



Norfolk County Council

---

# **Norfolk Local Transport Plan 4 Implementation Plan**

Information to Inform Habitats Regulations  
Screening and Appropriate Assessment



Norfolk County Council

---

# **Norfolk Local Transport Plan 4 Implementation Plan**

Information to Inform Habitats Regulations Screening and  
Appropriate Assessment

**Type of document (version) Public**

**Project no. 70091812**

**Date: March 2022**

WSP

62-64 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB2 1LA

Phone: +44 1223 558 050

Fax: +44 1223 558 051

WSP.com

# Quality control

---

Issue/revision	First issue	Revision 1	Revision 2	Revision 3
Remarks	First Draft for NCC	Revised Draft for NCC	Final for Consultation	
Date	March 2022	March 2022	March 2022	
Prepared by	UKSJM011	UKSJM011	UKSJM011	
Checked by	UKARH003	UKARH003	UKARH003	
Authorised by	UKODP001	UKODP001	UKODP001	
Project number	70091812	70091812	70091812	

# Contents

---

## Executive summary

<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Overview</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Report Framework</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>LTP4 Strategy HRA Background</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Habitats Directive and Habitats Regulations Assessment</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Legislative Background</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Habitats Sites</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Zone of Influence</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Identification of relevant Habitats Sites</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Screening Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>The Implementation Plan and Management of Habitats Sites</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Description of the Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Initial Screening for Impacts and Effects on Habitats Sites</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Summary of Screening Exercise</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>5.5</b>	<b>In-Combination Effects on Habitats Sites</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Appropriate Assessment</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Summary and Recommendations</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>References</b>	<b>91</b>

	<b>Figures</b>	<b>93</b>
--	----------------	-----------

---

## Appendices

---



Appendix A

CJEU Rulings

Appendix B

Habitats Sites Information

Appendix C

In-Combination Assessment

# Executive summary

The fourth Norfolk Local Transport Plan (LTP4) Strategy, adopted in 2021, proposes an approach for addressing current and future transport issues in the County. The Strategy encompasses all modes of transport and covers the period 2020 - 2036 with the following strategic objectives:

- Embracing the future
- Delivering a Sustainable Norfolk
- Enhancing Connectivity
- Enhancing Norfolk's Quality of Life
- Increasing Accessibility
- Improving Transport Safety
- A Well Managed and Maintained Transport Network

A critical role of the LTP4 Strategy is to provide the necessary transport, infrastructure and connectivity improvements to enable Norfolk County Council's vision to be realised. LTP4 is Norfolk County Council's highest level of transport policy.

Following its adoption, an Implementation Plan (IP) has been produced which focusses on achieving the strategic ambitions of the adopted LTP4 Strategy. The plan sets out a number of proposed actions showing how NCC intend to implement the policies and achieve the ambitions outlined in the LTP4 Strategy document.

Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the 'Habitats Regulations') it is necessary to consider whether the Norfolk LTP4 IP may have Likely Significant Effects (LSE) upon areas of nature conservation importance designated/classified under the Habitat Regulations. Should LSE be identified it would be necessary to further consider the effects of Norfolk LTP4 IP by way of an 'Appropriate Assessment' (AA) under the requirements of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).

This HRA assessment has been produced as an element of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that incorporates the requirement of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the LTP4 IP and associated plans.

A total of 37 Habitats Sites have been identified as being present within the Zone of Influence set for the LTP4 Strategy including 17 SACs, 11 SPAs and nine Ramsar Sites.

Through HRA screening for potential likely significant effects, it has not been possible to categorically demonstrate that the LTP4 IP will not have any adverse effects upon Habitats Sites. A number of actions have been screened-out at this stage due to their nugatory or beneficial effects on Habitats Sites, but other actions have been screened-in for their further

consideration in an AA. These actions are related primarily to proposed new infrastructure or improvement schemes, for which limited information is currently available.

The LTP4 IP is prepared at a strategic level. As a high level strategic plan there remains a degree of uncertainty in relation to the full range of actions that will be carried out in accordance with it. Given the possibility of LSE associated with the screened-in actions, further, detailed assessment through AA is considered necessary at a project-level and on a case-by-case basis to satisfy the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.

The following over-arching statement is therefore recommended for incorporation within Norfolk's LTP4 IP:

*Any new transport or improvement project which would be likely to have a significant effect on a Habitats Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, will be subject to assessment under part 6 of the Habitats Regulations at the application stage. The County Council will only support proposals where they meet the requirements of Part 6 of the Habitats Regulations.*

No further HRA work is considered necessary for the LTP4 IP to be adopted as a strategic document by Norfolk County Council subject to the condition noted above relating to the requirement that consideration for project-level HRA be undertaken for the proposed infrastructure schemes in the County as required by legislation and/or advised by policy and guidance.

Statutory consultation forms an important element of the HRA exercise and the response from Natural England on the LTP4 Strategy HRA has been considered in this HRA report.

The HRA concludes that the LTP4 IP is compliant with the Habitats Regulations and will not result in a breach of part 6 of the Habitats Regulations subject to the condition noted above, either alone or in-combination with other plans or projects.

## 2 Introduction

---

### 2.1 Overview

- 2.1.1. Norfolk County Council (NCC) has commissioned WSP UK Ltd to undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Draft Local Transport Plan Implementation Plan (IP) of their fourth Local Transport Plan Strategy (LTP4). The LTP4 Strategy proposes an approach for addressing current and future transport issues in the County, encompassing all modes of transport covering the period 2020 - 2036.
- 2.1.2. WSP UK Ltd previously undertook a HRA of the LTP4 Strategy in June 2021 (WSP, UK Ltd, 2021), which was produced as part of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that incorporates the requirement of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the LTP4 and associated plans.
- 2.1.3. The LTP4 Strategy was formally adopted in 2021, and the Implementation Plan (IP) sets out proposals for the application of the policies in the adopted strategy. Both the IP and the LTP4 Strategy represent one plan and therefore, should be read in conjunction with one another.
- 2.1.4. Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017<sup>1</sup> (as amended) (the 'Habitats Regulations')<sup>2</sup> it is necessary to consider whether the Norfolk LTP4 IP may have Likely Significant Effects (LSE) upon areas of nature conservation importance designated/classified under the Habitat Regulations. Should LSE be identified it would be necessary to further consider the effects of Norfolk LTP4 IP by way of an 'Appropriate Assessment' (AA)<sup>3</sup> under the requirements of Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2017/1012/contents/made> (Accessed 07/12/18)

<sup>2</sup> Post Brexit changes have been made to the 2017 Regulations and these involved transferring functions from the European Commission to the appropriate authorities in England and Wales. All other processes or terms in the 2017 Regulations remain unchanged and existing guidance is still relevant. The obligations of a competent authority in the 2017 Regulations for the protection of sites or species do not change. The changes are made by the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that the primary legislation refers to an appropriate assessment as the overarching HRA process, but by convention it is often a term which applies to a specific element or stage in the HRA process (see Section 2.2 below).



## 2.2 Report Framework

- 2.2.1. This HRA report has been produced as part of a SA that incorporates the requirement of a SEA for the LTP4 IP and associated plans.
- 2.2.2. This HRA has been prepared in parallel to SEA and will ensure that all HRA-related considerations are fully integrated into Norfolk's LTP4 IP as it is developed.
- 2.2.3. A SEA is a regulatory requirement in England under the "Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations" (SI 2004/1633, known as the SEA Regulations). These Regulations place an obligation on local authorities to undertake SEA for certain plans and programmes which include local transport plans and strategies.
- 2.2.4. This report details:
- the HRA process and methodology for assessment;
  - the relevant national site network and Ramsar sites within the zone of influence for the Norfolk LTP4 IP;
  - the challenges of the Norfolk LTP4 IP and how these may impact upon relevant national site network and Ramsar sites;
  - the screening of likely significant effects (Stage 1) of the Norfolk LTP4 IP; and
  - an appropriate assessment (AA) of the Norfolk LTP4 IP at AA (Stage 2).
- 2.2.5. It should be noted that this HRA has been based solely upon the Norfolk LTP4 IP and is proportionate to the level of detail held therein.

## 2.3 LTP4 Strategy HRA Background

- 2.3.1. The LTP4 Strategy HRA identified a total of 37 Habitats Sites as being present within the Zone of Influence set for the LTP4 Strategy, including 17 SACs, 11 SPAs and nine Ramsar Sites.
- 2.3.2. Through HRA screening for potential LSE, it was not possible to categorically demonstrate that the LTP4 Strategy will not have any adverse effects upon Habitats Sites. A number of policies were screened-out at the screening stage due to their nugatory or beneficial effects on Habitats Sites, but other policies were screened-in for further consideration in an AA. These policies were related primarily to proposed new infrastructure or improvement schemes, many for which limited information was available.
- 2.3.3. As a result, there was insufficient detail for some policies to enable a more in-depth analysis to the degree required for AA. Given the possibility of LSE associated with the screened-in policies, further, detailed assessment through Appropriate Assessment was considered necessary at a project-level and on a case-by-case basis to satisfy the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.
- 2.3.4. Although both the LTP4 Strategy and IP represent one plan, due to the timescales on the development of these, the assessment has been undertaken separately. As the LTP4



Strategy and IP are intrinsically linked, the assessment of the IP will take the previous assessment of the LTP4 Strategy into consideration.

- 2.3.5. Statutory consultation forms an important element of the HRA exercise and the responses from consultees on the LTP4 Strategy HRA has been considered in this HRA of the IP.

## 3 Habitats Directive and Habitats Regulations Assessment

---

### 3.1 Legislative Background

- 3.1.1. Under the Habitats Regulations ‘Competent Authorities’ must assess Plans, in this case the LTP4 IP and associated plans, for their potential to cause LSE on Habitats Sites. Where the Plan may lead to LSE it must be subject to an HRA to determine whether there will be no adverse effects to the integrity of any Habitats Sites. Any Plan that would lead to adverse effects on the integrity of Habitats site(s) cannot be given effect to without meeting strict additional tests (see regulation 64 Habitats Regulations).
- 3.1.2. Regulation 63 (1) of the Habitats Regulations<sup>4</sup> states that
- ‘...a Competent Authority, before deciding to undertake, or give any consent, permission or other authorisation for, a plan or project which—*
- (a) is likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), and*
- (b) is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of that site,*
- must make an appropriate assessment of the implications for that site in view of that site’s conservation objectives.’*
- 3.1.3. The Habitats Regulations also make allowance for projects or plans to be completed if they satisfy ‘imperative reasons of overriding public interest’. Regulation 64<sup>5</sup> relates to such situations.
- 3.1.4. The Competent Authority must include consideration of ‘in-combination’ effects arising from other projects and plans within their assessment, as well as those potentially acting alone.
- 3.1.5. Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) were originally designated under the Habitats Directive<sup>6</sup> and promote the protection of flora, fauna and habitats. Similarly, Special

---

<sup>4</sup> Regulation 63 of the Habitats Regulations. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2017/1012/regulation/63/made> [Accessed on 20 August 2020].

<sup>5</sup> Regulation 64 of the Habitats Regulations. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2017/1012/regulation/64/made> [Accessed on 20 August 2020].

<sup>6</sup> The ‘Habitats Directive’ (Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora) protects habitats and species of European Sites. Together with the ‘Birds Directive’ (Council Directive 2009/147/EC on the Conservation of Wild Birds), the Habitats Directive establishes a network of internationally important sites

Protection Areas (SPAs) were designated under the Birds Directive in order to protect vulnerable and migratory birds.

- 3.1.6. In the United Kingdom, the Habitats Regulations incorporate all SPAs and SACs into the definition of European sites.
- 3.1.7. It is a matter of Government policy (NPPF paragraph 176)<sup>7</sup> that sites designated under the 1971 Ramsar Convention for their internationally important wetlands (commonly known as Ramsar sites), potential SACs (pSACs) and potential SPAs (pSPA) (where consultation has been initiated) are also considered in the same way as SACs, SPAs and candidate SACs (cSACs).
- 3.1.8. For the purposes of this report all relevant sites as described above are collectively termed 'Habitats Sites'.
- 3.1.9. Defra guidance (2021)<sup>8</sup> states that SACs and SPAs in the UK no longer form part of the EU's Natura 2000 ecological network<sup>9</sup>. The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 have created a national site network on land and at sea, including both the inshore and offshore marine areas in the UK. The national site network includes:
  - existing SACs and SPAs; and
  - new SACs and SPAs designated under these Regulations.
- 3.1.10. Any references to Natura 2000 in the 2017 Regulations and in guidance now refers to the new national site network.
- 3.1.11. Maintaining a coherent network of protected sites with overarching conservation objectives is still required in order to:
  - fulfil the commitment made by government to maintain environmental protections; and
  - continue to meet our international legal obligations, such as the Bern Convention, the Oslo and Paris Conventions (OSPAR), Bonn and Ramsar Conventions.

---

designated for their ecological status. The Habitats Directive was transposed into British law through the Habitats Regulations.

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/15-conserving-and-enhancing-the-natural-environment>

<sup>8</sup> Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs (2021). Changes to the Habitats Regulations 2017. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/changes-to-the-habitats-regulations-2017/changes-to-the-habitats-regulations-2017>.

<sup>9</sup> The European sites noted in the text combined to create a Europe-wide 'Natura 2000' network of designated sites under the EU Habitats Directive.

- 3.1.12. It should be noted that the Competent Authority (Norfolk County Council) undertakes the Screening and AA (see section 2.2.2 below), the consultant provides the information or evidence-base to allow this to be completed. The Competent Authority must include consideration of 'in-combination' effects arising from other projects and plans within their assessment, as well as those potentially acting alone. Given the scale of the HRA the in-combination exercise will consider in-County, as well as outside-County interactions with Habitats Sites.
- 3.1.13. There are a number of recent Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) and UK High Court rulings which are relevant to this HRA and these are summarised in Appendix A.

## 4 Habitats Sites

### 4.1 Zone of Influence

- 4.1.1. Relevant Habitats Sites include all those that fall within a potential Zone of Influence (Zol) for the relevant actions take forward by the LTP4 IP. The Zol is defined by the potential effects arising from the project or plan and the available pathways for those effects to reach and affect interest features of Habitats Sites.
- 4.1.2. In order to identify all strategic corridors where potential direct, indirect and in-combination effects could reasonably be considered possible, a source-pathway-receptor approach was adopted. Habitats Sites with qualifying features with sensitivities, which have the potential to be affected by the implementation of the adopted LTP4 Strategy, were initially investigated in a 10km radius around the NCC boundary. The premise is that 10km represents the average trip length from the National Transport Survey and traffic data for this buffer will be consulted and used in any detailed analysis required at the project-level. This radius was extended to include other Habitats Sites as necessary to ensure all potential LSE could be investigated, for example, up to 30km where highly mobile bat or bird species are the qualifying features of a SAC/cSAC, SPA/pSPA or Ramsar Site.

### 4.2 Identification of relevant Habitats Sites

- 4.2.1. A total of 37 Habitats Sites lie within the potential Zol for the LTP4 IP, including 17 SACs, 11 SPAs and nine Ramsar Sites.
- 4.2.2. These Habitats Sites are listed in Table 3-1 and their locations given in Figure 1.

**Table 4-1 - Habitats Sites within the Zol**

<b>Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)</b>	
Breckland	Southern North Sea
Norfolk Valley Fens	The Broads
North Norfolk Coast	The Wash and North Norfolk Coast
Ouse Washes	Waveney and Little Ouse Valley Fens
Overstrand cliffs	Winterton-Horsey Dunes
Paston Great Barn	Haisborough, Hammond and Winterton
River Wensum	Benacre to Easton Bavents Lagoons
Roydon Common and Dersingham bog	Nene Washes

<b>Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)</b>	
Rex Graham Reserve <sup>10</sup>	
<b>Special Protection Area (SPA) (and Ramsar Site (* where both apply))</b>	
Breckland	Ouse Washes*
Breydon Water*	Outer Thames Estuary
Broadland*	Redgrave and South Lopham Fens Ramsar Site
Dersingham Bog Ramsar Site	Roydon Common Ramsar Site
Great Yarmouth North Denes	The Wash*
Greater Wash	Benacre to Easton Barents Lagoons
North Norfolk Coast *	Nene Washes*

- 4.2.3. The reasons for designation of these Habitats Sites and their known vulnerabilities are summarised in Appendix B, which has been collated from the Natura 2000 standard data forms and Site Improvement Plans for each Habitats Site (referenced in Appendix B) which incorporates the conservation objectives.
- 4.2.4. With regard for the qualifying features and information on vulnerability of the sites detailed in Appendix B, the broad conservation objectives for SACs and SPAs are to:
- Ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained or restored as appropriate, and ensure that the site contributes to achieving the Favourable Conservation Status of its Qualifying Features, by maintaining or restoring:
    - The extent and distribution of qualifying natural habitats and habitats of qualifying species
    - The structure and function (including typical species) of qualifying natural habitats
    - The structure and function of the habitats of qualifying species
    - The supporting processes on which qualifying natural habitats and the habitats of qualifying species rely
    - The populations of qualifying species; and

---

<sup>10</sup> The Rex Graham Reserve SAC lies 11.5km from the Norfolk County Boundary, but is included due to sensitivities relating to the deposition of airborne pollutants

- The distribution of qualifying species within the site.

