



**Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal Main Modifications Addendum (2024)**

Contents

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Context for Addendum – proposed Main Modifications .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Criteria for deciding if assessment is required .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Assessment of proposed modifications .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4.1 Minerals and Waste Local Plan Strategic Objectives .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4.2 General Policies.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.3 Waste Management Specific Policies.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4.4 Minerals Specific Policies.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.5 Allocated mineral extraction sites.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>5. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>6. Next steps.....</b>	<b>29</b>

## **1. Introduction**

This document is an addendum to the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Report (March 2022). The Sustainability Appraisal Report (March 2022) consists of documents A3.1 to A3.6 in the examination library. The Publication version of the NM&WLP contains Norfolk County Council's policies for the development and use of land for mineral extraction and associated development and waste management facilities in Norfolk and covers the period to 2038. The Sustainability Appraisal Report (March 2022) contains an assessment of the NM&WLP, following the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Regulations and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) and makes recommendations for Norfolk County Council to consider during the preparation of the NM&WLP. This Sustainability Appraisal Addendum is based on and updates the Sustainability Appraisal Report (March 2022) undertaken during the preparation of the NM&WLP.

## **2. Context for Addendum – proposed Main Modifications**

**2.1** Since the publication of the NM&WLP in September 2022 Norfolk County Council held a formal representations stage on the legal compliance and soundness of the Publication version of the NM&WLP. The NM&WLP and its supporting documents were submitted to Government for examination in December 2023. Examination hearings took place with an independent Planning Inspector in July 2024.

**2.2** During the examination in public, Norfolk County Council have proposed modifications to the NM&WLP to address some of the matters raised at the Regulation 19 pre-submission representation period stage, and in the examination. Other modifications have also been proposed to provide factual updates and for clarification.

**2.3** The assessment process in this addendum consists of two main parts: the first is an assessment of whether the proposed main modifications are likely to alter the conclusions of the SA, and if so the second stage is to carry out a reassessment of the relevant sections of the SA. It will focus on those modifications considered to be 'Main Modifications', i.e. those that have the potential to make the biggest difference, rather than the more minor amendments.

**2.4** As these modifications are refined policies based on previously selected options as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Report, the other options considered, and their assessment do not require update at this time.

**2.5** The issues present in the Plan Area identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Report (2022) remain the same and therefore there are no updates to other sections of the Sustainability Appraisal in this addendum.

**2.6** For information, the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives used in the Sustainability Appraisal and referred to in this Addendum document are as follows:

SA1: To adapt to and mitigate the effects of climate change by reducing contributions to climate change

SA2: To improve air quality in line with the National Air Quality Standards

SA3: To minimise noise, vibration and visual intrusion

SA4: To improve accessibility to jobs, services and facilities and reduce social exclusion

SA5: To maintain and enhance the character of the townscape and historic environment

SA6: To protect and enhance Norfolk's biodiversity and geodiversity

SA7: To promote innovative solutions for the restoration and after use of minerals sites  
SA8: To protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the countryside and landscape  
SA9: To contribute to improved health and amenity of local communities in Norfolk  
SA10: To protect and enhance water and soil quality in Norfolk  
SA11: To promote sustainable use of minerals and waste resources  
SA12: To reduce the risk of current and future flooding at new and existing development  
SA13: To encourage employment opportunities and promote economic growth

### **3. Criteria for deciding if assessment is required**

To assess whether a reassessment of a policy and its supporting text is required, the following process is used:

First, the changes proposed are identified. Of the changes identified, those that are minor in nature are discounted.

Consideration is then given to whether a reassessment is required, and in doing so, the following questions are considered:

- Are the proposed changes likely to alter the outcome of the assessment of any of the criteria against which the policy was assessed?
- If so, would the change outcome result in a significant change? i.e. would a criterion previously assessed to be not applicable now be relevant, or where an assessment took place, a significant change to the impact or significance of that effect?
- Additionally, would the proposed change result in additional areas or localities being affected and / or mitigation being recommended?

If it is identified that the answer to any of the above questions is yes, then a reassessment of that policy and its supporting text is likely to be appropriate.

### **4. Assessment of proposed modifications**

The following sections set out the key changes to policies and supporting text and an assessment of whether Sustainability Appraisal reassessment is required. For completeness, all the policies contained in the Publication version of the NM&WLP are included in this Addendum; however Main Modifications are only proposed to the policy wording or supporting text of some of those policies.

## 4.1 Minerals and Waste Local Plan Strategic Objectives

Main Modifications are proposed to some of the strategic objectives in the NM&WLP. The strategic objectives were tested against the SA/SEA objectives in Task B1 in the Sustainability Appraisal Report. Therefore, the Main Modifications to the strategic objectives also need to be considered against the SA/SEA objectives. The Main Modifications to the strategic objectives are listed below (new text is shown in bold and underlined):

**Waste Strategic Objective WSO7:** To ensure waste facilities and their proposed locations are sustainably designed, constructed and operated to reduce potential unacceptable adverse effects on human health, amenity and the natural, built and historic environment and to contribute to net zero carbon emissions. All developments will provide **a minimum measurable 10% biodiversity net gains and temporary developments will contribute to the deliver of the national Nature Recovery Network objectives on restoration.**

**Is sustainability appraisal reassessment required?** No. The modification provides greater detail regarding the provision of biodiversity net gains and does not affect the existing assessment of the objective within the SA.

**Minerals Strategic Objective MSO1:** To provide a steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals, by identifying adequate mineral extraction sites within Norfolk sufficient to meet the forecast need, based on the Local Aggregate Assessment; **by maintaining a landbank of at least 7 years for sand and gravel and at least 10 years for Carstone;** and safeguarding existing **extraction sites and** infrastructure.”

**Is sustainability appraisal reassessment required?** No. The modification provides clarification only by including the existing national policy requirements from the National Planning Policy Framework and does not affect the existing assessment of the objective within the SA.

