

Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk



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

May 2024

### Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Background context and relationship to previous SA work	4
3.	Sustainability Appraisal Method	5
4.	The Council's Strategy for Assessing Potential Locations for Current and Futu Gypsy and Traveller Provision	
5.	Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Policies	8
6.	Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Allocated Site Assessments	9
	Proposed Sites for Intensification and/or Extension	10
	Formalisation of existing pitches:	18
	Travelling Showpeople proposed sites:	19
7.	Cumulative Impacts	21
8.	Conclusion	21
9.	Next Steps	22
10	. Appendices	23
	Appendix A: Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives	23
	Appendix B: Site Sustainability Factors	26
	Appendix C: Relationship between Site Sustainability Factors and Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives	
	Appendix D: Scoring Criteria	29

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Addendum was published in January 2024 to support the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan examination (submitted March 2022), focusing on the assessment of potential Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (GTTS) sites and related local plan policies. It should be read alongside the King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), June 2023 (prepared by ORS on behalf of the Borough Council). The SA Scoping Report (2017), Scoping Report update (2020), SA Addendum and non-technical summary (2022) and the SA Incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) 2020<sup>1</sup> provide supporting context relating to the overall SA process. The SA 2020 with subsequent July 2022 updates sets out the background and process undertaken to produce the Sustainability Appraisal including SEA and the methodology.
- 1.2 The primary objective of the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum is to provide an objective and robust assessment of potential sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and evaluate their suitability across sustainability objectives, following production of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) (June 2023)<sup>2</sup>. As this had initially been proposed as a joint piece of work outside the current Local Plan Review at the time of producing the main SA report, the GTTS requirement was not included within the assessment. The SA report submitted alongside the Local Plan was supported by the 2016 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment<sup>3</sup>, However, further to the Planning Inspector's request for more up to date evidence on GTTS need in the Borough, the GTAA was commissioned in January 2023.
- 1.3 Within this document, proposed locations for GTTS sites have been considered against the criteria outlined in Appendix B (also detailed in the non-technical summary document<sup>4</sup>), which follow the methodology set for site allocations in the SA report (2020). The site sustainability factors consider access to services, community and social, economy (business and food production), flood risk, heritage, highways and transport, landscape and amenity, natural environment, infrastructure, pollution and waste and climate change. These are consistent with the site-specific criteria used for the main SA report.

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> <u>https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20079/planning\_policy\_and\_local\_plan/629/sustainability\_appraisal</u> <sup>2</sup> <u>https://www.west-</u>

norfolk.gov.uk/info/20185/planning\_policy\_research/523/gypsy\_and\_traveller\_accommodation\_assessment <sup>3</sup> <u>https://www.west-</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20079/planning\_policy\_and\_local\_plan/629/sustainability\_appraisal

- 1.4 In addition, the deliverability of these potential sites has also been considered in relation to whether these sites will be developed in the first-five years of the Plan or beyond. This is closely linked to where the accommodation need is coming from and the likely reality of whether undeveloped alternative locations will actually be delivered.
- 1.5 The outcome of this report will inform the Council on the selection of the most sustainable and deliverable site allocations and contribute to meeting the 15-year requirement as set out in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). In addition, to help manage any speculative development that may occur throughout the Plan period, the Council has proposed a criteria-based policy which, in line with national planning policy, will enable any future development for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation to be delivered in an appropriate and sustainable manner.
- 1.6 The Council is consulting has consulted on the full list of sites and locations, identified as potentially suitable and deliverable for accommodating the required GTTS need (26 January 8 March 2024). The consultation sought views on the proposed strategy for accommodating GTTS needs in the Borough, individual site proposals and supporting policies. The sites have further been filtered following the consultation and review of the most sustainable options. This report provides an updated sustainability appraisal of the proposed sites, including cumulative impact, that will be allocated in the Local Plan to meet GTTS needs, alongside supporting policies.

### 2. Background context and relationship to previous SA work

- 2.1 As noted above, the Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Council (BCKLWN) is in the process of preparing the Local Plan review and have updated the supporting evidence on GTTS housing needs as part of the Plan's ongoing examination. The GTAA identifies the number of pitches/plots required from 2023-2039, based on need identified through surveys undertaken during January May 2023.
- 2.2 Since the publication of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), an appeal decision for an existing site at Baldwin's Drove, Outwell and an appeal decision for land at Moyse's Bank, School Road, Marshland St. James has resulted in the number of pitches required over the plan period from 102 to 95 and within the first 5-years being reduced from and 76 to 69. There is also need for 5 plots for households that met the planning definition for Travelling Showpeople over the Plan period to 2039. To meet the need to allocate additional land, a call for sites was carried out in October 2023. The criteria for suitable sites, was set at a size between 0.2 and 3 hectares and situated in areas of lowest flood risk (flood zone 1). These sites are

considered reasonable alternatives and were assessed as part of the wider Site Assessments for all existing Gypsy and Traveller Sites.

