



Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Habitats Regulations Assessment – Test of Likely Significant Effects

Addendum to assess proposed Main Modifications (2024)

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (NM&WLP) concluded at the Screening stage that the plan would not result in likely significant effects on any European site either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects. The ‘Habitats Regulations Assessment –Test of Likely Significant Effects’ of the submission version of the NM&WLP consists of documents A8 and A8.1 in the examination library
- 1.2 Following the Examination hearings into the NM&WLP, in response to comments made by the Inspector, Norfolk County Council has drafted a series of Main Modifications (MM) to be made to the Plan. It is therefore necessary for those modifications to be assessed in order to confirm that they will not themselves introduce new likely significant effects that were not assessed for the HRA of the Publication version of the NM&WLP. This is the purpose of this report.
- 1.3 Therefore, this report should be considered as an Addendum to the HRA of the NM&WLP. As such it does not recap the methodology of the HRA, or the full result of the likely significant effects test of the NM&WLP, including the in-combination assessment. Instead, it focuses specifically on whether the Main Modifications (MMs) to policies will result in likely significant effects on any European sites.

2. Likely Significant Effects of Main Modifications (MMs)

The tables below set out the assessment of each Main Modification (MM) to a policy within the NM&WLP.

Modifications to supporting text are not included in the tables below because it has been determined that such changes would not affect the policy direction or outcomes and therefore do not affect the existing assessment of the policy in the original HRA.

Additional Modifications proposed by Norfolk County Council are not included in the tables below because Additional Modifications are those that do not materially affect policies and could be considered clarifications and corrections and therefore would not affect the policy direction or outcomes or the existing assessment of the policy in the original HRA (documents A8 and A8.1 in the examination library).

No LSE = No Likely Significant Effect

2.1 Assessment of General Policies

General Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy MW1: Development management criteria A criteria-based policy that details the issues that will be taken into account when reaching a decision on a particular planning application to ensure that permitted sites represent sustainable development. The policy lists the issues that a development should not have an unacceptable adverse impact on.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. The policy includes a requirement for it to be demonstrated that developments would not have an unacceptable impact (including cumulative impact) on the natural, geological and hydrogeological environment, including internationally, nationally or locally designated sites and irreplaceable habitats. Policy MW1 also requires proposals to demonstrate that the development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact (including cumulative impact) on the quality and quantity of surface water bodies and groundwater, for resource purposes and to prevent the deterioration of their existing status, and their associated ecosystems.</p>	<p>A modification is proposed to policy point (h) to include reference to intrinsically dark landscapes. A modification is proposed to include new text about mitigation for developments affecting archaeological assets of less than national importance. A modification is proposed to the second bullet point of the policy to replace ‘providing biodiversity and geodiversity net gains’ with ‘providing geodiversity gains, providing a minimum measurable 10% biodiversity net gain and contributing to the delivering of the national Nature Recovery Network objectives’. These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA.</p>

General Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy MW2: Transport Criteria for minerals and waste development to meet regarding transport impacts and assessments.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Policy requires development to not generate unacceptable impacts on air quality, to reduce car travel to site and to assess the potential for non-HGV transport of materials and take up these sustainable transport opportunities where available.</p>	<p>A modification is proposed to delete the existing requirement (d) text on unacceptable impacts on the highway network and replace it with “traffic movements along unsuitable sections of the highway network, taking into account the proposed level of traffic movement and provision of highway mitigation measures”.</p> <p>A modification is proposed to include new policy text to state that in relation to sustainable transport, proposals are also required to comply with requirement (g) of Policy MW3. These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA.</p>
<p>Policy MW3: Climate change mitigation and adaption Criteria for minerals and waste development to meet in their construction and operation, to minimise their potential contribution to climate change, incorporate energy and water efficient design strategies and be adaptable to future climatic conditions.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth. The purpose of the policy is to reduce the contribution to climate change from minerals and waste development whilst also adapting to its potential effects and includes measures that developments should include.</p>	<p>A modification is proposed to policy requirement (c) to add that proposals are expected to demonstrate how the proposed development will minimise and manage energy use (through the submission of an energy, climate change and sustainability statement) and to delete the existing requirement that where onsite renewable or low carbon energy generation is not practical the applicant should source the electricity required from renewables through an energy supplier. The rest of requirement (c) will remain the same.</p> <p>A modification is proposed to policy requirement (e) to include reference to larger river flows, as well as rising sea levels and coastal erosion.</p> <p>These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA.</p>
<p>Policy MW4: The Brecks protected habitats and species Protection of the Brecks protected habitats and species from inappropriate minerals and waste development.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth. The purpose of the policy is to protect the Brecks from inappropriate minerals and waste development. New built development is not permitted within 1.5km of the edge of the Breckland SPA, or within areas that have a functional link to the SPA, unless it can be demonstrated in an appropriate assessment</p>	<p>Modifications are proposed to the policy wording as follows: “The Council will require suitable information to be provided to enable it to undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment of all proposals for development that are likely to have a significant effect on the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA) which is classified designated for its populations of Stone Curlew, Woodlark and Nightjar, and/or Breckland Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is designated for its heathland</p>

General Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
	<p>that the development would not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA.</p>	<p>habitats amongst other features. Development will only be permitted where sufficient information is submitted to demonstrate that the proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA or SAC.</p> <p>Stone Curlew</p> <p>A buffer zone has been defined (indicated in red hatching on Map 2) that extends 1,500m from the edge of those parts of the SPA that support or are capable of supporting Stone Curlew, where new built development would may be likely to significantly affect the SPA population.</p> <p>A buffer zone has also been defined (indicated in orange hatching on map 2) that extends 1,500 metres around areas that have a functional link to the SPA, because they support Stone Curlew outside, but in close proximity to the SPA boundary, within which new built development would be likely to significantly affect the SPA population.</p> <p>Built development (including plant and processing sites) within the SPA boundary or located less than 1,500m away from the SPA boundary or identified areas that have a functional link (see map 2) will not normally be permitted, unless a project level HRA is able to demonstrate that adverse effects can be ruled out.</p> <p>Where a proposed building is outside the SPA but within 1,500m of the SPA boundary or identified areas that have a functional link, including those precautionary areas where there is currently a lack of data (see Map 2) or within areas considered functionally linked, there may be circumstances where a project level HRA is able to demonstrate that the proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA. Circumstances where the proposal is able to conclusively demonstrate that it will not result in an adverse effect on the Breckland SPA may include where the proposal is:</p>

General Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 1,500km away from potential stone curlew nesting sites inside the SPA (these are those parts of the SPA that are also designated as Breckland Farmland SSSI) however, these proposals will still need to assess direct and indirect impacts to stone curlew as a protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981; • A new building that will be completely masked from the SPA by existing built development; • A proposed re-development of an existing building that would not alter its footprint or increase its potential impact.” <p>There are no changes proposed to the policy text regarding woodlark and nightjar.</p> <p>These modifications slightly change the wording of the policy assessment in the HRA due the removal of the 1.5km buffer zone around areas that have a functional link to the SPA from the policy. However, the conclusion remains the same that the policy would have no likely significant effect.</p>
<p>Policy MW5: Agricultural Soils Protection of the Best and Most Versatile agricultural soils.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth. The purpose of the policy is to protect BMV agricultural land.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>