**Minerals Strategic Objective MSO2:** To provide a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals by identifying adequate mineral extraction sites within Norfolk and through the inclusion of ‘criteria-based’ locational policies, sufficient to meet the forecast need; **by maintaining a stock of permitted reserves of silica sand of at least 10 years where practicable** and safeguarding existing **extraction sites and** infrastructure.

**Is sustainability appraisal reassessment required?** No. The modification provides clarification only by including the existing national policy requirements from the National Planning Policy Framework and does not affect the existing assessment of the objective within the SA.

**Minerals Strategic Objective MSO9:** To positively contribute to the natural, built and historic environments with high quality, progressive and expedient restoration to achieve a beneficial afteruse. The restoration scheme and aftercare will protect and enhance the environment, including landscape improvements, **contributing to the delivery of the national Nature Recovery Network objectives** and the provision of **a minimum measurable 10% biodiversity net gains**

**Is sustainability appraisal reassessment required?** No. The modification provides greater detail regarding the provision of biodiversity net gains and does not affect the existing assessment of the objective within the SA.

## 4.2 General Policies

### Policy MW1: Development management criteria

**Policy description:** 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.

**Proposed modifications:** 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’.

No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text. Additional modifications are proposed to ensure the information is consistent with the current adopted Norfolk Validation Requirements for Minerals and Waste Planning Applications and to provide further information on lighting, archaeology (including Historic England’s guidance documents) and watercourse consents.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** Yes, due to the nature of the proposed main modifications to the policy wording.

**Sustainability Appraisal reassessment:** The modification to include reference to intrinsically dark landscapes would not change the existing positive (+) score for SA objective SA3 ‘to minimise noise, vibration and visual intrusion’ or the existing significant positive scores (++) for SA8 ‘to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the countryside and landscape’ or SA5 ‘to maintain and enhance the character of the townscape and historic environment’. The additional text about mitigation for developments affecting archaeological assets would not change the existing significant positive score (++) for SA objective SA5 ‘to maintain and enhance the character of the townscape and historic environment’. The amended text regarding biodiversity net gains would not change the existing positive score for SA objective SA6 ‘to protect and enhance Norfolk’s biodiversity and geodiversity’. The scores and assessments for all other SA objectives would also not be affected by the proposed modifications to the policy wording. The additional modifications to the supporting text are for consistency with the current adopted Norfolk Validation Requirements and to provide other useful information already contained in other guidance documents. Therefore, the main modifications proposed to the policy wording and the additional modifications proposed to the supporting text would not change the scores for any of the SA objectives.

### Policy MW2: Transport

**Policy description:** Criteria for minerals and waste development to meet regarding transport impacts and assessments.

**Proposed modifications:** A modification is proposed to delete the existing policy requirement (d) text on unacceptable physical 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”.

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.

No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The amended wording for policy requirement (d) is intended to have the same outcome as the original wording for policy requirement (d). The original wording of policy requirement (d) is not referred to in the SA. The additional text to clarify that in relation to sustainable transport proposals are also required to comply with requirement (g) of Policy MW3 is for clarification and would have been required regardless of the proposed modification. Therefore, the proposed modifications do not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **Policy MW3: Climate change mitigation and adaption**

**Policy description:** 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.

**Proposed modifications:** 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.

A modification is proposed to policy requirement (e) to include reference to larger river flows, as well as rising sea levels and coastal erosion.

No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The modification to requirement (e) does not impact the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA. Only SA objective SA1 'to adapt to and mitigate the effects of climate change by reducing contributions to climate change' is considered to be directly relevant to the assessment of the modification to requirement (c) regarding energy use. SA objective SA1 already scores significantly positive (++) and therefore the policy modification would not affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA. Due to the specific focus of the modification to requirement (c) it would not affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA against any of the other SA objectives.

### **Policy MW4: The Brecks protected habitats and species**

**Policy description:** Protection of the Brecks protected habitats and species from inappropriate minerals and waste development.

**Proposed modifications:** Modifications are proposed to the policy as follows (deleted text is shown as strikethrough and new text is shown in bold and underlined):

“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 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.

Stone Curlew

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.

~~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.~~

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.

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 Habitats Regulations Assessment 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:

- 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.”

There are no changes proposed to the policy text regarding woodlark and nightjar.

Main modifications are proposed to the supporting text to delete paragraphs 9.3 and 9.4, to amend paragraphs 9.2, 9.5 and 9.6 in line with the policy changes set out above.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** Yes, due to the nature of the policy and supporting text changes.

**Sustainability Appraisal reassessment:** The policy was originally assessed as having no effect on SA objectives SA1, SA2, SA3, SA4, SA7, SA10, SA11 and SA12 and this assessment would not change with the revised policy and supporting text wording. The proposed modifications to the policy and supporting text would not change the existing assessment for SA objectives SA5, SA6, SA8, SA9, SA10 and SA13 because the core aim of the policy is still to protect the Breckland SPA and SAC designated habitats and species from adverse effects due to inappropriate development and therefore whilst the detail of the policy and supporting text wording is proposed to be modified, the policy direction and outcomes will not be affected and the existing assessment within the SA will also not be affected by those proposed modifications.

## **Policy MW5: Agricultural Soils**

**Policy description:** Protection of the Best and Most Versatile agricultural soils.

**Proposed modifications:** No main modification is proposed to the policy wording. An additional factual modification is proposed to the policy wording to replace the reference to Defra’s ‘Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils’, with the ‘Institute of Quarrying’s Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (2021)’ because the Institute of Quarrying’s guidance has replaced the Defra guidance.

