). However, the site is located within the larger, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk. As such, an adverse score is still considered appropriate.</p> <p>Updated GIS analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis identified one change in respect of sub-question 7 (is site within 600m of a leisure centre?). The site was identified as falling out with this buffer in the</p>	<p>Yes, the potential for a significant adverse, uncertain (--/?) effect in respect of ENV7 is reduced due to the proposed modification referencing Critical Drainage Catchments.</p> <p>A revised minor, adverse, uncertain (-/?) score is now predicted.</p>

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		Regulation 19 SA Report and is now within the buffer. This affects the following SA objective – <i>SOC8: to improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs</i> . The SA score identified in the Regulation 19 SA Report (+) is not anticipated to change on account of the change to this objective.	
R23: Aylsham Road District Centre Further clarification provided in respect of critical drainage catchments.	To reflect concerns raised by the EA and Norfolk County Council as lead local flood authority.	<p>Proposed Modification</p> <p>Critical Drainage Catchments</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (R23 is over 1ha).</p> <p>Explanatory text: <i>'Since the site is over 1 ha a flood risk assessment is required and appropriate mitigation measures shall be provided as part of the development. As the site also lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map, a surface water management assessment should be included in the flood risk assessment.</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional area of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>Policy: <i>'A flood risk assessment including surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i> <i>(b) Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area.'</i> <p>The proposed modification seeks to manage the potential risk of surface water flooding at this location. However, as the site is located within the larger, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk an uncertain (- /?) is considered appropriate in respect of SA objective <i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk.</i></p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>The updated GIS analysis identified changes to two sub-questions: 8b (Is site within 600m of a river valley, woodland, riverside walk?) and 11b (Is site outside a critical drainage area?).</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA recorded the answer to both questions as 'Y', however, updated GIS data has indicated that the site is now outwith the 600m buffer (river valley/woodland/riverside walk) and is now part of the wider critical drainage catchment. The following SA objectives are underpinned by sub-question 8b: <i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment; ENV6: To adapt to an mitigate against the impacts of climate change; SOC2: To maintain and improve the health of the whole population and promote healthy lifestyles; SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live and SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs.</i> SA objective ENV7: <i>to avoid, reduce and manage flood risk is underpinned by sub-question 11b.</i></p> <p>The Regulation 19 Score predicted for ENV1 (+) is not predicted to change in response to question 8b as the overall score is underpinned by a range of other accessibility sub-criteria to which the site responds positively (i.e. within 600m of a primary school; healthcare facility; open/green space etc.).</p> <p>The same is true for SA objective ENV6 for which a positive (+) score was recorded at Regulation 19 stage; SOC 2 (a + score was recorded at Regulation 19) and SOC 8 (a + score was recorded at Regulation 19).</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA recorded a mixed effect (+/-/?) in respect of SOC7. This is not predicted to change in response to the change to sub-question 8b.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA recorded a neutral (0) score in respect of ENV7. As the site now falls within a Critical Drainage Catchment, this is expected to change to (-/?). This takes account of the proposed policy modification, which should mitigate effects to some extent.</p>	
R24: 165-187 Aylsham Road Further clarification provided in respect of critical drainage	To reflect concerns raised by the EA and Norfolk County Council as lead local flood authority.	<p>Proposed Modification</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (R24 is under 1ha).</p> <p>The following explanatory text would be added: "<i>The site lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map. Therefore development proposals involving</i></p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
catchments.		<p><i>new buildings, extensions and additional areas of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>The following policy text would be added: "A surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <i>Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i> (b) <i>Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area."</i> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis identified a change in respect of sub-question 11b (Is site outside of a Critical Drainage Area?). The previous analysis indicated that the site was outside a Critical Drainage Area, however, the updated GIS data now indicates that the site falls into the wider, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment.</p> <p>The key objective of relevance to this sub-question is <i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk?</i> The Regulation 19 SA reported a neutral (0) score against this objective. As the site now falls within the wider, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment, with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk, a negative, uncertain (-/?) score is relevant. This takes the proposed policy modification which should mitigate effects to some extent.</p>	
R25: Former Pupil Referral Unit, Aylsham Road Further clarification provided in respect of critical drainage catchments.	To reflect concerns raised by the EA and Norfolk County Council as lead local flood authority.	<p>Proposed Modification</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (R25 is under 1ha).</p> <p>The following explanatory text would be added: "<i>The site lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map. Therefore development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional areas of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>The following policy text would be added: "A <i>surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area."</i></p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis identified a change in respect of sub-question 11b (Is site outside of a Critical Drainage Area?). The previous analysis indicated that the site was outside a Critical Drainage Area, however, the updated GIS data now indicates that the site falls into the wider, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment.</p> <p>The key objective of relevance to this sub-question is <i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk?</i> The Regulation 19 SA reported a neutral (0) score against this objective. As the site now falls within the wider, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment, with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk, a negative, uncertain (-/?) score is relevant. This takes the proposed policy modification which should mitigate effects to some extent.</p>	
R26: Land adjoining Lime Kiln Mews, Drayton Road	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were identified in respect of this site.</p>	No
R27: 81-93 Drayton Road	N/A	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were identified in respect of this site.</p>	No
R28/Site North of Raynham Street	This change was agreed during the examination in public	<p>Site R28 was allocated for housing (minimum 40 dwellings to be delivered).</p> <p>Proposed Modification</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
<p>Further clarification provided in respect of the green spaces/paths which will be enhanced.</p> <p>Further clarification provided in respect of critical drainage catchments.</p>	<p>of the site allocations DPD.</p> <p>To reflect concerns raised by the EA and Norfolk County Council as lead local flood authority.</p>	<p>Green spaces / paths</p> <p>The proposed modification amends the first bullet of the policy as follows: "...enhance the setting of neighbouring green spaces and paths, <u>including integrating the Dolphin Path into its design to improve the setting of the strategic pedestrian/cycle route and make it a more attractive link...</u>"</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA recognised the potential for this specific enhancement (which was previously included in the supporting text to the policy). As such, potential positive scores were already identified in respect of the key SA objectives e.g. <i>ENV 1: to reduce the effect of traffic on the environment (+)</i>; <i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment (+)</i>; <i>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change (+)</i>; and <i>SOC2: To maintain and improve the health of the whole population and promote healthy lifestyles (+)</i>.</p> <p>Critical Drainage Areas</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (R28 is 1ha).</p> <p>Explanatory text: <i>'Since the site is over 1 ha a flood risk assessment is required and appropriate mitigation measures shall be provided as part of the development. As the site also lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map, a surface water management assessment should be included in the flood risk assessment.</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional area of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>Policy: <i>'A flood risk assessment including surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i> <i>(b) Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area.'</i> 	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>The site is now located within the wider Critical Drainage Catchment with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk. As such, a minor adverse, uncertain (-/?) is considered appropriate in respect of SA objective <i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk</i>. As the site is also located within a flood zone there is no change to the score predicted in the Regulation 19 SA.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis resulted in two changes in respect of this site. The first relates to SA Objective <i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk</i>. The site was previously identified as being outwith a Critical Drainage Area; however, it is now within the larger, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment.</p> <p>Regulation 19 score (-/?) (this reflected the location of the site within a flood zone)</p> <p>Proposed new score (-/?)</p> <p>Reasoning: The site now falls within the wider, redefined, Critical Drainage Catchment however; this is not expected to change the overall score as an adverse score is already predicted.</p>	
<p>R29: Goldsmith Street</p> <p>Further clarification provided in respect of critical drainage catchments.</p>	<p>To reflect concerns raised by the EA and Norfolk County Council as lead local flood authority.</p>	<p>Proposed Modification</p> <p>Critical Drainage Catchments</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (R29 is 1.2ha).</p> <p>Explanatory text: <i>'Since the site is over 1 ha a flood risk assessment is required and appropriate mitigation measures shall be provided as part of the development. As the site also lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map, a surface water management assessment should be included in the flood risk assessment.'</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional area of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>Policy: <i>'A flood risk assessment including surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this</i></p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p><i>allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area.'</i></p> <p>The site is now located within the wider, redefined, Critical Drainage Catchment with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk. As such, a minor adverse, uncertain (-/?) is considered appropriate in respect of SA objective ENV7: <i>To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk.</i> As the site is also located within a flood zone there is no change to the score predicted in the Regulation 19 SA.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis recorded changes in respect of sub-questions 11b (Is site outside of a critical drainage area?) and 14d (Is site more than 250m from a Conservation Area?). In respect of sub-question 11b, the GIS analysis previously recorded the site as falling outside a Critical Drainage Area and in respect of sub-question 14d, the site was previously assessed as falling within 250m of a Conservation Area. The updated GIS data now indicates that the site does fall within the wider, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment Area and is now more than 250m from a Conservation Area.</p> <p>The key SA objective relevant to sub-question 11b is ENV7: <i>To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk.</i> The Regulation 19 SA Report assessed the score against this objective to be minor adverse (-/?) on account of the sites' location in flood zone 2. Although the site now also falls within the wider Critical Drainage Catchment this is not expected to change the overall score. This takes account of the proposed policy modification, which should mitigate effects to some extent.</p> <p>In respect of sub-question 14d, the relevant SA objective is: ENV5: <i>To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment.</i> The Regulation 19 SA predicted a significant positive score (++) in respect of this objective and this is not predicted in respect of the change to sub-question 14d.</p>	
R30: 231-243 Heigham Street	N/A	<p>Proposed Modification</p> <p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis noted a change in respect of sub-question 11b (Is the site outside a Critical Drainage Area?). The Regulation 19 SA recorded the site as falling outside a Critical Drainage Area; however, the updated GIS analysis records the site as falling within the wider, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment.</p> <p>The key SA objective is ENV7: <i>To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk</i> and a minor adverse, uncertain score (-/?) was recorded in the Regulation 19 SA due to the proximity of the site to a flood zone. The site is now recorded as falling partially within a Critical Drainage Catchment. This is unlikely to materially change the score.</p>	
<p>R31/Hurricane Way</p> <p>Clarification provided to note that housing development will only be acceptable on the southern part of the site where this is needed to fund regeneration.</p> <p>Further clarification provided in respect of critical drainage catchments.</p>	<p>The change is proposed in response to two objections. It indicates the acceptability of residential development on part of the site where needed to help fund regeneration, subject to an agreed master plan. This modification has been agreed with the objector</p> <p>To reflect concerns raised by the EA and Norfolk County Council as lead local flood authority.</p>	<p>Site R31 was originally proposed in the Regulation 19 Plan for light industrial development and/or for small business uses.</p> <p>Proposed Modification</p> <p>The following changes are proposed to the supporting text to policy:</p> <p><i>"Two sites at Hurricane Way (as identified on the proposals map as site A and site B) are allocated for light industrial development and/or for small business uses. <u>Housing development (in the region of 30 dwellings) will be acceptable on the southern part of site B where this is needed to fund regeneration in accordance with an agreed Master plan. These uses must not be significantly detrimental to the amenity of adjoining neighbouring residential occupiers. A noise assessment will be required.</u>"</i></p> <p><i>"Both the design and use of the sites must avoid any potential noise and amenity conflicts with housing to the south and south-west of the sites. Therefore light industrial and small business uses are promoted and landscaped buffers must be provided to existing residential development. <u>Dependent on production of a Master plan, residential development may be suitable on the southern part of site B.</u>"</i></p> <p>This site was previously appraised in respect of 'employment' uses only. The key objective which would be affected by making provision for residential development at this site is SOC4: <i>To provide the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home.</i> Recognising the potential for provision of housing (where this is needed to fund regeneration in accordance with an agreed master plan) a new score of (+/?) is recorded in relation to this objective.</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>The other relevant score relates to <i>SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live</i>. This was previously assessed as (+/-/?) when the site was allocated for employment uses only. This recognised the potential for employment/light industrial uses to affect the amenity of neighbouring residential areas. The policy specifically required new development to take account of the amenity of neighbouring uses and stated that a noise assessment would be required (hence a mixed effect was recorded overall). The main modification now makes provision for new residential uses (in addition to light industrial/employment uses) on the southern part of the site B. This mixed use option is also likely to score mixed effects (+/-/?) against this objective reflecting the potential for new employment/industrial uses to be in conflict with new residential uses (on the southern part of Site B). However it is presumed that potential impacts on the amenity of new residents would be taken into account during the design of development and mitigation included as necessary.</p> <p>None of other scores are likely to materially change.</p> <p>Reflecting the fact that the two sites (allocation R31) are now proposed for two separate allocations (one for employment only and one for a mix of uses including employment), this SA has appraised the two separate uses.</p> <p>Critical Drainage Catchments</p> <p>The modification inserts a new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text and a new sentence to the end of each policy to reference Critical Drainage Catchments. This modification relates to sites under 1ha and sites over 1ha (Site B is 2.03ha in size). Explanatory text: <i>'Since the site is over 1 ha a flood risk assessment is required and appropriate mitigation measures shall be provided as part of the development. As the site also lies within a critical drainage catchment as identified on the Policies Map, a surface water management assessment should be included in the flood risk assessment.'</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals involving new buildings, extensions and additional area of hard surfacing should ensure that adequate and appropriate consideration has been given to mitigating surface water flooding in accordance with policy DM5.</i></p> <p>Policy: <i>'A flood risk assessment including surface water management assessment should be submitted with any application proposing development in accordance with this allocation. The assessment should show how the proposed development:</i></p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>(a) <i>Would not increase the vulnerability of the site, or the wider catchment, to flooding from surface water run-off from existing or predicted water flows; and</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Would, wherever practicable, have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area.'</i></p> <p>The site is now located within the wider, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment, with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk. As such, a minor adverse, uncertain (-/?) is considered appropriate in respect of SA objective ENV7: <i>To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk.</i></p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis resulted in one change in respect of this site, which relates to SA Objective ENV7: <i>To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk.</i> The site was previously identified as being outwith a Critical Drainage Area; however, it is now within the larger, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment.</p> <p>Regulation 19 score (+)</p> <p>Proposed new score (-/?).</p> <p>Reasoning: The site now falls within the larger, redefined, Critical Drainage Catchment with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk. The revised score reflects the proposed policy modification which should mitigate effects to some extent.</p>	
<p>R32:The Paddocks Holt Road</p> <p>The key modification to site R32 seeks to provide two scenarios under which 'general needs employment purposes' would</p>	<p>The change is proposed to respond to the concerns of the Inspector at examination in relation to the potential soundness of site allocation policy R32 and its supporting text. Both the City Council and the objector have put forward preferred</p>	<p>Proposed Modification</p> <p>The site was previously allocated for airport uses only, subject to master planning. As this proposed policy modification still provides for airport related uses (subject to the evidence arising from the master planning process) this remains a reasonable alternative for assessment through the SA process.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA assessed the site for airport related operational uses. No changes are proposed to this policy which would materially change the outcomes of the Regulation 19 SA (as the policy now provides for two possible options to bring forward employment, there is more certainty in the delivery of economic benefits).</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA Report recorded one significant positive effect in respect of SA objective EC2: <i>To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment.</i></p>	<p>Yes, there is potential for a new significant positive, uncertain (++) effect to arise in respect of SA objective SOC6 through scope for general employment uses to come forward at this site.</p>