2.3 Existing unauthorised sites have also been considered as part of this process, to ascertain if they could be formalised through an allocation in the Local Plan. The GTAA notes the potential for intensification or extension of existing sites, which could also provide a more sustainable approach to meeting GTTS needs, especially because the majority of the accommodation need is arising from existing sites. This various stages of SA have assisted the Council in the decision making process to determine which sites are the most appropriate within the available land in Kings Lynn and West Norfolk that will meet the needs of GTTS.

### 3. Sustainability Appraisal Method

- 3.1 The purpose of this addendum report is to provide an appraisal of the GTTS site allocations and related policies in line with the SEA regulations. Regulation 12 of the SEA Regulations<sup>5</sup> states that the report "shall identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects of the environment of (a) implementing the plan or programme; and (b) reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme". The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives economic, social and environmental).
- 3.2 SA is a legal requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and this report meets the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations) which is set out in more detail in the overarching SA 2020. The methodology follows the Site Sustainability Appraisal as used in the SA incorporating SEA for the Local Plan Review 2020<sup>6</sup>. The 11 Site Sustainability Factors are considered to be more directly related to issues affecting the choices between one site and another, yet still relate to the updated 20 Local Plan Sustainability Objectives. The relationship between the two are set out Appendix C.
- 3.3 The scoring criteria is set out in Appendix D relating the significance to each of the site sustainability factors. It is important to appreciate that the scoring of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> <u>https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2004/1633/regulation/12/made</u> 6

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

options against these factors is intended to give only a broad indication of its performance: more detailed and qualitative judgements are a necessary part of the final site selection and/or decision-making process. Neither can the scoring against different factors be directly compared to one another. A certain score against flood vulnerability, for instance, cannot be said to be equivalent to the same score against, say, economic impact. Rather, the scoring helps identify advantages and disadvantages, and hence where different considerations are in alignment and where trade-offs must be (or have been) made.

3.4 The key for assessing the importance of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople is shown below in Figure 1.

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

#### Figure 1: Significance Key

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

- 4.1 The majority of overall GTTS need (69 out of 95 pitches; 73%) is required within the next five years; i.e. by 2028. The Council anticipate that the first five-year requirement could be met by intensification and authorisation of existing sites where needs are arising (subject to any identified planning constraints being suitably mitigated). This also works in the interests of making the most efficient use of existing sites and ensuring that need is genuinely met in the locations it is required, which the Council believe to be the most sustainable and deliverable approach to development.
- 4.2 Any residual requirements are proposed to be met through authorising pitches and/or identifying broad locations for growth in the Plan. Beyond the first five years, it is likely that the remaining need (26 pitches) will be delivered via the proposed criteria-based policy, along with other relevant policies within the Local Plan.
- 4.3 Following a consultation exercise in January 2024, the Council have continued to collect all available information to understand whether the identified needs can be met through the intensification and authorisation of existing sites. The Council has undertaken a site assessment for all existing Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites/ yards across the Borough<sup>7</sup>. This looked at all known planning constraints such as highways access, flood risk and access to local services. It then identified whether sites are available, suitable and deliverable for further development. As part of the consultation exercise sites that would normally be discounted on suitability grounds were considered due to the nature of these sites and because the needs are arising from existing individual sites/specific locations. The Council believes that where existing sites have an opportunity to meet these direct accommodation needs, then further investigation must be undertaken to identify whether constraints can be overcome through measures such as flood mitigation.
- 4.4 In the case that there is little likelihood that constraints can be suitably mitigated, then these sites have no longer been considered. The Council have assessed all existing Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople's sites and have shortlisted and discounted 55 sites from future development at this time. The reasons why sites have been discounted have been set

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20079/planning policy and local plan/951/local plan review 2016-2036 examination

out in the Site Assessment Document (May 2024), but it is largely due to the availability, suitability or deliverability of these sites, that do not present the possibility of mitigating constraints.