2.2 Assessment of Waste Management Specific Policies

Waste Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy WP1: Waste management capacity to be provided</p> <p>This policy contains the quantum of waste that is forecast to need to be managed over the Plan period to 2038. This is a maximum of 3,651,000 tonnes of waste per annum consisting of:</p> <p>A maximum of 502,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) of Local Authority Collected Waste.</p> <p>A maximum of 1,959,000 tpa of commercial and industrial waste.</p> <p>A maximum of 1,100,000 tpa of inert waste.</p> <p>A maximum of 90,000 tpa of hazardous waste.</p>	<p>No LSE – The policy does not promote growth in any particular location. The Policy contains the quantum of waste that is forecast to need to be managed over the Plan period. Any land use impacts would arise through the provision of new or enhanced waste management facilities to manage this waste. However, the policy states that sufficient capacity currently exists to meet the growth forecast in waste arisings. Any planning applications that come forward for new or enhanced waste management facilities will need to be determined in accordance with the Plan which includes compliance with Policy MW1. Any facilities proposed in proximity to the Breckland SPA would also need to be determined in accordance with Policy MW4.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy WP2: Spatial Strategy for waste management facilities</p> <p>This policy contains the spatial strategy for the location of new waste management facilities. Facilities should be located within 5 miles of one of Norfolk’s urban areas or 3 miles of one of Norfolk’s main towns and be accessible via appropriate transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The urban areas and main towns are: Norwich, King’s Lynn, Thetford, Attleborough, Great Yarmouth, Gorleston-on-Sea, Aylsham, Cromer, Dereham, Diss, Downham Market, Fakenham, Harleston, Hunstanton, Long Stratton, North Walsham, Swaffham, Watton, Wymondham.</p>	<p>No LSE – There is the potential that a waste management facility located in accordance with this policy could be within the Impact Risk Zone of a SSSI which is also designated as a SPA, SAC or Ramsar site. Waste management facilities could potentially have adverse impacts on designated sites in terms of noise, dust, air quality, lighting and water pollution.</p> <p>However, no likely significant effects are expected because all planning applications for waste management facilities must also comply with the Development Management Criteria Policy MW1, which requires proposals to demonstrate that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the natural geological and</p>	<p>Modifications are proposed to this policy to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to National Landscapes (the new term for the AONB) • State that development should not be located within an irreplaceable habitat • Amend the paragraph on designated heritage assets to include conservation areas, and to refer to whether the proposed development would cause substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets (including and contribution to significance by setting). • Amend the list of main towns to include Long Stratton and delete Holt, in line with

Waste Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>In exceptional circumstances, locating a waste management facility at a greater distance of an urban area or main town will be acceptable if it is within three miles of the source of the waste or the destination of the recovered waste material. The spatial strategy is subject to the proposed development for a waste management facility not being located within a SSSI or habitats site and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it.</p>	<p>hydrogeological environment (including internationally, nationally or locally designated sites and irreplaceable habitats). In order to comply with Policy MW1 at the planning application stage, potential impacts would be able to be avoided and mitigated through appropriate site selection and the standard design and operation of sites, which are normally controlled by the Environmental Permit or planning conditions. Any proposals in proximity to the Breckland SPA will also need to be determined in accordance with Policy MW4.</p>	<p>the settlement hierarchies in the Local Planning Authorities' Local Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend the list of urban areas to delete West Lynn and to include Easton and the remainder of the Growth Triangle within the Norwich urban area, in line with the settlement hierarchies in the Local Planning Authorities Local Plans. • To provide additional flexibility by stating that in exceptional circumstances, locating a waste management facility at a greater distance from an urban area of main town will be acceptable if it is close to (that is within 3 miles of) the source of the waste or the destination of the recovered waste material; and to amend the list of facility types included in this part of the policy to be examples of the facilities this approach would apply to instead of being the only facilities this approach would apply to. • To amend the text on water recycling centres to state that they can normally only be located adjacent to watercourses, so they are acceptable in such locations. <p>These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA because policies MW1 and MW4 would still apply.</p>

Waste Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy WP3: Land suitable for waste management facilities This policy details the types of land that will be acceptable for waste management facilities, including: existing waste management facilities, land in or allocated for B8 or B2 use classes, previously-developed land and land within or adjacent to agriculture and forestry buildings.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>Modifications are proposed to amend the first sentence to refer to waste management facilities for non-hazardous waste and to amend criteria (g) to state: ‘water recycling centres (to principally manage wastes arising from the WRC process only)’ instead of ‘(composting and anaerobic digestion facilities only)’. These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA.</p>
<p>Policy WP4: Recycling or transfer of inert CD&E waste and production of recycled aggregates Criteria-based policy for the location of facilities for the recycling or transfer of inert CD&E waste, including production of recycled aggregates</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy WP5: Waste Transfer stations, materials recycling facilities, ELV facilities and WEEE recovery facilities Criteria-based policy for the location of waste transfer stations, MRFs, ELV and WEEE facilities.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy WP6: Transfer, storage, processing and treatment of hazardous waste Criteria-based policy for the location of facilities for the transfer, storage processing and treatment of hazardous waste</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy WP7: Household waste recycling centres Criteria-based policy for the location of household waste recycling centres.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>A modification is proposed to the first sentence of the policy to state that HWRCs will be acceptable, instead of may be acceptable, within purpose designed or suitably adapted facilities on the types of land identified within Policy WP3. This modification does not change the policy assessment in the HRA.</p>