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
<p>be acceptable on the site if (i) an airport master plan prepared within two years showed that the site was not needed for airport operational uses or (ii) if no master plan were to be agreed within that 2 year period.</p> <p>The preference for access from Gambling Close would be retained but direct access from Holt Road would be permitted if was demonstrated that a satisfactory access could be achieved without unacceptable transportation impacts.</p> <p>Reference to the requirement for a surface access strategy and a Travel Plan has</p>	<p>policy wordings and the resulting modification is proposed by the Inspector. The modified policy allows development of the site for general employment purposes in the event that an Airport Masterplan (to be produced within 2 years of the plan's adoption) shows that the land is not required for airport operational uses.</p>	<p>A significant adverse effect was recorded in respect of <i>ENV9: To make the best use of resources, including land and energy to minimise waste production</i> as part of the site falls within agricultural land classified as Grade 3. No other significant positive or negative effects were anticipated and the scores in respect of other objectives are expected to remain the same.</p> <p>The key change relates to the scope for general employment uses (B1 – Business, B2 – General Industrial and B8 – Storage or Distribution) to come forward provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The agreed airport master plan referred to above demonstrates that the land will not be required for Airport Operational Purposes during the plan period, or (b) No master plan for the Airport has been endorsed by the city council within two years from the date of adoption of this Plan. <p>As this provides an alternative to airport related uses, it should be appraised separately in the SA.</p> <p>The proposed SA objective scores and the reasoning behind this are provided below. Many of the SA objective scores are the same as those identified during assessment of the airport-operational uses as these are underpinned by proximity criteria which have not changed (i.e. the site location remains the same).</p> <p><i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment: (+)</i></p> <p>The site is proximate to public transport nodes, however, there is potential for general for employment uses, particularly B8 (which includes logistics uses) to increase car and freight traffic on the road. Policy DM28 of the Development Management Policies DPD provides encouragement for sustainable travel, which would include preparation of a Travel Plan (the specific requirement for this in respect of this site has been removed from the policy) which should act to mitigate adverse effects.</p> <p><i>ENV2: To improve the quality of the water environment (0)</i></p> <p>The score is the same as recorded in respect of the airport-related use.</p> <p><i>ENV3: To improve environmental amenity including air quality (?)</i></p> <p>Support for general employment uses including B8 could result in increased traffic on the road network and a worsening of local air quality. This is uncertain, given potential</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
been removed.		<p>mitigation through Development Management Policies such as DM28.</p> <p><i>ENV4: To maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity (-/?)</i></p> <p>Although the site is not within 250m of any nature conservation designations, it is predominantly greenfield and as such there is potential for adverse effects on biodiversity.</p> <p><i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment (0)</i></p> <p>The site is more than 250m from any sites with designated heritage interest.</p> <p><i>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change (+)</i></p> <p>Similar to the score reflected for ENV1 above, there is potential for this option to increase car and freight based traffic and hence car based emissions. However, the site is close to a public transport node, providing the opportunity to access the site by sustainable modes and mitigation would be provided through DM policy 28.</p> <p><i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk (+)</i></p> <p>The site is outside a Critical Drainage Area and is not within an area at risk of flooding.</p> <p><i>ENV9: To make the best use of resources, including land and energy to minimise waste production (--)</i></p> <p>Part of the site is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land and is greenfield.</p> <p><i>SOC1: To reduce poverty and social exclusion (+)</i></p> <p>Support for general employment related uses would provide employment opportunities which could contribute positively to reducing poverty and social exclusion.</p> <p><i>SOC2: To maintain and improve the health of the whole population and promote healthy lifestyles (+)</i></p> <p>There may be potential for new employees to access the site via walking and cycling, which could result in positive impacts on health.</p> <p><i>SOC3: To improve education and skills (0)</i></p> <p>Development of general employment uses is unlikely to significantly affect this objective.</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p><i>SOC5: To build community identity, improve social welfare and reduce crime and antisocial behaviour (+)</i></p> <p>There is potential for a well-designed site regardless of the use involved to contribute positively to this objective through creation of additional surveillance.</p> <p><i>SOC6: To offer more opportunities for rewarding and satisfying employment for all (++/?)</i></p> <p>This option provides scope for a range of employment use types to come forward which could contribute significantly positively to this objective. However, the exact nature of the employment which could come forward is unknown bringing uncertainty to the appraisal.</p> <p><i>SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live (-/?)</i></p> <p>A minor uncertain adverse effect is anticipated. This reflects the potential for new development to impact adversely on open land in a greenfield setting and potential for localised impacts on air quality. It is recognised that the policy requires production of a noise impact assessment and incorporation suitable boundary treatment which should mitigate potential amenity effects to some extent.</p> <p><i>SOC8: to improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs (+)</i></p> <p>The site is within 300m of a public transport node which could provide opportunities to access the site via sustainable modes. Furthermore, the policy seeks to promote sustainable transport in accordance with DM Policy 28: Encouraging Sustainable Travel.</p> <p><i>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth (+)</i></p> <p>Support for development of general employment uses at the site could contribute positively to this objective.</p> <p><i>EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment (++)</i></p> <p>Development of general employment uses could have significant positive effects on this objective.</p> <p><i>EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth (+)</i></p> <p>The site is within 300m of a public transport node which could provide opportunities to access the site via sustainable modes. Furthermore, the policy seeks to promote sustainable transport in accordance with DM Policy 28: Encouraging Sustainable Travel.</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p><i>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy (+/-/?)</i></p> <p>The site is outwith the buffer zones of key designations (heritage and nature conservation) and does not lie within a flood zone or critical drainage area.</p> <p>The site is proximate to public transport nodes, however, there is potential for general employment uses, particularly B8 (which includes logistics uses) to increase car and freight traffic on the road. As such, an adverse score is anticipated. There is uncertainty as policy DM28 of the Development Management Policies DPD provides encouragement for sustainable travel, which would include preparation of a Travel Plan.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were identified on account of the updated GIS analysis.</p>	
R33: Heigham Water Treatment Works, Waterworks Road	N/A	<p>Proposed Modifications</p> <p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were proposed as a result of the updated GIS analysis.</p>	No
R35: 120-130 Northumberland Street	N/A	<p>Proposed Modifications</p> <p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were proposed as a result of the updated GIS analysis.</p>	No
R36: Site of former Earl of Leicester PH, 238 Dereham Road	N/A	<p>Proposed Modifications</p> <p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were proposed as a result of the updated GIS analysis.</p>	No
R37: Land adjacent to and	N/A	<p>Proposed Modifications</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
including 349a and 349b Dereham Road		<p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were proposed as a result of the updated GIS analysis.</p>	
R38: Land at Havers Road	N/A	<p>Proposed Modifications</p> <p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were proposed as a result of the updated GIS analysis.</p>	No
R39: Mile Cross Depot	N/A	<p>Proposed Modifications</p> <p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were proposed as a result of the updated GIS analysis.</p>	No
R40: Part of Norwich Community Hospital, Bowthorpe Road	N/A	<p>Proposed Modifications</p> <p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were proposed as a result of the updated GIS analysis.</p>	No
R41: Three Score Bowthorpe	N/A	<p>Proposed Modifications</p> <p>No Main Modifications are proposed in respect of this site.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No Main Modifications were proposed as a result of the updated GIS analysis.</p>	No
R42/Earlham Hall Building areas provided as	Change is in response to an objector and is for clarification	Site R42 was allocated for employment (business use, including a new exemplary low carbon building) in the Regulation 19 Plan.	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
approximates rather than 'maximums'.		<p>Proposed Modification</p> <p>As the modification only relates to site areas (i.e. referring to these as 'approximates' rather than 'maximums') it is not considered to impact on any of the SA scores.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were identified on account of the updated GIS analysis.</p>	
<p>R43/Former Blackdale School UEA</p> <p>Links to the university's district heating network are to be provided 'where possible'.</p> <p>Site development to be guided by a "coherent and coordinated planning approach that has involved English Heritage, UEA and Norwich City Council. Lasdun's original vision should be a key consideration.." rather than solely a "coherent master plan..."</p>	<p>Change is in response to two objections and to clarify the policy in relation to feasibility considerations relating to linking to a district heating network, and to add Lasdun's original vision for the site as a qualification to the policy. The wording 'coherent and co-ordinated planning approach' is proposed rather than English Heritage's suggested 'coherent master plan' (as in the Reg22 version) to allow for the possibility of different forms of supplementary guidance for the site rather than a purely design-led master plan.</p>	<p>Site R43 was allocated for university related uses in the Regulation 19 Plan.</p> <p>Proposed Modification</p> <p>The proposed modification seeks to amend the last bullet point in the policy and add a final paragraph as follows:</p> <p><i>"Be linked to the university district heating network <u>where possible</u>."</i></p> <p><i>"Development of this site should be guided by a coherent and co-ordinated planning approach that has involved English Heritage, UEA and Norwich City Council. Lasdun's original vision should be a key consideration."</i></p> <p>The key SA objectives relating to the modification regarding the district heating network are ENV6: <i>To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change</i> and ENV9: <i>To make the best of resources, including land and energy to minimise waste production</i>;</p> <p>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change</p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (++)</p> <p>No change is proposed to the original score. Whilst the previous assessment identified uncertainty (?) in relation to the source of the heat from the district heating network (i.e. would this be from renewable sources?), further uncertainty would be built in to recognise this network will now only come forward if this is supported by viability testing.</p> <p>ENV9: To make the best of resources, including land and energy and to minimise waste production</p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+/-)</p> <p>No change is proposed to the original score. The inclusion of the district heating network was considered to have positive effects in respect of energy efficiency; however, there</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>was uncertainty as it was not clear if the heat source would be from renewable sources. Further uncertainty would be built in to recognise this network will now only come forward if this is supported by viability testing.</p> <p>No changes to the SA are considered necessary to reflect the change in policy from a master plan-led approach to a coherent and co-ordinated planning approach.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes were identified on account of the updated GIS analysis.</p>	
<p>R44/Land between Suffolk Walk and Bluebell Road, UEA</p> <p>Site development to be guided by a "coherent and coordinated planning approach that has involved English Heritage, UEA and Norwich City Council. Lasdun's original vision should be a key consideration" rather than solely a "coherent master plan..."</p>	<p>Change is in response to two objections and to clarify the policy in relation to feasibility considerations relating to linking to a district heating network, and to add Lasdun's original vision for a site as a qualification to the policy. The wording 'coherent and co-ordinated planning approach' is proposed rather than English Heritage's suggested 'coherent master plan' (as in the Reg22 version) to allow for the possibility of different forms of supplementary guidance for the site rather than a purely design-led master</p>	<p>Site R44 was allocated as a strategic reserve for a university campus extension in the Regulation 19 Plan.</p> <p>Proposed Modification</p> <p>The proposed modification seeks to amend the last bullet point in the policy and add a final paragraph as follows:</p> <p><i>"Be linked to the university district heating network <u>where possible</u>."</i></p> <p><i><u>"Development of this site should be guided by a coherent and co-ordinated planning approach that has involved English Heritage, UEA and Norwich City Council. Lasdun's original vision should be a key consideration."</u></i></p> <p>The key SA objectives relating to the modification regarding the district heating network are ENV6: <i>To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change</i> and ENV9: <i>To make the best of resources, including land and energy to minimise waste production</i>;</p> <p>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change</p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (++)</p> <p>No change is proposed to the original score. Whilst the previous assessment identified uncertainty (?) in relation to the source of the heat from the district heating network (i.e. would this be from renewable sources?), further uncertainty would be built in to recognise this network will now only come forward if this is supported by viability testing.</p> <p>ENV9: To make the best of resources, including land and energy and to minimise waste production</p>	<p>Yes, the significant mixed effect previously identified in respect of ENV9 now has uncertainty (--/+/?).</p>