No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text. An additional modification is proposed to include information on the soil management and handling strategy as detailed in the adopted Norfolk Validation Requirements for Minerals and Waste Planning Applications.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The proposed modifications are factual updates and do not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### 4.3 Waste Management Specific Policies

#### WP1: Waste management capacity to be provided

**Policy description:** 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:

A maximum of 502,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) of Local Authority Collected Waste.

A maximum of 1,959,000 tpa of commercial and industrial waste.

A maximum of 1,100,000 tpa of inert waste.

A maximum of 90,000 tpa of hazardous waste.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording.

Modifications are proposed to the supporting text to update the waste management data on existing capacity, arisings and recycling rates to include 2022/23 information.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The quantities of waste forecast to be managed over the Plan period have not changed and therefore the policy direction and outcomes have not changed and the existing assessment of the policy within the SA is not affected.

#### WP2: Spatial Strategy for waste management facilities

**Policy description:** 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.

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.

A more flexible approach is taken to the location of agricultural waste treatment facilities, windrow composting facilities, community composting facilities, small scale local facilities and water recycling centres.

Modifications are proposed to this policy to:

- 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 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.



- 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.

**Proposed modifications:** A Main Modification is proposed to the supporting text to update the list of urban areas and main towns as set out above. Additional modifications are proposed to the supporting text to provide additional information on heritage assets and to provide information on the proximity principle for waste.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** Yes, due to the nature of the modifications to the policy wording affecting the spatial strategy.

**Sustainability Appraisal reassessment:** Due to the number of modifications to the policy wording and supporting text a reassessment of the policy against each of the SA objectives is detailed below.

SA1: positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because the policy continues to state that waste management facilities should be located within five miles of one of Norfolk's urban areas or three miles of one of the main towns (although there are modifications to the list of main towns and urban areas). The modified policy wording states 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 the source of the waste or the destination of the recovered waste material. The modified policy wording no longer limits this flexibility to specific waste management facility types. Therefore, the comments for the assessment of Policy WP2 against SA objective SA1 will change in line with the modified policy wording. These requirements are still expected to limit the distance that waste will be transported to and from facilities and the associated emissions to air from road transport, which should reduce contributions to climate change.

SA2: positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because the policy continues to state that waste management facilities should be located within five miles of one of Norfolk's urban areas or three miles of one of the main towns (although there are modifications to the list of main towns and urban areas). The modified policy wording states 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 the source of the waste or the destination of the recovered waste material. The modified policy wording no longer limits this flexibility to specific waste management facility types. Therefore, the comments for the assessment of Policy WP2 against SA objective SA2 will change in line with the modified policy wording. These requirements are still expected to limit the distance that waste will be transported to and from facilities and the associated emissions to air from road transport. Local effects will depend upon the location of new facilities.

SA3: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because the purpose of the policy continues to be to locate waste management facilities close to the source of waste or the destination of the recovered waste material and local effects will depend upon the specific location of new facilities in relation to sensitive receptors to amenity impacts.

SA4: positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because the policy continues to state that most waste management facilities should be located within five miles of one of Norfolk's urban areas or three miles of one of the main towns. Although there are modifications to the list of urban areas and main towns, the spatial strategy should improve accessibility to waste management services.

SA5: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment score due to the proposed modifications because there continue to be heritage assets located within five miles of Norfolk's urban areas and three miles of Norfolk's main towns with the modifications to the list of urban areas and main towns. There are also heritage assets located at greater distances from Norfolk's urban areas and main towns. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new facilities. The modified policy wording states that development should not be located within a designated heritage asset, or its setting if the proposed development would cause substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset (including any contribution to significance by setting).

SA6: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment score due to the proposed modifications because there continue to be designated sites for biodiversity and also locations of geodiversity priority features within five miles of Norfolk's urban areas and three miles of Norfolk's main towns with the modifications to the list of urban areas and main towns. There are also designated sites for biodiversity and locations of geodiversity priority features at greater distances from Norfolk's urban areas and main towns. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new facilities. The modified policy wording states that development should not be located within an SSSI or habitats site if it is likely to have an adverse effect on it, or within an ancient woodland or other irreplaceable habitat.

SA7: no effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because the policy does not relate to the restoration and afteruse of minerals or waste sites.

SA8: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because there continue to be areas of protected landscapes (such as AONB/National Landscapes, the Broads and Conservation Areas) and areas of countryside within five miles of some of Norfolk's urban areas and three miles of some of Norfolk's main towns with the modifications to the list of urban areas and main towns. There are also areas of protected landscapes and areas of countryside at greater distances of Norfolk's urban areas and main towns. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new facilities. The policy continues to state that development should not be located within the Broads Authority Area or the AONB (now called National Landscapes), other than in exceptional circumstances.

SA9: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because local effects will depend upon the specific location of new facilities in relation to sensitive receptors to health and amenity impacts. The purpose of the policy continues to be to locate waste management facilities close to the source of waste or the destination of the recovered waste material.

SA10: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because there continue to be areas of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land within five miles of Norfolk's urban areas and 3 miles of Norfolk's main towns with the modifications to the list of urban areas and main towns. There are also areas of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land at greater distances from Norfolk's urban areas and main towns. The spatial strategy in this policy is also expected to have a neutral effect on water quality. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new facilities.

SA11: positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment score due to the proposed modifications because the policy continues to state that waste management facilities should be

located within five miles of one of Norfolk's urban areas or three miles of one of the main towns (although there are modifications to the list of main towns and urban areas). The modified policy wording states 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 the source of the waste or the destination of the recovered waste material. The modified policy wording no longer limits this flexibility to specific waste management facility types. Therefore, the comments for the assessment of Policy WP2 against SA objective SA11 will change in line with the modified policy wording. The policy requirements are still expected to ensure that waste management facilities are developed in sustainable locations in transport terms.