Waste Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy WP8: Composting Criteria-based policy for the location of composting facilities.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy WP9: Anaerobic digestion Criteria-based policy for the location of anaerobic digestion facilities.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy WP10: Residual waste treatment facilities Criteria-based policy for the location of residual waste treatment facilities.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy WP11: Disposal of inert waste by landfill Criteria-based policy for the location of sites for the disposal of inert waste by landfill.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy WP12: Non-hazardous and hazardous waste landfills Criteria-based policy for the location of sites for non-hazardous and hazardous waste landfills.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy WP13: Landfill mining and reclamation Criteria-based policy for determining proposals for landfill mining or excavation.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote landfill mining or excavation in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>A modification is proposed to include an additional bullet point requirement to be met stating that “the proposals demonstrate that there will be improvements to biodiversity, landscape, the historic environment and/or amenity on restoration, when compared to the baseline prior to landfill”. This modification does not change the policy assessment in the HRA.</p>

Waste Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy WP14: Water Recycling Centres Criteria-based policy for the location of sites for waste recycling centres.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>Modifications are proposed to include a new requirement (d) ‘comply with new legislation’ and a new requirement (e) ‘incorporate climate change adaption and mitigation measures (as detailed in Policy MW3)’. A modification is also proposed to add a new requirement that “where appropriate, applications will also need to demonstrate the contribution that the development would make to water quality improvement”. These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA.</p>
<p>Policy WP15: Whitlingham Water Recycling Centre Criteria-based policy requiring Anglian Water to develop and agree a medium-term strategy for Whitlingham WRC and includes requirements regarding minimising amenity impacts, routing HGVs, landscape, heritage assets, the Broads SAC and flood risk.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy is regarding the approach to future development at an existing water recycling centre. The policy requires development proposals at Whitlingham WRC to not have an adverse effect on the Broads SAC. Policy WP14 above would also apply to any proposed development at Whitlingham WRC. Policy WP14 requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>A modification is proposed to the policy to require consistency with a ‘medium-term strategy’ for the WRC instead of requiring consistency with a ‘longer term masterplan’. Proposed modifications to the supporting text set out what the scope of the strategy will include. These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA.</p>
<p>Policy WP16: Design of waste management facilities Criteria for waste management facilities to meet in their design, including measures to protect, conserve and where opportunities arise, enhance the natural environment.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Encourages facilities to incorporate measures to protect, conserve and where opportunities arise, enhance the natural environment.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy WP17: Safeguarding waste management facilities Policy to safeguard existing waste management facilities and water recycling centres from incompatible development.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy is safeguarding existing facilities and does not promote growth.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>