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
	plan.	<p>Regulation 19 Score (--/+)</p> <p>A minor positive effect was identified in respect of the potential for the site to link to the University District Heating Network. The significant adverse effects (--) reflected development of a greenfield site.</p> <p>Proposed new score (--/+/?)</p> <p>Reasons: The proposed modification adds a clause to the policy which means developer would not need to link to the district heating network if this proved unviable. As such, there is now uncertainty (?) in the potential for benefits from the delivery of a district heating system.</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes are proposed in respect of this site.</p>	
<p>R45: Bartram Mowers site</p> <p>Addition of a new policy and site map</p>	<p>The site was removed as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan following a Cabinet Meeting in July 2012.</p> <p>The site was subsequently discussed at the examination into the Plan in March 2014.</p> <p>In order to respond to the concerns of the Inspector at examination, both the City Council and the</p>	<p>The site is allocated for development of a housing scheme for the over 55s, which may include assisted-living and/or extra care housing (in the region of 120 dwellings would be provided).</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA did not identify any significant positive effects in respect of this site. A significant adverse, uncertain effect (--/?) was identified in respect of <i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</i>. This reflected the location of the site on the slopes of the Yare Valley (identified in the JCS as a green corridor). The Yare Valley plays an important role in defining the southern edge of the built up area of the city and providing a landscape buffer. It was recognised that the policy would require development to be designed to minimise its setting on the Yare Valley and to protect neighbouring environmental assets, however, it was considered that any form of further development in this sensitive location could significantly reduce the value of the landscape buffer around the southern edge of the city and have a negative effect on views of the city from the south.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 Appraisal has been reviewed in light of the updated GIS analysis and</p>	<p>Yes, the proposed modification would reduce the likelihood of a significant adverse effect arising in respect of ENV 5⁶.</p> <p>A revised score of (+/-/?) is now proposed in respect of this objective.</p>

⁶ As explained earlier in this report, Site R45 was removed from the Plan at a late stage following a cabinet decision in July 2012. However, the Regulation 19 SA Report (dated June 2012) still included site R45 as an allocation (and reported a significant adverse effect in respect of SA Objective ENV5). Following examination into the Plan in March 2014 the inspector proposed that the site be re-allocated and a new policy and site map has been included as a Main Modification (and is the subject of this SA Addendum). The proposed Main Modification for Site R45 has been assessed in this SA Addendum and the effects compared to the assessment of Site R45 in the Regulation 19 SA Report dated June 2012.