4.5 In terms of the general locations for Gypsy and Travellers, the majority of existing sites are mostly situated in countryside/ rural locations and away from services and facilities. Where sites are made available within or close to existing settlements, and a specific needs has arisen, then these have been taken forward. However, due to the limited number of such sites, a large majority of potential locations for accommodating the current and future needs are on more isolated existing sites. Although the sustainability assessment is considering each site within the existing methodology, the nature of gypsy and traveller sites tend to be located further from existing services and public transport; however, this is often compensated by the benefits to the existing GTTS community and meeting the housing needs for this group.

#### 5. Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Policies

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

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

5.2 GTTS Policy A, sets out the proposed allocations but also includes a criteria-based policy on requirements for acceptable development. This sets out requirements on allocated sites as well as any speculative applications and will also seek to address the identified GTTS need beyond 2028, when the GTAA is then expected to be reviewed and updated. The

reasonable alternatives considered are a criteria-based policy that doesn't allocate sites or no policy. As scored above, Policy A has an overall positive effect of +10 and the other reasonable alternatives have negative overall impact.

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

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

#### 6. Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Allocated Site Assessments

6.1 The Council has taken a pragmatic approach to the process of assessing land for GTTS accommodation. The following section presents each of the sites put forward as allocations in the Local Plan. This document does not consider sites that have been previously discounted in earlier stages of the process (following additional consultation). Although noted in the comments that mitigation is possible, at this stage the details of proposed mitigation hasn't been provided in most cases so the score is based on the baseline assessment. The proposed number of pitches is indicative at this stage and dependent on any potential constraints or mitigation required on the site as part of the detailed application process.

### Proposed Sites for Intensification and/or Extension

					SITE	GT05							
		Locat	ion					Proposed	No Pitches				
	19-121 M	agdalen Road, <sup>-</sup>	Filney Street, La	wrence					1				
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change		
Score	+/x         +         O         O         XX         O         O         #         o/#         ?/#												
Summary	terms of acces however, acce address the ex future need; h approval will r Development site is not with	ss to services. T eptable visibility xisting flooding owever in terms not be granted v of this site is lik in a conservatio	here is existing should be dem constraints on t s of this sustaina vithout sufficient ely to have posi on area or near	vehicle access onstrated. The he site. If these ability assessme t mitigation and tive impact on o heritage assets	onto the highw site lies within fl issues can be a ent, the impacts impacts should community (as t therefore there	ay and the prop ood risk zone 2 dequately addr are scored as I therefore be m here is existing is a neutral effe	posed developm therefore pose ressed by mitiga highly negative. hinimal on that b Gypsy and Trav	nent of one pitcles significant ne ation then the si This also has ir pasis, depender veller residents environment w	h does not have gative impact. If te could be use filuence on the at on implement ), economy and ill depend on ho	gative score has e significant impace Further work is need to accommoda climate scoring; I ation of suitable r landscape and a pow the site is imp cter.	ct overall; eeded to te the direct however, mitigation. menity. The		

					SITE	GT09					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Th	e Stables, Mars	hland, St James	3					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	+/x	+	0	0	XX	0	0	O/#	#	O/#	?/#
Summary	score has bee significant imp impact. Furthe not be granted is likely to hav near heritage	n given in terms bact overall; how er work is neede d without sufficie e positive comm assets therefore	s of access to so vever, acceptabled to assess suite ent mitigation and nunity impact to there is a neut	ervices. There is le visibility shou table mitigation nd impacts shou meet housing ral effect. The in	s existing vehic Ild be demonstr to address exis Ild be minimal on need (and there mpact on natura	le access onto t rated. The site li ting flood const on that basis, de e is existing Gyp al environment	the highway and ies within flood traints. This also ependent on imposy and Travelle	d the proposed risk zone 2 and b has influence of plementation of r residents). Th will depend on	development of 3, therefore por on the climate s suitable mitigat e site is not with now the site is in	ne route so a pos one pitch should ses significant ne coring; however, ion. Developmen nin a conservatio mplemented; for	d not have gative approval will it of this site n area or

					SITE	GT11					
		Locat	tion				Proposed	No Pitches			
H	Homefields (We	stern Side, Goo	se Lane), Walpe	ole, St Andrew					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	+/x	+	0	О	XX	0	0	O/#	#	O/#	?/#
Summary	score has bee significant imp impact. Furthe not be granted is likely to hav near heritage	en given in terme bact overall; hov er work is neede d without sufficie e positive comr assets therefore	s of access to s vever, acceptab ed to assess sui ent mitigation a nunity impact to e there is a neur	ervices. There is le visibility shou table mitigation nd impacts shou meet housing tral effect. The in	s existing vehic Ild be demonstr to address exis Ild be minimal on need (and there mpact on nature	le access onto rated. The site I ting flood cons on that basis, de e is existing Gyp al environment	the highway and ies within flood i traints. This also ependent on imp osy and Travelle	the proposed risk zone 2 and has influence olementation of r residents). Th will depend on	development of 3, therefore po on the climate s suitable mitigat e site is not with now the site is in	he route so a pos one pitch should ses significant ne coring; however tion. Developmer hin a conservation mplemented; for	d not have egative approval will at of this site n area or