2.3 Assessment of Minerals Specific Policies

Minerals Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy MP1: Provision for minerals extraction</p> <p>The policy is to allocate sufficient sites to meet the forecast need for sand and gravel and hard rock (carstone) over the Plan period to 2038. Specific sites to deliver at least 6.91 million tonnes of sand and gravel resources will be allocated.</p> <p>A site for Carstone will be allocated, although there is not a forecast shortfall in permitted reserves.</p> <p>Sufficient sites to deliver at least 8.98 million tonnes of silica sand will be required during the Plan period.</p>	<p>No LSE – The policy promotes growth, but not in any particular location. The mineral resource includes areas within the Impact Risk Zone for SSSIs which are also designated as SPAs, SACs or Ramsar sites. Mineral extraction could potentially have adverse impacts on designated sites due to noise, dust, air quality, lighting, habitat loss, habitat damage, impacts to water quality and water resources. However, no likely significant effects are expected because all planning applications for mineral extraction sites will be determined in accordance with the relevant policies of the plan, which includes Development Management Criteria Policy MW1. Policy MW1 requires proposals to demonstrate that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the natural geological and hydrogeological environment (including internationally, nationally or locally designated sites and irreplaceable habitats).</p> <p>In order to comply with Policy MW1 at the planning application state, potential impacts would be able to be avoided and mitigated through appropriate site selection and the standard design and operation of sites, which are normally controlled by planning conditions.</p> <p>Proposed sites located in proximity to the Breckland SPA will also need to comply with Policy MW4. The individual sites proposed to be allocated for mineral extraction during the plan period have also been subject to a Test of Likely Significant Effects.</p>	<p>Modifications are proposed to the policy to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduce the quantity of sand and gravel resources to be allocated from 12.597 million tonnes to 6.91 million tonnes. • reduce the quantity of additional silica sand resources required from 10.34 million to 8.98 million tonnes. • include support for mineral extraction for sand and gravel outside of allocated sites (instead of resisting such proposals) where the applicant can demonstrate that there is an overriding justification and / or overriding benefit for the proposed extraction; and/or the landbank of permitted reserves of sand and gravel in Norfolk is below seven years. <p>These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA because policies MW1 and MW4 would still apply.</p>

Minerals Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy MP2: Spatial strategy for minerals extraction</p> <p>The policy contains the spatial strategy for mineral extraction within the resource areas for sand and gravel, carstone and silica sand. Sand and gravel and carstone sites should be located within five miles of one of Norfolk’s urban areas or three miles of one of Norfolk’s main towns and /or be well-related to one of these urban areas or main towns via appropriate transport infrastructure. The urban areas and main towns are: Norwich, King’s Lynn, Thetford, Attleborough, Great Yarmouth, Gorleston-on-Sea, Aylsham, Cromer, Dereham, Diss, Downham Market, Fakenham, Harleston, Hunstanton, Long Stratton, North Walsham, Swaffham, Watton, Wymondham. Specific sites for silica sand should be located where they are able to access the existing processing plant at Leziate (or another processing plant in Norfolk if one was to be built) and railhead via conveyor, pipeline or off-public highway haul route. The spatial strategy is subject to the proposed development for mineral extraction not being located within a SSSI or habitats site and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it.</p>	<p>No LSE – There is the potential that a mineral extraction site located in accordance with this policy could be within an Impact Risk Zone for a SSSI that is also designated as a SPA, SAC or Ramsar site. Mineral extraction could have impacts on designated sites due to noise, dust, air quality, lighting, habitat loss, habitat damage, impacts to water quality and water resources. However, no likely significant effects are expected because all planning applications for mineral extraction sites will be determined in accordance with the relevant policies of the plan, which includes Development Management Criteria Policy MW1. Policy MW1, requires proposals to demonstrate that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the natural geological and hydrogeological environment (including internationally, nationally or locally designated sites and irreplaceable habitats). In order to comply with Policy MW1 at the planning application stage, potential impacts would be able to be avoided and mitigated through appropriate site selection and the standard design and operation of sites, which are normally controlled by planning conditions. Proposed sites located in proximity to the Breckland SPA will also need to comply with Policy MW4. The individual sites proposed to be allocated for mineral extraction during the plan period have also been subject to a Test of Likely Significant Effects.</p>	<p>Modifications are proposed to this policy to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to National Landscapes (the new term for the AONB) • State that development should not be located within an irreplaceable habitat • Amend the paragraph on designated heritage assets to include conservation areas, and to refer to if the proposed development would cause substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets (including and contribution to significance by setting). • Amend the list of main towns to include Long Stratton and delete Holt, in line with the settlement hierarchies in the Local Planning Authorities’ Local Plans. • Amend the list of urban areas to delete West Lynn and to include Easton and the remainder of the Growth Triangle within the Norwich urban area, in line with the settlement hierarchies in the Local Planning Authorities Local Plans. • Amend the locational strategy for silica sand extraction sites to include locations outside of the mapped resource area where borehole data is submitted to demonstrate a viable silica sand resource. • Amend the locational strategy for silica sand sites to include locations where the site can access the existing processing plant at Leziate (or another processing plant in Norfolk if one was to be built) and railhead via conveyor, pipeline or off-public highway haul route.