SA12: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because there continue to be areas at high risk and areas at low risk of flooding within five miles of Norfolk's urban areas and three miles of Norfolk's main towns with the modifications to the list of urban areas and main towns. There are also areas at high risk of flooding at greater distances of Norfolk's urban areas and main towns. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new facilities.

SA13: positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because the SA assessment already refers to the spatial strategy to locate waste management facilities close to the source of the waste or the destination of the recovered waste material

In conclusion, following a reassessment of the Sustainability Appraisal for Policy WP2, the modifications do not affect the existing assessment scores of the policy within the SA, although there are changes to the comments for SA objectives SA1, SA2, SA5, SA6, and SA11 due to the modified policy wording.

### **WP3: Land suitable for waste management facilities**

**Policy description:** This policy details the types of land that will be acceptable for non-hazardous 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.

**Proposed modifications:** 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)'.

No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The modification to state that the policy applies to non-hazardous waste only is for clarity as there is a separate policy WP6 regarding hazardous waste. The modification to criteria (g) provides greater flexibility on facility types suitable at water recycling centres. The current SA assessment for Policy WP3 states that effects will depend upon the location of new facilities and notes that Policy WP3 requires compliance with Policy MW1. Therefore, the modifications do not affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

#### **WP4: Recycling or transfer of inert CD&E waste and production of recycled aggregates**

**Policy description:** Criteria-based policy for the location of facilities for the recycling or transfer of inert CD&E waste, including production of recycled aggregates

**Proposed modifications:** No main modifications are proposed to the policy wording. The title of the policy is proposed to be modified for clarity to: “Recycling or transfer of inert CD&E waste and production of recycled aggregates”. A Main Modification is proposed to the supporting text to clarify that the policy applies to proposals to treat and process inert CD&E waste to produce recycled aggregates and that these proposals will be supported where they will promote the sustainable management of waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy and facilitate a reduction in the need for primary aggregates.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The proposed modification to the policy title and to the supporting text is to clarify that the policy applies to proposals to produce recycled aggregates from inert CD&E waste. These modifications are for clarification and do not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

#### **WP5: Waste Transfer stations, materials recycling facilities, ELV facilities and WEEE recovery facilities**

**Policy description:** Criteria-based policy for the location of waste transfer stations, MRFs, ELV and WEEE facilities.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

#### **WP6: Transfer, storage, processing and treatment of hazardous waste**

**Policy description:** Criteria-based policy for the location of facilities for the transfer, storage processing and treatment of hazardous waste

**Proposed modifications:** No main modifications are proposed to the policy wording. An additional modification is proposed to point (c) of the policy to refer to previously developed (brownfield) land, instead of just referring to brownfield land. This is for clarity and consistency with the NPPF. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No, the modification is for clarity and consistency with the NPPF and does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

#### **WP7: Household waste recycling centres**

**Policy description:** Criteria-based policy for the location of household waste recycling centres.

**Proposed modifications:** 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. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No, the modification from ‘may be acceptable’ to ‘will be acceptable’ does not materially impact on either the likely outcome of the policy or the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **WP8: Composting**

**Policy description:** Criteria-based policy for the location of composting facilities.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

### **WP9: Anaerobic digestion**

**Policy description:** Criteria-based policy for the location of anaerobic digestion facilities.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

### **WP10: Residual waste treatment facilities**

**Policy description:** Criteria-based policy for the location of residual waste treatment facilities.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

### **WP11: Disposal of inert waste by landfill**

**Policy description:** Criteria-based policy for the location of sites for the disposal of inert waste by landfill.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

### **WP12: Non-hazardous and hazardous waste landfills**

**Policy description:** Criteria-based policy for the location of sites for non-hazardous and hazardous waste landfills.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

### **WP13: Landfill mining and reclamation**

**Policy description:** Criteria-based policy for determining proposals for landfill mining or excavation.

**Proposed modifications:** 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”.

No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** Yes, due to the additional requirement.

**Sustainability Appraisal reassessment:** The policy already scores positively for SA objectives SA3 ‘to minimise noise, vibration and visual intrusion’, SA5 ‘to maintain and enhance the character of the townscape and historic environment’, SA6 ‘to protect and enhance Norfolk’s biodiversity and geodiversity’, SA8 ‘to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the countryside and landscape’ and SA9 ‘to contribute to improved health and amenity of local communities in Norfolk’. Therefore, the additional policy requirement will not change the scores of these SA objectives in the SA assessment. The scores and assessments for all other SA objectives would also not be affected by the proposed modifications to the policy wording.

#### **WP14: Water Recycling Centres**

**Policy description:** Criteria-based policy for the location of sites for waste recycling centres.

**Proposed modifications:** Modifications are proposed to include a new requirement (d) ‘comply with new legislation’ and a new requirement (e) ‘incorporate climate change adaptation 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”.

No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** Yes, due to the additional requirements.

**Sustainability Appraisal reassessment:** The inclusion of new requirement (e) will change the score against SA objective SA1 ‘to adapt and mitigate the effects of climate change by reducing contributions to climate change’, from the current neutral (0) score to a positive score (+) for short-term, medium-term and long-term effects. The additional requirement for applications to demonstrate the contribution that the development would make to water quality improvement would score positively for the short-term, medium-term and long-term effects for SA objectives SA6 ‘to protect and enhance Norfolk’s biodiversity and geodiversity’, and SA10 ‘to protect and enhance water and soil quality in Norfolk’, but the policy already scores positively for these objectives. Therefore, in the reassessment of the policy with the proposed main modifications, the policy scores positively for SA objective SA1, but there are no changes to the scores against the other SA objectives.