4.2.5. The use of the term Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) is not amended by The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 and the term still has the meaning given by Article 1 of the Habitats Directive. Defra (2021) does however note that *“an appropriate authority is only responsible for managing and adapting the national site network to secure FCS of a feature proportionately to the importance of the UK within the feature’s natural range”*. The Habitats Directive provides further interpretation of the meaning of ‘favourable conservation status’ within Article 1 parts a, e and i as below.

*‘(a) conservation means a series of measures required to maintain or restore the natural habitats and the populations of species of wild fauna and flora at a favourable status as defined in (e) and (i);.....*

*(e) conservation status of a natural habitat means the sum of the influences acting on a natural habitat and its typical species that may affect its long-term natural distribution, structure and functions as well as the long-term survival of its typical species within the territory referred to in Article 2. The conservative status of a natural habitat will be taken as "favourable" when:*

- *its natural range and areas it covers within that range are stable or increasing, and*
- *the specific structure and functions which are necessary for its long-term maintenance exist and are likely to continue to exist for the foreseeable future, and*
- *the conservation status of its typical species is favourable as defined in (i);*

*(i) conservation status of a species means the sum of the influences acting on the species concerned that may affect the long-term distribution and abundance of its populations within the territory referred to in Article 2; The conservation status will be taken as "favourable" when:*

- *- population dynamics data on the species concerned indicate that it is maintaining itself on a long-term basis as a viable component of its natural habitats, and*
- *- the natural range of the species is neither being reduced nor is likely to be reduced for the foreseeable future, and*
- *- there is, and will probably continue to be, a sufficiently large habitat to maintain its populations on a long-term basis’.*



## 5 Screening Assessment

---

### 5.1 The Implementation Plan and Management of Habitats Sites

- 5.1.1. This stage considers whether the LTP4 IP is directly connected with or necessary to the management of Habitats Sites. Within this context 'directly' means that the plan is solely conceived for the conservation management of a site or group of sites and 'management' refers to the management measures required in order to maintain, in favourable condition, the features for which e.g., a European site has been designated.
- 5.1.2. The Norfolk LTP4 IP is neither directly connected with, nor necessary for, the management of any of the Habitats Sites listed. As such, it is clear that further consideration of the plan by way of an HRA screening assessment is required.

### 5.2 Description of the Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan

- 5.2.1. The overall vision of the adopted LTP4 Strategy is for Norfolk to have a transport system that allows residents and visitors to have a range of low carbon options to meet their transport needs and attract and retain business investment in the County.
- 5.2.1.1 LTP4 explores key issues including how they will:
- achieve the policy aim to work towards carbon neutrality by 2030 as agreed in the environmental policy recently adopted;
  - improve air quality in urban areas;
  - meet the challenge of technology and innovation in the transport system and the ways in which people work; and
  - support the economy of the county by ensuring that people can make the connections they need.
- 5.2.1.2 Following its adoption, an Implementation Plan has been produced which is firmly focussed on achieving the strategic ambitions of the adopted LTP4 Strategy. The plan sets out a number of proposed actions showing how NCC intend to implement the policies and achieve the ambitions outlined in the LTP4 Strategy document. The proposals set out within the IP reflect the LTP4's seven strategic objectives which are:
- Embracing the Future;
  - Delivering a Sustainable Norfolk;
  - Enhancing Connectivity;
  - Enhancing Norfolk's Quality of Life;
  - Increasing Accessibility;
  - Improving Transport Safety; and
  - A Well Managed and Maintained Transport Network.
- 5.2.2. The strategic objectives are described in more detail below:

■ **Objective 1 – Embracing the Future**

Rapid advances in technology bring opportunities for us to be more innovative and agile in delivering an efficient and effective transport network. Increased data can help to inform how we manage and maintain the network. At the same time, we need to make sure that everyone benefits from the advances that technology can bring.

■ **Objective 2 - Delivering a Sustainable Norfolk**

Delivering sustainable development is highly important, especially with the planned housing growth. We will seek to preserve and enhance our built, natural and historic environment and seek to ensure new development is beneficial to Norfolk's society, economy and environment.

■ **Objective 3 – Enhancing Connectivity**

It is our priority to maintain and enhance important connections to enable movement into and around the county and increase our attractiveness as a location both for businesses and people. Good connectivity is very important for getting from A to B easily whether for work, education, visiting family and friends, and deliveries.

■ **Objective 4 – Enhancing Norfolk's Quality of Life**

Enhancing the quality of life for Norfolk's residents is very important to Norfolk County Council. We want to improve the health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active travel options to improve health and fitness. Our commitment is to work towards zero carbon.

■ **Objective 5 - Increasing Accessibility**

Increasing accessibility is important so that everyone has access to the services and opportunities they require. In this plan we aim to increase the accessibility of Norfolk and address the challenges such a rural county faces and also to adapt to accessibility requirements in the future.

■ **Objective 6 – Improving Transport Safety**

We aim to improve the safety of our transport network in order to reduce casualties and help people feel safe when using any mode of transport. Norfolk County Council aims to overcome the various challenges on the network and to create a network which encourages safe usage of our roads and to protect vulnerable transport users.

■ **Objective 7 – A Well Managed and Maintained Transport Network**

Norfolk County Council is responsible for the management and maintenance of 10,000 kms of Norfolk's roads and 4,000 kms of Norfolk's footpaths and other public rights of way. We will apply new and innovative technology where it will be most effective to improve the management and maintenance of the network to keep Norfolk moving.

- 5.2.3. Each of the above objectives has a number of corresponding policies. In total there are 22 policies which have all been allocated a number of proposed actions for the implementation of the policy. There are 140 actions included within the IP which have been included within Table 5-2 to Table 5-23 below.

## 5.3 Initial Screening for Impacts and Effects on Habitats Sites

- 5.3.1. The development of or improvements to infrastructure within the Zol of Habitats Sites as a result of the implementation of the adopted LTP4 Strategy has the potential to result in a number of short and long-term effects, as detailed in Table 5-1 below.

**Table 5-1 – Potential Effects on Habitats Sites Resulting from the Implementation of the Adopted LTP4 Strategy**

Potential effects	Development actions/activities
Water Resources and Quality	Pollution from accidental spills and run off (construction and operation).
Air Quality	Increase in atmospheric pollutants during construction and operation (nitrogen deposition and levels, ammonia levels, dust).
Habitat / Species Disturbance	Construction and operation of new developments (noise, air, visual disturbance). Recreational pressures during operation including improved access
Habitat (and species) loss and fragmentation (including supporting habitats and functionally linked land)	Direct land take during construction Barriers to migration during operation (for example bridge construction)

- 5.3.6. Each of the proposed actions set out to implement the policies of the adopted LTP4 Strategy have been subject to an initial screening exercise to assess whether they could give rise to likely significant effects (LSE) on Habitats Sites.
- 5.3.7. Where proposals will clearly not lead to specific infrastructure projects or any tangible effects on Habitats Sites, for example as a result of being communication-based, they have been screened out. Where there is still the likelihood of significant effects of policy actions on the integrity of Habitats Sites or any uncertainty in this respect, in line with the precautionary principle, policies have been screened in. The results of this assessment are summarised in Table 5-2 to Table 5-23.

### **Policy 1 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 1: Embracing the Future**

*‘We will plan and prepare the county for future challenges and changes to ensure the best for our society, environment and economy, and to actively review these developments through time.’*

5.3.8. Table 5-2 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 1, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-2 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 1**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>1a).</b> Explore opportunities and funding for trials of new forms of transport and mobility (such as autonomous vehicles, or digitally connected vehicles)	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>1b).</b> Explore the use of Artificial Intelligence and cognitive thinking to help plan for and manage transport networks.	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>1c).</b> Review and revise the highway network performance report. Increase the focus on public transport, walking & cycling, electric vehicles and air quality.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours and therefore will not lead to LSE.
<b>1d).</b> Monitor outcomes and indicators in the Asset Management Strategy Performance framework.	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>1e).</b> Undertake vulnerability assessments of transport networks: Undertake Resilient Network Assessment on core A roads which identify vulnerability	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>1f).</b> Review Winter Service Policy	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.

## Policy 2 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 1: Embracing the Future

*‘The priority for reducing emissions will be to support a shift to more sustainable modes and more efficient vehicles, including lower carbon technology and cleaner fuels; this includes the facilitation of necessary infrastructure.’*

- 5.3.9. Table 5-3 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 2, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-3 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 2**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>2a).</b> Explore opportunities to participate in projects and trials to decarbonise the transport system.  Explore opportunities for first mile / last mile delivery solutions by for example autonomous or semi-autonomous electric vehicles / pods to reduce the numbers of van related delivery trips	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet), it is also a general action which will lead to no LSE.
<b>2b).</b> Deliver our Electric Vehicle (EV) strategy. The county council can play an important role in helping to increase the uptake of electric vehicles by ensuring that the necessary charging infrastructure is in place.	Screened out	Principles of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites. In addition, the infrastructure referred to in this strategy is likely to be urban-focussed and small-scale in nature and as such will not lead to LSE.
<b>2c).</b> Deliver ‘Charge Collective,’ a regional pilot looking to promote on-street charge points for electric vehicles. This is being conducted in partnership with our regional electricity network operators UK Power Networks	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours and will not lead to LSE.
<b>2d).</b> Take forward energy projects such as Local Area Energy	<b>Screened in</b>	Principles of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable

<b>Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)</b>	<b>Screening outcome</b>	<b>Justification</b>
Planning to ensure resilience of local energy networks required for a shift to electric vehicles.		lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites, however the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support this action has the potential to lead to LSE depending on spatial location and extent. As such, this action has been screened in for further assessment.
<b>2e).</b> Support Beryl Bikes and e-scooter trials and look at opportunities at expanding out the Beryl offer	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours, it will not lead to LSE.
<b>2f).</b> Develop Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) for countywide coverage	<b>Screened in</b>	Development of active transport modes and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites, however the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support this action has the potential to lead to LSE depending on spatial location and extent. As such, this action has been screened in for further assessment.
<b>2g).</b> Work with Transport East on bringing forward EV infrastructure	Screened out	Principles of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites. The infrastructure referred to in this action is likely to be urban-focussed and small scale in nature. As such, this action will not lead to LSE.

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>2h).</b> Adopt Parking Standards to (amongst other things) ensure every new home with a parking space has an EV charge point.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>2i).</b> Adopt EV parking standards for new workplaces and other new non-residential developments.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.

### Policy 3 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 1: Embracing the Future

*‘Innovation and new technologies will be embraced and used proactively in order to achieve our vision, including responding to new targets set by the recently adopted environmental policy.’*

- 5.3.10. Table 5-4 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 3, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-4 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 3**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>3a).</b> Investigate the delivery of ‘Mobility as a Service’ solutions. Such solutions could range from car-sharing to phone apps that allow customers to make easy, multi-modal journeys. The customer simply enters details of the journey they wish to make, and the app plans the journey and makes a single charge to the customer	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.



Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>3b).</b> Seek opportunities to improve digital connectivity	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>3c).</b> Explore and utilise innovative monitoring equipment to show usage of the transport network (e.g. video technology that recognises different user types, use of GPS, mobile or telephone data)	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>3d).</b> Investigate trial of a smart street, showcasing a range of technological innovations to enable better service delivery across a range of functions (e.g. street bins, air quality, street usage)	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>3e).</b> Explore the use of low-cost air quality monitoring equipment including trialling the use of innovative, low-cost and portable devices	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>3f).</b> Work with Transport East on Regional Agent Base Model + travel and behaviour data. This is an innovative modelling tool	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.



Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>3g).</b> Implement the Bus Service Improvement Plan objective of multi-operator ticketing	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by encouraging increased bus patronage. It will not lead to LSE.

#### Policy 4 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 1: Embracing the Future

*‘We will work with people to shape the way they travel, why they are travelling and whether they need to travel, encouraging behaviour change and interventions that can help to increase the use of sustainable transport.’*

5.3.11. Table 5-5 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 4, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-5 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 4**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>4a).</b> Develop an online information hub under the brand of Travel Norfolk to encourage behaviour change. This will act as a journey planner that encourages sustainable travel as the preferred method of transport. This hub will also provide a high quality resource of information to help people break down barriers that remain to using sustainable transport.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of sustainable travel and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>4b).</b> Promote behaviour change through Getting Norfolk Active: Active Norfolk’s 2021-2026 strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocating for walking and cycling to be the first choice for short journey</li> </ul>	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to promote active travel and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoting physical activity's contribution to carbon reduction targets</li> </ul> <p>Addressing other barriers that prevent this positive behaviour change</p>		
<b>4c).</b> Deliver travel plans at residential development	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of sustainable travel and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>4d).</b> Monitor travel habits at residential developments through travel plans delivered via our AtoBetter programme	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of sustainable travel and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.

### Policy 5 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 2: Delivering a Sustainable Norfolk

*'We will work with partners to inform decisions about new development ensuring they are well connected to maximise use of sustainable and active transport options. This will make new developments more attractive places to live, thus supporting a strong sense of the public realm.'*

5.3.12. Table 5-6 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 5, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-6 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 5**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>5a).</b> Review the planning and health protocol to ensure principles of health and wellbeing are adequately considered in plan making, and when evaluating and determining planning applications. This will include considerations of connection to, and accessibility of, public and active travel options	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable travel. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>5b).</b> Review the Norfolk Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan (NSIDP) to ensure it captures the full range of projects being delivered to support growth including decarbonisation projects, and transport projects focused on active travel, public transport and decarbonisation	Screened out	The action “review” in itself will not lead directly to LSE. In addition, the NSIDP is a non-statutory plan which is reviewed and updated annually and comprises a status report on committed and planned road and improvement schemes. These schemes should be subject to specific project level HRA and therefore are considered in other actions in this IP. This action is therefore not considered further in this document.
<b>5c).</b> Review and roll forward the market town Network Improvement Strategies	Screened out	The action “review” in itself will not lead directly to LSE. In addition, this action will embed LTP4 principles, objectives and outcomes, including the requirement for environmental assessment of emerging new infrastructure or improvement schemes which could have LSE on Habitats Sites depending on their spatial location. This action is therefore not considered further in this document.
<b>5d).</b> Take forward work with partners on infrastructure requirements to unlock growth, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ North Walsham housing link road</li></ul>	Screened in	The up-and-coming projects and associated infrastructure to be taken forward by this action have the potential to lead to LSE on Habitats

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ East Norwich masterplan</li> <li>■ W Winch masterplan</li> <li>■ Thetford A11 junctions and successor to link road work</li> <li>■ Bradwell</li> </ul>		Sites. This action has therefore been screened in for further assessment.
<b>5e).</b> Review Safe Sustainable Development (guidance document for new developments)	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable travel and development. It will not lead to LSE
<b>5f).</b> Review Parking Standards	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable travel. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>5g).</b> Work as part of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership and Greater Norwich Local Plan Partnership	Screened out	<p>This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable travel. It will not lead to LSE.</p> <p>In addition, housing growth identified in the Greater Norwich Local Plan has been subject to a plan-level HRA which concluded that there would be no adverse effect upon the integrity of any European site subject to the satisfactory resolution of a number of outstanding matters (The Landscape Partnership, 2020).</p>
<b>5h).</b> Work with District Councils as local plans are reviewed	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable development and travel. It will not lead to LSE.

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>5i).</b> Provide comments on neighbourhood plans to inform their development	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable development. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>5j).</b> Work with County Council service providers on location of services, e.g. schools	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>5k).</b> Work closely with DfT, National Highways, Network Rail / Great British Railways and other local authorities to influence transport decisions in Norfolk to ensure good connectivity to new developments	<b>Screened in</b>	Construction of infrastructure to connect new developments in the county has the potential to lead to LSE on Habitats Sites depending on its spatial location. This action has therefore been screened in for further assessment.

### **Policy 6 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 2: Delivering a Sustainable Norfolk**

*‘We will work with the development community and local stakeholders to ensure greener transport solutions are embedded in land-use planning to significantly reduce traffic generation by private car. We will also work to ensure that the necessary infrastructure to support the transition to a clean transport network is in place. We will seek that that any carbon impacts are monitored and offset by locally applicable measures. As part of our ongoing work on developing guidance for how we will deal with new development we will amongst other things consider how to establish carbon plans and budgets and devise methodologies to achieve carbon neutrality.’*

5.3.13. Table 5-7 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 6, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-7 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 6**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<p><b>6a).</b> Consider options for monitoring and offsetting carbon impacts arising from new development</p> <p>Alongside this, develop carbon plans and budgets and devise methodologies to achieve carbon neutrality from new development</p> <p>Write these into future reviews of our guidance documents for new developments</p>	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<p><b>6b).</b> Work with other active travel groups to expand sustainable travel plans to schools.</p>	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet) and improving air quality. It will not lead to LSE.
<p><b>6c).</b> Engage with developers in pre-application discussions on major sites to secure sustainable transport links</p> <p>In our role as statutory consultee on planning applications, seek sustainable transport links</p>	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet) and improving air quality. It will not lead to LSE.
<p><b>6d).</b> Develop proposals for, and introduce, pre-application charges</p>	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable travel. It will not lead to LSE.
<p><b>6e).</b> Work with partners on the development of land-use planning documents: See above, policy 5</p>	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable travel. It will not lead to LSE.

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>6f).</b> Review Safe Sustainable Development  Review Parking Standards	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable travel. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>6g).</b> Deliver travel plans at residential development	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of sustainable travel and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.