Minerals Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
		These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA because policies MW1 and MW4 would still apply.
<p>Policy MPSS1: Silica sand extraction sites Criteria based policy for planning applications for silica sand extraction sites to adhere to. Includes requirements for the submission of a noise assessment, air quality/dust assessment and a programme of mitigation measures to deal with any potential impacts. Also requires submission of a biodiversity survey and report, a phased working and restoration scheme incorporating ecological enhancement and biodiversity net gain on restoration. Also requires submission of a Hydrogeological Impact Assessment and appropriate mitigation measures to protect SSSIs, SPAs and SACs.</p>	<p>No LSE - Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. The silica sand resource does include areas that are within the Impact Risk Zone for a SSSI that is also designated as a SPA, SAC or Ramsar site. Mineral extraction could have impacts on designated sites due to noise, dust, air quality, lighting, habitat loss, habitat damage, impacts to water quality and water resources. However, no likely significant effects are expected because all planning applications for mineral extraction sites will be determined in accordance with the relevant policies of the Plan, which includes Development Management Criteria Policy MW1. Policy MW1, requires proposals to demonstrate that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the natural geological and hydrogeological environment (including internationally, nationally or locally designated sites and irreplaceable habitats). To comply with Policy MW1 at the planning application stage, potential impacts would be able to be avoided and mitigated through appropriate site selection and the standard design and operation of sites, which are normally controlled by planning conditions. In addition, the policy requirements of MPSS1 include protection of ecosystems and surface water features that are reliant on groundwater, including SSSIs, SPAs and SACs.</p>	<p>A modification is proposed to policy requirement (a) to state: “To address the shortfall in silica sand supply to meet the requirements of the existing processing plant in Norfolk and/or a new processing plant in Norfolk if one was built (as set out in the NPPF)”.</p> <p>A modification is proposed to policy requirement (i) to include reference to a stand-off distance round a foul sewer that crosses the site or diversion of the sewer; this is in addition to the existing policy references to a water main.</p> <p>A modification is proposed to policy requirement (m) to state that the processing plant and railhead should be accessed via conveyor, pipeline or off-public haul routes. This is so that the requirement applies to any processing plant, not just the existing one. Another modification to requirement (m) is to clarify that the preferred public highway route details apply to silica sand being transported to the existing processing plant at Leziate</p> <p>These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA because Policy MW1 would still apply.</p>

Minerals Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy MP3: Borrow pits Criteria based policy for applications for borrow pits to adhere to.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria based policy only. Policy requires extraction from the site to cause less environmental damage than would result from using material from an established source of supply. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy MP4: Agricultural or potable water reservoirs Criteria based policy for applications for water reservoirs with incidental mineral extraction involving off-site removal of minerals to adhere to.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy MP5: Core River Valleys Protection of defined core river valleys from inappropriate mineral development.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria-based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>Modifications are proposed to amend the first section of the policy wording to state that “Minerals development will only be permitted in Core River Valleys where the applicant demonstrates that the development will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance the landscape character, consistent with the relevant local Landscape Character Assessment; and • Enhance the historic environment where appropriate; and • Provide a measurable net gain in the biodiversity of the river valley (either immediately or on restoration); and • Not impede floodplain functionality.” <p>The rest of the policy wording will not change. These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA.</p>