					SITE	GT14					
		Loca	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	West Walte	on Court, Blunts	Drove, Walton	Highway					10		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	XX	0	0	0	ХХ	0	XX	0	0	O/#	?/#
Summary	access to serv lack of off-roa provide suitab within Flood z however, the should be min and landscape	vices. There is a d facilities, such le access for ac one 2 and 3, the constraints are simal on that base and amenity. w the site is imp	an existing access as footpaths, c dditional users. erefore poses si unlikely to preve sis, dependent of The site is not w	ss through the e ycle lanes and   The remote nati gnificant negati ent developmen on implementati ithin a conserva	existing site, how public transport ure of the site d ve impact. Furth t. Approval will on of suitable m ation area or ne	wever the highw to access local oes would not p her work is need not be granted nitigation. Devel ar heritage asse	vay is constrained services. Acceptoresent realistic ded to assess survithout sufficient opment of this sets therefore the	ed by its size ar ptability visibilit opportunity for uitable mitigation nt mitigation an site is likely to h ere is a neutral	nd the scoring is y would also ne modal shift away on to address ex d overall impact ave neutral imp effect. The natu	as been given in as also negative be ed to be demons ay from car use. I kisting flood cons ts relating to clim pact on communi- ral environment i g, which is sympa	ecause of the strated to The site lies traints; sate change ty, economy mpact will

					SITE	GT17					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Land	at the Lodge, S	Small Lode, Upv	vell					9		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	Х	+	О	0	0	Ο	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	terms of accer nearby. Althou site. Developm economy, floo natural enviro	ss to services. T ugh there is exis nent of this site d risk (level 1),	The impact is not sting vehicle acc is likely to have and landscape ate change imp	t considered to cess onto the hig positive impact and amenity. Th act will depend	be major becau ghway, suitable on community he site is not wit	use there is an mitigation will (as there is an hin a conserva	existing Gypsy a be required for i existing Gypsy a tion area or near	and Traveller sit mprovement to and Traveller sit heritage asset	e and potential visibility due to te and contribut s therefore ther	e score has been agricultural emp the increased c ing towards hous e is a neutral effo ddress landscapi	loyment apacity of the sing need), ect. The

					SITE	GT18					
		Locat	ion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Land at	2 Primrose Farr	n, Small Lode, I	Jpwell					13		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+	Ο	?	xx	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	terms of acces nearby. There frontage of the in terms of this granted withou positive impace amenity has b conservation a	ss to services. T is existing vehi e site lies in floo s sustainability a ut sufficient miti of on community een scored as h area or near her	the impact is not cle access onto d zone 1 with the assessment, the gation and impa- (as there is an having neutral in itage assets the	t considered to the highway, w he remainder zo impacts are so acts should be r existing Gypsy npact. The site perfore there is	be major becau hich would nee one 2 and 3; the ored as highly r ninimal, depend and Traveller s is agricultural g a neutral effect.	use there is an ed d to demonstra refore, posing s negative. This a lent on implement ite and contribu- rade 1 and ther The natural en	existing Gypsy a te acceptable v significant negat lso has influenc entation of suita tting towards ho efore could hav	and Traveller si isibility for the p ive impact over e on the climate ble flood mitiga pusing need). The impact on ec ct will depend o	te and potential proposed increa all. Suitable mit e scoring; howe ttion. Developm ne business ecc onomy B factor on how the site	e score has beer agricultural emp se in capacity of igation is proposiver, approval will ent of this site is nomy and landso . The site is not w is implemented; t	loyment the site. The ed; however, not be likely to have cape and rithin a

