

Interim Sustainability Appraisal To Accompany the Issues and Options version of the Local Plan February 2016

1. Introduction

The Issues and Options identifies issues in the Broads Authority which the Local Plan could seek to address. It is the first stage of the Local Plan production. The options range from no policy or minimal intervention to more significant intervention. At this stage, policy content is not included; this is for the subsequent stages of the Local Plan.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) be undertaken for plans such as Local Plans. The term “sustainability appraisal” is used to describe a form of assessment that considers the social, environmental and economic effects of implementing a particular plan or planning policy document. It is intended that the SA process helps plans meet the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. The results of the sustainability appraisal will inform the Authority’s decisions on the Local Plan, and the planning inspector’s judgement on the Local Plan’s legal compliance and soundness.

2. The Scoping Report

This Scoping Report¹ forms the starting point for a process of sustainability appraisal which will guide the evolution and assessment of the Broads Local Plan. A key aim of the scoping procedure is to help ensure the sustainability appraisal process is proportionate and relevant to the Local Plan being assessed.

This Scoping Report sets the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and decides the scope. It:

1. Identifies other relevant policies, plans and programmes and sustainability objectives;
2. Collects baseline information;
3. Identifies sustainability issues and problems;
4. Develops the sustainability appraisal framework; and
5. Consults the consultation bodies on the scope of the sustainability report.

The Scoping Report was consulted on between 13 October 2014 and 14 November 2014. The Authority consulted Natural England, English Heritage and Environment Agency as well as the Marine Management Organisation, RSPB, Norfolk and Suffolk County Council, Broadland, Waveney, South Norfolk and North Norfolk District Councils, Great Yarmouth Borough Council and Norwich City Council.

3. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal

A Sustainability Appraisal is designed to inform policy content following the assessments against the SA Objectives. At the Issues and Options stage, there is no policy wording. The options discuss potential ways to address the issue. That is to say that these could be broad policy directions rather

¹ <http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/planning/planning-policies/development/future-local-plan>

than content. As such, this interim SA uses a traffic light system to give an indication about how the potential policy direction rates against each SA objective:

	Conflict with SA Objective that is unlikely to be able to be addressed through policy wording.
	Potential conflict with SA Objective but could be addressed through policy wording.
	Positive impact on SA Objective.
?	Unknown impact on SA Objective. Depends on wording or reflects current situation.
	Not relevant

DRAFT

Appendix 1: Assessment of options.

Issue 1: how should we address run off from boat wash in the new Local Plan?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: Roll forward DP16.																					?		?	
Option 2: Separate improved policy relating to boat wash down.																					?		?	

- ? relate to the potential for improved wash down facilities to be an additional cost for consideration.

Issue 2: How to address water efficiency of residential developments in the Local Plan

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: do not address water efficiency any further than DP3		?	?		?												?							
Option 2: policy requirement for new dwellings to be built to 110 l/h/d																								

- With no policy, the current building regulations level of 125 l/h/d would be in place which is the current situation. The amber is related to the issue of viability of development if tighter water efficiency was applied.

Issue 3: How to address sewerage treatment in the Broads.

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: Roll forward DP3		?	?	?													?							
Option 2: adopt the hierarchy of preferred treatment methods. Apply to new build and rebuild.																								
Option 3: the policy as set out in option 2 applies to extensions,																								

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
new and rebuild.																								

- The amber is related to viability if any requirement relating to sewerage would increase scheme costs. Question marks reflect that the current approach uses the hierarchy at planning application stage and that approach would continue.

Issue 4: How to address land-based open space, allotments and play requirements in the Broads

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: do not address play, allotments and open space in the Local Plan and leave it for the planning application discussions.			?	?	?	?				?				?					?					
Option 2: set specific rates for play, allotment and open space in the Broads.																								
Option 3: include a policy that refers/defers to existing and future play and open space policies in constituent district's policy documents																								
Option 4: have a less specific policy which discusses principles of open space, play and allotments.			?	?	?	?				?				?					?					

- Options 1 and 4 could see these facilities delivered but through conversations at planning application stage.

Issue 5: How do we address Green Infrastructure in the Broads Executive Area?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
1: Roll forward existing policies only.																								

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
2: A Strategic Green Infrastructure Policy																								
3: Specific policies covering some GI projects.																								