Minerals Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy MP6: Cumulative impacts and phasing of workings The policy details how cumulative impacts of mineral workings may be considered acceptable if phased or adequately mitigated.</p>	<p>No LSE – The policy does not promote growth in any particular location, but details how cumulative impacts of mineral workings may be considered acceptable if phased or adequately mitigated. This would be assessed on a case-by-case basis at the planning application stage. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy MP7: Progressive working, restoration and after-use The policy requires proposals for mineral workings to be accompanied by a scheme for the phased and progressive working and restoration of the site, with a preference for restoration enhancing Norfolk’s biodiversity, contributing to Green Infrastructure corridors, known ecological networks, the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and the Nature Recovery Network; and creating landscapes informed by and consistent with the relevant Landscape Character Assessment. It also includes a preference for restoration to enable access links to Public Rights of Way and national trails and to reinstate BMV agricultural land where it occurs.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy does not promote growth. The purpose of the policy is to ensure that proposals for mineral workings are accompanied by a scheme for the phased and progressive working and restoration of the site.</p>	<p>Modifications are proposed to the policy wording to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a preference for restoration schemes to contribute positively to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and the Nature Recovery Network • Delete the reference to the creation of ‘high quality, locally distinctive landscapes’ and replace it with the creation of ‘landscapes which are informed by and consistent with the relevant Local Landscape Character’ • Require restoration schemes to demonstrate that the scheme provides for a minimum measurable 10% biodiversity net gain • Require schemes to be informed by historic landscape characterisation • Include a requirement that there will be no increase in flood risk from the pre-development scenarios and opportunities for betterment are sought <p>These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA.</p>

Minerals Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy MP8: Aftercare Measures requiring an aftercare strategy and annual management report for proposed restoration to agriculture, forestry, amenity or ecology after-uses, or including a geological exposure following mineral extraction.</p>	<p>No LSE – The policy does not promote growth. The policy is to ensure that restoration of mineral workings is carried out to the required standard for the proposed afteruse.</p>	<p>Modifications are proposed to the policy wording to clarify that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where the proposed restoration is to agriculture an outline aftercare strategy for five years is required • planning conditions and /or longer-term planning obligations will be used to ensure that a detailed annual management report is provided for the duration of the aftercare period, where required. <p>These modifications do not change the policy assessment in the HRA.</p>
<p>Policy MP9: Asphalt plants, concrete batching plants and manufacture of concrete products Criteria based policy for the location of asphalt plants, concrete batching plants and the manufacture of concrete products.</p>	<p>No LSE – The policy does not promote growth in any particular location. Criteria based policy only. Requires compliance with Policy MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Policy MP10: Safeguarding of port and rail facilities, and facilities for the manufacture of concrete, asphalt and recycled materials Policy to safeguard rail heads, rail links to quarries, wharfage and associated facilities for the storage, handling and processing facilities for the bulk transport of minerals and to safeguard sites for concrete batching, manufacture of coated materials, other concrete products, and the handling, processing and distribution of other aggregates from incompatible development.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy is safeguarding facilities and does not promote growth in any particular location.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>

Minerals Policy and Description	Likely Significant Effect Alone or in-combination	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
<p>Policy MP11: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas Policy to safeguard existing, permitted and allocated mineral extraction sites from incompatible development and to safeguard mineral resources from inappropriate development proposals that may sterilise the mineral resource.</p>	<p>No LSE – Policy is safeguarding existing facilities and the mineral resource from inappropriate development. The inclusion of land within a Mineral Safeguarding Area does not necessarily mean that planning permission would be granted for mineral extraction. Any application for mineral extraction within a MSA would be determined in accordance with the relevant policies, including MW1.</p>	<p>No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.</p>

2.4 Assessment of allocated mineral extraction sites in the NM&WLP

Site reference, parish and proposal	Distance to designated site	Task 1 assessment conclusion of likely significant effect alone or in combination	Designated sites affected	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
MIN 12 in Beetley Extraction of sand and gravel	3.47km to River Wensum SAC	No likely significant effect	None	Reduction in estimated site resource from 1,175,000 tonnes to 992,000 tonnes. A modification is proposed to the policy wording to require the site to be worked dry (above the water table). These modifications do not change the site assessment in the HRA.
MIN 51 / MIN 13 / MIN 08 in Beetley Extraction of sand and gravel	4.54km to River Wensum SAC	No likely significant effect	None	Reduction in estimate site resource from 1,830,000 tonnes to 1,551,000 tonnes. Modifications are proposed to the policy wording to require the site to be worked dry (above the water table) and to include wet woodland around retained wetland areas in the site restoration scheme. These modifications do not change the site assessment in the HRA.