#### **WP15: Whitlingham Water Recycling Centre**

**Policy description:** 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.

**Proposed modifications:** 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 also replace the requirement for a ‘longer term masterplan’ with a ‘medium term strategy’ and set out what the scope of the strategy will include.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The policy amendments are to change the terms used to refer to a ‘medium term strategy’ instead of a ‘longer term masterplan’. The SA does not refer to the masterplan. These changes do not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

#### **WP16: Design of waste management facilities**

**Policy description:** Criteria for waste management facilities to meet in their design, including measures to protect, conserve and where opportunities arise, enhance the natural environment.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

#### **WP17: Safeguarding waste management facilities**

**Policy description:** Policy to safeguard existing waste management facilities and water recycling centres from incompatible development.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

### **4.4 Minerals Specific Policies**

#### **MP1: Provision for minerals extraction**

**Policy description:** 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. A site for Carstone will be allocated, although there is not a forecast shortfall in permitted reserves. Sufficient sites to deliver at least 8.98 million tonnes of silica sand will be required during the Plan period.

**Proposed modifications:** Modifications are proposed to the policy to:

- 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.

Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text to Policy MP1 to update the data on sand and gravel, Carstone and silica sand sales and permitted reserves in line with the published data for 2022 in the Local Aggregate Assessment and to update the calculations of forecast need using this data. A modification to the supporting text also explains that there is the potential for the silica sand processing plant throughput to increase if a suitable planning application was submitted and granted.

Additional modifications are proposed to the supporting text to provide more information on the uses of Carstone and the policies to be used to assess applications for clay and chalk extraction.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** Yes, due to the nature of the policy and supporting text changes amending the quantity of minerals to be planned for and to support mineral extraction for sand and gravel outside of allocated sites in certain circumstances.

**Sustainability Appraisal reassessment:** Due to the policy containing the quantity of minerals to be planned for, but not the location of the mineral extraction (which is covered by Policy MW2), the SA assessment of the policy concluded that the policy would have no direct effects on SA

objectives SA1, SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, SA6, SA7, SA8, SA9, SA10 and SA12 and the proposed modifications do not change this assessment. The policy scored positively (+) for SA objective SA11 ‘to promote sustainable use of minerals and waste resources’ and SA13 ‘to encourage employment opportunities and promote economic growth’ and these scores would not change with the policy modifications because the only changes are updates to the quantity of minerals to be planned for based on more recent data and to support mineral extraction for sand and gravel outside allocated sites in certain circumstances. The method of calculating the quantity to be planned for has not changed. Therefore, the policy with the proposed modifications would provide a steady and adequate supply of minerals to meet the forecast need and would still score positively against SA objectives SA11 and SA13.

## **MP2: Spatial strategy for minerals extraction**

**Policy description:** 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 Leziat (or another processing plant in Norfolk if one was to be built) and railhead via conveyor, pipeline or off-public highway haul route.

**Proposed modifications:** Modifications are proposed to this policy to:

- 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 Leziat (or another processing plant in Norfolk if one was to be built) and railhead via conveyor, pipeline or off-public highway haul route.

Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text to update the list of urban areas and main towns as set out above, to recognise that there is the possibility for another silica sand processing plant to be built in Norfolk in the future and to explain the relationship between policy MP2 and Policy MPSS1.

Additional modifications are proposed to the supporting text regarding heritage assets.



**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** Yes, due to the nature of the policy and supporting text changes affecting the spatial strategy.

**Sustainability Appraisal reassessment:** Due to the number of modifications to the policy wording and supporting text a reassessment of the policy against each of the SA objectives is detailed below.

SA1: positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment score due to the proposed modifications because the spatial strategy for the location of specific aggregate extraction sites continues to be in proximity to locations of greatest housing and employment growth and/or well-related via appropriate transport infrastructure. The modification to the silica sand locational requirements is for specific sites for silica sand extraction to be preferably 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. These requirements are still expected to limit the distance that minerals will be transported from extraction sites and the associated emission to air from road transport, which should reduce contributions to climate change.

SA2: positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment score due to the proposed modifications because the spatial strategy for the location of specific aggregate extraction sites continues to be in proximity to locations of greatest housing and employment growth and/or well-related via appropriate transport infrastructure. The modification to the silica sand locational requirements is for specific sites for silica sand extraction to be preferably 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. These requirements are still expected to limit the distance that minerals will be transported from extraction sites and the associated emission to air from road transport. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new sites. Each proposed extraction site has been assessed separately in the SA.

SA3: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because the aim of the spatial strategy for the location of specific sites continues to be to locate sand and gravel, or carstone, extraction sites in proximity to the locations of greatest housing and employment growth in Norfolk, or in the case of silica sand, in proximity to the processing plant. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new sites in relation to sensitive receptors to amenity impacts. Each proposed extraction site has been assessed separately in the SA.

SA4: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment because mineral extraction sites are unlikely to provide improved accessibility to services and facilities or reduce social exclusion.

SA5: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment score due to the proposed modifications because there continue to be heritage assets located within five miles of Norfolk's urban areas and three miles of Norfolk's main towns with the modifications to the list of urban areas and main towns. There are also heritage assets located at greater distances from Norfolk's urban areas and main towns. The modified policy wording states that development should not be located within a designated heritage asset, or its setting if the proposed development would cause substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset (including any contribution to significance by setting). Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new sites. Each proposed extraction site has been assessed separately in the SA.

SA6: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment score due to the proposed modifications because there continue to be designated sites for biodiversity and also locations of

geodiversity priority features within five miles of Norfolk's urban areas and three miles of Norfolk's main towns with the modifications to the list of urban areas and main towns. There are also designated sites for biodiversity and locations of geodiversity priority features at greater distances from Norfolk's urban areas and main towns. The modified policy wording states that development should not be located within an SSSI or habitats site if it is likely to have an adverse effect on it, or within an ancient woodland or other irreplaceable habitat. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new sites. Each proposed extraction site has been assessed separately in the SA.

SA7: no effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because the policy does not relate to the restoration and afteruse of minerals or waste sites.