- Whilst all options rate the same, option 1 tends to relate to some site specific policies. Options 2 and 3 would relate to more of, or the entire area of the Broads.

Issue 6: How should we address climate change in the Local Plan

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: Roll forward existing policy CS8.					?		?			?	?	?		?			?	?	?		?	?	?	?
Option 2: Climate Change Ready and Carbon Reduction guide.																	?	?	?		?	?	?	?
Option 3: Scoping of development type and scale																	?	?	?		?	?	?	?
Option 4: Require assessment as part of applications showing how climate change mitigation and adaptation have been incorporated into the design of the proposal and how it will be used.																	?	?	?		?	?	?	?
Option 5: community or landscape scale mitigation or adaptation.																	?	?	?		?	?	?	?

- ? in SOC and ECO relate to the potential for policy to lead to different approaches to the delivery of buildings as well as other implications. Viability would be a consideration, but the result of the policy may not necessarily lead to cost increase – would depend on policy content.

Issue 7: How should we address peat affected by land use change in the Broads?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No specific policy		?	?		?				?								?							
Option 2: A policy which seeks to minimise peat disruption																	?							
Option 3: A policy which seeks to address the disposal of peat		?	?						?								?							
Option 4: Provide guidance to elaborate on any policy which seeks to minimise peat disturbance and/or seeks reuse of peat.																	?							
Option 5: Offsetting the loss of peat																	?							
Option 6: A policy which protects peat and restricts development on peat.																	?							

- Option 1 – current situation continues whereby peat could be disturbed so developments on peat could affect climate change, biodiversity and geodiversity and archaeology. Peat is not a constraint to development.
- Option 2 – amber – reflects that this policy would require development to consider design, which could affect costs.
- Option 3, ENV9 – could provide an opportunity for interpretation, but does reflect that peat is still removed.
- Option 3, ENV2 and 3 – depends on how the peat is disposed of. Amber reflects that this policy would require development to consider design disposal of peat.
- Option 4 - ? – housing development would only be through allocated sites and the potential for such sites to be on peat will be assessed.
- Option 5: is amber/green as this would still result in peat removal on site, thus affecting climate change, biodiversity, geodiversity, water and archaeology. But the offsetting could result in other areas of peat being protected or enhanced or created.

Issue 8: How do we give further weight to the Local List and undesignated heritage assets (that we know about and those that we do not know about)?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No policy				?					?	?							?				?		?	
Option 2: Policy approach that simply rolls DP5 forward.																	?				?		?	
Option 3: A stronger policy on undesignated heritage assets.																	?				?		?	

- Whilst option 2 and 3 are the same rating, option 3 would be a stronger stance relating to these criteria. The question marks for options 1 and 2 reflect the potential for such development to be near to or redevelop heritage assets which could affect the cost and ability to deliver. However, appropriate well designed change to heritage assets could still be possible.

Issue 9: How can the Local Plan help enable restoration of the drainage mills of the Broads?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No policy other than rolling forward XNS5 of the Sites Specifics Local Plan.																								
Option 2: An additional generic policy relating to restoring and reuse of heritage assets.																								
Option 3: An additional policy or extra wording to XNS5 relating to 'enabling development' of mills																								
Option 4: An additional policy which allocates certain mills for development or change																								

- All options rate positive, however options 2, 3 and 4 could result in more change than option 1.

Issue 10: How can the Local Plan address interpretation of the historic environment and culture in the Broads?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No policy				?					?	?										?				?
Option 2: Policy or criteria that relates to interpretation of the historic and cultural environment.																								?
Option 3: Guidance to heritage and cultural interpretation.																								?

- Option one is rated as ? to reflect the potential for interpretation to come forward as part of planning application discussions. The question mark for options 2 and 3 in relation to ECO4 reflects the potential for tourists to be interested in the past use of a site.

Issue 11: How can we give non-designated sites recognition?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No policy			?	?																				
Option 2: Allocate sites for recognition																								

- Option 1 is ? as such sites could be protected or their ecological value considered as part of a scheme and planning application.

Issue 12: How can we protect habitats and species on brownfield sites?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No policy			?							?						?					?	?	?	?
Option 2: Criteria based policy																?					?	?	?	?