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
	<p>objector have put forward preferred policy wordings at the request of the Inspector, and the resulting modification is proposed by the Inspector. The new policy allocates the site for housing for the over 55s.</p>	<p>revised policy wording. The updated appraisal is provided below.</p> <p><i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+)</p> <p>Revised score: No change.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 appraisal recognised the proximity of the site to a number of existing features and facilities including a retail centre, open/green space, river valley/woodland/riverside walk and public transport node providing access to facilities by non-car modes. Furthermore, the policy seeks to provide improved pedestrian and cycle access to and within the valley.</p> <p><i>ENV2: To improve the quality of the water environment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (-/?)</p> <p>Revised score: No change</p> <p>The previous score reflected the proximity of the site to the River Yare to the west as well as Bluebell Marsh and Easton Street Meadow CWS and hence the potential for indirect adverse effects (e.g. pollution).</p> <p><i>ENV3: To improve environmental amenity including air quality</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (0)</p> <p>Revised Score: No change.</p> <p>The previous score recognised that the site was outside of an Air Quality 'Hotspot' and a Waste Management Facility.</p> <p><i>ENV4: To maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+/-/?)</p> <p>Revised Score: No change.</p> <p>The previous score reflected the proximity of the site to a number of sensitive ecological designations and habitats, including fenland to the west and a County Wildlife Site. However, the policy seeks to improve the strategic Yare Valley green infrastructure corridor, providing public open space (but excluding the County Wildlife site in the fen</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>area), and to protect and enhance environmental assets within and adjacent to the site, including retaining tree belts.</p> <p>As such, a mixed score is still considered appropriate.</p> <p><i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (--/?)</p> <p>The Regulation score reflected the proximity of the site to the Eaton Conservation area and Cringleford Bridge Scheduled Monument (although it is recognised that the A11 Newmarket Road lies between the site and these assets) which would limit the impact on the setting of these features. However, more significant is the location of the site on the slopes of the Yare Valley, which defines the southern edge of the built up area of the city and provides a landscape buffer. Development in this location could erode this buffer effect. The policy seeks to respond to this issue through development of a Master plan and Management Plan for the site informed by a full landscape and visual assessment and topographical and levels survey. The development would be required to improve the strategic Yare Valley green infrastructure corridor and provide 17.5 hectares of public open space on land adjoining the site. The public open space would be managed and maintained in perpetuity through development of a legal agreement.</p> <p>Although development in this location would have adverse effects on this objective, it is recognised that the site policy seeks to deliver permanent, long term improvements through provision of a public open space to the west and that site development would be supported by an agreed Master plan. As such as revised mixed, uncertain score (+/-/?) is considered appropriate.</p> <p><i>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (+)</p> <p>Revised Score: No change.</p> <p>Refer to justification provided in respect of SA objective ENV1.</p> <p><i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (-/?)</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>Revised score: No change.</p> <p>The majority of the site is outside any flood zones and is not within a Critical Drainage Zone (nor the wider critical drainage catchment), however, a small portion of the site, at the western boundary, is within flood zone 2 and as such a minor adverse score (-/?) was reported. This still remains the case.</p> <p><i>ENV9: To make the best use of resources, including land and energy to minimise waste production</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (-/?)</p> <p>The Regulation 19 appraisal identified the site as part brownfield/greenfield. It is recognised that the northern part of the site is occupied by Bartram Mower's garden machinery, sales and repair business and ancillary buildings, however, the southern part of the site is grassland and has reverted to a naturalised state (the south-east portion of the site was also identified as falling within Grade 3 agricultural land). Recognising that development would result in the entire site boundary becoming developed, a minor adverse score is still considered appropriate.</p> <p><i>SOC1: To reduce poverty and social exclusion</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (0)</p> <p>Revised score: No change.</p> <p><i>SOC2: To maintain and improve the health of the whole population and promote healthy lifestyles</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+)</p> <p>Revised Score: No change</p> <p>As recognised earlier the site is proximate to a number of existing facilities/features which could increase the number of journeys made on foot/by bike and hence contribute positively to this objective. Furthermore, the policy requires provision of new publicly accessible open space with improved pedestrian/cycle access.</p> <p><i>SOC3: To improve education and skills</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (0)</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p>Revised Score: No change.</p> <p><i>SOC4: To provide the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+)</p> <p>Revised Score: No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed for housing for the over 55s (which may include assisted living and/or extra care housing). In the region of 120 homes would be delivered. This form of housing meets a local and city wide need; Eaton ward in particular has a significantly higher proportion of elderly residents than in other parts of the city and there is an identified shortage of such housing in Norwich.</p> <p>As such, a minor positive score is still deemed appropriate.</p> <p><i>SOC5: To build community identity, improve social welfare and reduce crime and antisocial activity</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+)</p> <p>Revised Score: No change.</p> <p><i>SOC6: To offer more opportunities for rewarding and satisfying employment for all</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (0)</p> <p>Revised Score: No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed for housing only. Furthermore, the site is located more than 600m from an employment area meaning there is no employment within walking distance.</p> <p><i>SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+)</p> <p>The site is within 600m of open space/green space and a river valley/woodland/riverside walk and the policy requires delivery of 17.5 ha of public open space on land adjoining the site. Although the development has potential to improve the local area, further development in this area could impact on the landscape buffering provided in this location. As such a revised mixed, uncertain (+/-/?) score is considered appropriate.</p>	

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
		<p><i>SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (+)</p> <p>Revised score: No change.</p> <p>As already discussed, the site is reasonably well located to existing services and facilities and is proximate to a public transport node.</p> <p><i>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 score (+/?)</p> <p>Revised score: No change</p> <p>The site is proximate to an existing retail centre; however, housing for older people is unlikely to significantly contribute to economic growth.</p> <p><i>EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</i></p> <p>Regulation 19 Score (+)</p> <p>Revised score: No change</p> <p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis did not identify any changes in respect of this site.</p>	
<p>Reasonable Alternative Sites</p> <p>There are no proposed Main Modifications in respect of the reasonable alternative sites.</p>			
E002: Victoria House, Queens Road, Norwich ('mixed use')	N/A	<p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes are proposed in respect of this site.</p>	No
E002: Victoria House, Queen's Road, Norwich	N/A	<p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes are proposed in respect of this site.</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
('employment')			
H004: Land to rear of 180 Earlham Road, Norwich (proposed for 'housing' only)	N/A	<p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis identified a change in respect of sub-question 8b (Is site within 600m of a river valley, woodland, riverside walk?). The Regulation 19 SA assessed the answer to this question as 'Y', however, updated data indicates that the site is now outwith this buffer. The following SA objectives are underpinned by this sub-question (Regulation 19 scores are included in brackets): <i>ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment (+)</i>; <i>ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change (+)</i>; <i>SOC2: To maintain and improve the health of the whole population and promote healthy lifestyles (+)</i>; <i>SOC7 To improve the quality of where people live (+/-)</i> and <i>SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs (+)</i>.</p> <p>The change to sub-question 8 is not considered likely to change any of these scores.</p>	No
H008: Land at Northumberland Street (proposed for 'housing' only)	N/A	<p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes are proposed in respect of this site.</p>	No
H011: Land at Eaton Golf Club (part) (proposed for 'housing' only)	N/A	<p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes are proposed in respect of this site.</p>	No
M001: Gooseberry Gardens and access there via existing allotments, Cathedral Precinct (proposed for 'mixed use' only)	N/A	<p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes are proposed in respect of this site.</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
M002: Land between Hooks Walk & Ferry Lane on west flank of Norwich School playing fields, Cathedral Precinct ('mixed use')	N/A	Updated GIS Analysis No changes are proposed in respect of this site.	No
M003: Brownes Meadow Car Park and land to the rear of 20-24 The Close (proposed for 'mixed use' only)	N/A	Updated GIS Analysis No changes are proposed in respect of this site.	No
M004: Land to the rear of 9-14a The Close and car park west of Horsefair House (proposed for 'mixed use' only)	N/A	Updated GIS Analysis No changes are proposed in respect of this site.	No
M005: 10 Barnard Road (proposed for 'mixed use' only)	N/A	Updated GIS Analysis No changes are proposed in respect of this site.	No
M008: Norfolk Tower, Surrey Street (proposed	N/A	Updated GIS Analysis The updated GIS analysis recorded a change in respect of sub-question 14b (Is site more	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
for 'mixed use' only)		<p>than 250m from a Scheduled Monument?). The previous response to this question was 'N', however, the updated data indicates that the site is now outwith the 250m buffer zone. The key SA objectives which are underpinned by this sub-question are (Regulation 19 Scores are recorded in brackets): <i>ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment (++)</i> and <i>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy (+/-/?)</i>.</p> <p>The change to this sub-question is not likely to change the overall scores.</p>	
M009: Land West of Bluebell Road, Bartram Mowers ('mixed use')	N/A	<p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes are proposed in respect of this site.</p>	No
M048: 1-6b Craft Workshops, Bowthorpe ('mixed use')	N/A	<p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes are proposed in respect of this site.</p>	No
M052: Colegate Car Park ('housing')	N/A	<p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>The updated GIS analysis indicated a change in respect of sub-question 11b (Is site outside of a Critical Drainage Area?). Previously the analysis suggested that the site is outside of a Critical Drainage Area, however, updated data indicates that it now falls within the larger, redefined Critical Drainage Catchment. The key SA objective which is underpinned by this sub-question (the Regulation 19 score is provided in brackets) is <i>ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk (--/?)</i>. This is because the site lies within a flood risk area.</p> <p>The change to sub-question 11b is not considered to change the overall score.</p>	No
M056: 38 Surrey Street, Saints Court and Land to the North of Surrey Grove	N/A	<p>Updated GIS Analysis</p> <p>No changes are proposed in respect of this site.</p>	No

Proposed Main Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects? ⁵
('mixed use')			
NOR0005: Former Eaton Rise Service Station, Ipswich Road ('housing')	N/A	Updated GIS Analysis No changes are proposed in respect of this site.	No
R6: Former Lakenham Sports & Leisure Centre ('housing')	N/A	Updated GIS Analysis No changes are proposed in respect of this site.	No

7 SA of Minor (Additional) Modifications to Regulation 19 Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Plan

- 7.1 A number of Minor Modifications have also been put forward. The majority of these have no implications for the Regulation 19 SA; however, a number of these have been identified as having the potential to result in minor changes to the SA objective scores (these are discussed in Table 7.1 below). The proposed Minor (Additional Modifications) do not result in any changes to significant effects (i.e. no new potential significant positive or adverse effects are likely).
- 7.2 Table 7.1 below sets out the proposed Minor Modifications to the Plan (which could have implications for the SA) and provides a description of the likely change.