SA8: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because there continue to be areas of protected landscapes (such as AONB/National Landscapes, the Broads and Conservation Areas) and areas of countryside within five miles of some of Norfolk's urban areas and three miles of some of Norfolk's main towns with the modifications to the list of urban areas and main towns. There are also areas of protected landscapes and areas of countryside at greater distances of Norfolk's urban areas and main towns. The policy continues to state that development should not be located within the Broads Authority Area or the AONB (now called National Landscapes), other than in exceptional circumstances. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new sites. Each proposed extraction site has been assessed separately in the SA.

SA9: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because local effects will depend upon the specific location of new facilities in relation to sensitive receptors to health and amenity impacts. The purpose of the policy continues to be to locate mineral extraction sites in proximity to locations of greatest housing or employment growth in Norfolk, or in the case of silica sand, in proximity to the processing plant. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new sites in relation to sensitive receptors to health and amenity impacts. Each proposed extraction site has been assessed separately in the SA.

SA10: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because there continue to be areas of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land within five miles of Norfolk's urban areas and 3 miles of Norfolk's main towns with the modifications to the list of urban areas and main towns. There are also areas of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land at greater distances from Norfolk's urban areas and main towns. The spatial strategy in this policy is also expected to have a neutral effect on water quality. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new sites. Each proposed extraction site has been assessed separately in the SA.

SA11: positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because the SA assessment already refers to the spatial strategy to locate mineral extraction sites in proximity to the locations of greatest housing and employment growth in Norfolk, or in the case of silica sand, in proximity to the processing plant. These requirements are expected to ensure that mineral extraction sites are development in sustainable locations in transport terms. Local effects will depend upon the specific location of new sites. Each proposed extraction site has been assessed separately in the SA.

SA12: neutral effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because there continue to be areas at high risk and areas at low risk of flooding within five miles of Norfolk's urban areas and three miles of Norfolk's main towns with the modifications to the list of urban areas and main towns. There are also areas at high risk of flooding at greater distances of Norfolk's urban areas and main towns. Local effects will depend upon the

specific location of new sites. Each proposed extraction site has been assessed separately in the SA.

SA13: significantly positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment due to the proposed modifications because the SA assessment already refers to the spatial strategy to locate mineral extraction sites in proximity to the locations of greatest housing and employment growth in Norfolk, or in the case of silica sand, in proximity to the processing plant.

In conclusion, following a reassessment of the Sustainability Appraisal for Policy MP2, the modifications do not affect the existing assessment scores of the policy within the SA, although there are changes to the comments for SA objectives SA1, SA2, SA5 and SA6 due to the modified policy wording.

### **MPSS1: Silica sand extraction sites**

**Policy description:** 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.

**Proposed modifications:** 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)”.

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.

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.

No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** Yes, due to the nature of the policy modifications to include reference to how the policy would apply to sites supplying a new processing plant site in Norfolk instead of only referring to the existing processing plant site.

**Sustainability Appraisal reassessment:** The policy modifications would not affect the existing assessment and score of the policy against SA objectives SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, SA6, SA7, SA8, SA9, SA10 and SA12. The reassessment of the policy against SA objectives SA1 ‘to adapt to and mitigate the effects of climate change by reducing contributions to climate change’, SA11 ‘to promote sustainable use of minerals and waste resources’ and SA13 ‘to encourage employment opportunities and promote economic growth’ is as follows:

SA1: positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment score due to the proposed modifications because the effect will still depend upon the distance that silica sand will need to be transported by road to the processing plant and the policy still requires the submission of a transport assessment or statement at the planning application stage. The policy also states that the processing plant should be accessed via conveyor, pipeline or off-public haul route, which

would have a positive effect on reducing carbon emissions. The modified policy wording states that the processing plant and railhead should be accessed via conveyor, pipeline or off-public haul route, and also refers to meeting the requirements of the existing processing plant in Norfolk and/or a new processing plant in Norfolk if one was built, these modifications slightly change the policy assessment comments which currently only refer to the existing processing plant at Leziate.

SA11: significantly positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment score due to the proposed modifications because the policy will continue to enable a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals to be provided and continues to require a transport assessment or statement to be provided at the planning application stage to identify or mitigate any transport impacts. The modified policy wording states a silica sand extraction site would be 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, and therefore this slightly changes the policy assessment comments, which currently only refer to addressing the shortfall in silica sand supply to meet the requirements of the existing processing plant at Leziate.

SA13: significantly positive effect. No change to the existing SA policy assessment score due to the proposed modifications because silica sand extraction will still offer continuing local employment opportunities and provide downstream economic benefits. The modified policy wording states a silica sand extraction site would be 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, and therefore this slightly changes the policy assessment comments, which currently only refer to supplying the existing processing plant at Leziate.

In conclusion, the modifications to Policy MPSS1 do not affect the existing assessment scores of the policy within the SA, although there are changes to the comments for SA objectives SA1, SA11 and SA13 due to the modified policy wording.

### **MP3: Borrow pits**

**Policy description:** Criteria based policy for applications for borrow pits to adhere to.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No modification is proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

### **MP4: Agricultural or potable water reservoirs**

**Policy description:** Criteria based policy for applications for water reservoirs with incidental mineral extraction involving off-site removal of minerals to adhere to.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No modification is proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

### **MP5: Core River Valleys**

**Policy description:** Protection of defined core river valleys from inappropriate mineral development.

**Proposed modifications:** 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:

- 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.”

The rest of the policy wording will not change.