- Option 1 is ?. The ecological value of brownfield sites could be understood, considered, protected and enhanced currently through planning application discussions.
- Option 2 is ? for SOC3 and ECO objectives. Considering the ecological value of brownfield sites could lead to different designs of development or could lead to some constraints on what is acceptable or how the proposal is to be designed.

Issue 13: How can we compensate for residual adverse biodiversity impacts arising from a development after mitigation measures have been taken?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No policy			?	?												?					?	?	?	?
Option 2: Compensation policy																?					?	?	?	?

- Option 1 is ?. Such compensation measures have been used in the Broads as a result of planning application discussions.
- Option 2 is ? for SOC3 and ECO objectives. Compensating off site could allow a scheme to go forward as planned. The cost would need to be a consideration in relation to viability.
- ENV3 is positive as habitats could be enhanced elsewhere which could give a greater net benefit, but it is important to acknowledge that compensation means that on-site biodiversity and habitats could be impacted/lost.

Issue 14: How should we consider land-raising in the new Local Plan?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No Policy			?	?	?	?	?		?															
Option 2: Criteria based policy.				?	?	?	?		?															
Option 3: do not allow land raising				?	?	?	?		?															

- Option 1 ? reflects that land raising can be addressed through planning applications currently and the outcome would depend on the detail of the scheme.
- Option 2 and 3 ? - Land raising could address flood risk for that particular site but can make it worse elsewhere. With regards to culture, raising land is something that has been undertaken in the past in the Broads. Regarding effective use of materials, land raising could use excavated material which is a by-product of other practices.

Issue 15: how should we consider disposing of excavated material in the new Local Plan?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No Policy			?	?		?	?	?																
Option 2: Policy relating to disposal.						?																		

- Option 1 is a ? as discussions could relate to disposal of excavated material at planning application stage, but option two ensures that appropriate disposal is considered early on in a scheme's design.

Issue 16: how should we address landscaping design in the new Local Plan?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No Policy			?	?					?	?												?		?
Option 2: Landscaping policy																								
Option 3: A guide																								

- Options one could still see benefits through discussions at planning application stage.

Issue 17: how should we address overhead lines in the new Local Plan?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No Policy				?					?	?														
Option 2: Policy relating to overhead lines and cables.																								
Option 3: An agreement or protocol.																								

- Options one could still see benefits through discussions at planning application stage.

Issue 18: how should we consider settlement fringe in the new Local Plan?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No Policy				?					?	?											?	?	?	?
Option 2: Criteria based policy.																					?	?	?	?
Option 3: Site specific policy																					?	?	?	?

- Option 1 ? reflects that impact of proposals could reflect their location on the edge of settlements and design.
- ? for options 2 and 3 reflect potential impacts on scheme design and delivery which could add costs to some businesses which is a consideration.

Issue 19: How should we address tranquillity?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: Roll forward policies XNS1, 2 and 3 only.																								?
Option 2: Assess other areas of the Broads for consideration as tranquil areas.																								
Option 3: Have a strategic policy on tranquillity																								

- The policy options are generally the same. Option 1 however relates to specific sites only whereas option 2 could extend tranquil areas and option 3 would apply Broads-wide.
- Option 1 is a ? for ECO4 as it is not clear if these policies are having a negative or positive effect on tourism (could be restrictive but the tranquil areas could be an attraction themselves).
- The effect of options 2 and 3 on ECO4 would reflect precise wording.

Issue 20: How should we address light pollution?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: Roll forward DP28																				?				
Option 2: Address light pollution in a more detailed way																				?				
Option 3: Have a Broads Authority bespoke light pollution guidance																				?				

- Whilst all three options show the same assessment, a more detailed light pollution policy and guidance would be a more positive approach than option 1. The question mark reflects that any policy approach should emphasise that it is not necessarily about turning off lights (and therefore affecting a community negatively), but light pollution can be reduced by lighting angled down.

Issue 21: How to address waste in the Broads Local Plan

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: no policy				?				?	?	?														
Option 2: Require waste statement as part of planning applications.																								
Option 3: policy relating to carefully planned bin storage.																								

- Question marks reflect that these issues could be discussed as part of a planning application. But greens reflect a strong policy stance relating to waste.

Issue 22: How can the Local Plan address the Full Objectively Assessed Housing Need of the Broads?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: Housing requirement of zero.			?	?	?	?	?	?	?								?							
Option 2: Meet full objectively assessed housing need in the Broads.			?	?	?	?	?	?	?								?							