### Policy 7 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 2: Delivering a Sustainable Norfolk

*'In air quality management areas development will need to demonstrate its positive contribution to tackling the air quality problem.'*

5.3.14. Table 5-8 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 7, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-8 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 7**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>7a).</b> Roll-forward our 2022 review of Safe Sustainable Development to adopt guidance on our expectations of how developers would need to demonstrate how development would address air quality or bring forward measures to address the issue.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by ensuring improvements in air quality. It will not lead to LSE.



Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>7b).</b> Take account of any changes to UK law, best practice or guidance following new air quality guidelines announced by the World Health Organisation (WHO) in 2021.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by ensuring general improvements in air quality (noting that the new WHO guidelines are targeted at the protection of human health). It will not lead to LSE.

### Policy 8 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 3: Enhancing Connectivity

*‘Our priority will be to improve major road and rail connections between larger places in the county, and to major ports, airports and cities in the rest of the UK.’*

5.3.15. Table 5-9 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 8, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-9 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 8**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>8a).</b> Make the case for early electrification of the remainder of the rail network serving the county	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by de-carbonising the rail network. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>8b).</b> Look to secure inclusion of rail, trunk road and major road networks in digitally-connected programmes.	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>8c).</b> Remain an active member of Transport East and work with Transport East on development of its transport strategy and its subsequent delivery, and any review	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>8d).</b> Work with Transport East on Connectivity Study	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats



<b>Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)</b>	<b>Screening outcome</b>	<b>Justification</b>
Work with Transport East on Rail Connectivity		Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>8e).</b> Continue to lead and coordinate the A47 Alliance  Review the Alliance programme and activities to include further focus on carbon and technology (See Policy 9)	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>8f).</b> Work with partners on Task Forces and other consortia making the case for rail improvements. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ East West Rail (EWR) Main Line Partnership (formerly the Consortium) to build the case and the evidence base for the East West Rail Main Line</li><li>■ Great Eastern Main Line (GEML) Task Force (Norwich to London)</li><li>■ Ely Task Force (to make the case for improvements that would unlock a range of passenger and freight services)</li></ul>	<b>Screened in</b>	The rail projects to be brought forward by this action have the potential to lead to LSE on Habitats Sites depending on their spatial location. This action has therefore been screened in for further assessment.
<b>8g).</b> Work with partners to understand the evidence base to identify and secure improvements to transport gateways	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>8h).</b> Take forward schemes that are included in the current government large local major and major road network funding streams; and develop the forward pipeline of projects.	<b>Screened in</b>	The schemes to be taken forward by this action have the potential to lead to LSE on Habitats Sites depending on their spatial location. This action has therefore been screened in for further assessment.

## Policy 9 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 3: Enhancing Connectivity

*‘Our priority for improved connectivity will be that the network is used by clean transport modes.’*

- 5.3.16. Table 5-10 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 9, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-10 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 9**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>9a).</b> Assess the carbon impacts of schemes the county council brings forward	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>9b).</b> Investigate funding opportunities to deliver a range of initiatives to deliver clean freight including e-cargo bikes, freight consolidation centres (where last-mile deliveries are made by clean modes) and more innovative technologies such as drones or automated vehicles / pods (see Policy 2)	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>9c).</b> Prepare evidence to support the case for improvements, reviewing previous work to – in particular – update and build in low carbon objectives and the future role of the A47 given technological advancements	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet) and improving air quality. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>9d).</b> Work with National Highways to secure active travel and public transport improvements on the trunk road network	<b>Screened in</b>	Development of active travel and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites, however the delivery of the necessary improvements to support this action has the potential to lead to

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
		LSE depending on spatial location and extent. As such, this action has been screened in for further assessment.
<b>9e).</b> Actively seek funding investment from central government in partnership with bus operators to bring zero emissions busses to Norfolk and enable a transition to zero emissions vehicles	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet) and improving air quality. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>9f).</b> Implement a Behaviour Change Programme	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by encouraging shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>9g).</b> Develop LCWIPs to set out policy for walking and cycling	<b>Screened in</b>	Development of active transport modes and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites, however the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support this action has the potential to lead to LSE depending on spatial location and extent. As such, this action has been screened in for further assessment.

### Policy 10 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 3: Enhancing Connectivity

*‘We will seek to improve connectivity between rural areas and services in urban centres.’*

5.3.17. Table 5-11 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 10 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 10, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-11 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 10**

<b>Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)</b>	<b>Screening outcome</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>10a).</b> Develop countywide Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs)	<b>Screened in</b>	Development of active transport modes and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites, however the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support this action has the potential to lead to LSE depending on spatial location and extent. As such, this action has been screened in for further assessment.
<b>10b).</b> Consult on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by encouraging shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>10c).</b> Implement the Bus Service Improvement Plan to improve public transport services and infrastructure connecting into settlements	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable transport. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>10d).</b> Trial innovative technology in different parts of the network by developing prototypes, preferably with local companies	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>10e).</b> Deliver our EV strategy: Encourage stakeholders to deliver charge points at other key destinations including supermarkets and rail stations	Screened out	Principles of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites. In addition, the infrastructure referred to in this strategy is likely to

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
		be urban-focussed and small-scale in nature. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>10d).</b> Investigate the delivery of 'Mobility as a Service' solutions. See Policy 3	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.

### Policy 11 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 4: Enhancing Norfolk's Quality of Life

*'When making changes and improvements to our transport network, and in working with users on how they choose to use the transport network, we will seek to understand the consequences of the decisions on meeting the collective challenge of protecting and improving our global environment to meet the environmental policy target of working towards carbon neutrality.'*

5.3.18. Table 5-12 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 11, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-12 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 11**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>11a).</b> Undertake appropriate and proportionate whole life carbon assessments on proposed schemes including construction and use of the asset	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>11b).</b> Deliver net zero carbon on our own estate	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>11c).</b> Work with Transport East on the Decarbonisation analysis toolkit (being led by England's Economic Heartland)	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>11d).</b> Work with Transport East on alternative fuels (being led by Midlands Connect)	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>11e).</b> Develop our assessment criteria for schemes on the project pipeline to consider their impact across the range of LTP4 objectives	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by ensuring that schemes on the project pipeline are subject to the necessary assessments in order to identify LSE and is therefore not considered further in this document.
<b>11f).</b> Consider implications of LTP guidance and take appropriate and necessary action on carbon as required in the guidance.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>11g).</b> Consider implication of LTP guidance on future reviews of the LTP	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>11h).</b> Investigate working with Broads Authority and other partners on decarbonising waterways	<b>Screened in</b>	The decarbonisation of waterways is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites, however the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support this action has the potential to lead to LSE on Broadland Habitats Sites, for example the requirement for EV charging points along waterways. As

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
		such, this action has been screened in for further assessment.
<b>11i).</b> Deliver a range of actions to reduce carbon. These include delivery of the EV strategy, investment in active travel networks, rollout of digital connectivity to reduce travel, and working with partners to influence the location and nature of development. These actions are detailed elsewhere in the implementation plan.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.

#### **Policy 12 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 4: Enhancing Norfolk's Quality of Life**

*'Our priority for tackling air quality will be to take action to improve air quality, including investigating vehicular restrictions or charging, where air quality falls below the threshold for Air Quality Management Areas. We will also embrace new ways of monitoring air quality to inform interventions, including in other areas, where this is deemed necessary.'*

- 5.3.19. Table 5-13 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 12, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-13 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 12**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>12a).</b> Deliver Transport for Norwich (TfN) Strategy including development of feasibility work on a range of measures to reduce traffic (examination of amongst other things Clean Air Zone, Workplace parking place levy, Road charging / congestion charge, Vehicle bans	Screened out	The TfN Strategy has been subject to a HRA (WSP UK Ltd, 2021b) which concluded that the Strategy is compliant with the Habitats Regulations and will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of Habitats Sites, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.



Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
(e.g. prohibiting petrol and diesel engine vehicles from the city centre)		
<b>12b).</b> Review King's Lynn transport strategy	Screened out	The action "review" in itself will not lead directly to LSE. In addition, this action will embed LTP4 principles, objectives and outcomes, including the requirement for environmental assessment of emerging new infrastructure or improvement schemes which could have LSE on Habitats Sites depending on their spatial location. This action is therefore not considered further in this document.
<b>12c).</b> Review Great Yarmouth transport strategy	Screened out	The action "review" in itself will not lead directly to LSE. In addition, this action will embed LTP4 principles, objectives and outcomes, including the requirement for environmental assessment of emerging new infrastructure or improvement schemes which could have LSE on Habitats Sites depending on their spatial location. This action is therefore not considered further in this document.
<b>12d).</b> Promote behaviour change work	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by encouraging shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>12e).</b> Work with bus operators and other transport providers to achieve a shift to clean fuels	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet) and improving air quality. It will not lead to LSE.



Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>12f).</b> Explore the use of low-cost air quality monitoring equipment, survey equipment	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by monitoring anticipated improvements in air quality. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>12g).</b> Develop and implement LCWIPs	<b>Screened in</b>	Development of active transport modes and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites, however the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support this action has the potential to lead to LSE depending on spatial location and extent. As such, this action has been screened in for further assessment.
<b>12h).</b> Deliver our EV Strategy	Screened out	Principles of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites. In addition, the infrastructure referred to in this strategy is likely to be urban-focussed and small-scale in nature. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>12i).</b> Support District Councils in monitoring Air Quality Action Areas. Develop action plans for transport interventions where transport is a cause of poor air quality. These action plans will consider more than simply traffic management changes: we will look to promote a range of measures to reduce travel and achieve a shift to sustainable travel. These will include consideration of restrictions, behaviour change campaigns and network changes	Screened out	The action “develop action plans” in itself will not lead directly to LSE. In addition, this action will embed LTP4 principles, objectives and outcomes, including the requirement for environmental assessment of emerging new infrastructure or improvement schemes which could have LSE on Habitats Sites depending on their spatial location. This action is therefore not considered further in this document.

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
Seek funding to deliver and implement programmes of work		

### Policy 13 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 4: Enhancing Norfolk's Quality of Life

*'We will seek to improve quality of place, conserving and enhancing our built and historic environments, when we take action to improve the transport network.'*

- 5.3.20. Table 5-14 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 13, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-14 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 13**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>13a).</b> Undertake proportionate assessments of schemes to consider their impact across the range of LTP4 objectives  Develop our assessment criteria for schemes on the project pipeline to consider their impact across the range of LTP4 objectives	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by ensuring that schemes on the project pipeline are subject to the necessary assessments in order to identify LSE and is therefore not considered further in this document.
<b>13b).</b> Apply a Healthy Streets approach in Norfolk. This approach has been adopted for Norwich in the Transport for Norwich Strategy.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by encouraging shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>13c).</b> Identify opportunities for linear habitat creation along the active travel network as part of an integrated approach between active travel and Greenways to Greenspaces.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites and may have the potential to positively affect Sites and functionally linked land (FLL) by removing barriers to dispersal and providing/enhancing habitat corridors, which may add resilience to the added effects of

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
		climate change. It is not considered that it will lead to LSE.

#### Policy 14 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 5: Increasing Accessibility

*'We will work in partnership with agencies in Norfolk to tackle accessibility problems, targeting those communities most in need. We will seek to ensure that accessibility is planned as part of service delivery.'*

- 5.3.21. Table 5-15 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 14, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-15 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 14**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>14a).</b> Deliver the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP). The BSIP includes a range of interventions including more frequent and reliable services, integration of services with other forms of transport, improvements to fares and ticketing and improvements to the bus passenger experience including 100 zero emission buses from 2025, and more accessible and higher quality buses	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable transport. It will not lead to LSE. .
<b>14b).</b> Make an Enhanced Partnership Plan and Enhanced Partnership Scheme	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>14c).</b> Facilitate the commercial operation of the bus network through physical design including	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport

<b>Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)</b>	<b>Screening outcome</b>	<b>Justification</b>
busways, bus priority and advising local planning authorities on appropriate estate design		networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). In addition, the infrastructure referred to in this strategy is likely to be urban-focussed and small-scale in nature. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>14d).</b> Support roll out of improved digital connectivity in rural areas.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>14e).</b> Represent the county council on the Board of Community Rail Norfolk	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>14f).</b> Work within the county council and with other partners to plan accessibility as part of service delivery	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>14g).</b> Work with Transport East on Regional rural mobility centre of excellence  Work with Transport East on Regional rural mobility case for investment (led by the Western Gateway)	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet). It will not lead to LSE.
<b>14h).</b> Explore opportunities to secure funding to develop and trial innovative rural mobility solutions	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>14i).</b> Investigate the delivery of 'Mobility as a Service' solutions. See Policy 3	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
		sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.

### Policy 15 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 5: Increasing Accessibility

*'We will identify routes important for sustainable and active transport and give priority – especially in urban areas – to sustainable and active modes of transport.'*

5.3.22. Table 5-16 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 15, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-16 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 15**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>15a).</b> Prioritise space for certain types of user in urban areas, putting in dedicated, segregated lanes for public transport and / or cycling. We will do this when we implement transport strategies in urban areas and market towns (See Policy 12 and Policy 5)	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by decarbonising transport networks (i.e. rail/road fleet) and improving air quality. In addition, the infrastructure referred to in this strategy is likely to be urban-focussed and small-scale in nature. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>15b).</b> Develop countywide Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs)	<b>Screened in</b>	Development of active transport modes and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites, however the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support this action has the potential to lead to LSE depending on spatial location and extent. As such, this action has been screened in for further assessment.
<b>15c).</b> Consult on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
		Sites by encouraging shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>15d).</b> Work with partners at an early stage of planning and development on accessibility to key regeneration, housing and employment sites	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable and active transport options. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>15e).</b> Work with National Highways to improve local connections along and adjacent to trunk roads as set out in the NSIDP (more information in Chapter 3)	Screened in	Proposed improvements to transport networks with a focus on reducing carbon are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites, however the delivery of the necessary improvements to support this action has the potential to lead to LSE depending on spatial location and extent. As such, this action has been screened in for further assessment.
<b>15f).</b> Promote the use of mobility solutions such as electric bikes  See also Policy 2 commitment to Beryl Bikes scheme	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the successful delivery of green technology and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>15g).</b> Respond to the Norfolk Rural Economic Delivery Plan and support priorities, such as programmes to improve connectivity between coast and rural Norfolk, including market towns	Screened in	One of the objectives of the Norfolk Rural Economic Delivery Plan is to deliver sustainable modern infrastructure, such as broadband and mobile digital technology, roads, public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure. While the delivery of sustainable infrastructure and shifts towards more sustainable lifestyles and behaviours are compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites, the delivery of the necessary

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
		infrastructure to support this action however, has the potential to lead to LSE depending on spatial location and extent. As such, this action has been screened in for further assessment.

### Policy 16 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 5: Increasing Accessibility

*'We commit to providing a network where transport and movement can be accessed, understood and used to the greatest extent possible by all people. We recognise that people who live, work in and visit Norfolk access the network in different ways, depending on their individual circumstances and characteristics, and that what enables good access for one person may act as a barrier to another. We will therefore robustly assess all schemes and pay due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (along with our other duties and responsibilities), to identify potential barriers and determine how best to overcome any barriers and facilitate access to the greatest extent possible for all. Where appropriate, on a case-by-case basis, we will make reasonable adjustments.'*

5.3.23. Table 5-17 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 16, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-17 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 16**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>16a).</b> Undertake proportionate assessments of proposals to make sure they are suitable for all users including people with disabilities or restricted mobility.	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>16b).</b> Continue to support and review the Safe Sustainable Development in development management guidance, which gives due regard to equality as part of meeting the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by ensuring improvements in air quality. It will not lead to LSE.



## Policy 17 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 6: Improving Transport Safety

*‘Using the safe systems approach, the county council and road safety partners will work together to contribute to a reduction in the number of people killed and seriously injured on the road network.’*

5.3.24. Table 5-18 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 17, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-18 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 17**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>17a).</b> Deliver road safety through the Safe Systems Approach by agreeing annual plans with interventions focusing on education and behaviour change with Road Safety Partnership.	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>17b).</b> Work in partnership with the Road Safety Partnership and Safety Camera Partnership to deliver the adopted Safe Systems approach. This is based on four pillars: safe roads; safe vehicles; safe road users, and safe speeds.	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by ensuring improvements in air quality as a result of reduced speed limits. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>17c).</b> Refresh the county council's speed limit strategy	Screened out	The action to refresh a strategy in itself will not lead directly to LSE. In addition, this action will embed LTP4 principles, objectives and outcomes, including the requirement for environmental assessment of emerging new infrastructure or improvement schemes which could have LSE on Habitats Sites depending on their spatial location. This action is therefore not considered further in this document.
<b>17d).</b> Monitor casualty numbers on the network with the priority being to	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.



Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
reduce the number of people killed and seriously injured		
<b>17e).</b> Continue to support the road safety partnership priorities supported by the Road Safety Communities Team	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>17f).</b> Deliver a range of projects including driver development, driver education and enforcement	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>17g).</b> Investigate the implementation of trials of technology and innovation to improve transport safety	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>17h).</b> Roll out via the Road Safety team training programmes in schools for pedestrians and cyclists including Step on it, Crucial Crew and Bikeability	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.