					SITE	GT20					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
		Land at Bo	tany Bay						1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	+	+	О	О	х	Ο	0	Ο	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	access, which Zone 1; the Ff negative pend to the water si change impact	will need to de RA has identified ling further inve upply network.	monstrate appr d a potential iss stigation. Devel The site is not v n how the site is	opriate visibility ue with surface opment of this s vithin a conserva	however, one water drainage site is likely to h ation area or ne	additional pitch due to impacts ave neutral imp ar heritage ass	will not create s from adjacent s pact on landscap ets therefore the	significant impa surface water fl be and amenity ere is a neutral	ct on traffic. Alt owpath and has and infrastructu effect. The natu	es. There is existi hough the site is therefore been ire and water as ral environment ind tree planting t	within Flood scored as it has access and climate

					SITE	GT21					
		Locat	ion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Lan	d at Four Acres	, March Riversi	de					5		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	#	0	0	xx	0	0	#	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	transport acce accommodation of existing occur risk (zones 2 a has its own se	ess is also appro on; however, the cupiers on the s and 3); however eptic tank or pac porting policy s	e site assessme ite or those nea t, it is likely that kage treatment	m away, providin ant has identified irby needs to be measures can h plant. The natu	ng bus services d potential confl e considered. Th be taken to mition al environmen	to Downham M icts with neighb nere is existing gate this risk wit t and climate ch	larket, Three Ho pouring uses and vehicle access of th further assess nange impact wi	bles and Wisbed d therefore suit onto the highwa sment. The site ill depend on ho	ch. The site has able mitigation r ay. The site is pa has access to a bow the site is im	cycling provision. existing Gypsy a regarding the privartially constrained water supply ne plemented; for e pation will have in	nd Traveller vate amenity ed by flood stwork and xample, the

					SITE	GT28					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Many Acr	es, (Smithy's Fie	eld), Small Lode	, Upwell					2		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	HeritageHighways & TransportLandscapeNaturalInfrastructureClim ChaHeritageTransport& AmenityEnvironment& WasteCha					
Score	х	+	0	0	0	0	0	О	#	/#	?/#
Summary	terms of accer nearby. There an existing Gy therefore there	ss to services. T is existing vehi vpsy and Travell e is a neutral ef	The impact is no cle access onto er site), econor fect. The natura	t considered to the highway. D ny, flood risk (le I environment a	be major becau evelopment of t vel 1), and land ind climate char	use there is an this site is likely scape and ame nge impact will	existing Gypsy a to have positive enity. The site is	and Traveller sit e impact on cor not within a cou the site is imple	e and potential nmunity to meenservation area	e score has beer agricultural emp t housing need (a or near heritage ample, the propo	loyment and there is assets

					SITE	GT29					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	No 2 The Sta	bles, Lynn Road	d, Wiggenhall, S	t Germans							
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	0	+	0	0	xx	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	distance; how Traveller occu scored highly highly negativ dependent on not within a co	ever, there is lir ipation, which w negative. Suital e. This also has implementation onservation area	nited or walking vill contribute to ble mitigation is influence on th n of suitable floc a or near heritag	/cycling provision a positive impart proposed with e climate scoring and mitigation. De ge assets theref	on currently ava ct in terms of d further investiga ig; however, ap evelopment of t ore there is a n	ailable. There is elivering housin ation needed; he proval will not b his site is likely eutral effect. Th	existing vehicle g need. The site owever, in term be granted without to have neutral e natural enviro	e access onto the e lies within floor s of this sustair put sufficient mi impact on ecor onment and clin	ne highway. The od zone 2 and/o hability assessmo- tigation and imp homy and landso hate impacts wil	Wiggenhall are ware is also existing r 3 and therefore ent, the impacts bacts should be n cape and amenity I depend on how the existing chara	g Gypsy and has been are scored as hinimal, /. The site is the site is

					SITE	GT34					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
I	and at Creaks	ville, The Comm	on, South Crea	ke, Fakenham					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	XX	#	Ο	0	#	0	o/#	#	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	services. There suitable mitigat suitable mitigat consideration landscape and change impact	re is an existing ation. There is a ation regarding t needs to be giv d amenity. The s	access, which r n existing Gyps the private ame en to surface w site is not within n how the site is	nay require miti y and Traveller nity of existing o ater, including a a conservation	gation; howeve site; however, t occupiers on the adjacent surface area or near he	r, the developn he site assessn e site or those i e water flowpat eritage assets tl	nent of one addi nent has identifie nearby needs to hs to the north a nerefore there is	tional pitch sho ed potential cor be considered and west. There a neutral effect	uld not have sign flicts with neigh . Although the s a is likely to be r at. The natural e	given in terms of gnificant impact s abouring uses and ite lies in flood zo neutral impact on nvironment and o nd tree planting to	ubject to d therefore one 1, economy, climate