Table 7.1: SA of Minor (Additional) Modifications

Proposed Minor Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
Amendment to policy explanatory text to acknowledge that site is over 1ha in size and therefore a flood risk assessment is required	For clarification	<p>Explanatory text is provided in respect of the following sites:</p> <p>CC7: St Anne's Wharf and Adjoining Land</p> <p>CC17: Land Adjoining Norwich City Football Club, Kerrison Road</p> <p>R5: Part of School Playing Field, Hewett School</p> <p>R33: Heigham Water Treatment Works</p> <p>This is a statement of fact and is not considered to change any SA objective scores</p>	No
Amendment to policy explanatory text to recognise the proximity of the site to the River Wensum.	For clarification	<p>The following additional paragraph explanatory text is added: <i>"The site lies adjacent to the River Wensum. A written consent from the Environment Agency is required for proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9 metres of the top of the bank of a designated 'main river'. It is recommended that developers engage in early discussions with the Environment Agency."</i></p> <p>This text has been added to the following sites:</p> <p>CC7: St Anne's Wharf and Adjoining Land</p> <p>CC8: Land at Hobrough Lane, King Street</p> <p>CC9: King Street Stores</p> <p>CC13: Site at Wherry Road</p> <p>CC17: Land Adjoining Norwich City Football Club, Kerrison Road</p> <p>CC35: Westwick Street Car Park</p> <p>R10: Deal Ground</p> <p>R33: Heigham Water Treatment Works</p> <p>This is a statement of fact and is not considered to change any SA objective scores.</p>	No

Proposed Minor Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
Amendment to policy explanatory text to acknowledge that site is within Source Protection Zone 1, designated to protect water supplies	For clarification	<p>The following additional paragraph explanatory text is added: <i>"Development needs to ensure that the water environment is protected. The site falls within Source Protection Zone 1, designated to protect water supplies, and therefore the water environment is particularly vulnerable in this location. Detailed discussions over the issue will be required with the Environment Agency to ensure that proposals are appropriate for the site and that the site is developed in a manner which protects the water environment..."</i></p> <p>This text has been added to the following sites:</p> <p>CC5: Rose Lane/Mountergate</p> <p>CC7: St Anne's Wharf and Adjoining Land</p> <p>CC8: Land at Hobrough Lane, King Street</p> <p>CC9: King Street Stores</p> <p>CC10: 144-162 King Street</p> <p>CC11: Land at Garden Street</p> <p>CC13: Site at Wherry Road</p> <p>CC14: Land at Lower Clarence Road</p> <p>CC15: Busseys Garage Site, Thorpe Road and Lower Clarence Road</p> <p>CC16: Norwich Mail Centre, 13-17 Thorpe Road</p> <p>CC17: Land Adjoining Norwich City Football Club, Kerrison Road</p> <p>R10: Deal Ground</p> <p>R41: Three Score, Bowthorpe</p> <p>The key SA objective which is of relevance to this change is <i>ENV2: To improve the quality of the water environment.</i></p> <p>The proposed amendments to reflect the SPZ status of these sites is considered to result in minor positive, uncertain (+/?) effects on all of these sites (in respect of this objective) due to the need for measures to improve and protect water quality and engage effectively with the Environment Agency.</p>	No

Proposed Minor Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
		The Regulation 19 SA scores for this objective varied from minor adverse uncertain (-/?), negligible (0) to mixed, uncertain (+/-/?).	
Amend text to reflect the need for the development to take account of possible contamination issues	For clarification	<p>Additional text is proposed in relation to the following sites:</p> <p>CC8: Land at Hobrough Lane, King Street</p> <p>CC11: Land at Garden Street</p> <p>CC20: 14-154 Oak Street</p> <p>CC21: Furniture Store, 70-72 Oak Street</p> <p>CC22: Oak Street and Sussex Street Commercial Sites, 160-162 Oak Street</p> <p>R23: Land at Aylsham Road</p> <p>R24: 165-187 Aylsham Road</p> <p>R33: Heigham Water Treatment Works</p> <p>The key SA objective of relevance to this amendment is <i>ENV2: To improve the quality of the water environment</i>. This could lead to minor positive (+/?) effects by providing scope for contaminated land to be remediated.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 SA scores for this objective varied from minor adverse uncertain (-/?), negligible (0) to mixed, uncertain (+/-/?).</p>	No
Amendment to explanatory text of site R3: Hall Road District Centre	To reflect recent proposals for the site and the fact that the previous consent has expired.	<p>Delete the final paragraph of the explanatory text ("<i>There is a reasonable prospect that the site will be delivered during the plan period. Planning permission has been granted for a new district centre, including retail, commercial, community and residential uses, with 231 dwellings</i>") and replace the final sentence with <u>...Planning permission has been granted for a new district centre, including retail, commercial, leisure and community uses..</u></p> <p>This is a factual change with no implications for the SA.</p>	No
Various amendments to explanatory text of R10:	For clarification	<p>Amend third bullet point of explanatory for clarification:</p> <p>"..Need to manage the transport impact of the development on the strategic highway network, <u>and on the nearby village of Trowse</u>, and provide for..."</p>	No

Proposed Minor Modification	Explanation for Change	SA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
Deal Ground (only the key amendments have reproduced in this table)		<p>Make a minor change for clarification to bullet point 2 in explanatory text as follows: "<u>Any new bridge or bridges should allow adequate clearance for river craft and provide river moorings and de-masting points along the River Wensum.</u>"</p> <p>Neither of these changes is predicted to have an effect on any of the SA objectives.</p>	

8 Summary of Effects of Changes

SA of Changes Prior to Regulation 19 Consultation

8.1 The key changes which were made prior to the formal consultation into the Regulation 19 Plan related to removal of a number of sites from the Plan (R34: Land at Northumberland Street; R6: Former Lakenham Sports Centre; R45: Land West of Bluebell Road) and a reduction in the site area of site CC9: King Street Stores.

8.2 The sustainability implications of removing these sites from the Plan are explained in full in **Chapter 4** of this report. The following paragraphs provide a short summary of issues.

Removal of Site R34

8.3 Removal of this site as an allocation would reduce the potential for a significant positive (++) effect in respect of SA Objective *ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment* through potential to restore the frontage to Northumberland Street and significantly improve the townscape of this residential area through redevelopment.

Removal of Site R6

8.4 Removal of this site as an allocation would reduce the potential for a significant positive effect (++) in respect of SA Objective *SOC5: To build community identity, improve social welfare and reduce crime and antisocial behaviour* (redevelopment could provide the opportunity for environmental improvements to be made to the locality).

8.5 The site has since come forward as an application for housing, which was approved on appeal in October 2013. As the consent remains unimplemented the site has been retained as a reasonable alternative in this SA Addendum.

Removal of Site R45

8.6 This site was removed as an allocation prior to the formal Regulation 19 consultation in August 2012.

8.7 The site was subsequently discussed at an examination session in March 2014. The inspector now proposes that it be brought back into the Site Allocations Plan as an allocation on the basis that the proposed modification is made without prejudice to his final conclusions on his report and all representations will be taken into account. Consequently a main modification is proposed to the Site Allocations Plan to allocate R45 which will be consulted upon in the forthcoming main modifications consultation.

Reduction in the Site area of CC9: King Street Stores

8.8 Site CC9 was reduced in size prior to the formal Regulation 19 consultation (the existing sports hall and car park on the site were removed from the area with potential for development due to concerns regarding the loss of sports facilities and associated car parking). An appraisal was undertaken in respect of this smaller site and no material changes were recorded to SA scores. Specifically, the significant positive score (++) in respect of *SOC5: To build community identity, improve social welfare and reduce crime and antisocial behaviour* is still expected to arise (due to the potential for the site to contribute to the regeneration of the King Street Area and help build community identity).

SA of Changes in Response to SA Recommendations from the Regulation 19 SA Report

- 8.9 A number of recommendations were put forward in the Regulation 19 SA Report. NCC accepted a number of these and amended site policy wording and explanatory text. This did not result in any new significant effects arising through the SA, however, it did remove the uncertainty (?) attached to certain SA objectives e.g. *ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of the landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment* (Policy/explanatory text was amended to specify the need to respect the setting of heritage assets) and in respect of *SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live*, which resulted in scores changing from potential mixed effects (+/-/?) to minor positive effects (+/?). (Policy/explanatory text was amended to recognise the need for noise impacts to be addressed).