- Option 1: ? reflects that appropriate housing has been provided in appropriate locations in the past with acceptable impacts (when compared to how else they could have been provided).
- Option 2: ? reflects that appropriate housing could be provided in appropriate locations in the future with acceptable impacts (when compared to how else they could be provided).

Issue 23: How can the Local Plan address Gypsy and Traveller needs?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: Do not address Gypsy and Travellers in the Local Plan.			?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?				?		?							
Option 2: Have a criteria based policy.			?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?													
Option 3: Allocate land for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Show People.			?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?													

- Option 1 is rated as ?. This reflects the absence of a policy, but that any applications for Gypsy and Traveller sites would be addressed through National Policy as well as other local policies.
- The question marks in the ENV section for option 1 relate to other adopted policies on these subject matters would be used to determine planning applications.
- With regards to options 2 and 3 they could be criteria relating to these considerations in a policy or used to address site allocations.

Issue 24: How can the Local Plan address the issue of rural enterprise dwellings?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: Roll forward DP26.				?					?	?														
Option 2: Enhance DP26 to further enshrine the principles of PPS7.				?					?	?														
Option 3: Make short guidance for determining relevant planning applications.				?					?	?														

- ? relate to the detail of the scheme. Other policies in the Local Plan would address these aspects.

Issue 25: How should the Local Plan address second homes in the Broads?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: Roll forward DP15 with limited changes.																	?		?					?
Option 2: Policy approach that is more restrictive on second homes.																	?							?
Option 3: Policy approach that is more permissive for second homes.																	?							?
Option 4: A policy approach that relates to locations.																	?		?					?

- SCO4 – it is important to note that the objectively assessed need for the Broads reflects second homes and holiday homes.

- SOC6 – because second homes are not occupied all the time, there could be impacts on the facilities and services in a settlement.
- ECO4 – people have second homes because they like visiting an area and could spend money in the area on tourist related activities.

Issue 26: How can the Local Plan support those who wish to build their own homes?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No policy	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?			?	?			?				
Option 2: Set a requirement for self-build plots as part of site allocation policies.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?											
Option 3: Policy requiring a percentage of plots set aside for self-build.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?											

- Option 1: self-build could still come forward.
- Option 2 and 3: ? for ENV objectives reflect that these issues relate to location and design. Other policies in the Local Plan could address these aspects.

Issue 27: how to address design in the Broads Local Plan

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: role forward DP4																?					?	?	?	?
Option 2: Masterplans for larger development.																?					?	?	?	?
Option 3: Policy relating to waterside chalets and homes.																?					?	?	?	?

- All rate as positive. Final policy could be a combination of all these aspects.
- ? reflect that extra design considerations could impact a scheme's viability.

Issue 28: How to address energy efficiency in the Local Plan

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: Roll forward DP7																	?							
Option 2: Policy																	?							

[illegible]

- SCO4 is a ? to reflect the potential for such requirements to add to the cost of a dwelling.

Issue 29: How can the Local Plan address the issue of residential items and equipment associated with residential moorings?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No policy				?					?	?										?				
Option 2: Address this through improving the sites specific policies that refer to residential moorings																				?				
Option 3: Address this issue by improving DP25.																				?				

- Option 1 ? reflect that such items could be in place now, with a variety of impacts on the surroundings.
- SCO7 reflects that such items and equipment are desired by society.

Issue 30: how should we consider leisure plots in the new Local Plan?

[illegible]

- Option 1: SCO7 ? current policy is restrictive but such plots could be desired by the community.
- Option 2 and 3: would be more permissive. ? could be addressed in the detail of the policy as well as locations chosen.

Issue 31: How to address accessibility and wheelchair standards in the Local Plan

[illegible]

[illegible]

- Option 1 ? – schemes could still come forward designed with wheelchairs in mind.
- Option 3 ? – depends on the approach taken by our districts. Some could adopt the standard and others may not.

Issue 32: how do we address sport and recreational buildings in the Broads Executive Area?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: Roll forward DIT2.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?										?	?	?	
Option 2: Site specific policies for all sports facilities in the area.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?										?	?	?	
Option 3: Generic policy relating to indoor sports facilities.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?										?	?	?	