					SITE	GT54					
		Locat	ion					Proposed	I No Pitches		
	l	Land at the Pine	es, Whittington						1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage					Climate Change
Score	xx	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	away; therefor impact in term site is not with	re, scored highl ns of delivering nin a conservatio	y negative. The housing need. I on area or near	re is existing hig Development of heritage assets	hways access. this site is likely therefore there	There is also e to have neutra is a neutral eff	xisting Gypsy ar al impact on eco	nd Traveller occ nomy, flood rist environment w	cupation, which k (zone 1) and la ill depend on ho	ch are approxima will contribute to andscape and am ow the site is impl cter.	a positive enity. The

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

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

					SITE	GT59						
		Locat	ion					Proposed	No Pitches			
	Lai	nd at Spriggs H	ollow, Walsoker	ı					5			
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change	
Score	xx	+	О	Ο	0	Ο	о	О	#	o/#	?/#	
Summary	been given in contribute to a likely to have effect. The na	XX+OOOOOOO#o/#?/#The site is located more than 1200m from the nearest services, with no public transport or walking/cycling provision available, therefore a highly negative score has been given in terms of access to services. There is existing vehicle access on to the highway. There is also existing Gypsy and Traveller occupation, which will contribute to a positive impact in terms of delivering housing need. The site lies within flood risk zone 1 and therefore has scored neutral. Development of this site is ikely to have neutral impact on economy and landscape and amenity. The site is not within a conservation area or near heritage assets therefore there is a neutral effect. The natural environment and climate impacts will depend on how the site is implemented; for example, the proposed supporting policy seeks to address poundary treatment and screening, which is sympathetic to the existing character.										

					SITE	GT65					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Tall	Trees (A1122)	Downham Mark	et					4		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	+	+	0	0	xx	0	О	0	#	O/#	?/#
Summary	station by foot terms of delive of sustainabilit suitable mitiga heritage asset	t. There is existi ering housing n ty assessment, t ation. Developm	ng vehicle acce eed. The site lie he impacts are ent of this site is e is a neutral ef	ss on to the hig s within flood zo scored as high s likely to have fect. The natura	hway. There is a one 2 and 3, the ly negative. This neutral impact o al environment v	also existing Gy erefore poses si s also has influe on economy and will depend on h	psy and Travell ignificant negation once on the clim d landscape and now the site is ir	er occupation, ve impact. Suita ate scoring, wh d amenity. The	which will contr able mitigation is ich is depender site is not within	arby Downham M ibute to a positive s proposed, how at on implementa a conservation a proposed suppor	e impact in ever, in terms ition of area or near

					SITE	GT66					
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	La	nd at Brandon	Road, Methwold						1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	xx	+	0	Ο	0	0	0	0	#	O/#	?/#
Summary	been given in additional pitc delivering hou Development therefore ther policy seeks to	terms of access h is likely to hav using need. The of this site is lik e is a neutral ef	s to services. The ve limited significial site lies within for ely to have neut fect. The natura dary treatment	e site is remote cance. There is lood risk zone 1 ral impact on e l environment a and screening, v	and located or also existing G I and therefore conomy and lar and climate impo which is sympa	a fast B road; ypsy and Trave has scored neu idscape and an acts will depend	however, there eller occupation, utral, with furthen nenity. The site d on how the site	is an existing a which will cont assessment to s not within a c e is implemente	ccess and proper ribute to a position be carried out conservation are ed; for example,	a highly negative based development ive impact in terr on surface water a or near heritag the proposed sur- rea of dense vega	nt of an ms of - e assets pporting

### Formalisation of existing pitches:

					SITE	GT59					
		Locat	ion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	La	nd at Spriggs H	ollow, Walsoker	ı					1		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	xx	+	Ο	Ο	О	Ο	О	Ο	#	o/#	?/#
Summary	been given in contribute to a landscape and impacts will de	terms of access a positive impac d amenity. The s	s to services. Th t in terms of de site is not within he site is impler	ere is existing v livering housing a conservation	vehicle access of need. Develop area or near he	on to the highwa ment of this site eritage assets th	ay. There is also e is likely to have nerefore there is	existing Gypsy e neutral impac a neutral effect	/ and Traveller o t on economy, f t. The natural e	highly negative s occupation, which lood risk (zone 1) nvironment and c nd screening, wh	will and limate