SA of Main Modifications to Regulation 19 Site Allocations Plan

- 8.10 A set of Main Modifications has been prepared by NCC which consolidates issues raised during consultation into the Regulation 19 Plan, issues raised during the examination into the Plan and responds to national policy changes and clarifications which have emerged since the Plan was submitted.
- 8.11 The modifications (and the implications of these) are discussed in full in **Chapter 6** of this report. The modifications can be grouped as follows:
- Removal of sites from the Plan
 - Amendments and Clarifications to the Policy Proposals Map
 - Changes to Key Site Policies
 - Minor Changes to Site Policies

Removal of Sites from the Plan

- 8.12 Seven sites have been removed from the Plan since the Regulation 19 consultation was undertaken. These are:
- CC2: 84-110 Ber Street (proposed for housing allocation, minimum 120 dwellings with office development accepted).
 - CC18: Former Hunters Squash Club (proposed for housing, minimum 20 dwellings).
 - CC25: Norfolk House, Exchange Street (proposed for mixed use development including a minimum of 20 dwellings).
 - CC28: Fire Station, Bethel Street (proposed for mixed use development, including a minimum of 15 dwellings).
 - CC33: Westlegate Tower (proposed for mixed use developing, including a minimum of 30 dwellings).
 - R14: Chalk Hill Works, Rosary Road (proposed for housing development, in the region of 25 dwellings).
 - R46: Land at Pointers Field (proposed for housing development, in the region of 10 dwellings).
- 8.13 Sites CC2, CC25 are no longer available for development. Sites CC18, R14 and R46 have consented schemes which are being built out; site CC28 is being converted into a free school and CC33 is currently undergoing redevelopment.
- 8.14 Collectively these sites would have resulted in the delivery of at least 240 dwellings and a range of mixed uses. NCC has indicated that deletion of these allocations will not affect the City Council's overall housing figure of 3,000 dwellings.

- 8.15 A number of significant positive effects would have arisen through allocation of these sites, specifically the redevelopment of sites CC2 and CC33 would have resulted in significant positive (++) effects on *ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment* as redevelopment provides the opportunity to significantly improve the townscape and setting of these locations. Removal of these sites as allocations in the Plan reduces the potential for these significant positive effects to arise.
- 8.16 Site R46 was predicted to have significant adverse (--) effects on *ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk* and on *ENV9: To make the best use of resources, including land and energy to minimise waste production* reflecting the sites location in a Critical Drainage Area and in an area of open space. A significant positive effect (++) was recorded in respect of *SOC5: To build community identity, improve social welfare and reduce crime and antisocial behaviour* recognising the potential for redevelopment to increase local surveillance and reduce the potential for crime and fear of crime.
- 8.17 Without allocation in the Plan, the likelihood of the proposed significant positive or negative effects arising is reduced. However, evidently some sites have been consented through the normal application process which means benefits could still be realised through a separate planning process.

Amendments and Clarifications to the Policy Proposals Map

- 8.18 A number of amendments were made to the policy proposals mapping for the Development Management Policies Plan. The most substantive changes of relevance to the SA are:
- Policy DM6 Natural Environmental Assets – change to Woodland notation at Rostwold Way.
 - Policy DM8: Open Space – correction of errors.
 - Policy DM9: Conservation Areas – new and amended boundaries at Bracondale, Heigham Grove and Bowthorpe.
 - Policy DM9: Scheduled Ancient Monuments – boundary corrections.
 - DM18/DM23: City Centre Leisure Area – reinstatement of omitted areas on Northern City Centre Area Action Plan area inset.
 - DM20: Primary Retail Frontage – presentational change at Castle Mall and Chapelfield for clarity.
 - DM28: Existing and Proposed Riverside Walks – updates and correction of errors.
 - DM18: District and Local Centres – boundary change to Sprowston Road Local Centre and change status to District Centre.
 - DM5: Critical Drainage Areas – Replacement with Critical Drainage Catchments.
 - DM8: Open Space – updating of areas at Hall Road (Hewett School) and Earlham Road (City Academy) to reflect the completion of new development in these locations.
- 8.19 As a result of these changes, updated GIS data was provided to LUC and the GIS analysis was re-run for all sites currently allocated in the Plan and the proposed reasonable alternatives. Generally these changes only resulted in a change to a single sub-question (one of a number underpinning each SA objective) and consequently there were no overall changes to SA scores (or the resultant change was minor in nature only i.e. a change to a + or -).
- 8.20 The most substantive change resulted from the updated dataset replacing Critical Drainage Areas with the larger Critical Drainage Catchments. The updated GIS analysis indicates that a number of sites now fall within the wider Critical Drainage Catchment and this has changed the scores predicted in respect of SA objective *ENV7: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk*.
- 8.21 NCC has sought to address this issue through the inclusion of a new policy modification relating to Critical Drainage Catchments (sites within these areas are expected to appropriately mitigate the risk of surface water flooding in accordance with Development Management Policy DM5). However, recognising that new development in these locations could potentially contribute to

the risk of surface water flooding it has been necessary to change the SA scores previously predicted to an adverse, uncertain effect (-/?).

- 8.22 Table 8.1 below lists the sites affected by this change, the score reported for SA Objective ENV7 in the Regulation 19 SA report and the new, revised score. In some instances the scores have not changed (for example if the site was already wholly or partially located in an area at risk of fluvial flooding). The proposed modification is considered to change the Regulation 19 score identified for site R22: Starling Road from a significant, adverse uncertain (--/?) effect to a minor, adverse, uncertain (-/?) effect.

Table 8.1: SA Implications of Redefined Critical Drainage Catchments

Site Name	SA Objective ENV 7 Regulation 19 Score	SA Objective ENV 7 Revised Score
CC35: Westwick Street Car Park	(-/?)	(-/?) No change
R13: 233-277 Aylsham Road	(0)	(-/?)
R19: Van Dal Shoes	(0)	(-/?)
R20: Start Rite Factory, Mousehold Lane	(0)	(-/?)
R21: Land at Sprowston Road	(0)	(-/?)
R22: Starling Road	(--/?)	(-/?)
R25: Former Pupil Referral Unit, Aylsham Road	(0)	(-/?)
R28: Site North of Raynham Street	(-/?)	(-/?) No change
R29: Land at Goldsmith Street	(-/?)	(-/?) No change
R30: 231-243 Heigham Street	(-/?)	(-/?) No change
CC24: Barn Road Car Park	(0)	(-/?)
CC26: Pottergate Car Park	(0)	(-/?)
R23: Aylsham Road District Centre and Adjacent Land	(0)	(-/?)
R24: 165-187 Aylsham Road	(0)	(-/?)
R31: Hurricane Way,	(+)	(-/?)

Site Name	SA Objective ENV 7 Regulation 19 Score	SA Objective ENV 7 Revised Score
Airport Industrial Estate		

Changes to Key Site Policies

- 8.23 A number of the Key Site Policies have main modifications associated with them. The modifications and the implications of these are summarised below:

Site R10: Deal Ground

- 8.24 The policy and explanatory text has been amended to enable the design and layout of the development to reflect the findings of noise and other assessments (in order to protect future residents) and to ensure that existing uses and operations will not be prejudiced as a result of the proposed development. The modification recognises that physical separation between new residents and existing developments may be necessary to mitigate impacts.
- 8.25 The proposed modifications would result in an improvement to two predicted scores for SA objectives *ENV3: To improve environmental amenity including air quality* and *SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live*. The Regulation Score for ENV3 (?) is predicted to change to **(0)**. The Regulation 19 Score for SOC7 (+/-/?) is predicted to change to **(+)**.
- 8.26 The changes to these scores reflect the need for additional assessments to be completed and mitigation put forward as necessary, including changes to the design and layout of development to achieve physical separation between residents and existing uses.

Site R32: The Paddocks, Holt Road

- 8.27 This site was previously allocated for airport uses only, subject to masterplanning. The proposed modification still provides for airport related uses, however, this must be evidenced through the masterplanning process and a master plan must be prepared within two years. If the evidence suggests the site is not required solely for airport related operational uses and/or a master plan is not completed within a two year period, the proposed modification enables 'general employment uses' to be accepted at the site.
- 8.28 As a consequence, there are two possible scenarios for development at the site: (i) use of the site for airport related operational uses and (ii) use of the site for general employment uses (B1 – business, B2 – general industrial and B8 – storage or distribution). The first scenario (airport operational uses) has already been tested through the Regulation 19 SA and the proposed modifications would not materially change this assessment. The second scenario (general employment uses) has not yet been tested and as such has been appraised separately. For the most part, the SA scores for use of the site for general employment uses are the same as the original assessment (evidently the site location remains the same). However, there are differences. These are set out in table 8.2 below.

Table 8.2: Site R32 Alternative Scenarios

SA Objective	Site Option / SA Score		Explanation
	Airport Operational Uses	General Employment Uses	
ENV1: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	(+)	(+)	Potential for general employment uses, particularly B8 to increase car and freight traffic on the road, however, policy DM28 should provide mitigation. The site is well located in respect of public transport nodes.
ENV3: To improve environmental	(?)	(?)	Support for general employment uses including B8 could result in increased traffic on the road

SA Objective	Site Option / SA Score		Explanation
amenity, including air quality			network and a worsening of local air quality. However, policy DM28 should provide mitigation. The site is well located in respect of public transport nodes.
ENV6: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change	(+)	(+)	Refer to justification provided in respect of SA objective ENV1 above.
SOC6: To offer more opportunities for rewarding and satisfying employment for all	(+)	(++/?)	Support for general employment uses provides scope for a range of employment use types to come forward which could contribute significantly positively to this objective. The uncertainty recognises that the exact nature of the employment which could come forward is unknown.