A Main Modification is proposed to the supporting text to set out how Landscape Character Assessments will be used in the implementation of this policy and to clarify that mineral extraction proposals in a Core River Valley will also need to comply with restoration Policy MP7.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The modifications to the policy wording and supporting text do not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **MP6: Cumulative impacts and phasing of workings**

**Policy description:** The policy details how cumulative impacts of mineral workings may be considered acceptable if phased or adequately mitigated.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No modification is proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

### **MP7: Progressive working, restoration and after-use**

**Policy description:** 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.

**Proposed modifications:** Modifications are proposed to the policy wording to:

- 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

A Main Modification is proposed to the supporting text to set out how Landscape Character Assessments will be used in the implementation of this policy

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The addition of the flood risk requirement into the policy would have a positive effect, but the existing SA assessment of the policy already scores positively (+) for SA objective SA12 regarding reducing flood risk. The policy

already scores very positively (++) for SA objective SA6 on protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity, objective SA8 to protect and enhance the countryside and landscape and positively (+) for objective SA5 to maintain and enhance the historic environment. Therefore, the other modifications to the policy wording do not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **MP8: Aftercare**

**Policy description:** 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.

**Proposed modifications:** Modifications are proposed to the policy wording to clarify that:

- 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.

Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text to separate agriculture from other uses in terms of aftercare periods, and to set out the circumstances where aftercare beyond 5 years may be necessary and the mechanism by which this would be achieved.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The modifications are for clarification and do not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **MP9: Asphalt plants, concrete batching plants and manufacture of concrete products**

**Policy description:** Criteria based policy for the location of asphalt plants, concrete batching plants and the manufacture of concrete products.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No modification is proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

### **MP10: Safeguarding of port and rail facilities, and facilities for the manufacture of concrete, asphalt and recycled materials**

**Policy description:** 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.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modification is proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

## **MP11: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas**

**Policy description:** 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.

**Proposed modifications:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. A Main Modification is proposed to the supporting text to explain the reason for a 250m consultation area around safeguarded sites.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. There is no change to the policy wording. The Main Modification to the supporting text is for clarification and does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **4.5 Allocated mineral extraction sites**

The Sustainability Appraisal (March 2022) assessed all sites and areas proposed for consideration in the NM&WLP. The assessment below only contains those sites that are allocated in the submitted NM&WLP. Main Modifications are only proposed to the policy wording or supporting text for some of the sites listed below.

#### **Site reference and parish: MIN 12 in Beetley**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** 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).

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The reduction in the estimated site resource does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

The supporting text in the publication NM&WLP already stated that the site would be worked dry (above the water table) and the existing SA site assessment also states that the extraction site would be worked dry. Therefore, the policy wording modification to require the site to be worked dry (above the water table) is in line with the existing assessment of the site in the SA and does not change that assessment.

#### **Site reference and parish: MIN 51 / MIN 13 / MIN 08 in Beetley**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** 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.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The reduction in the estimated site resource does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

The supporting text in the publication NM&WLP already states that the site would be worked dry (above the water table) and that the restoration would include wet woodland around retained pond areas. The existing SA site assessment also states that the site would be worked dry, and that the restoration would include wet woodland around retained ponds. Therefore, the policy wording

changes are in line with the existing assessment of the site in the SA and do not change that assessment.

**Site reference and parish: MIN 200 in Carbrooke**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** Increase in estimated site resource from 300,000 tonnes to 400,000 tonnes. No modification is proposed to the policy wording.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The increase in the estimated site resource does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

**Site reference and parish: MIN 202 in Attlebridge**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text. The estimated start date for extraction is proposed to be changed from 2022 to 2025.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The update to the likely start date does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

**Site reference and parish: MIN 37 in Frettenham, Buxton with Lammas**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

**Site reference and parish: MIN 64 in Horstead with Stanninghall**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

**Site reference and parish: MIN 65 in Stanninghall**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No



### **Site reference and parish: MIN 96 in Spixworth, Horsham St Faith & Newton St Faith**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** A modification is proposed to the policy wording and the supporting text to require screening planting and/or bunding as appropriate along the north-western and south-eastern site boundaries.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The modifications detail the measures required to mitigate landscape impacts and protect the setting of heritage assets. The SA assessment and scoring methodology for the proposed extraction sites is based on the distance of heritage assets (SA objective SA5) from the extraction sites and the landscape setting of the extraction site (SA objective SA8). Therefore, the modifications do not affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **Site reference and parish: MIN 6 in Middleton**

**Proposal:** Extraction of carstone

**Proposed modification:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text. The estimated start date for extraction is proposed to be changed from 2025 to 2027 and the quantity of mineral to be extracted during the Plan period reduced to 960,000 tonnes, although the total resource in the site remains the same

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The update to the likely start date does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **Site reference and parish: MIN 40 in East Winch**

**Proposal:** Extraction of silica sand

**Proposed modification:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text. The estimated start date for extraction is proposed to be changed from 2022 to 2024.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The update to the likely start date does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **Site reference and parish: SIL 01 in Bawsey**

**Proposal:** Extraction of silica sand

**Proposed modification:** A modification is proposed to the policy wording regarding the information to be provided in a heritage statement. No modifications are proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The modification to the policy wording provides additional detail by specifying that assessment of a particular listed building/structure should be included in the heritage statement. The SA had already considered this listed building in the site assessment. The modification does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **Site reference and parish: MIN 206 in Tottenhill**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text. The estimated start date for extraction is proposed to be changed from 2022 to 2024.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The update to the likely start date does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **Site reference and parish: MIN 69 in Aylmerton**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** Criteria (j) of the policy wording is proposed to be modified to reflect the fact that advanced planting is already in place and will need to be maintained. Modifications are proposed to the supporting text to update factual information about the site regarding: archaeological trial trenching that has been carried out, the existing amenity impacts from traffic on the A148, the cessation of extraction operations at the original adjacent quarry site and the planning status of the restoration and other permanent operations on the adjacent site, the nature conservation benefits on restoration, the progress made regarding footpath diversions on the allocated site, site geodiversity.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The factual updates to the supporting text and the policy wording all reflect the current status of the allocated site due to planning permission having been granted and implemented on the northern part of the site. Therefore, these modifications do not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **Site reference and parish: MIN 115 in North Walsham**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No Main Modifications are proposed to the supporting text. The estimated start date for extraction is proposed to be changed from 2023 to 2031 and the quantity of mineral to be extracted during the Plan period reduced to 480,000 tonnes, although the total resource in the site remains the same.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No. The update to the likely start date does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA.