	SITE GT65													
		Locat	tion					Proposed	No Pitches					
	Tall	Trees (A1122)	Downham Mark	tet					1					
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change			
Score	+	+	0	0	XX	0	0	0	#	O/#	?/#			
Summary	station by foot terms of delive of sustainability suitable mitigatheritage asset	There is existi ering housing n ty assessment, t ation. Developm is therefore ther	ng vehicle acce eed. The site lie the impacts are ent of this site is re is a neutral ef	ss on to the hig s within flood zo scored as highl s likely to have i	hway. There is a one 2 and 3, the y negative. This neutral impact o al environment v	also existing Gy erefore poses si s also has influe on economy and will depend on l	ypsy and Travell ignificant negativence on the clime d landscape and how the site is ir	er occupation, ve impact. Suita ate scoring, wh amenity. The	which will contr able mitigation i ich is depender site is not withir	earby Downham N ibute to a positive s proposed, howe nt on implementa n a conservation a proposed suppor	e impact in ever, in terms tion of area or near			

### Travelling Showpeople proposed sites:

					SITE	GT25					
		Loca	tion					Proposed	No Pitches		
	Land	at the Oaks, Mi	ll Drove, Northv	vold					2		
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change
Score	х	+	0	0	0	0	о	0	О	o/#	?/#
Summary	1200m away a and Traveller amenity. The	and the route is housing is cons site is not withir	n't supported fo idered as havin a conservation	r walking or cyc g a positive imp area or near he	cling. There is e act on commur eritage assets th	xisting vehicle a hity. Developme herefore there i	access to the hig ent of this site is s a neutral effec	ghway. The pote likely to have n t. The natural e	ential for the site eutral impact or nvironment will	est key services e to provide requ n economy and la depend on how the existing char	ired Gypsy andscape and the site is

	SITE GT62												
		Locat	tion		Proposed No Pitches								
Land at Redgate Farm, Magdelan Road, Tilney St Lawrence						2							
Site Sustainability Factor	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A-Business	Economy B-Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Infrastructure & Waste	Climate Change					
Score	XX	+	0	0	xx	0	0	0	#	o/#	x/#		
Summary	walking/cyclin risk zone 2/3, scored as high minimal, depe positive impace area or near h	g provision so a and therefore p hly negative. Th ndent on implei t on community eritage assets t	a negative score oses significant is also has influ mentation of su /. Development herefore there	has been given negative impact ence on the clin table mitigation of this site is lik s a neutral effect	n in terms of ac st. Suitable mitig nate scoring; ho . The potential ely to have neu st. The natural e	cess to services gation is propos owever, approva- for the site to pro- tral impact on e environment wil	s. There is existi sed; however, in al will not be gra rovide required economy and lar	ng vehicle acco terms of this so inted without so Gypsy and Tra- ndscape and ar w the site is imp	ess onto the hig ustainability ass ufficient mitigation veller housing is nenity. The site	ces although the hway. The site lie essment, the imp on and impacts s considered as h is not within a co xample, the prop	es within flood bacts are hould be baving a bonservation		

#### 7. Cumulative Impacts

- 7.1 The SA Addendum 2022 provided an update to the 2020 SA, which concluded that the cumulative impacts of the Plan and subsequent amendments have a positive impact on sustainability.
- 7.2 The addition of the GTTS policies (A & B) increases the positive score by 17 points. Overall, the allocated sites assessments result in a negative score of -23; however, the cumulative impacts of the Plan remain positive as outlined below. Five site locations have neutral impact, in addition to the positive and negative scores outlined below.

	SA 2020	Impact of SA Addendum 2022	SA 2022	Impact of GT Addendum 2024	Updated Score
Policies - positive	548	Additional 7 positive	555	Additional 17 positive	572
Policies - negative	-70	1 less negative	-69	No change	-69
Total	478		486		503
Site Specific - positive	396	No change	n/a	Additional 3 sites positive (+3)	399
Site Specific - negative	-170	No change	n/a	Additional 13 site locations negative (-26)	-196
Total	226		226		203
Local Plan Scoring	704		712		706

Summary of updated scores

7.3 The SA Addendum considers that the cumulative impacts of the Plan as updated following the GTTS policies and site assessments, are not significantly impacted overall. The changes have not had significant effect on the overall scoring, which remains likely positive.

#### 8. Conclusion

8.1 Overall, negative scorings are generally a result of the remote location of the proposed GTTS sites and therefore access to services; however, as noted earlier in the report, the Council have considered potentially suitable sites based on supply aligning to demand and meeting the needs of the community. By necessity this differs from general housing need, given the status of Gypsies

and Travellers as having protected characteristics under the 2010 Equality Act. The draft consultation document was also subject to a full Equalities Impact Assessment<sup>8</sup>, to ensure the legal requirements of the Equality Act are correctly met.