Site reference, parish and proposal	Distance to designated site	Task 1 assessment conclusion of likely significant effect alone or in combination	Designated sites affected	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
MIN 200 in Carbrooke Extraction of sand and gravel	4.47km to Norfolk Valley Fens SAC	No likely significant effect	None	Increase in estimated site resource from 300,000 tonnes to 400,000 tonnes. No modification proposed to the policy wording. The increase in the mineral resource does not change the site assessment in the HRA.
MIN 202 in Attlebridge Extraction of sand and gravel	1.14km to River Wensum SAC 4.93km to Norfolk Valley Fens SAC	No likely significant effect	None	No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.
MIN 37 in Frettenham, Buxton with Lammas Extraction of sand and gravel	4.23km to The Broads SAC and Broadland SPA / Ramsar	No likely significant effect	None	No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.
MIN 64 in Horstead with Stanninghall Extraction of sand and gravel	3.39km to The Broads SAC and Broadland SPA / Ramsar	No likely significant effect	None	No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.
MIN 65 in Stanninghall Extraction of sand and gravel	1.43km to The Broads SAC and Broadland SPA / Ramsar	No likely significant effect	None	No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.
MIN 96 in Spixworth, Horsham St Faith & Newton St Faith Extraction of sand and gravel	2.22km to The Broads SAC and Broadland SPA / Ramsar 4.76km to River Wensum SAC	No likely significant effect	None	A modification is proposed to the policy wording to require screening planting and/or bunding as appropriate along the north-western and south-eastern site boundaries. This modification does not change the site assessment in the HRA.
MIN 6 in Middleton Extraction of carstone	More than 5km to all designated sites	No likely significant effect	None	No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.

Site reference, parish and proposal	Distance to designated site	Task 1 assessment conclusion of likely significant effect alone or in combination	Designated sites affected	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
MIN 40 in East Winch Extraction of silica sand	3.79km to Norfolk Valley Fens SAC	No likely significant effect	None	No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.
SIL 01 in Bawsey Extraction of silica sand	2.74km to Roydon Common Ramsar and Roydon Common and Dersingham Bog SAC	No likely significant effect	None	A modification is proposed to the policy wording regarding the information to be provided in a heritage statement. The modification does not change the site assessment in the HRA.
MIN 206 in Tottenhill Extraction of sand and gravel	More than 5km to all designated sites	No likely significant effect	None	No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.
MIN 69 in Aylmerton Extraction of sand and gravel	0.65km to Norfolk Valley Fens SAC 1.86km to Greater Wash SPA	No likely significant effect	None	No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.
MIN 115 in North Walsham Extraction of sand and gravel	More than 5km to all designated sites	No likely significant effect	None	No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.
MIN 207 in Edgefield Extraction of sand and gravel	2.57km to Norfolk Valley Fens SAC	No likely significant effect	None	No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.
MIN 208 in East Beckham Extraction of sand and gravel	1.45km to Norfolk Valley Fens SAC 2.85km to Greater Wash SPA	No likely significant effect	None	No Main Modifications are proposed to the policy wording, therefore no change to the assessment.

Site reference, parish and proposal	Distance to designated site	Task 1 assessment conclusion of likely significant effect alone or in combination	Designated sites affected	Proposed modification and any change to the assessment
MIN 25 in Haddiscoe Extraction of sand and gravel	3.83km to The Broads SAC and Broadland SPA / Ramsar 4.33km to Breydon Water SPA / Ramsar	No likely significant effect	None	A modification is proposed to policy requirement (c) to require the restoration scheme to include reinstatement of historic hedgerows and field boundaries informed by Historic Landscape Characterisation. A modification is proposed to policy requirement (a) to delete the requirement for mitigation measures to include setting back the working area at least 100m from the nearest residential properties and replace it with a requirement for a standoff distance between the working area and sensitive receptors to air quality, noise and other amenity impacts, based on the findings of noise and dust assessments and proposed mitigation measures. These modifications do not change the site assessment in the HRA.

3. Conclusion

Following the analysis of the proposed Main Modifications to policies within the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, it can be concluded that they will not lead to likely significant effects on European sites, alone or in combination with other plans and projects, and do not change the conclusions of the HRA of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Plan.