### Policy 18 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 7: A Well Managed and Maintained Transport Network

*‘Maintaining the current highway asset will be a key priority for funding. Works should be targeted to ensure A and urban / inter-urban routes are in good condition.’*

5.3.25. Table 5-19 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 18, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-19 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 18**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>18a).</b> Vigorously exploit all funding opportunities to deliver the widest	Screened out	The action “vigorously exploit funding opportunities” in itself will not lead

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
range of improvement and maintenance schemes, and other initiatives.  Seek to secure funding for innovative schemes such as trials of new technology through exploiting opportunities		directly to LSE, but the delivery of a wide range of improvement and maintenance schemes to improve the transport network as an outcome of this action has the potential to lead to LSE on Habitats Sites depending on spatial location and extent. These schemes should be subject to the requirement for environmental assessment and as such is covered by other relevant policies and actions in the LTP4 Strategy and IP documents. This action is therefore not considered further in this document.
<b>18b).</b> Annually update the Transport Asset Management Plan	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.  The risk-based approach of the Transport Asset Management Plan will also be key in avoiding any effects on Habitats Sites.
<b>18c).</b> We will annually monitor the Asset Management Strategy and its performance framework	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.  The risk-based approach of the Transport Asset Management Plan will also be key in avoiding any effects on Habitats Sites.

### **Policy 19 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 7: A Well Managed and Maintained Transport Network**

*‘We will identify corridors important for sustainable and active transport and focus maintenance on provision for these users where its impact would be most beneficial in market towns and urban areas.’*

- 5.3.26. Table 5-20 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 19, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-20 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 19**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>19a).</b> Include outcomes of prioritisation for active travel and public transport (See Policy 15), and from other initiatives such as LCWIPs (See Policy 15), in reviews of the Transport Asset Management Plan	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable and active transport options. It will not lead to LSE.  The risk-based approach of the Transport Asset Management Plan will also be key in avoiding any effects on Habitats Sites.
<b>19b).</b> Consider banning parking on pavements	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.

#### **Policy 20 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 7: A Well Managed and Maintained Transport Network**

*‘In urban areas we will focus on measures to improve public transport corridors to make those journeys quicker and, in areas identified as having less congestion, we will aim to make all journeys more reliable.’*

- 5.3.27. Table 5-21 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 20, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-21 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 20**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>20a).</b> Implement the Bus Service Improvement Plan (See policy 15) and priority measures in urban areas (policy 19)	Screened out	This action is compatible with the aims of conserving the integrity of Habitats Sites by helping to ensure the delivery of sustainable transport. In addition, the infrastructure referred to in this plan is generally urban-focussed and small-scale in nature. It will not lead to LSE.
<b>20b).</b> Monitor journey times and reliability to inform implementation	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.

## Policy 21 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 7: A Well Managed and Maintained Transport Network

*‘The likely impacts of climate change on the highway network should be addressed to ensure assets are resilient. Where assets can’t be made resilient to impacts of climate change, such as coastal erosion, we should have planned alternatives so we can respond faster and avoid disruption. We will use a risk-based approach to determine the priority for action.’*

- 5.3.28. Table 5-22 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 21, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-22 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 21**

Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)	Screening outcome	Justification
<b>21a).</b> Review the resilient network assessment (see Policy 1 action to identify vulnerability on the network)	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>21b).</b> Maintain an up-to-date Norfolk Local Flood Risk Management Strategy to manage risk of flooding due to climate change	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.

## Policy 22 of the adopted LTP4 Strategy under Objective 7: A Well Managed and Maintained Transport Network

*‘New and innovative technology to collect data about the network, inform decisions, assess where to target funding on the network and share information with the public will be embraced and used proactively.’*

- 5.3.29. Table 5-23 below sets out each of the proposed actions for implementation of Policy 21, which have been subject to an initial screening assessment.

**Table 5-23 - Initial screening of proposals for implementation of Policy 22**

<b>Action (source: Norfolk LTP4 Implementation Plan) (NB. Numbering of actions specific to this document)</b>	<b>Screening outcome</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>22a).</b> Explore the use of connected vehicle and mobile phone data	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>22b).</b> Trial artificial intelligence cameras to better capture walking and cycling data	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>22c).</b> Exploit key contracts with companies such as Microsoft to trial use of artificial intelligence technology to improve decision making	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>22d).</b> Implement and evolve the prototype for network management data using vehicle movement data	Screened out	This is a general action which will not lead to LSE.
<b>22e).</b> Trial sensor technology to collect information about air quality, network use, and road and weather conditions (Also see Policy 3)	Screened out	This is a general action, which will not lead to LSE.
<b>22f).</b> Work with Transport East on the future of freight strategy	Screened out	This is a general action, which will not lead to LSE.

## 5.4 Summary of Screening Exercise

- 5.4.1. Following the screening exercise, a number of actions set out in the IP have been screened-out as they are likely to have nugatory or general positive impacts on Habitats Sites in Norfolk, for example as a result of being communication-based or where actions relate to the review or development of plans and strategies which require consideration of their own requirements for HRA (see Table 5-2 to Table 5-23 for details). The actions screened out relate to Policies 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 of the LTP4 Strategy.
- 5.4.2. At screening, a number of actions have been screened-in where they are likely to or will clearly lead to specific infrastructure projects which could give rise to likely significant effects on Habitats Sites.

The actions screened-in are associated with Policies 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 15 and are summarised below in

- 5.4.3. Table 5-24 along with their associated schemes (where this information is available). It should be noted that where actions are similar, they have been combined for the purpose of this assessment to avoid duplication

The results of the screening exercise summarised above broadly aligns with the outcomes of the initial screening assessment undertaken as part of the LTP4 Strategy HRA. Policies 9, 11 and 12 previously screened-out in the LTP4 Strategy HRA however, have now been screened-in given that their associated actions set out in the Implementation Plan have the potential to lead to specific infrastructure projects which could give rise to likely significant effects on Habitats Sites. In contrast, Policies 7, 13, 14 and 17 previously screened-in have subsequently been screened-out given that it has been concluded that their associated actions will not lead to any LSE.

**Table 5-24 – Actions Screened in and Associated Schemes**

Actions Screened in	Associated Schemes
<b>2d).</b> Take forward energy projects such as Local Area Energy Planning to ensure resilience of local energy networks required for a shift to electric vehicles.	No specific Schemes identified at this stage.
<b>2f, 9g, 9g, 10a, 12g, 15b.)</b> (all relating to the development of LCWIPs).	<p>Current locations where infrastructure plans are being developed in Norfolk include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Greater Norwich</li> <li>■ King's Lynn</li> <li>■ Great Yarmouth</li> <li>■ Dereham</li> </ul> <p>At the time of assessment, summary documents of plans for Greater Norwich and Great Yarmouth were only available (Norfolk County Council, 2021a; 2021b).</p> <p>A brief review of the summary document of plans for Greater Norwich identified a priority improvement scheme (referenced 5) to realign the existing Marriott's Way walking and cycling route near Hellesdon Bridge close to the River Wensum SAC though no further details are provided.</p> <p>A brief review of the summary document of plans for Great Yarmouth also identified a proposed scheme (referenced 01-10) to</p>

Actions Screened in	Associated Schemes
	<p>connect Beach Road, Caister to North Drive. The preferred alignment for this section would utilise the remains of the existing railway track bed between the existing car park at Beach Road, and the northern end of Seashore Holiday Park, at which point the alignment would cross the existing sand dunes (within Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA) as far as North Drive.</p> <p>Potential additional schemes extending into the wider study area are also being developed, with the aim to provide residents and visitors to the region with sustainable transport access along the coast and the Broads network, which may lead to increased recreational pressure on further Habitats Sites such as Winterton-Horsey Dune SAC.</p> <p>Further schemes may also emerge as plans are developed across the County, such as in King's Lynn and Dereham.</p>
<p><b>5d).</b> Take forward work with partners on infrastructure requirements to unlock growth, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ N Walsham housing link road</li> <li>■ East Norwich masterplan</li> <li>■ W Winch masterplan</li> <li>■ Thetford A11 junctions and successor to link road work</li> <li>■ Bradwell</li> </ul>	<p>Schemes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ North Walsham housing link road</li> <li>■ East Norwich masterplan</li> <li>■ West Winch masterplan</li> <li>■ A11 Thetford Bypass Junctions</li> <li>■ Bradwell</li> </ul>
<p><b>5k).</b> Work closely with DfT, National Highways, Network Rail / Great British Railways and other local authorities to influence transport decisions in Norfolk to ensure good connectivity to new developments</p>	<p>No specific Schemes identified at this stage.</p>
<p><b>8f).</b> Work with partners on Task Forces and other consortia making the case for rail improvements. These include:</p>	<p>Schemes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ East West Rail (EWR) (Cambridge to Oxford)</li> <li>■ Norwich to London Rail Improvements</li> </ul>



Actions Screened in	Associated Schemes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ East West Rail (EWR) Main Line Partnership (formerly the Consortium) to build the case and the evidence base for the East West Rail Main Line</li> <li>■ Great Eastern Main Line (GEML) Task Force (Norwich to London)</li> <li>■ Ely Task Force (to make the case for improvements that would unlock a range of passenger and freight services)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ely Area Enhancements</li> </ul>
<p><b>8h).</b> Take forward schemes that are included in the current government large local major and major road network funding streams; and develop the forward pipeline of projects</p>	<p>Current government large local major and major road network schemes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Norwich Western Link</li> <li>■ A10 West Winch Housing Access Road</li> <li>■ A140 Long Stratton Bypass</li> <li>■ A17/A47 Pullover Junction, King's Lynn</li> </ul> <p>The forward pipeline of projects includes a number of schemes within local authority control, as well as schemes on national networks such as trunk roads and railways not in local authority control. Schemes on the project pipeline include:</p> <p><u>Trunk roads</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ A11 Thetford Bypass Junctions</li> <li>■ A47 Wisbech Bypass Junctions</li> <li>■ A47 Tilney to East Winch Dualling</li> <li>■ A47 Acle Straight Dualling</li> </ul> <p><u>Railways</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Norwich to London Rail Improvements</li> <li>■ Great Yarmouth Rail Station</li> <li>■ Ely Area Enhancements</li> <li>■ East West Rail (EWR) (Cambridge to Oxford)</li> </ul> <p><u>Schemes within local authority control</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Broadland Growth Triangle Link Road</li> <li>■ Attleborough Link Road</li> <li>■ A148 Fakenham Roundabout Enhancement</li> <li>■ Broadland Business Park Railway Station</li> <li>■ Weavers Way</li> </ul>



Actions Screened in	Associated Schemes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The Green Loop</li> </ul> <p><u>Up-and-coming projects in local authority control</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ North Walsham Link Road</li> <li>■ Thetford A134 to A11 connection</li> <li>■ Longwater additional access</li> <li>■ Transport Infrastructure to support Norwich East</li> <li>■ A149 King's Lynn Bypass</li> <li>■ A10 Setchey (south of West Winch)</li> <li>■ A140 north of Long Stratton</li> <li>■ Great Yarmouth Town Centre Improvements</li> <li>■ Active Travel in Breckland</li> </ul> <p><u>Up-and-coming projects not in local authority control</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Trowse Rail Bridge</li> </ul>
<p><b>9d).</b> Work with National Highways to secure active travel and public transport improvements on the trunk road network</p> <p><b>15e).</b> Work with National Highways to improve local connections along and adjacent to trunk roads as set out in the NSIDP (more information in Chapter 3)</p>	No specific Schemes identified at this stage.
<p><b>11h).</b> Investigate working with Broads Authority and other partners on decarbonising waterways</p>	No specific Schemes identified at this stage.
<p><b>15g).</b> Respond to the Norfolk Rural Economic Delivery Plan and support priorities, such as programmes to improve connectivity between coast and rural Norfolk, including market towns</p>	No specific Schemes identified at this stage.

- 5.4.4. Following the screening stage, if likely significant effects on Habitats Sites are unable to be ruled out, the plan-making authority is required under Regulation 61 of the Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended) to make an 'Appropriate Assessment' of the implications of

the plan for Habitats Sites, in view of their conservation objectives. EC Guidance<sup>11</sup> states that the Appropriate Assessment should consider the impacts of the plan (either alone or in combination with other projects or plans) on the integrity of European sites with respect to their conservation objectives and to their structure and function.

The actions and associated schemes screened-in in

- 5.4.5. Table 5-24 have therefore been taken forward to Appropriate Assessment which forms Section 6 of this document.

## 5.5 In-Combination Effects on Habitats Sites

- 5.5.1. There is potential for in-combination effects between transportation improvement schemes to be brought forward under the LTP4 IP and other transport schemes. It is therefore possible to outline at a strategic level the broad types of effects that may arise from the implementation of other plans in the County and beyond the County boundary. Some of the effects may occur as a result of a given scheme but may also occur or be compounded as a result of a wider range of development actions and activities arising from the implementation of other plans and projects.
- 5.5.2. The strategic nature of the LTP4 IP and the uncertainties surrounding the timing and effects of proposed schemes, as well as other higher tier plans and projects often in development or emerging stages, makes it impracticable to identify all the possible plans and projects that may act 'in-combination' and to consider the specific nature of likely effects arising.
- 5.5.3. The focus therefore for the in-combination assessment initially undertaken as part of the LTP4 Strategy HRA was on higher tier and strategic level plans at County and District level. In most cases associated HRA work has been completed and this was used to guide the assessment.
- 5.5.4. Following this assessment, a brief search was undertaken to determine whether any plans or projects had recently emerged since the LTP4 Strategy HRA. This review found no additional recently emerging plans or projects and therefore no additional plans or projects were considered as part of the LTP4 IP in-combination assessment.
- 5.5.5. The Local Plan (core strategies, development frameworks) for each local authority district in Norfolk form the main policies for delivering development and infrastructure within each area. The HRAs of these Local Plans generally conclude that there are no likely significant

---

<sup>11</sup> Assessment of plans and projects significantly affecting European sites. Methodological guidance on the provisions of Article 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC. European Commission Environment DG, November 2001. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/art6/natura\\_2000\\_assess\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/art6/natura_2000_assess_en.pdf) [Accessed on 4 March 2022].

effects on any Habitats Sites reasonably anticipated through adoption of the Local Plans policies. This should be qualified however, as most have undergone policy amendments and appropriate mitigation has been applied in some cases to avoid and manage LSE on Habitats Sites. In accordance with current CJEU and UK High Court rulings (see Appendix A) the application of mitigation measures is now only considered at AA stage, however in this assessment it is the outcome of the assessment process for the relevant Local Plans and strategies which is being considered in combination with the LTP4 Strategy rather than the pre-mitigated effects of such. The conclusions of older Plan-level HRAs has been adopted with caution at the Stage 1 Screening level.

- 5.5.6. Recreational pressures were identified in all Local Plans as an issue for selected Habitats Sites, in particular, the Breckland and Broadland SPAs, and the Broads SAC, and this factor will need to be considered in lower tier HRAs where access to the Habitats Sites is improved, alongside potential changes in air quality as a result of new road schemes and improvements. In this respect, the Norfolk Authorities are progressing a Norfolk-wide study, the Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (GIRAMS). This strategy is expected to set out a proposed approach to tariff contributions from new development. This study will also provide useful evidence/guidance for a future Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs) strategy which will be a key feature at AA (Stage 2) HRA work at project level.
- 5.5.7. It is understood for example, that project-level HRAs are already underway for the proposed Norwich Western Link Road and A10 West Winch Housing Access Road (relating to action 8h). A conclusion of no adverse effects from schemes such as these being brought forward by the IP in-combination with other development activities has been reached, as this is considered a likely achievable outcome based on information available at a plan level and the flexibility inherent to less-developed schemes. Nevertheless, this would need to be further assessed and confirmed at project-level HRA in these cases.
- 5.5.8. Local transport plans for the surrounding three County planning authorities have also been reviewed; all propose similar policies to the Norfolk LTP4 Strategy and all have published HRA information.
- 5.5.9. Each of the three HRAs also conclude no adverse effects on Habitats Sites following adoption of the LTPs, no specific conflicts of objectives or interventions have been identified and it is therefore reasonable to conclude at plan level that there will be no adverse effects arising from the implementation of policies of the Norfolk LTP4 Strategy in-combination with these other higher tier LTPs. It is generally concluded therefore that no in-combination effects are likely between these Local Plan policies and the Norfolk LTP4 IP. This is due to the inherent flexibility of lower tier plans or projects at an early stage, whereby avoidance and mitigation measures can effectively be used to address any adverse effects on Habitats Sites. A review of all identified projects and other strategic plans incorporating their assessment has not identified any necessary conflict with this conclusion. However, it is

clear that at a road scheme or project level, lower tier HRAs will be necessary to address potential in-combination effects.

- 5.5.10. Background information on the plans considered and a conclusion on the in-combination assessment are provided in Appendix C. Table 6-1 in the AA also describes and indicates where potential in-combination effects should be considered at the project level.

## 6 Appropriate Assessment

---

- 6.1.1. This HRA recognises that addressing current and future transport issues in the County does pose potential risks to Habitats Sites, notably where new infrastructure or improvement schemes will be brought forward under the Implementation Plan. All actions screened into this AA therefore relate to new infrastructure or improvement schemes which are associated with the following LTP4 Strategy policies:

Policies 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 15 (see

- Table 5-24 for details).