Site R45: Bartram Mowers

- 8.29 This site was removed as an allocation from the Regulation 19 Plan following a Cabinet meeting in July 2012. Subsequent to the examination into the Plan in March 2014 the Inspector proposed that the site be brought back in as an allocation.
- 8.30 A revised policy was agreed between NCC, the site promoters and the Inspector and this forms one of the Main Modifications to the Plan which is currently being consulted upon.
- 8.31 The Regulation 19 SA⁷ did not identify any significant positive effects (++) in relation to this site, however, a significant adverse, uncertain (--/?) effect was identified in respect of objective *ENV5: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment*. This recognised the location of the site on the southern slopes of the Yare Valley. The Yare Valley is identified under JCS policy 1 as a key green infrastructure corridor and plays an important role in defining the southern edge of the built up area of the city and provides a landscape buffer.
- 8.32 The proposed main modification seeks to re-allocate the site for housing for the over 55s including retirement housing and potentially assisted living and/or extra care housing. The site was previously put forward for this use.
- 8.33 The new policy wording places significant emphasis on the need for the site to minimise the impact on the landscape and important views. This includes delivery of 17.5 hectares of public open space on land adjoining the site, maintained and managed in perpetuity. Furthermore, proposals will accord with an agreed Master plan produced by the developer following a brief set by the Council, covering the development site and adjacent open space. The Master plan and Management Plan would be informed by a full landscape and visual impact assessment, a topographical and levels survey and an ecological survey.
- 8.34 Although development in this location would have adverse effects on this objective, it is recognised that the site policy seeks to deliver permanent, long term improvements through provision of a public open space to the west and requires site development to be supported by an agreed Master plan. As such a revised mixed, uncertain score **(+/-/?)** is considered appropriate.

⁷ As explained earlier in this report, Site R45 was removed from the Plan at a late stage following a cabinet decision in July 2012. However, the Regulation 19 SA Report (dated June 2012) still included site R45 as an allocation (and reported a significant adverse effect in respect of SA Objective ENV5). Following examination into the Plan in March 2014 the inspector proposed that the site be re-allocated and a new policy and site map has been included as a Main Modification (and is the subject of this SA Addendum). The proposed Main Modification for Site R45 has been assessed in this SA Addendum and the effects compared to the assessment of Site R45 in the Regulation 19 SA Report dated June 2012.

- 8.35 The Regulation 19 SA recorded a minor positive (+) effect in respect of SA objective *SOC7: To improve the quality of where people live*. The site is within 600m of open space/green space and a river valley/woodland/riverside walk and the policy requires delivery of 17.5 ha of public open space on land adjoining the site. Although the development has potential to improve the local area, further development in this area could impact on the landscape buffering provided in this location. As such a revised mixed, uncertain **(+/-/?)** score is considered appropriate.
- 8.36 No other scores have changed since the Regulation 19 SA and the updated GIS analysis did not predict any changes in respect of this site.

Changes to Other Site Policies

- 8.37 A number of other proposed main modifications have been put forward including a reduction in the number of dwellings, an overall reduction in site area, the need to build in viability considerations into site delivery proposals and clarifications to reflect changes since the Regulation 19 Plan was completed (for example, if part of a site has since been developed).
- 8.38 Generally, these changes have not materially changed the Regulation 19 SA assessment or only a minor change is predicted. The implication of each change is described in full in **Chapter 6**.
- 8.39 The proposed modification to site CC11: Garden Street provides potential for a temporary primary school to be introduced at the site (subject to a detailed study by Norfolk County Council). This has potential to contribute significantly positively to SA objective *SOC3: To improve education and skills* and as such a significant positive, uncertain score **(++/?)** is predicted. This is a change from the minor positive, uncertain **(+/?)** score predicted in the Regulation 19 SA Report.
- 8.40 The main modifications proposed in respect of site CC31: St Stephen's Street build in viability to the overall mixed use development proposals at this site. If the comprehensive mixed use development of the site proves unviable, the reuse and redevelopment of existing buildings will be acceptable. Some of the existing buildings are viewed negatively in respect of townscape and hence the previous significant positive score recorded in respect of ENV5: *To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment* has now changed to a significant, mixed, uncertain effect **(++/-/?)** – the potential for comprehensive redevelopment of the site (with anticipated improvements to townscape) is now less certain. The previous score for SA objective *SOC8: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and jobs* has also changed from significant positive **(++)** to significant positive uncertain effect **(++/?)** as there is now uncertainty in the delivery of positive benefits at the site.

SA of Minor Modifications to Regulation 19 Site Allocations Plan

- 8.41 A number of Minor Modifications have also been put forward. Most of these do not have any implications for the SA or will result in minor benefits. For example, clarification is provided in the explanatory text to a number of site policies to reflect their location within Source Protection Zone 1 and hence the need for development to take place in a manner which protects the water environment. This should result in minor positive effects **(+/?)** on SA objective *ENV2: To improve the quality of the water environment*.

9 Effects of Regulation 19 Plan including proposed Modifications and Reasonable Alternatives

- 9.1 The following tables (9.1-9.4) provide a summary of the appraisal scores for all sites allocated in the Plan and the reasonable alternative sites.
- 9.2 Where a score against a particular SA objective has changed since publication of the Regulation 19 SA Report, the revised score is highlighted by a black border around the relevant cell.

Table 9.1: Summary of SA Scores for the sites allocated for Housing in the Site Allocations Plan

Housing Sites	ENV1: Traffic	ENV2: Water quality	ENV3: Env Amenity	ENV4: Bio+Geo	ENV5: Landscape+ Townscape	ENV6: Climate Change	ENV7: Flood Risk	ENV9: Resource Use	SOC1: Poverty	SOC2: Health	SOC3: Education	SOC4: Housing	SOC5: Crime + Comm	SOC6: Employment	SOC7: Quality of where people live	SOC8: Access to services	EC1: Sustained Economic Growth	EC2: Inward investment	EC3: Efficient patterns of movement	EC4: Social+Env performance of economy
CC3	(+)	0	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
CC6	(+)	0	0	0	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	?	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	N/A	(+)	N/A
CC9	(+)	(+/?)	0	(-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
CC12	(+)	(-/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
CC13	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(++/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
CC14	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(++/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
CC15	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(++/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
CC20	(+)	(-/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(++)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
CC21	(+)	(-/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(++)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	?	(+)	?
CC22	(+)	(-/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(++)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
CC35	(++)	(-/?)	(+/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(++)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R2	(+)	(+/-/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	0	(++)	0	(+)	(+)	(+/-)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R4	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+/-)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R7	(+)	(+/?)	0	0	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A

Housing Sites	ENV1: Traffic	ENV2: Water quality	ENV3: Env Amenity	ENV4: Bio+Geo	ENV5: Landscape+ Townscape	ENV6: Climate Change	ENV7: Flood Risk	ENV9: Resource Use	SOC1: Poverty	SOC2: Health	SOC3: Education	SOC4: Housing	SOC5: Crime + Comm	SOC6: Employment	SOC7: Quality of where people live	SOC8: Access to services	EC1: Sustained Economic Growth	EC2: Inward investment	EC3: Efficient patterns of movement	EC4: Social+Env performance of economy
R8	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	0	(+)	0	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R9	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-)	(+)	(++/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R15	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R16	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R17	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(++/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/-)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R18	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	0	(+)	(++/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/-)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R19	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+)	(+/-)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/-)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R20	(+/?)	0	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	0	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R21	(+)	0	0	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	?	(+)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R22	(+)	(+/?)	0	0	(+)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/-)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R25	(+)	0	0	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/-)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R26	(+)	(+/-/?)	0	(+/-)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R27	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/-)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R28	(+)	(-/?)	0	(+/-)	(+)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(++)	(+/-)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R29	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+)	(++)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/-)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+/-)	N/A
R30	(+)	(+/-)	0	(+/-)	(+)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A

Housing Sites	ENV1: Traffic	ENV2: Water quality	ENV3: Env Amenity	ENV4: Bio+Geo	ENV5: Landscape+ Townscape	ENV6: Climate Change	ENV7: Flood Risk	ENV9: Resource Use	SOC1: Poverty	SOC2: Health	SOC3: Education	SOC4: Housing	SOC5: Crime + Comm	SOC6: Employment	SOC7: Quality of where people live	SOC8: Access to services	EC1: Sustained Economic Growth	EC2: Inward investment	EC3: Efficient patterns of movement	EC4: Social+Env performance of economy
R35	(+)	(+/?)	0	0	(++)	(+)	0	(+)	0	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R36	(+)	0	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	0	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R37	(+)	(+)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	0	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R38	(+)	(+/-/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(++)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R40	(+)	0	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	0	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R41	(++)	(+/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(++)	(-/?)	(++/--)	(+)	(+/-)	(+/?)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(--/+)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
R45	(+)	(-/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(-/?)	(-/?)	0	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A

Table 9.2: Summary of SA scores for the sites allocated for Mixed Use in the Site Allocations Plan

Mixed Use Sites	ENV1: Traffic	ENV2: Water quality	ENV3: Env Amenity	ENV4: Bio + Geo	ENV5: Landscape + Townscape	ENV6: Climate Change	ENV7: Flood Risk	ENV9: Resource Use	SOC1: Poverty	SOC2: Health	SOC3: Education	SOC4: Housing	SOC5: Crime + Comm	SOC6: Employment	SOC7: Quality of where people live	SOC8: Access to services	EC1: Sustained Economic Growth	EC2: Inward Investment	EC3: Efficient patterns of movement	EC4: Social + Env performance of economy
CC1	(+)	0	0	(+/-/?)	(++)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC4	(++/?)	0	(+/?)	(-/?)	(++)	(++/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC5	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(++/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC7	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)	(++)	(++/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC8	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)	(++)	(++/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC10	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC11	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(++)	(+/-/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC16	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC17	(++)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(++)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	?	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC19a	(+)	(+/-/?)	0	0	(++)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC19b	(+/?)	(-/?)	(+/?)	0	+/?	(+/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	?	0	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC23	(+)	(+/-/?)	0	0	(+)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC24	(++/?)	0	(+/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(++/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
CC26	(++)	0	(+/?)	0	(+)	(++)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	?	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)
CC27	(++/?)	0	(+/?)	0	(+)	(++/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)
CC29	(++/?)	0	(+/?)	(+/?)	(++)	(++/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+/?)	(++)	(+/?)
CC31	(++/?)	0	(+/?)	0	(++/-/?)	(++/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)
CC32	(+)	0	0	0	(++)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	0	(++)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)
CC34	(++/?)	0	(+/?)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(++/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
R3	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)