- ENV ? relate to location and design. A policy on sport and recreation allows potential to set criteria relating to design.
- ECO ? relate to the potential for acceptable change to these sports facilities having a knock on effect on the local economy if these businesses are made more viable.

Issue 33: How can we design places for healthy lives?

[illegible]

- Option 1: Development and change could still be designed in a healthy way.
- Option 2: would provide more certainty.

Issue 34: how to address retail issues in the Broads Local Plan

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: no specific policy																			?		?	?	?	?
Option 2: set primary and secondary frontages																								
Option 3: retail hierarchy																								
Option 4: Retail impact assessment requirement																								
Option 5: Safeguard existing retail units																								

- Option 1: ? relates to uncertainty reflecting that these units could change or if continue to be viable, could remain in retail uses.

Issue 35: How can the Local Plan address the dualling of the Acle Straight?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No policy																		?			?		?	
Option 2: Criteria based policy.																		?			?		?	
Option 3: Allocate site for dualling.																		?			?		?	

- Dualling is likely to come forward in the plan period. The scheme could be judged to have over riding public benefits when compared to the impacts on the landscape and biodiversity of the Broads. Whilst there will be impacts on the current situation, having a policy stance could result in the scheme coming forward in a way that reduces the impacts on the Broads.
- With regards to the ? for SOC and ECO, there could be economic benefits of dualling this stretch of road.

Issue 36: How can the Local Plan safeguard future recreation routes?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No policy other than XNS7																								
Option 2: Policy that safeguards routes.																								

- These routes are historic so enabling them to be in place, albeit used for recreation rather than trains is a positive impact on the objectives.

Issue 37: How to address car parking in the Local Plan

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: no specific policy.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?			?					?					?
Option 2: Policy relating to car parks.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?													

- Option 1 is ? as schemes could still come forward. Impacts on the objectives would reflect location and design.
- Option 2 ? reflect design issues which could be addressed in a policy.

Issue 38: what should the Authority's approach be for redundant boat yards or boat yard buildings?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: no change to the policy DP20			?						?							?		?	?		?	?	?	?
Option 2: Less restrictive																?			?					
Option 3: Seek to retain sites in employment use.																?			?					
Option 4: Promote starter units.																?			?					

- ENV4 and ENV9 – Option 1 seeks to retain boatyard uses on the site. The other options could open up boatyards to other uses which could affect the cultural heritage of the Broads as well as potentially the landscape. Boatyards are a traditional land use in the Broads.
- SOC3 and SOC6 are? as it depends on the business that moves into a boat yard.

Issue 39: How to address location of new employment land in the Local Plan

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: maintain approach in the Development Management DPD (development boundaries relate to	?		?	?					?													?		

Issue 41: how do we make the mooring provision as a result of related development more deliverable and reasonable?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: no change to the policy	?																				?			?
Option 2: no policy relating to the provision of visitor moorings as part of a scheme.	?																				?			?
Option 3: improve the existing policy																								

- Option 1 and 2: visitor moorings could still come forward with the same positives as option 3.

Issue 42: how should we consider safety by the water in the new Local Plan?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: No Policy				?					?					?										?
Option 2: Guidance				?					?															
Option 3: Policy covering detail of safety equipment to be provided at different developments				?					?															

- Option 1: appropriate and adequate safety provisions could still be put in place through the planning application process and conditions.
- ENV4 and ENV9 are ?. This relates to the design and placing of these facilities potentially negatively affecting landscape and heritage. Design could be addressed through the policy and/or the guide.

Issue 43: how do we protect the car parking area near Staithe and Willow?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: no specific policy (other than removing the open space allocation)	?																							?
Option 2: Protect this parking area in a																								

[illegible]

- Option 1: car park could still be protected. This would address a drafting error of a current policy.

Issue 44: how to address Thorpe Island in the Local Plan?

	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	ENV6	ENV7	ENV8	ENV9	ENV10	ENV11	ENV12	ENV13	SOC1	SOC2	SOC3	SOC4	SOC5	SOC6	SOC7	ECO1	ECO2	ECO3	ECO4
Option 1: roll forward TSA2 from the 1997 Local Plan.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?				?		?			?				
Option 2: A refreshed criteria based policy.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?				?		?			?				

- All options and objectives are ? as it will depend on the detail of the policy.