### **Site reference and parish: MIN 207 in Edgefield**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No modification is proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

**Site reference and parish: MIN 208 in East Beckham**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** No modification is proposed to the policy wording. No modification is proposed to the supporting text.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** No

**Site reference and parish: MIN 25 in Haddiscoe**

**Proposal:** Extraction of sand and gravel

**Proposed modification:** 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.

A Main Modification is proposed to the supporting text on amenity to: delete the requirement for the operational area of the site to be set back approximately 100 metres from the nearest residential properties, in line with the proposed modification to policy requirement (a) and include information from the site proposer that land within 100 metres of the nearest sensitive receptors will not be extracted, therefore there are 47 sensitive receptors (buildings) within 250m of the proposed extraction area. This is consistent with the method used to assess potential amenity impacts from other proposed mineral extraction sites.

A Main Modification is proposed to the supporting text to include the retention of boundary hedgerows and trees and the reinstatement of historic hedgerows and field boundaries in the restoration scheme.

The estimated start date for extraction is proposed to be changed from 2022 to 2025.

**Is Sustainability Appraisal reassessment required?** Yes, due to the proposed modifications to the policy requirements.

**Sustainability Appraisal reassessment:** The update to the likely start date does not impact on the policy direction or outcomes or affect the existing assessment of the policy within the SA. The existing SA assessments for SA objectives SA1, SA2, SA4, SA6, SA8, SA10, SA11, SA12, SA13 are not affected by the proposed modifications to policy requirements (a) and (c) and the related supporting text. The reassessment of the policy against SA objectives SA3 'to minimise noise, vibration and visual intrusion', SA5 'to maintain' and enhance the character of the townscape and historic environment', SA7 'to promote innovative solutions for the restoration and use of minerals sites' and SA9 'to contribute to improved health and amenity of local communities in Norfolk' is as follows:

SA3: significant negative effect during the extraction phase. No effect post extraction.

The scoring methodology for this SA objective is for a significant negative effect for any sites where there are residential properties within 100m of the proposed mineral site boundary. Therefore, site MIN 25 was scored as having a significant negative effect for SA objective SA3. Whilst policy requirement (a) stated that the working area needed to be set back at least 100m from the nearest residential properties, this did not affect the SA assessment score for SA objective SA3. Therefore, deleting this requirement and replacing 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' does not change the SA assessment or score for this objective.

SA5: Significant negative effect during the extraction phase. Significant negative effect post extraction.

The scoring methodology for this SA objective is for a significant negative effect for any sites where there are heritage assets within 250m of the proposed mineral site boundary. Therefore, site MIN 25 was scored as having a significant negative effect for SA objective SA9 due to the site's proximity to the location of designated heritage assets. The policy requirements to assess and mitigate these effects did not affect the SA assessment scores for SA objective SA9. Therefore, the modification to include an additional policy requirement for the restoration scheme to 'include reinstatement of historic hedgerows and field boundaries informed by Historic Landscape Characterisation' does not change the SA assessment or score for this objective, which had already considered that an appropriate restoration scheme should ensure no unacceptable impacts on the setting of heritage assets post extraction.

SA7: No effect during the extraction phase. Positive effect post extraction because the proposed restoration scheme would provide some biodiversity gains. The modification to the restoration scheme requirements would not affect the SA assessment or score for this SA objective.

SA9: Significant negative effect during the extraction phase. Neutral effect post-extraction.

The scoring methodology for this SA objective is for a significant negative effect for any sites where there are residential properties within 100m of the proposed mineral site boundary or a Public Right of Way within the site. The SA assessment of the site did state that the operational area would need to be set back around 10m [this is a typographical error and should have said 100m] from the nearest residential properties. Whilst policy requirement (a) stated that the working area needed to be set back at least 100m from the nearest residential properties, this did not affect the SA assessment score for SA objective SA9. Therefore, deleting this requirement and replacing 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' would change the SA assessment wording, but would not change the SA assessment score for this objective.

In conclusion, following a reassessment of the Sustainability Appraisal for Policy MIN 25, the modifications do not affect the existing assessment scores of the policy within the SA, although there are changes to the assessment wording for SA objective SA9 due to the modified policy wording.

## **5. Conclusion**

Based on the proposed Main Modifications to policies, an assessment of if those modifications would require reassessment within the context of the Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out. The following policies were identified as requiring reassessment which was then undertaken:

MW1 (Development Management Criteria),  
MW4 (The Brecks Protected Habitats and Species),  
WP2 (Spatial strategy for waste management facilities),  
WP13 (Landfill mining and reclamation),  
WP14 (Water Recycling Centres),  
MP1 (Provision for minerals extraction),  
MP2 (Spatial strategy for minerals extraction),  
MPSS1 (silica sand extraction sites)  
MIN 25 (land at Manor Farm, Haddiscoe)

The updated assessments findings were broadly in line with the original assessments, and no additional significant effects were identified, therefore no additional mitigation measures are recommended. In the context of the Strategic Environment Assessment Regulations the main conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal Report remain unaltered.

## **6. Next steps**

The Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan is currently at the Public Examination stage. During the Public Examination of the NM&WLP modifications were suggested to ensure the soundness and legal compliance of the Plan. Norfolk County Council has now proposed modifications, and these have been submitted to the independent Planning Inspector for his consideration.

The Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum has been published alongside the Main Modifications for consultation. The Inspector will consider all comments made during that representations period on the proposed Main Modifications and their effect on the legal compliance and 'soundness' of the NM&WLP.