- 8.2 Highways access has also scored negatively on some proposed sites; however, mitigation is suggested and therefore that would improve the outcome if successfully implemented. Lastly, several sites have scored negatively due to some or all of the land being within Flood Zone 2 and/or 3. At the time of assessment mitigation has already been established on some of the sites through previous planning permissions. The Council has produced a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Level 2 for each of the sites concerned. This identifies the risk from flooding and what, if any, mitigation measures are needed to enable safe development of the site in the future.
- 8.3 The SA Addendum 2024 has concluded that overall the Plan would constitute a sustainable form of development. The Habitats Regulation Assessment has also been updated alongside this part of the process to determine which sites are most suitable for allocation in the Local Plan.

#### 9. Next Steps

- 9.1 This SA Report has been prepared as an addendum to the previously published SA Scoping Report (2017), Scoping Report update (2020), SA Addendum and non-technical summary (2022), and will support the next stages of Local Plan Examination hearing sessions. Any further amendments proposed through the examination process will be subject to further assessment and appraisal in relation to both individual policies and the cumulative impacts of the Plan.
- 9.2 On adoption of the BCKLWN Local Plan Review, the Council will publish the Post-Adoption Statement setting out how the SA and SEA process was undertaken. The Plan will then be monitored for its impact on the SA and SEA objective. All documentation relating to the BCKLWN Local Plan Examination and the various stages of SA and SEA preparation can be accessed on the Council's website<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> (Public Pack)Agenda Document for Local Plan Task Group, 08/01/2024 09:30 (west-norfolk.gov.uk) (p19-30)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20079/planning policy and local plan/951/local plan review 2016-2036 examination

### 10. Appendices

### Appendix A: Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives

Topics	Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives	SEA Environmental Effect 'Issues'
Land and Water Resources	<ol> <li>Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped Greenfield land, agricultural (Best Most Versatile 1- 3) land and productive agricultural holdings</li> <li>Limit water consumption to levels supportable by natural processes and storage systems</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>Soil</li> <li>Water</li> <li>Material assets</li> <li>Landscape</li> </ul>
Biodiversity and Geodiversity	<ol> <li>Maintain, restore and enhance the natural environment and sites designated for biological and geological interest</li> <li>Maintain and enhance the range, functionality and connectivity of characteristic habitats and species</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Fauna</li> <li>Flora</li> <li>Soil</li> <li>Water</li> <li>Landscape</li> </ul>
Landscape and Townscape	<ol> <li>Avoid damage to protected sites and historic buildings</li> <li>Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character</li> <li>Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>Material assets</li> <li>Cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage</li> <li>Landscape</li> </ul>

Topics	Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives	SEA Environmental Effect 'Issues'
Climate Change and Pollution (continued)	<ol> <li>Reduce pollution and GHG emissions that affects the quality of land, air, water or soils in the Borough including: noise, light, vibrations. Mitigate GHG emissions by moving towards sustainable transport systems and reducing the reliance on fossil fuel-based vehicles.</li> <li>Minimise waste production, reduce the use of non-renewable energy sources and support the recycling of waste products</li> <li>Minimise vulnerability and provide resilience and adaptation to climate change, taking account of flood risk and coastal change</li> <li>New development should be designed to be better adapted to climate change and flood risk</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>Soil</li> <li>Water</li> <li>Climatic factors</li> <li>Material assets</li> <li>Coastal erosion/ Flood risk</li> <li>Energy</li> <li>High GHG emissions</li> <li>Design &amp; quality</li> <li>Transport</li> </ul>
Healthy Communities	<ul> <li>12. Maintain and enhance human health</li> <li>13. Reduce and prevent crime, and reduce the fear of crime</li> <li>14. Improve the quantity and quality of Green Infrastructure, publicly accessible open space, Public Rights of Way and access</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Population</li> <li>Human health</li> <li>(There are also links to Biodiversity, Flora and fauna, Soil and Water)</li> </ul>
Inclusive Communities	<ul> <li>15. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities)</li> <li>16. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income</li> <li>17. Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing</li> <li>18. Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities</li> </ul>	• Population

Topics	Local Plan Review Sustainability Objectives	SEA Environmental Effect 'Issues'
Economic Activity	19. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	<ul><li>Population</li><li>Material assets</li></ul>
	20. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy	

### **Appendix B: Site Sustainability Factors**

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

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

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

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

## Appendix D: Scoring Criteria

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

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