- 6.1.2. It has not been possible to rule out likely significant effects in the absence of mitigation for these actions and associated schemes due to insufficient detail to enable a more in-depth analysis to the degree required for AA. It will only be possible to undertake this level of assessment once sufficient detail is available to enable a thorough and robust analysis to be carried out.

- 6.1.3. The information presented within this AA is therefore high-level and does not contain the detail typically presented for project level HRA AA. A degree of uncertainty remains which limits the extent to which such projects could rely on this AA without further assessment.

- 6.1.4. In the Opinion of Advocate General Kokott in Case C-6/04 Commission v UK [2005] ECR I-9017 at paragraph<sup>12</sup> she noted that an assessment of plans cannot by definition take into account all effects because:

*“Many details are regularly not settled until the time of the final permission” and “[i]t would also hardly be proper to require a greater level of detail in preceding plans or the abolition of multi-stage planning and approval procedures so that the assessment of implications can be concentrated on one point in the procedure. Rather, adverse effects on areas of conservation must be assessed at every relevant stage of the procedure to the extent possible on the basis of the precision of the plan. This assessment is to be updated with increasing specificity in subsequent stages of the procedure”.*

- 6.1.5. The Kokott finding was also bolstered and added to in UK High Court Feeney case<sup>13</sup>:

---

<sup>12</sup> Case C-6/04 Commission v UK [2005] ECR I-9017. Available at: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62009CJ0538\\_SUM](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62009CJ0538_SUM) [Accessed 20 August 2020].

<sup>13</sup> Feeney v Oxford City Council and SSCLG [2011] EWHC 2699 Admin (Para.92). Available at: <http://www.programmeofficers.co.uk/posl/documents/Gloucester/CD13/CD13.40.pdf> [Accessed 28 August 2020].

*"A core strategy is a high level strategic document and the detail falls to be worked out at a later stage. Subsequent appropriate assessment of specific proposals is plainly envisaged by, and indeed necessitated under, the regime. Each appropriate assessment must be commensurate to the relative precision of the plans at any particular stage and no more. There does have to be an appropriate assessment at the Core Strategy stage, but such an assessment cannot do more than the level of detail of the strategy at that stage permits."*

- 6.1.6. In accordance, any projects brought forward under the IP are likely to require consideration of their own requirements for HRA and this document does not preclude the need for further assessment at the project or lower tier level. However, the findings of this strategic level HRA can be incorporated into and explored at the appropriate level of detail at the next tier.
- 6.1.7. The LTP IP HRA has identified the potential for effects on Habitats Sites, but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the policies assessed. It is considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration, can be wholly avoided or mitigated. As a result, the HRA for these policies and any associated schemes should be undertaken at project level under these particular circumstances:
  - the HRA of the IP cannot reasonably assess the effects on Habitats Sites in a meaningful way;
  - the HRA of any projects will be required as a matter of law or government policy;
  - the results of the project level HRA will be able to inform changes in a proposal (including rejecting it outright) if necessary; and
  - enabling a retrospective update of the plan-level HRA (LTP4 IP) if required.
- 6.1.8. It is important to re-emphasise that the adoption of the LTP4 IP does not facilitate the granting of permissions for developments (or projects) that would be contrary to the Habitats Regulations.
- 6.1.9. With any Schemes brought forward under the LTP4 IP, there are a number of environmental control measures that it will be necessary to employ to ensure adverse impacts upon the environment are avoided (in the first instance) or minimised.
- 6.1.10. Actions 5d, 8f and 8h of the LTP4 IP refer to a number of specific infrastructure schemes and these have been considered in relation to the vulnerabilities of Habitats Sites identified in the Zol (see Table 6-1 below). These will be the primary considerations at project-level HRA.
- 6.1.11. Air quality emissions will be a critical consideration at project-level HRA and their reduction to below critical threshold levels as identified by the air pollution information system (APIS) and others for sensitive qualifying features of Habitats Sites will be the primary aim. It should be noted that the levels and loads (deposition) of nitrogen within some Habitats Sites are already above critical thresholds as shown in the relevant APIS tables appended to the LTP4 Strategy HRA.

- 6.1.12. The control of water abstraction and discharge of water is required via the Water Framework Directive<sup>14</sup> and the consideration of impacts on designated sites is covered under the Habitats Regulations, Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and national and location planning policy.
- 6.1.13. With appropriate measures in place, adverse effects can be avoided / minimised and the integrity of the Habitats Sites can be maintained and protected where Schemes are brought forward under the LTP4 IP.
- 6.1.14. Table 6-1 below sets out further details of the relevant infrastructure schemes to be brought forward under the LTP4 IP (where sufficient detail is available), along with the vulnerabilities to be considered at project-level HRA work, taking into account the specific issues, threats and conservation objectives of the Habitats Sites.
- 6.1.15. Where insufficient detail is available, potential development requirements are described and considered assumptions are made regarding likely effects.

---

<sup>14</sup> The Water Framework Directive (2000) Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/index\\_en.html](https://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/index_en.html) [Accessed on 27 August 2020]. The WFD is transposed into UK law under The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 as further amended at EU exit by The Floods and Water (Amendment etc.) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.



**Table 6-1 – Infrastructure Schemes to be brought forward under the LTP4 IP and vulnerabilities to be considered at project-level HRA work**

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential ZOI	Habitat loss/fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/visual disturbance	Water quality/quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
<b>2d).</b> Take forward energy projects such as Local Area Energy Planning to ensure resilience of local energy networks required for a shift to electric vehicles.	No specific Schemes identified at this stage.	It is not possible to identify the location of any Schemes or necessary infrastructure that may arise as a result of this action. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						
<b>2f, 9g, 9g, 10a, 12g, 15b.)</b> (all relating to the development of LCWIPs).	Scheme to realign the existing Marriott's Way walking and cycling route close to Hellesdon Bridge (referenced 5).	▪ <b>River Wensum SAC</b>	Scheme details unknown at this stage. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.					
	Scheme to connect Beach Road, Caister to North Drive (referenced 1-10).	▪ <b>Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA</b>	Potential direct habitat loss/fragmentation where alignment would cross the existing sand dunes within the SPA boundary.	Potential for noise/vibrational/visual disturbance during construction phase on breeding little terns during construction phase.	Not considered to be a vulnerability of Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA interest feature.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature and scale of the scheme.	Greater levels of access may occur as a result of improved linkages increasing recreational pressure on breeding little terns during the operational phase alone and in-combination with other development.	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the



Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								<p>detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ habitat loss and fragmentation;</li> <li>■ disturbance; and</li> <li>■ increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	Further schemes emerging as LCWIPs are developed across the County, such as in King's Lynn and Dereham, though not specified at this stage.	It is not possible to identify the location of any additional Schemes or necessary infrastructure that may arise as a result of these actions. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						
<b>5d).</b> Take forward work with partners on infrastructure requirements to unlock growth, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ N Walsham housing link road</li> <li>■ East Norwich masterplan</li> <li>■ W Winch masterplan</li> <li>■ Thetford A11 junctions and</li> </ul>	<b>North Walsham housing link road</b> A new road required to open up development identified in the review of the North Norfolk Local Plan, which was consulted on early 2022 and is due to be adopted in Winter 2022/early 2023. North Walsham link road unlocks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>The Broads SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Paston Great Barn SAC</b></li> </ul>	Direct loss of habitat within the Habitats Sites boundaries is unlikely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol, however there is potential for	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Changes in air quality during the construction and operational phases of the scheme could result in adverse effects when considered in-combination with other development on <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland</b>	Greater levels of access may occur as a result of improved linkages and associated growth, and this will need to be considered further alone and in-combination with other development such as the associated mixed-	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC and Paston Great Barn SAC</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
<p>successor to link road work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bradwell</li> </ul>	<p>growth on the land to the west of North Walsham to provide a mixed-use sustainable urban extension amounting to 108 hectares, which is allocated for approximately 1,800 dwellings, 7 hectares of employment land, green infrastructure and community facilities.</p>		<p>loss/fragmentation of supporting habitat and FLL when taking into account the proximity of <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar and Paston Great Barn SAC</b> and the habitat requirements of their interest features.</p>			<p><b>SPA, Broadland Ramsar and Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b> including their supporting habitats and FLL.</p>	<p>use sustainable urban extension. The HRA for the North Norfolk Local Plan (Liley, et al, 2021) concluded that this development had the potential to trigger in-combination recreational effects on <b>Breydon Water SPA, Breydon Water Ramsar, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA, North Norfolk Coast SPA, North Norfolk Coast Ramsar, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC, North Norfolk Coast SAC, The Broads SAC, The Wash &amp; North Norfolk Coast SAC, The Wash SPA and The Wash Ramsar.</b></p>	<p>confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>loss of supporting habitat and FLL;</li> <li>changes in air quality; and</li> <li>increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	<p><b>East Norwich masterplan</b></p> <p>The East Norwich development represents a transformative opportunity for regeneration of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The Broads SAC</b></li> <li><b>Broadland SPA</b></li> <li><b>Broadland Ramsar</b></li> <li><b>River Wensum SAC</b></li> </ul>	<p>Not likely to be a consideration due to the urban nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Site</p>	<p>Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Site within the potential Zol.</p>	<p>Potential for changes in water quality as a result of increased discharge from new housing alone and in-combination with</p>	<p>As above for <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar and River Wensum SAC.</b></p>	<p>Greater levels of visitor numbers may occur as a result of increases to the local population, and this will need to be considered</p>	<p>There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar and</b></p>

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
	east Norwich area and the wider city. It is an ambitious project to create a sustainable new urban quarter for the city, supported by the preparation of a joined-up development masterplan for East Norwich and a commitment to substantial future investment.		within the potential Zol.		other development. This will need to be considered further for <b>Broads SAC, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b> .		further for the <b>Broads SAC, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b> alone and in-combination with other development.	<b>River Wensum SAC</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>changes in water quality;</li> <li>changes in air quality; and</li> <li>increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.
	<b>West Winch masterplan</b> Major housing development of up to 4,000 homes between the A10 and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The Wash SPA</b></li> <li><b>The Wash Ramsar</b></li> <li><b>The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC</b></li> </ul>	Direct loss of habitat within the Habitats Sites boundaries is unlikely to be a consideration due	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Site	Potential for changes in water quality and quantity as a result of increased water	As above for <b>Breckland SAC, North Norfolk Coast SAC, Ouse Washes SAC, Roydon</b>	Greater levels of visitor numbers may occur as a result of increases to the local population,	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog</b>

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
	the A47 near King's Lynn. The development would be facilitated by the A10 West Winch Housing Access Road in relation to action 8h).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Roydon Common Ramsar</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Dersingham Bog Ramsar</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Ouse Washes SPA</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Ouse Washes Ramsar</b></li> <li>▪ <b>North Norfolk Coast SPA</b></li> <li>▪ <b>North Norfolk Coast Ramsar</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Breckland SAC</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Breckland SPA</b></li> <li>▪ <b>River Wensum SAC</b></li> </ul>	to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol, however there is potential for loss of supporting habitat and FLL when taking into account the proximity of <b>The Wash SPA, The Wash Ramsar, North Norfolk Coast SPA and North Norfolk Coast Ramsar</b> and the habitat requirements of their interest features. This should be considered both alone and in-combination with other development.	within the potential Zol.	abstraction and discharge from new housing. This will need to be considered further in-combination with other development for <b>Breckland SAC, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC, North Norfolk Coast SAC, Ouse Washes SAC, River Wensum SAC, Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC, The Wash &amp; North Norfolk Coast SAC, North Norfolk Coast SPA, Ouse Washes SPA, The Wash SPA, Dersingham Bog Ramsar, North Norfolk Coast Ramsar, Ouse Washes Ramsar, Roydon Common Ramsar and The Wash Ramsar.</b>	<b>Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC, The Wash &amp; North Norfolk Coast SAC, Breckland SPA, North Norfolk Coast SPA, The Wash SPA, Dersingham Bog Ramsar, North Norfolk Coast Ramsar, Ouse Washes Ramsar and The Wash Ramsar.</b>	and this will need to be considered further in-combination with other development for <b>Breckland SAC, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC, North Norfolk Coast SAC, Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC, The Wash &amp; North Norfolk Coast SAC, Breckland SPA, North Norfolk Coast SPA, The Wash SPA, Dersingham Bog Ramsar, North Norfolk Coast Ramsar, Roydon Common Ramsar and The Wash Ramsar.</b>	<p><b>SAC, Roydon Common Ramsar, Dersingham Bog Ramsar, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC, The Wash SPA, The Wash Ramsar, The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, North Norfolk Coast SPA and North Norfolk Coast Ramsar</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ loss of supporting habitat and FLL;</li> </ul>

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ changes in water quality;</li> <li>■ changes in air quality; and</li> <li>■ increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	<p><b>A11 Thetford Bypass Junctions</b></p> <p>Upgrades to five existing junctions on the A11 bypass around Thetford. It is likely that the agreed scope of work will comprise traffic signals on the roundabouts and speed limits on the A11.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Breckland SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Breckland SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Rex Graham SAC</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme based on the current agreed scope of work (i.e. upgrades within the existing public highway boundary).	Not considered likely to be a vulnerability of the SAC interest features, but the <b>Breckland SPA</b> interest features may be vulnerable to change due to acoustic disturbance.	Due to proximity and vulnerability, changes to water quality during the construction phase could result in adverse effects on <b>Breckland SAC</b> alone and in-combination with other development.	As above for <b>Breckland SAC, Breckland SPA, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC and Rex Graham SAC</b> .	Greater levels of access may occur as a result of the A11 improvements and linkages and this will need to be considered further for <b>Breckland SAC</b> and <b>Breckland SPA</b> alone and in-combination with other development.	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>Breckland SAC, Breckland SPA, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC and Rex Graham SAC</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential



Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								<p>effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ disturbance;</li> <li>■ changes in water quality;</li> <li>■ changes in air quality; and</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	<p><b>Bradwell</b></p> <p>Further housing growth earmarked in the Bradwell area near Great Yarmouth. Scheme details unknown at this stage. The County Council is to undertake a study to examine if the existing A143 junction and the road links have capacity to accommodate the traffic from additional housing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Breydon Water SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Breydon Water Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>The Broads SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Greater Wash SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Outer Thames Estuary SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Winterton-Horsey Dunes SAC</b></li> </ul>	<p>Direct loss of habitat within the Habitats Sites boundaries is unlikely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol, however there is potential for loss of supporting habitat and FLL when taking into account the proximity of <b>Breydon Water SPA, Breydon Water Ramsar, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b> and the habitat requirements of their interest features. This should be considered both alone and in-</p>	<p>Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Site within the potential Zol.</p>	<p>Potential for changes in water quality and quantity as a result of increased water abstraction and discharge from new housing. This will need to be considered further for <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b>.</p>	<p>As above for <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, and Broadland Ramsar</b>.</p>	<p>Greater levels of visitor numbers may occur as a result of increases to the local population, and this will need to be considered further for <b>Breydon Water SPA, Breydon Water Ramsar, The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Great Yarmouth North Denes and Winterton-Horsey Dunes SAC</b>.</p>	<p>There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>Breydon Water SPA, Breydon Water Ramsar, The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Great Yarmouth North Denes and Winterton-Horsey Dunes SAC</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design</p>

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
			combination with other development.					<p>stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ loss of supporting habitat and FLL;</li> <li>■ changes in water quality;</li> <li>■ changes in air quality; and</li> <li>■ increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
<b>5k).</b> Work closely with DfT, National Highways, Network Rail / Great British Railways and other local authorities to influence transport decisions in Norfolk to ensure good connectivity to new developments	No specific Schemes identified at this stage.	It is not possible to identify the location of any Schemes or necessary infrastructure that may arise as a result of this action. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
<b>8f).</b> Work with partners on Task Forces and other consortia making the case for rail improvements. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East West Rail (EWR) Main Line Partnership (formerly the Consortium) to build the case and the evidence base for the East West Rail Main Line</li> <li>Great Eastern Main Line (GEML) Task Force (Norwich to London)</li> <li>Ely Task Force (to make the case for improvements that would unlock a range of passenger and freight services)</li> </ul>	<b>East West Rail (Cambridge to Oxford)</b>  The complete East West Rail scheme comprises a strategic rail route that will link Ipswich and Norwich to Cambridge, Bedford, Milton Keynes, Bicester, and Oxford. Government has set up a Special Delivery Vehicle for the project and this is currently taking forward design and development work on a new line from Cambridge to Bedford. Delivery of this could be completed in the mid-2020s.	No Habitats Sites within the Zol of the LTP4 Strategy.	N/A					
	<b>Norwich to London Rail Improvements</b>  Subject to government funding approval a Strategic Outline Business Case will be completed on a package to deliver performance and journey time benefits. This includes timetable performance work for the line and also looking at the benefits of Bow Junction and Trowse, Norwich.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The Broads SAC</b></li> <li><b>Broadland SPA</b></li> <li><b>Broadland Ramsar</b></li> <li><b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b></li> <li><b>Redgrave &amp; South Lopham Fens Ramsar</b></li> <li><b>River Wensum SAC</b></li> <li><b>Waveney &amp; Little Ouse Valley Fens SAC</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme (i.e. improvements to existing infrastructure) and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Improvements to the Trowse Rail Bridge proposed as part of these works has the potential to result in changes in water quality during the construction phase. This will need to be considered further for <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b> situated downstream of	Changes in air quality during the construction phase of the scheme could result in adverse effects when considered alone and in-combination with other development on all Habitats Sites within the potential Zol including their supporting habitats and FLL.	The nature of the rail improvements is considered unlikely to result in increased recreational pressures on the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC, Redgrave &amp; South Lopham Fens Ramsar, River Wensum SAC and Waveney &amp; Little Ouse Valley Fens SAC</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a



Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
					the bridge. This particular scheme is covered separately in relation to action 8h below.			confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ changes in water quality; and</li> <li>■ changes in air quality.</li> </ul> A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.
	<b>Ely Area Enhancements</b> A large number of rail services pass through Ely. A package of improvements has been identified and an Outline Business Case is being prepared for	It is not possible to identify the location of any Schemes or necessary infrastructure that may arise as a result of this action. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
	submission to government							
<b>8h).</b> Take forward schemes that are included in the current government large local major and major road network funding streams; and develop the forward pipeline of projects.	<b>Norwich Western Link</b> The Norwich Western Link would provide a higher standard route between the western end of A1270 Broadland Northway and the A47 and significantly improve travel between these two major roads.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>River Wensum SAC</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Paston Great Barn SAC</b></li> </ul>	Due to proximity, habitat loss and fragmentation could occur during the construction phase which could result in adverse effects on the River Wensum SAC.	Due to proximity, changes in the baseline noise environment during the construction and operational phases could result in adverse effects on the <b>River Wensum SAC</b> when considering the scheme alone.	Due to proximity, changes to water quality during the construction and operational phases has the potential to lead to adverse effects on the <b>River Wensum SAC</b> when considering the scheme alone.	Changes in air quality during the construction and operational phases of the scheme could result in adverse effects when considering the scheme alone on the <b>River Wensum</b> including its supporting habitats and FLL.	Greater levels of access may occur at as a result of improved linkages; however, recreation is not identified as a key threat for the <b>River Wensum SAC</b> .	<p>There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case the <b>River Wensum SAC</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ habitat loss and fragmentation;</li> <li>▪ disturbance;</li> </ul>

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>changes in water quality; and</li> <li>changes in air quality.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	<p><b>A10 West Winch Housing Access Road</b></p> <p>Provision of a new housing access road scheme is planned for West Winch. This is required for the growth area which will see up to 4,000 new homes built. The West Winch Housing Access Road will also address existing traffic problems on the A10 by providing an alternative route around the village that conforms to Major Road Network standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The Wash SPA</b></li> <li><b>The Wash Ramsar</b></li> <li><b>The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC</b></li> <li><b>Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC</b></li> <li><b>Roydon Common Ramsar</b></li> <li><b>Dersingham Bog Ramsar</b></li> <li><b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b></li> <li><b>Ouse Washes SPA</b></li> <li><b>Ouse Washes Ramsar</b></li> <li><b>North Norfolk Coast SPA</b></li> <li><b>North Norfolk Coast Ramsar</b></li> </ul>	<p>Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol, though there is potential for loss of supporting habitat and FLL when taking into account the proximity of <b>The Wash SPA, The Wash Ramsar, North Norfolk Coast SPA and North Norfolk Coast Ramsar</b> and the habitat requirements of their interest features. This should be considered both alone and in-combination with other development.</p>	<p>Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.</p>	<p>Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.</p>	<p>As above for <b>Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC, Roydon Common Ramsar, Dersingham Bog Ramsar, and Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b> when considered in-combination with other development.</p>	<p>Greater levels of access may occur as a result of improved linkages and associated growth, and this will need to be considered further for in-combination with other development such as the associated West Winch masterplan. The HRA of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Review (Liley, et al, 2020) concluded that this development had the potential to trigger in-combination recreational effects on <b>Breckland SAC, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC, North Norfolk Coast SAC, Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC, The Wash</b></p>	<p>There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC, Roydon Common Ramsar, Dersingham Bog Ramsar, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC, The Wash SPA, The Wash Ramsar, The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, North Norfolk Coast SPA and North Norfolk Coast Ramsar</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be</p>

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
							<b>&amp; North Norfolk Coast SAC, Breckland SPA, North Norfolk Coast SPA, The Wash SPA, Dersingham Bog Ramsar, North Norfolk Coast Ramsar, Roydon Common Ramsar and The Wash Ramsar.</b>	<p>mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ loss of supporting habitat and FLL;</li> <li>■ changes in air quality; and</li> <li>■ increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	<b>A140 Long Stratton Bypass</b> Norfolk County Council is currently working in collaboration with South Norfolk District Council, Norfolk Homes Ltd and Norfolk Land Ltd to develop proposals to deliver a long-awaited bypass of Long Stratton on the eastern side of the town, which will cut congestion and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Norfolk Valley Fens</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Site within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Site within the potential Zol and its identified vulnerabilities.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Site within the potential Zol.	As above for <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b> when considered in-combination with other development.	Greater levels of access may occur at as a result of improved linkages; however, recreation is not identified as a key threat for <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b> .	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case the <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
	support the local economy.							level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ changes in air quality.</li> </ul> A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.
	<b>A17/A47 Pullover Junction, King's Lynn</b> The A17/A47 Pullover Junction improvement is required to reduce congestion and delay in the King's Lynn area and to support the planned growth set out in the adopted Local Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>The Wash SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>The Wash Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Roydon Common Ramsar</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme (i.e. junction improvements) and the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Site within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Site within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Site within the potential Zol.	As above for <b>Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC and Roydon Common Ramsar.</b>	Greater levels of access may occur as a result of improved linkages and associated growth, and this will need to be considered further for the <b>The Wash SPA, The Wash Ramsar and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC</b> in-combination with other development.	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC, Roydon Common Ramsar, The Wash SPA, The Wash Ramsar and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								<p>consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ changes in air quality; and</li> <li>■ increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	<b>A11 Thetford Bypass Junctions</b>	See above in relation to action <b>5d</b> ).						
	<b>A47 Wisbech Bypass Junctions</b> Improvements to the Broadend Road junction and minor improvements to the existing Elm High Road / A47 roundabout will be brought forward with the Growth Deal Funding from the Cambridgeshire Peterborough Combined Authority. Scheme details	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Nene Washes SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Nene Washes SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Nene Washes Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>Ouse Washes SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Ouse Washes Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>The Wash SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>The Wash Ramsar</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme (i.e. junction improvements) and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Changes in air quality during the construction and operational phases Scheme may occur, however, this is not identified as a key threat for the Habitats Sites within the Zol of air quality effects.	Greater levels of access may occur at as a result of improved linkages; however, recreation is not identified as a key threat for the Habitats Sites within the Zol of recreational effects.	It may be possible to rule out effects on all of the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol due to their identified vulnerabilities as well as the distance and nature of the Scheme (i.e. improvements to existing junctions). Consider for HRA at project or lower tier level, though



Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
	unknown at this stage.							unlikely that this will progress beyond Stage 1 screening due to reasons provided above.
	<b>A47 Tilney to East Winch Dualling</b> Dualling of the A47 between Tilney and East Winch. Scheme details unknown at this stage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Breckland SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Roydon Common Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>Dersingham Bog Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>The Wash &amp; North Norfolk Coast SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>The Wash Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>The Wash SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Ouse Washes SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Ouse Washes Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>North Norfolk Coast SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>North Norfolk Coast Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>Nene Washes SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Nene Washes Ramsar</b></li> </ul>	Direct loss of habitat within the Habitats Sites boundaries is unlikely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol, however there is potential for loss of supporting habitat and FLL when taking into account the proximity of <b>The Wash SPA, The Wash Ramsar, North Norfolk Coast SPA and North Norfolk Coast Ramsar</b> and the habitat requirements of their interest features. This should be considered both alone and in-combination with other development.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Changes in air quality during the construction and operational phases of the scheme could result in adverse effects when considered alone and in-combination with other development on <b>Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC, Roydon Common Ramsar, Dersingham Bog Ramsar, and Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b> including their supporting habitats and FLL.	Greater levels of access may occur as a result of improved linkages and associated growth, and this will need to be considered further for <b>The Wash SPA, The Wash Ramsar, The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, North Norfolk Coast SPA and North Norfolk Coast Ramsar</b> alone and in-combination with other development.	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>Roydon Common &amp; Dersingham Bog SAC, Roydon Common Ramsar, Dersingham Bog Ramsar, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC, The Wash SPA, The Wash Ramsar, The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, North Norfolk Coast SPA and North Norfolk Coast Ramsar</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								<p>stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ loss of supporting habitat and FLL;</li> <li>▪ changes in air quality; and</li> <li>▪ increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	<p><b>A47 Acle Straight Dualling</b></p> <p>Dualling of the A47 Acle Straight between Acle and Great Yarmouth.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Breydon Water SPA</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Breydon Water Ramsar</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Broadland Ramsar</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Broadland SPA</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Greater Wash SPA</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Haisborough, Hammond and Winterton SAC</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Outer Thames Estuary SPA</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Southern North Sea SAC</b></li> <li>▪ <b>The Broads SAC</b></li> </ul>	<p>Potential for direct loss of habitat within <b>The Broads SAC and Broadland Ramsar</b> due to proximity. Potential for loss of supporting habitat and FLL when taking into account the proximity of <b>Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Breydon Water SPA and Breydon Water Ramsar</b> and the habitat requirements of</p>	<p>Potential for noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance during construction phase to interest features of <b>Broadland Ramsar, Breydon Water SPA and Breydon Water Ramsar</b>.</p>	<p>Due to proximity, changes to water quality during the construction and operational phases has the potential to lead to adverse effects on <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Breydon Water SPA and Breydon Water Ramsar</b> alone and in-combination with other development.</p>	<p>As above for <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b>.</p>	<p>Greater levels of access may occur as a result of improved linkages and associated growth, and this will need to be considered further for <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Breydon Water SPA, Breydon Water Ramsar, and Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA</b> alone and in-combination with other development.</p>	<p>There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Breydon Water SPA, Breydon Water Ramsar, and Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such</p>



Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Winterton-Horsey Dunes SAC</li> <li>Paston Great Barn SAC</li> </ul>	their interest features.					<p>effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>loss of supporting habitat and FLL;</li> <li>disturbance;</li> <li>changes in air quality;</li> <li>changes in water quality; and</li> <li>increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	Norwich to London Rail Improvements	See above in relation to action 8f).						
	<b>Great Yarmouth Rail Station</b> Major upgrade to the existing station to improve this gateway to the town.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Broads SAC</li> <li>Broadland SPA</li> <li>Broadland Ramsar</li> <li>Breydon Water SPA</li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the urban nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites	Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites	The nature of the rail upgrades is considered unlikely to result in increased recreational pressures on the	It may be possible to rule out effects on all of the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol due to the nature of the

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Breydon Water Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Greater Wash SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Southern North Sea SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Outer Thames Estuary SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Winterton-Horsey Dunes SAC</b></li> </ul>	the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	within the potential Zol.	within the potential Zol.	within the potential Zol.	Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites. Consider for HRA at project or lower tier level, though unlikely that this will progress beyond Stage 1 screening due to reasons provided above.
	<b>Ely Area Enhancements</b>	See above in relation to action <b>8f</b> ).						
	<b>East West Rail (EWR) (Cambridge to Oxford)</b>	See above in relation to action <b>8f</b> ).						
	<b>Broadland Growth Triangle Link Road</b> A road linking the strategic employment areas of Broadland Business Park and Norwich Airport through the development sites within the northern suburbs of Norwich. It will significantly increase the accessibility of employment sites in the Broadland Growth Triangle area and support the development of approximately 55 hectares of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>The Broads SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>River Wensum SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the suburban nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Changes in air quality during the construction and operational phases of the scheme could result in adverse effects when considered in-combination with other development on the <b>Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, River Wensum SAC and Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b> including their supporting habitats and FLL.	Greater levels of access may occur as a result of improved linkages and associated growth, and this will need to be considered further for the <b>Broads SAC, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b> in-combination with other development.	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, River Wensum SAC and Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
	employment land in this vicinity.							(project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ changes in air quality; and</li> <li>■ increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.
	<b>Attleborough Link Road</b> A link road between the B1077 near Bunns Bank to London Road to the south of the town. It is required for planned strategic growth (4,000 dwellings) in Attleborough. It will distribute new and existing traffic away from the town centre.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Breckland SPA</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the suburban nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	As above for <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC and Breckland SPA</b> when considered in-combination with other development.	Greater levels of access may occur as a result of improved linkages and associated growth, and this will need to be considered further for <b>Breckland SPA</b> in-combination with other development.	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC and Breckland SPA</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								<p>be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ changes in air quality; and</li> <li>■ increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	<p><b>Fakenham A148 Roundabout Enhancement</b></p> <p>Required to support the delivery of one of North Norfolk's largest Local Plan allocations of 950 dwellings. Scheme details unknown at this stage.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>River Wensum SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>North Norfolk Coast SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>North Norfolk Coast Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>The Wash SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>The Wash Ramsar</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the suburban nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the small-scale nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	As above for <b>River Wensum SAC</b> when considered in-combination with other development.	Greater levels of access may occur as a result of improved linkages and associated growth, and this will need to be considered further for <b>North Norfolk Coast SPA, North Norfolk Coast Ramsar, The Wash SPA and The Wash Ramsar</b> in-combination with other development.	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case the <b>River Wensum SAC, North Norfolk Coast SPA, North Norfolk Coast Ramsar, The Wash SPA and The Wash Ramsar</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								(project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ changes in air quality; and</li> <li>■ increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.
	<b>Broadland Business Park Rail Station</b> Delivery of a new station on the Norwich to Sheringham line at Broadland Business Park. Scheme details unknown at this stage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>The Broads SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>River Wensum SAC</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the urban nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	The nature of this scheme is considered unlikely to result in increased recreational pressures on the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	It may be possible to rule out effects on all of the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol due to the nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites. Consider for HRA at project or lower tier level, though unlikely that this will progress beyond Stage 1 screening due to reasons provided above.

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
	<p><b>Weavers Way</b></p> <p>New walking and cycling infrastructure in rural Norfolk. Weaver's Way links Cromer, Aylsham, Stalham, and Great Yarmouth. This project will focus principally on revitalising the disused railway line between Aylsham and Stalham. Route improvements will include new surfacing to ensure year-round accessibility for walkers (including access impaired users) and cyclists, increased safety, and accessibility at road crossings through installation of new gates and improved signage and connectivity to amenities and other routes throughout.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>The Broads SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland Ramsar</b></li> <li>■ <b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Paston Great Barn SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Winterton-Horsey Dunes SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Southern North Sea SAC</b></li> </ul>	<p>Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme (i.e. improvements to existing footpath) and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.</p>	<p>Due to the proximity of <b>Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b>, there is the potential for noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance to qualifying geese and swan species on FLL outside the SPA and Ramsar Site boundaries close to the route near Stalham.</p>	<p>Changes in water quality during the construction phase cannot be ruled out taking into account the proximity of <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b> close to the route near Stalham and the potential for hydrological linkages. This should be considered further at the project level.</p>	<p>Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.</p>	<p>Greater levels of access may occur as a result of improved linkages and associated growth, and this will need to be considered further for <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Great Yarmouth North Denes and Winterton-Horsey SAC</b> in-combination with other development.</p>	<p>There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case the <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Great Yarmouth North Denes and Winterton-Horsey SAC</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ disturbance;</li> <li>■ changes in water quality; and</li> </ul>



Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	<p><b>The Green Loop</b></p> <p>A 46-mile circular route for walking / cycling and disabled use. Encompassing the Marriott's Way, Bure Valley Path and Broadland Way. It will also connect to the Three Rivers Way Cycle route and to Weaver's Way. It is understood that the scheme will involve upgrades to the existing route in some areas to make them more accessible for disabled users, though further details unknown at this stage.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>River Wensum SAC</b></li> <li><b>The Broads SAC</b></li> <li><b>Broadland SPA</b></li> <li><b>Broadland Ramsar</b></li> <li><b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme (i.e. improvements to existing footpath) and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Changes in water quality during the construction phase cannot be ruled out taking into account the proximity of the <b>River Wensum SAC and Norfolk Valley Fens SAC</b> .	Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Greater levels of access may occur as a result of improved linkages and associated growth, and this will need to be considered further for <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b> in-combination with other development.	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case the <b>River Wensum SAC and Norfolk Valley Fens SAC, The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>changes in water quality; and</li> <li>increased recreational pressure.</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
	<b>North Walsham Link Road</b>	See above in relation to action <b>5d</b> ).						
	<b>Thetford A134 to A11 connection</b>  Although this project was included in the 2021 NSIDP, further work is now focusing on working with National Highways in respect of mitigating the impacts of growth in the town on the A11, and improvements within the town itself. The form and nature of these are not yet known, with work planned during 2022.	Scheme details unknown at this stage. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						
	<b>Longwater additional access</b>  A potential new link from Queens Hills onto the A1074 Dereham Road in Norwich.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>River Wensum SAC</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the River Wensum SAC.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the River Wensum SAC.	Changes in water quality during the construction and operational phases cannot be ruled out taking into account the proximity of the <b>River Wensum SAC</b> and the potential for	As above for <b>River Wensum SAC</b> when considered in-combination with other development.	Greater levels of access may occur at as a result of improved linkages; however, recreation is not identified as a key threat for the	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case the <b>River Wensum SAC</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies



Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
					hydrological linkages. This should be considered further at the project level.		River Wensum SAC.	assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ changes in air quality.</li> </ul> A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.
	<b>Transport Infrastructure to support Norwich East</b>  New infrastructure across a range of modes to facilitate an exciting regeneration opportunity in east Norwich.	Scheme details unknown at this stage. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						
	<b>A149 King's Lynn Bypass</b>  Work will look at how congestion and delay on the A149 could be overcome including	Scheme details unknown at this stage. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The						

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
	by moving trips across the town and along the bypass to active travel or public transport modes, or reducing trips altogether, to achieve wider outcomes around decarbonisation.	locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						
	<b>A10 Setchey</b> Investigation of issues on the A10 south of the proposed West Winch Housing Access Road.	Scheme details unknown at this stage. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						
	<b>A140 north of Long Stratton</b> Investigation of issues on the A140 north of the proposed Long Stratton Bypass.	Scheme details unknown at this stage. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						
	<b>Great Yarmouth Town Centre Improvements</b> A range of measures aimed at regeneration of the town.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The Broads SAC</li> <li>■ Broadland SPA</li> <li>■ Broadland Ramsar</li> <li>■ Breydon Water SPA</li> <li>■ Breydon Water Ramsar</li> <li>■ Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA</li> <li>■ Greater Wash SPA</li> <li>■ Southern North Sea SAC</li> <li>■ Outer Thames Estuary SPA</li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	The nature of these improvements considered unlikely to result in increased recreational pressures on the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	It may be possible to rule out effects on all of the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol due to the nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites. Consider for HRA at project or lower tier level, though unlikely that this will progress beyond Stage 1 screening due to

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								reasons provided above.
	<b>Active Travel in Breckland</b> Active travel measures to link towns, employment sites and services.	It is not possible to identify the location of any Schemes or necessary infrastructure that may arise as a result of this development of this project. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						
	<b>Trowse Rail Bridge</b> The single-track bridge on the approach to Norwich Station has been identified as a pinch-point restricting service frequencies and timetabling and being a cause of unreliability to current services. Work on development of an improvement is being closely linked to the work ongoing to regenerate East Norwich. Scheme details unknown at this stage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>The Broads SAC</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland SPA</b></li> <li>■ <b>Broadland Ramsar</b></li> </ul>	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	Improvement works have the potential to result in changes in water quality during the construction phase. This will need to be considered further for <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b> situated downstream of the bridge.	Not likely to be a consideration due to the nature of the Scheme and distance between the Scheme and the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	The nature of the rail improvements is considered unlikely to result in increased recreational pressures on the Habitats Sites within the potential Zol.	There is potential for effects on Habitats Sites, in this case <b>The Broads SAC, Broadland SPA and Broadland Ramsar</b> but these effects are by no means certain or a confirmed outcome of the actions/policies assessed. It is also considered likely that such effects, at a more detailed stage of consideration (project HRA level), can be mitigated or can be explored at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. At the project level the following potential effects should be considered:

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>changes in water quality</li> </ul> <p>A project-level HRA is therefore required for this Scheme.</p>
<p><b>9d).</b> Work with National Highways to secure active travel and public transport improvements on the trunk road network</p> <p><b>15e).</b> Work with National Highways to improve local connections along and adjacent to trunk roads as set out in the NSIDP (more information in Chapter 3)</p>	No specific Schemes identified at this stage.	It is not possible to identify the location of any Schemes or necessary infrastructure that may arise as a result of these actions. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						
<b>11h).</b> Investigate working with Broads Authority and other partners on decarbonising waterways	No specific Schemes identified at this stage.	It is not possible to identify the location of any Schemes or necessary infrastructure that may arise as a result of this action. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						
<b>15g).</b> Respond to the Norfolk Rural Economic Delivery Plan and support priorities, such as programmes to improve connectivity between coast and rural Norfolk,	No specific Schemes identified at this stage.	It is not possible to identify the location of any Schemes or necessary infrastructure that may arise as a result of this action. It is therefore not possible to rule out adverse effects at this strategic level. Notwithstanding the need for project-level HRAs, there are a number of measures that can be exploited at the detailed design stage to ensure that adverse effects are avoided. Specifically, that there will be a presumption against land-take within designated sites and in addition, construction best-practice measures will be integrated into Scheme designs to avoid indirect effects. It is also considered likely that adverse effects as a result of disturbance can be avoided with the use of carefully designed measures which will be based on evidence acquired through survey. The locations exploited should ensure that disturbance effects do not arise and/or that engineering solutions are exploited at the detailed design stage to avoid adverse effects.						

Proposed Action Screened in	Relevant/Associated Schemes	Habitats Sites in potential Zol	Habitat loss/ fragmentation (including FLL)	Noise/vibrational/ visual disturbance	Water quality/ quantity	Air quality (emissions, deposition and dust)	Recreational disturbance	Conclusion of adverse effects
including market towns								

## 7 Summary and Recommendations

---

- 7.1.1. The Norfolk LTP4 IP sets out a number of proposed actions showing how NCC intend to implement the policies and achieve the ambitions outlined in the LTP Strategy document. Norfolk LTP4 IP proposes actions for addressing current and future transport issues in the County and in this document, it has been subject to HRA screening and AA for potential LSE and adverse effects on the integrity of Habitats Sites at a strategic level.
- 7.1.2. A number of proposed actions have been screened-out due to their nugatory or beneficial effects on Habitats Sites, but other actions were screened-in for further consideration at AA Stage 2. These actions are related primarily to proposed new infrastructure or improvement schemes, for which limited information is currently available.
- 7.1.3. Given the possibility of LSE associated with the screened-in policy/actions, further detailed assessment through Appropriate Assessment is considered likely to be necessary at a project-level and on a case-by-case basis to satisfy the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. It is considered however, that, due to the inherent flexibility of lower tier plans or projects at an early stage, avoidance and mitigation measures can be effectively used to address any adverse effects on Habitats Sites. Therefore, this assessment, together with the over-arching statement below means that the competent authority can conclude at this plan level that the LTP4 IP is not likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Habitats Sites. A review of all identified projects and other strategic plans incorporating their assessment has not identified any necessary conflict with this conclusion.
- 7.1.4. The following over-arching statement is recommended for incorporation within the accompanying supplementary guidance or directly within the LTP4 IP:  
  
*Any new transport or improvement project which would be likely to have a significant effect on a Habitats Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, will be subject to assessment under part 6 of the Habitats Regulations at the application stage. The County Council will only support proposals where they meet the requirements of Part 6 of the Habitats Regulations.*
- 7.1.5. No further HRA work is considered necessary for the LTP4 IP to be adopted as a strategic document by Norfolk County Council subject to the condition noted above relating to the requirement that consideration for project-level HRA be undertaken for the proposed infrastructure schemes in the County as required by legislation and/or advised by policy and guidance.
- 7.1.6. Statutory consultation forms an important element of the HRA exercise and the response from consultees on the LTP4 Strategy HRA has been considered in this HRA report. Natural England will also be consulted for their detailed views on this HRA for the LTP4 IP, with feedback incorporated into this document, as required.
- 7.1.7. The HRA concludes that the LTP4 IP is compliant with the Habitats Regulations and will not result in adverse effects on any Habitats Sites subject to the condition noted above, either





alone or in-combination with other plans or projects. Infrastructure schemes or associated development coming forward through the IP will be considered for the correct level of assessment to ensure the integrity of relevant Habitats Sites is protected in the long term.

## 8 References

---

- APIS (2011). Air Pollution Information System Database, available at [www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk). Accessed 2nd July 2019.
- Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat. Ramsar (Iran), 2 February 1971. UN Treaty Series No. 14583. As amended by the Paris Protocol, 3 December 1982, and Regina Amendments, 28 May 1987.
- Council of the European Union (1992). Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. Available online: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/ALL/?uri=CELEX:31992L0043>. Accessed 2nd July 2019.
- Council of the European Union (2009). Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds. Available online: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=URISERV:ev0024>. Accessed 2nd July 2019.
- Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) 2012. National Planning Policy Framework.
- DETR (1998). European Marine Sites in England & Wales: A guide to the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 and to the Preparation and Application of Management Schemes. Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions: UK.
- European Commission (2000). Managing Natura 2000 Sites, the provisions of Article 6 of the 'Habitats' Directive 92/43/EEC. Available: [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/art6/provision\\_of\\_art6\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/art6/provision_of_art6_en.pdf). Accessed 2nd July 2019.
- European Communities (2007). Guidance document on Article 6 (4) of the 'Habitats Directive' 92/43/EEC; Available: [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/art6/guidance\\_art6\\_4\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/art6/guidance_art6_4_en.pdf) Accessed: accessed 2nd July 2019.
- Her Majesty's Stationary Office (2017). The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017/490.
- HMSO (2007). The Offshore Marine Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 2007, SI 2007/1842.
- Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) (2016). SAC and SPA Standard Data Forms and Ramsar Information Sheets. Available online: <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/>. Accessed 2nd July 2019.
- Lily, D., Saunders, P., & Panter, C. 2021. North Norfolk Local Plan HRA Submission version. Unpublished report for North Norfolk County Council.
- Lily, D., Saunders, P., & Caals, Z. 2020. Habitats Regulations Assessment of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Review at pre-submission. Unpublished report by Footprint Ecology.
- The Landscape Partnership 2020. Habitats Regulations Assessment of Greater Norwich Regulation 18 Draft Plan v8.1. Report for Greater Norwich Development Partnership.




- Natural England (2018). Natural England's approach to advising competent authorities on the assessment of road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations. Available online: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4720542048845824> Accessed 15th June 2020.
- Norfolk County Council 2021a. Great Norwich Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Summary. May 2021.
- Norfolk County Council 2021b. Great Yarmouth Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Summary. July 2021.
- WSP UK Ltd 2021a. Norfolk Local Transport Plan 4 Strategy 2021- 2036 - Information to Inform Habitats Regulations Screening and Appropriate Assessment. Report for Norfolk County Council (Ref: 0072839/HRA0).
- WSP UK Ltd 2021a. Norfolk Local Transport Plan 4 Strategy 2021- 2036 - Information to Inform Habitats Regulations Screening and Appropriate Assessment. Report for Norfolk County Council (Ref: 70072839/HRA0).
- WSP UK Ltd 2021b. Transport for Norwich Strategy - Information to Inform Habitats Regulations Screening and Appropriate Assessment. Report for Norfolk County Council (Ref: 70085124/HRA0).

## Figures

---

**Figure 1 - Locations of Habitats Sites in the County of Norfolk and Zol**





THIS DRAWING MAY BE USED ONLY FOR THE PURPOSE INTENDED AND ONLY WRITTEN DIMENSIONS SHALL BE USED

Legend

- Norfolk County Boundary
- 10km Search Area
- Habitats Sites
  - Ramsar Site - Wetland of International Importance
  - Special Area of Conservation
  - Special Protection Area

Copyright

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

© Crown copyright

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Contains Ordnance Survey data.

© Crown copyright and database right 2021

Revision Details		By	Date	Scale
		Check		

Drawing Status

FINAL

Job Title

LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 4 DRAFT STRATEGY

Drawing Title

HABITATS SITES IN THE NCC AND THE SURROUNDING 10KM AREA

Scale at A3

1:400,000

Drawn	UKJER600	Date	
Stage 1 check	AH	Stage 2 check	-
Originated	AH	Date	29/06/2021

0 5 10 15 Kilometers

Drawing Number


FIGURE 1

Path: \\uk.weggroup.com\Central Data\Project\100728\10072801 - Norfolk LTP Combined SEA HRA\03 WP\004 GIS\MapEcology\10072801 - Norfolk Habitats Sites Within 10km\_29062021.mxd



# Appendix A

**CJEU Rulings**



**Domestic Judgments and Judgments from the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)** A number of CJEU rulings are relevant to the HRA screening and AA exercises and these are noted below.


### **Kokott Ruling**

In the Opinion of Advocate General Kokott in Case C-6/04 Commission v UK [2005] ECR I-9017 at paragraph 49 she noted that an assessment of plans cannot by definition take into account all effects because

*“Many details are regularly not settled until the time of the final permission” and “[i]t would also hardly be proper to require a greater level of detail in preceding plans or the abolition of multi-stage planning and approval procedures so that the assessment of implications can be concentrated on one point in the procedure. Rather, adverse effects on areas of conservation must be assessed at every relevant stage of the procedure to the extent possible on the basis of the precision of the plan. This assessment is to be updated with increasing specificity in subsequent stages of the procedure”.*

# Appendix B

## Habitats Sites Information



Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
Breckland SAC	7,544	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 2330 Inland dunes with open <i>Corynephorus</i> and <i>Agrostis</i> grasslands</li> <li>■ 3150 Natural eutrophic lakes with <i>Magnopotamion</i> or <i>Hydrocharition</i> - type vegetation</li> <li>■ 4030 European dry heaths</li> <li>■ 6210 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>) (* important orchid sites)</li> </ul> <p>Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 91E0 Alluvial forests with <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae) * Priority feature</li> </ul> <p>Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 1166 Great crested newt <i>Triturus cristatus</i><sup>15</sup></li> </ul>
Breckland SPA	39,434	<p>The site qualifies under article 4.1 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) as it is used regularly by 1% or more of the Great Britain (GB) populations of the following species listed in Annex I in any season.</p>

---

<sup>15</sup> Breckland SAC citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/6216271045591040>



Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<p>Breeding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Stone curlew <i>Burhinus oedichnemus</i> - 115 pairs representing 60.1% of GB population</li> <li>■ Nightjar <i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i> - 415 males representing 12.2% of GB population</li> <li>■ Woodlark <i>Lullula arborea</i> - 430 pairs representing 28.7% of GB population<sup>16</sup></li> </ul>
Breydon Water SPA	1,203	<p>The site qualifies under article 4.1 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) as it is used regularly by 1% or more of the Great Britain population of five species listed on Annex 1, in any season.</p> <p>Over Winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Bewick's Swan <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i> - 391 individuals representing 5.6% of GB population</li> <li>■ Pied Avocet <i>Recurvirostra avosetta</i> - 33 individuals representing 3.3% of GB population</li> <li>■ Golden Plover <i>Pluvialis apricaria</i> 5,040 individuals representing 2.0% of GB population</li> </ul> <p>Passage:</p>

---

<sup>16</sup> Breckland SPA Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5250790146965504>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ruff <i>Philomachus pugnax</i> 54 individuals representing 7.7% of GB population</li> </ul> <p>Breeding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Common Tern <i>Sterna hirundo</i> 155 pairs</li> </ul> <p>The site qualifies under article 4.2 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) as it is used regularly by more than 1% of the biogeographic population of a regularly occurring migratory species (other than those listed on Annex 1), in any season.</p> <p>In Winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Lapwing <i>Vanellus vanellus</i> 24,940 individuals representing 1.2% of Europe's breeding population</li> </ul> <p>The site qualifies under article 4.2 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) as it is used regularly by over 20,000 waterfowl in any season.</p> <p>In Winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 43,225 waterfowl (5-year peak mean 1991/2 – 1995/6)<sup>17</sup></li> </ul>
Breydon Water Ramsar	1,203	<p>Ramsar Criterion 5</p> <p>Assemblages of international importance: Species with peak counts in winter:</p>

<sup>17</sup> Breydon Water SPA. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/6031456824459264>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>68175 waterfowl (5-year peak mean 1998/99-2002/2003)</li> </ul> <p>Ramsar Criterion 6 - Qualifying Species/populations (as identified at designation):</p> <p>Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tundra swan <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i> - 171 individuals, representing an average of 2.1% of GB population</li> <li>Northern lapwing <i>Vanellus vanellus</i> - 20142 individuals, representing an average of 1.3% of the GB population</li> </ul> <p>Species/populations identified subsequent to designation for possible future consideration under criterion 6.</p> <p>Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pink-footed goose <i>Anser brachyrhynchus</i> - 5816 individuals representing an average of 2.4% of the population</li> <li>Eurasian wigeon <i>Anas penelope</i> - 15624 individuals, representing an average of 1% of the population</li> <li>Northern shoveler <i>Anas clypeata</i> - 478 individuals, representing an average of 1.1% of the population</li> <li>European golden plover <i>Pluvialis apricaria apricaria</i> - 10656 individuals, representing an average of 1.1% of the population</li> </ul>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Black-tailed godwit <i>Limosa limosa islandica</i> -1100 individuals, representing an average of 3.1% of the population<sup>18</sup></li> </ul>
Broadland SPA	5,502	<p>The site qualifies under article 4.1 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) as it is used regularly by 1% or more of the Great Britain population of six species listed on Annex 1, in any season.</p> <p>Breeding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bittern <i>Botaurus stellaris</i> - 2-3 booming males representing 10 – 15% of GB population</li> </ul> <p>In winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bewick's Swan <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i> – 495 individuals representing 7.1% of GB wintering population</li> <li>Whooper Swan <i>Cygnus cygnus cygnus</i> - 121 individuals representing at least 2% of GB population</li> <li>Marsh Harrier <i>Circus aeruginosus</i> - 16 breeding females representing 16% of GB breeding population</li> <li>Hen Harrier <i>Circus cyaneus</i> - 22 individuals representing 3% of GB population (3% GB)</li> <li>Ruff <i>Philomachus pugnax</i> - 96 individuals representing 6.4% GB population</li> </ul>