Mixed Use Sites	ENV1: Traffic	ENV2: Water quality	ENV3: Env Amenity	ENV4: Bio+ Geo	ENV5: Landscape + Townscape	ENV6: Climate Change	ENV7: Flood Risk	ENV9: Resource Use	SOC1: Poverty	SOC2: Health	SOC3: Education	SOC4: Housing	SOC5: Crime + Comm	SOC6: Employment	SOC7: Quality of where people live	SOC8: Access to services	EC1: Sustained Economic Growth	EC2: Inward investment	EC3: Efficient patterns of movement	EC4: Social + Env performance of economy
R5	(+)	0	0	0	(-/?)	(+)	0	(-/?)	(+)	(+/-)	0	0	(+)	(+)	(-/+)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+/-/?)
R10	(++/?)	(+/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(++)	(++/?)	(-/?)	(++)	(+)	(+/?)	?	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)
R11	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)	(++)	(++/?)	(-/?)	(++)	(+)	(+)	?	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)
R12	(+/?)	(+/?)	0	0	(+/?)	(+/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	?	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
R13	(+)	0	0	0	(+)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)
R23	(+)	(+/?)	0	0	(+)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)
R24	(+)	(+/?)	0	0	(+)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)
R31: Site B mixed use	(++)	0	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(++)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	0	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(++)	(+)	(+/?)	(++)	(+/-/?)
R33	(+)	(+/?)	(-/?)	(+/-/?)	(++)	(+)	(-/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
R39	(+)	(+/-/?)	(-/?)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	(-/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
R43	(+)	0	0	(+/-)	(+)	(++/?)	(+/?)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	(++)	0	(+)	(+)	(+/-)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)

Table 9.3: Summary of SA scores for the sites allocated for Employment in the Site Allocations Plan

Employment Sites	ENV1: Traffic	ENV2: Water quality	ENV3: Env Amenities	ENV4: Bio+ Geo	ENV5: Landscape+ Townscape	ENV6: Climate Change	ENV7: Flood Risk	ENV9: Resource Use	SOC1: Poverty	SOC2: Health	SOC3: Education	SOC4: Housing	SOC5: Crime + Comm	SOC6: Employment	SOC7: Quality of where people live	SOC8: Access to services	EC1: Sustained Economic Growth	EC2: Inward investment	EC3: Efficient patterns of movement	EC4: Social+Env performance of economy
CC30	(+)	0	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	?	N/A	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
R1	(+)	(+/-/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-)	(+)	(+)	0	N/A	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
R31: Site A (employment)	(++)	0	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(++)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	0	N/A	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(++)	(+)	(++/?)	(++)	(+/-/?)
R32 (Airport Uses Only)	(+)	0	?	(-/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(--)	(+)	(+)	0	N/A	(+)	(+)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+/-/?)
R32 (General Employment Accepted)	(+)	0	?	(-/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(--)	(+)	(+)	0	N/A	(+)	(++)	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+/-/?)
R42	(+)	(+/-/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(++/?)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+/-)	(++)	N/A	(+)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(+)	(+/-/?)
R44	(+)	(-/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(-/?)	(++/?)	(+)	(--/+/?)	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	0	(--/+)	(+)	(+/?)	?	0	?

Table 9.4: Summary of SA scores for the 'Reasonable Alternative' sites

Reasonable Alternative Sites	Site use	ENV1: Traffic	ENV2: Water quality	ENV3: Env Amenity	ENV4: Bio + Geo	ENV5: Landscape + Townscape	ENV6: Climate Change	ENV7: Flood Risk	ENV9: Resource Use	SOC1: Poverty	SOC2: Health	SOC3: Education	SOC4: Housing	SOC5: Crime + Comm	SOC6: Employment	SOC7: Quality of where people live	SOC8: Access to services	EC1: Sustained Economic Growth	EC2: Inward investment	EC3: Efficient patterns of movement	EC4: Social+Env performance of economy
H004	Housing	(+)	(-/?)	0	(-/?)	(-)	(+)	(--/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+/-)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
H008	Housing	(+)	0	0	0	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	0	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
H011	Housing	(+)	(-/?)	0	(-/?)	(-)	(+)	0	(--)	0	(+/-)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(--/+)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
NOR0005	Housing	(+)	0	0	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	0	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	N/A	(+)	N/A
M001	Mixed Use	(+)	0	0	0	(--)	(+)	(--/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(--/+)
M002	Mixed Use	(+)	0	0	(-/?)	(--)	(+)	(--/?)	(--)	(+)	(++/-)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(--/+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(--/+)
M003	Mixed Use	(+)	(-/?)	(-/?)	(-/?)	(-/?)	(+)	(--/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(--/+)
M004	Mixed Use	(+/?)	0	0	(-/?)	?	(+/?)	(--/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	?	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)

Reasonable Alternative Sites	Site use	ENV1: Traffic	ENV2: Water quality	ENV3: Env Amenity	ENV4: Bio + Geo	ENV5: Landscape + Townscape	ENV6: Climate Change	ENV7: Flood Risk	ENV9: Resource Use	SOC1: Poverty	SOC2: Health	SOC3: Education	SOC4: Housing	SOC5: Crime + Comm	SOC6: Employment	SOC7: Quality of where people live	SOC8: Access to services	EC1: Sustained Economic Growth	EC2: Inward investment	EC3: Efficient patterns of movement	EC4: Social+Env performance of economy
M005	Mixed Use	(+)	0	0	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
M008	Mixed Use	(+)	0	0	(-/?)	(++)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
M009	Mixed Use	(+)	(-/?)	0	(-/?)	(--/?)	(+)	(--/?)	(-/?)	0	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+/-/?)	0	(+)	(--/+)
M048	Mixed Use	(+)	(-/?)	0	(-/?)	?	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	0	(+/-)	(+)	(+/-/?)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
M052	Housing	(+)	0	0	0	(+)	(+)	(--/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	N/A	(+)	N/A
M056	Mixed Use	(+)	0	0	(-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/-)	(++)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/-/?)
R6	Housing	(+)	0	0	(+/-/?)	(+)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	?	(+)	?
E002	Mixed Use	(+)	0	0	0	(+/?)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	0	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)
E002	Employment	(+)	0	0	0	(+/?)	(+)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)	?	N/A	0	(+)	?	(+)	(+)	(+/?)	(+)	(+/?)

10 Cumulative Effects

- 10.1 In respect of cumulative effects, the key change is to SA objective *ENV7: to avoid, reduce and manage flood risk* – redefinition of the larger Critical Drainage Catchment (as oppose to Critical Drainage Areas). This has increased the number of sites which are within the wider Critical Drainage Catchment area, where new development could potentially contribute to the risk of flooding. The list of proposed Main Modifications includes a specific policy reference to recognise this risk (all sites within a Critical Drainage Catchment must undertake a flood risk/surface management assessment which should demonstrate that the site would not increase the vulnerability of the site or wider catchment to flooding from surface water run-off and should, wherever practicable have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area), which has resulted in a predicted minor adverse, uncertain (-/?) for each site affected, recognising that there remains an element of risk during extreme weather events. Taken together, it is possible that the mitigation could fail on a number of such sites at the same time, for example during a period of intense rainfall in the Norwich area, with potential for cumulative significant adverse, uncertain (--/?) effects on this SA objective.
- 10.2 The potential for cumulative significant positive (++) effects in respect of a number of the SA objectives (e.g. *ENV1*, *ENV5* and *ENV6* as well as a number of the social objectives), as identified in the Regulation 19 SA Report, are still predicted to arise.

11 Conclusions

- 11.1 Generally, the proposed Modifications have (and other changes e.g. response to SA recommendations in the Regulation 19 Report) resulted in no or limited changes to the SA objective scores or the proposed changes are not significant (i.e. a score has changed from a minor adverse to a minor positive as a result).
- 11.2 Seven sites (CC2; CC18; CC25; CC28; CC33; R14 and R46) have been removed from the Plan since the Regulation 19 Plan was prepared. The removal of these sites as proposed allocations reduces the likelihood of a number of potential significant positive and negative effects (identified in the Regulation 19 SA report dated June 2012) arising.
- 11.3 For the most part, the Main Modifications do not result in any changes to any significant effects identified in the Regulation 19 SA. Exceptions include site CC31: St Stephens Street – the proposed main modification builds in viability considerations into development of this site. This is predicted to change the significant positive (++) scores identified for SA objectives ENV5 and SOC8 to (++)/(-/?) and (++)/(-/?) respectively recognising that benefits arising from significant improvements to townscape and the wider environment are partially dependent on scheme viability.
- 11.4 An element of uncertainty has now arisen in the appraisal of a number of other sites due to the need to build in viability into some of the development proposals.
- 11.5 Site R45: Bartram Mowers is included as a new allocation through the proposed Main Modifications and has been appraised in this SA Addendum. No significant positive or negative effects are identified in respect of this new allocation.
- 11.6 A proposed Main Modification in respect of the redefined Critical Drainage Catchments has resulted in a number of additional sites falling within the wider catchment area with potential for new development to contribute to flood risk, though the policy requires mitigation through the inclusion of sustainable drainage in any such development. A revised minor adverse, uncertain (-/?) has been identified in respect of these sites.
- 11.7 A new significant positive uncertain (++)/(-/?) effect is predicted in relation to SA objective SOC6 for site R32: The Paddocks, Holt Road. The Main Modification for this site makes provision for general employment to come forward at the site (if supported through an evidence based masterplanning process) providing the opportunity for a diversity of new employment opportunities.
- 11.8 Finally, a new significant positive uncertain (++)/(-/?) effect is predicted in relation to SA objective SOC3 for site CC11: Garden Street where the proposed Main Modification makes provision for a temporary primary school at the site (subject to evidence) which should increase the supply of available school places.