Issue 45: do we protect the live/work units at Ferry Corner through the Local Plan and if so, how?

[illegible]

- ? reflect that the planning application process has guided what is in place now. However, there is potential for change. A policy would provide some control for that change.
- SOC7 is positive as the residential element can provide some presence which could address security issues relating to business premises.
- ENV1 a positive as the site has moorings and car parking.

Appendix 2: The SA and Ecosystem Services

Ecosystem services can be defined as services provided by the natural environment that benefit people – what nature provides us for free. There are typically four broad categories: **provisioning**, such as the production of food and water; **regulating**, such as the control of climate and disease; **supporting**, such as nutrient cycles and crop pollination; and **cultural**, such as spiritual and recreational benefits.

Assessing the Plan against Ecosystem Services gives another opportunity to assess the sustainability of the plan. The Authority has related Ecosystem Services to the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives.

PROVISIONING Food, fibre and timber Water supply Energy harvesting Genetic diversity	REGULATING Water flow and water quality Climate regulation and carbon storage Natural hazard regulation Salinity control Soil quality Erosion Pollination Disease and pests Air quality	CULTURAL Inspiration and tranquillity Cultural heritage Recreation and tourism Education Aesthetic values Community and sense of place
SUPPORTING Biodiversity, soil formation, primary production, nutrient cycling, water cycling		

SA Objective	Related Ecosystem Service
ENV1: To reduce the adverse effects of traffic (on roads and water).	Water flow and water quality; Climate regulation and carbon storage
ENV2: To improve water quality and use water efficiently.	Water flow and water quality; Water supply; water cycling
ENV3: To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity.	Genetic diversity; Soil quality; Pollination; Disease and pests; Aesthetic values; soil formation; Biodiversity
ENV4: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and towns/villages.	Inspiration and tranquillity; Cultural heritage; Recreation and tourism; Education; Aesthetic values; Community and sense of place
ENV5: To adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change.	Climate regulation and carbon storage; Energy harvesting
ENV6: To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk.	Water flow and water quality; water cycling
ENV7: To manage resources sustainably through the effective use of land, energy and materials.	Food, fibre and timber; Water supply; Energy harvesting; primary production
ENV8: To minimise the production and impacts of waste through reducing what is wasted, re-using and recycling what is left.	Food, fibre and timber
ENV9: To conserve and enhance the cultural heritage, historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	Inspiration and tranquillity; Cultural heritage; Recreation and tourism; Education; Aesthetic values; Community and sense of place
ENV10: To achieve the highest quality of design that is innovative, imaginable, and sustainable and	Inspiration and tranquillity; Cultural heritage; Recreation and tourism; Education; Aesthetic values;

SA Objective	Related Ecosystem Service
reflects local distinctiveness.	Community and sense of place
ENV11: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution.	Air quality; Aesthetic values; Inspiration and tranquillity
ENV12: To increase the proportion of energy generated through renewable/low carbon processes without unacceptable adverse impacts to/on the Broads landscape	Energy harvesting; Climate regulation and carbon storage; Aesthetic values
ENV13: To reduce vulnerability to coastal change.	Climate regulation and carbon storage; Natural hazard regulation; Salinity control; Erosion
SOC1: To improve the health of the population and promote a healthy lifestyle.	Community and sense of place; Disease and pests; Air quality
SCO2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion.	Community and sense of place
SOC3: To improve education and skills including those related to local traditional industries.	Education; Cultural heritage
SOC4: To enable suitable stock of housing meeting local needs including affordability.	Community and sense of place
SOC5: To maximise opportunities for new/ additional employment	Food, fibre and timber; Community and sense of place
SOC6: To improve the quality, range and accessibility of community services and facilities.	Community and sense of place
SOC7: To build community identity, improve social welfare and reduce crime and anti-social activity.	Community and sense of place
ECO1: To support a flourishing and sustainable economy	Food, fibre and timber; Community and sense of place
ECO2: To ensure the economy actively contributes to social and environmental well-being.	Food, fibre and timber; Community and sense of place
ECO3: To improve economic performance in rural areas.	Food, fibre and timber
ECO4: To offer opportunities for Tourism and recreation in a way that helps the economy, society and the environment.	Inspiration and tranquillity; Cultural heritage; Recreation and tourism; Education; Aesthetic values; Community and sense of place