<sup>18</sup> Breydon Water Ramsar Information Sheet (RIS). Available at: <https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/RIS/UK11008.pdf>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<p>It is used regularly by 1 % or more of the biogeographic population of a regularly occurring non- Annex 1 migratory species any season:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Wigeon <i>Anas penelope</i> 10,071 individuals representing 1.34% NW Europe's population</li> <li>■ Gadwall <i>Anas strepera</i> 240 individuals representing 0.96% NW Europe's population</li> <li>■ Shoveler <i>Anas clypeata</i> 231 individuals representing &lt;1% NW Europe population.<sup>19</sup></li> </ul>
Broadland Ramsar	5,489	<p>Ramsar criterion 2 The site supports a number of rare species and habitats within the biogeographical zone context, including the following Habitats Directive Annex I features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ H7210 Calcareous fens with <i>Cladium mariscus</i> and species of the <i>Caricion davallianae</i> Calcium-rich fen dominated by great fen sedge (saw sedge).</li> <li>■ H7230 Alkaline fens Calcium-rich springwater-fed fens.</li> <li>■ H91E0 Alluvial forests with <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> (<i>Alno-Padion</i>, <i>Alnion incanae</i>, <i>Salicion albae</i>) Alder woodland on floodplains, a</li> <li>■ and the Annex II species:</li> <li>■ S1016 <i>Vertigo moulinsiana</i> Desmoulin's whorl snail</li> <li>■ S1355 <i>Lutra lutra</i> Otter</li> <li>■ S1903 <i>Liparis loeselii</i> Fen orchid.</li> </ul>

<sup>19</sup> Broadland SPA citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/6411704506253312>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<p>Ramsar criterion 6 – species/populations occurring at levels of international importance.</p> <p>Qualifying Species/populations (as identified at designation):</p> <p>Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Tundra swan <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i> - 196 individuals, representing an average of 2.4% of the GB population</li> <li>■ Eurasian wigeon <i>Anas penelope</i>, (NW Europe) - 6769 individuals, representing an average of 1.6% of the GB population</li> <li>■ Gadwall <i>Anas strepera strepera</i> (NW Europe) 545 individuals, representing an average of 3.1% of the GB population</li> <li>■ Northern shoveler <i>Anas clypeat</i> (NW &amp; C</li> <li>■ Europe) - 247 individuals representing an average of 1.6% of the GB population</li> </ul> <p>Species/populations identified subsequent to designation for possible future consideration under criterion 6.</p> <p>Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Pink-footed goose <i>Anser brachyrhynchus</i></li> <li>■ (Greenland, Iceland/UK) - 4263 individuals, representing an average of 1.7% of the population</li> <li>■ Greylag goose <i>Anser anser anser</i> (Iceland/UK, Ireland) - 1007 individuals, representing an average of 1.1% of the population.<sup>20</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>20</sup> Broadland Ramsar Citation. Available at: <https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/RIS/UK11010.pdf>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
Dersingham bog Ramsar	158	Ramsar criterion 2 This site supports an important assemblage of invertebrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ nine British Red Data Book species have been recorded.<sup>21</sup></li> </ul>
Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA	149	The site qualifies under article 4.1 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) as it is used regularly by 1% or more of the Great Britain population of one species listed on Annex 1, in any season. Breeding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Little tern <i>Sterna albifrons</i> - 220 pairs representing 9.2% of the GB population.<sup>22</sup></li> </ul>
Greater Wash SPA	353,578	The site qualifies under Article 4.1 of the Directive 2009/147/EC by regularly supporting populations of national importance of the Annex I species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Red-throated diver <i>Gavia stellata</i> - 1,407 individuals representing 8.3% GB non-breeding population</li> <li>■ Little gull <i>Hydrocoloeus minutus</i> - 1,255 individuals</li> <li>■ Sandwich tern <i>Sterna sandvicensis</i> -3,852 pairs representing 35.0% of GB breeding population</li> <li>■ Common tern <i>Sterna hirundo</i> - 510 breeding pairs representing 5.1% of GB breeding population</li> </ul>

21 Dersingham Bog Ramsar Information Sheet (RIS). Available at: <https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/RIS/UK11019.pdf>

22 Great Yarmouth and North Denes SPA Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5943369930899456c>



Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little tern <i>Sternula albifrons</i> 798 pairs representing 42.0% of GB breeding population</li> </ul> <p>The site qualifies under Article 4.2 of the Directive 2009/147/EC by regularly supporting a population of international importance of the migratory species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Common scoter <i>Melanitta nigra</i> – 3,449 individuals representing 0.6% biogeographic population.<sup>23</sup></li> </ul>
Norfolk Valley Fens SAC	617	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7230 Alkaline fens</li> </ul> <p>Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4010 Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i></li> <li>4030 European dry heaths</li> <li>6210 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>) (*important orchid sites)</li> <li>6410 Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (<i>Molinion caeruleae</i>)</li> <li>7210 Calcareous fens with <i>Cladium mariscus</i> and species of the <i>Caricion davallianae</i> (* Priority feature)</li> </ul>

<sup>23</sup> Greater Wash SPA Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/6567930578075648>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>91E0 Alluvial forests with <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> (<i>Alno-Padion</i>, <i>Alnion incanae</i>, <i>Salicion albae</i>) (* Priority feature)</li> </ul> <p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1014 Narrow-mouthed whorl snail <i>Vertigo angustior</i></li> <li>1016 Desmoulin's whorl snail <i>Vertigo moulinsiana</i><sup>24</sup></li> </ul>
North Norfolk coast SAC	3,149	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1150 Coastal lagoons (* Priority feature)</li> <li>1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks</li> <li>1420 Mediterranean and thermo-Atlantic halophilous scrubs (<i>Sarcocornetea fruticosi</i>)</li> <li>2120 "Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> ("white dunes")"</li> <li>2130 "Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation ("grey dunes")" (* Priority feature)</li> <li>2190 Humid dune slack</li> </ul> <p>Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1355 Otter <i>Lutra lutra</i></li> <li>1395 Petalwort <i>Petalophyllum ralfsii</i><sup>25</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>24</sup> Norfolk Valley Fens SAC Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5011049535242240>

<sup>25</sup> North Norfolk Coast SAC Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5787922582208512>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
North Norfolk Coast SPA		<p>The site qualifies under Article 4(1) by supporting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ up to 4500 pairs of sandwich terns <i>Sterna sandvicensis</i> (12% of the EC breeding population and one-third of the British breeding population),</li> <li>■ up to 1000 pairs of common terns <i>Sterna hirundo</i> (3% of the EC and 9% of the British breeding population), and</li> <li>■ up to 400 pairs of little terns <i>Sterna albifrons</i> (9% of the EC and 20% of the British breeding populations).</li> </ul> <p>The site qualifies also under Article 4(l) by supporting nationally important numbers of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ bitterns <i>Botaurus stellaris</i> (about 10% of the British breeding population),</li> <li>■ marsh harriers <i>Circus aeruginosus</i> (about 30%),</li> <li>■ Montagu's harrier <i>Circus pygargus</i>, and</li> <li>■ avocets <i>Recurvirostra avosetta</i> (about. 30%).</li> </ul> <p>The site qualifies under Article 4(2) as an internationally important wetland, regularly supporting, in winter, over 10,000 wildfowl (average over 20,000) and internationally important numbers of the following waterfowl species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 9000 dark-bellied Brent geese <i>Branta bernicla bernicla</i> (7% of the European wintering population),</li> <li>■ 6000 pink-footed-geese <i>Anser brachyrhynchus</i> (6%),</li> <li>■ 6000 knot <i>Calidris canutus</i> (2%)</li> <li>■ 5600 wigeon <i>Anas penelope</i> (1%).</li> </ul> <p>Nationally important wintering numbers of the following species are also supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 270 European white-fronted geese <i>Anser albifrons albifrons</i> (4% of the British wintering population),</li> </ul>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 450 pintails <i>Anas acuta</i> (2%),</li> <li>■ 2600 shelducks <i>Tadorna tadorna</i> (1%),</li> <li>■ 500 grey plovers <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i> (2%),</li> <li>■ 400 ringed plovers <i>Charadrius hiaticula</i> (2%),</li> <li>■ 5000 oyster catchers <i>Haematopus ostralegus</i> (2%);</li> <li>■ and 800 redshanks <i>Tringa totanus</i> (1%).<sup>26</sup></li> </ul>
North Norfolk Coast Ramsar	7,862	<p>Ramsar criterion 1 -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The site is one of the largest expanses of undeveloped coastal habitat of its type in Europe. It is a particularly good example of a marshland coast with intertidal sand and mud, saltmarshes, shingle banks and sand dunes. There are a series of brackish-water lagoons and extensive areas of freshwater grazing marsh and reed beds.</li> </ul> <p>Ramsar criterion 2 -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Supports at least three British Red Data Book and nine nationally scarce vascular plants, one British Red Data Book lichen and 38 British Red Data Book invertebrates.</li> </ul> <p>Ramsar criterion 5 - assemblages of international importance. Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 98462 waterfowl (5-year peak mean 1998/99-2002/2003)</li> </ul>

<sup>26</sup> North Norfolk Coast SPA citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/4548204783730688>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<p>Ramsar criterion 6 – species/populations occurring at levels of international importance.</p> <p>Qualifying Species/populations (as identified at designation):</p> <p>Species regularly supported during the breeding season:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Sandwich tern <i>Sterna (Thalasseus)sandvicensis sandvicensis</i> (W Europe) - 4275 apparently occupied nests, representing an average of 7.7% of the breeding population</li> <li>■ Common tern <i>Sterna hirundo hirundo</i> (N &amp; E Europe) - 408 apparently occupied nests, representing an average of 4% of the GB population</li> <li>■ Little tern <i>Sterna albifrons albifrons</i> (W Europe) - 291 apparently occupied nests, representing an average of 2.5% of the breeding population</li> </ul> <p>Species with peak counts in spring/autumn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Red knot <i>Calidris canutus islandica</i> (W &amp; Southern Africa) - 30781 individuals, representing an average of 6.8% of the population</li> </ul> <p>Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Pink-footed goose <i>Anser brachyrhynchus</i> (Greenland, Iceland/UK) – 16787 individuals, representing an average of 6.9% of the population</li> <li>■ Dark-bellied brent goose <i>Branta bernicla bernicla</i> - 8690 individuals, representing an average of 4% of the population</li> <li>■ Eurasian wigeon <i>Anas penelope</i> (NW Europe) - 17940 individuals, representing an average of 1.1% of the population</li> <li>■ Northern pintail <i>Anas acuta</i> (NW Europe) - 1148 individuals, representing an average of 1.9% of the population</li> </ul> <p>Species/populations identified subsequent to designation for possible future consideration under criterion 6.</p>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<p>Species with peak counts in spring/autumn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ringed plover <i>Charadrius hiaticula</i> (Europe/Northwest Africa) - 1740 individuals, representing an average of 2.3% of the population</li> <li>■ Sanderling <i>Calidris alba</i> (Eastern Atlantic) - 1303 individuals, representing an average of 1% of the population</li> <li>■ Bar-tailed godwit <i>Limosa lapponica lapponica</i> (W Palearctic) - 3933 individuals, representing an average of 3.2% of the population. <sup>27</sup></li> </ul>
Ouse Washes SAC	333	<p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 1149 Spined Loach <i>Cobitis taenia</i><sup>28</sup></li> </ul>
Ouse Washes SPA	2,494	<p>The site qualifies under Article 4.1 of the Directive 2009/147/EC by regularly supporting populations of national importance of the Annex I species:</p> <p>Breeding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ruff <i>Philomachus pugnax</i> – 57 individuals lekking</li> </ul> <p>Over winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Bewick's swan <i>Cygnus cohtnrbarius bewictii</i> - 4,980 individuals, representing 29% of the NW Europe population and 70% of the GB population</li> <li>■ Whooper swan <i>Cygnus cygnus</i> - 90 individuals, representing 3% of the international population and 10% of GB population.</li> </ul>

<sup>27</sup> North Norfolk Ramsar Information Sheet (RIS). Available at: <https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/RIS/UK11048.pdf>

<sup>28</sup> Ouse Washes SAC Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5469802726424576>



Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Hen harrier <i>Circus cyaneus</i> – 12 individuals, representing 2% GB population</li> </ul> <p>The site also qualifies under Article 4.2 by supporting nationally important breeding populations of five migratory species. Over summer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ gadwall <i>Anas strepera</i> - 11 pairs representing 20% of the GB breeding population,</li> <li>■ mallard <i>Anas platyrhynchos</i> - 850 pairs representing 2%,</li> <li>■ garganey <i>Anas querquedula</i> - 14 pairs representing 20%,</li> <li>■ shoveler <i>A. clypeata</i> - 155 pairs representing 12%, and</li> <li>■ black-tailed godwits <i>Limosa limosa</i> - 26 pairs representing 44%.</li> </ul> <p>The site further qualifies under Article 4.2 as a wetland of international importance by regularly supporting over 20,000 waterfowl:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 60,950 waterfowl (5-year peak mean 1986/7 - 1990/91)<sup>29</sup></li> </ul>
Ouse Washes Ramsar	2,469	<p>Ramsar criterion 1a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The site is a good representative example of a natural or near-natural wetland characteristic of its biogeographic region. It is one of the most</li> </ul>

<sup>29</sup> Ouse Washes SPA citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/6584475202879488>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<p>extensive areas of seasonally flooding washland of its type in Britain, and the wetland has high conservation value for many plants and animals.</p> <p>Ramsar criterion 2a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The site supports appreciable numbers of nationally rare plants and animals. This includes several nationally scarce plants, including, small water pepper <i>Polygonum minus</i>, whorled water-milfoil <i>Myriophyllum verticillatum</i>, greater water parsnip <i>Sium latifolium</i>, river water-dropwort <i>Oenanthe fluviatilis</i>, fringed water-lily <i>Nymphoides peltata</i>, long-stalked pondweed <i>Potamogeton praelongus</i>, hair-like pondweed <i>Potamogeton trichoides</i>, grass-wrack pondweed <i>Potamogeton compressus</i>, tasteless water-pepper <i>Polygonum mite</i> and marsh dock <i>Rumex palustris</i>. Invertebrate records indicate that the site holds good relict fenland fauna, including the National Red Data Book species, large darter dragonfly <i>Libellula fulva</i> and the rifle beetle <i>Oulimnius major</i>.</li> <li>■ The site also supports a diverse assemblage of nationally rare breeding waterfowl associated with</li> <li>■ seasonally-flooding wet grassland.</li> </ul> <p>Ramsar criterion 5 - Internationally important waterfowl assemblage (greater than 20,000 birds)</p> <p>Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 59133 waterfowl (5-year peak mean 1998/99-2002/2003)</li> </ul> <p>Ramsar criterion 6 - species/populations occurring at levels of international importance.</p> <p>Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Berwick's swan <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i> (NW Europe) – 1140 individuals representing an average of 3.9% of the population</li> </ul>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Gadwall <i>Anas strepera</i> (NW Europe) – 653 individuals, representing an average of 3.9% of the population</li> <li>■ Pintail <i>Anas acuta</i> (NE Europe) – 2108 individuals, representing on average 3.5% of the population,</li> <li>■ Shoveler <i>Anas clypeata</i> (NW &amp; C Europe) – 627 individuals, representing on average 1.5% of the population,</li> <li>■ Teal <i>Anas crecca</i> (NE Europe) – 3384 individuals representing on average 2.5% of the population</li> <li>■ Whooper Swan <i>Cygnus cygnus</i> (Iceland, UK, Ireland) – 653 individuals, representing on average 3.1% of the population</li> <li>■ Wigeon <i>Anas penelope</i> (NW Europe) – 22630 individuals, representing on average 1.5% of the population.</li> </ul> <p>Species/populations identified subsequent to designation for possible future consideration under criterion 6.</p> <p>Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Mute swan <i>Cygnus olor</i> (Britain) - 722 individuals, representing an average of 1.9% of the population</li> <li>■ Common pochard <i>Aythya ferina</i> (NE &amp; NW Europe) - 4678 individuals, representing an average of</li> <li>■ 1.3% of the population</li> <li>■ Black-tailed godwit <i>Limosa limosa islandica</i> (Iceland/W Europe) - 2647 individuals, representing an average of</li> </ul>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.5% of the population<sup>30</sup></li> </ul>
Outer Thames Estuary SPA	392,542	<p>The site qualifies under article 4.1 of the Directive (2009/147/EC) as it is used regularly by 1% or more of the Great Britain populations of the following species listed in Annex I in any season:</p> <p>Non-Breeding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Red-throated diver – 6,466 individuals, representing 38% of the GB population</li> </ul> <p>Breeding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little tern – 746 individuals, representing 19.6% of the GB population</li> <li>Common tern – 532 individuals, representing 2.66% of the GB population<sup>31</sup></li> </ul>
Overstrand cliffs SAC		<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1230 Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic Coasts<sup>32</sup></li> </ul>
Paston Great Barn SAC	<1	<p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1308 Barbastelle <i>Barbastella barbastellus</i><sup>33</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>30</sup> Ouse Washes Ramsar Information Sheet (RIS). Available at: <https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/RIS/UK11051.pdf>

<sup>31</sup> Outer Thames Estuary SPA citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5459831745413120>

<sup>32</sup> Overstrand Cliffs SAC citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5744819196395520>

<sup>33</sup> Paston and Great Barn SAC citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5977901165969408>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
Redgrave and South Lopham fens Ramsar	127	<p>Ramsar criterion 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is an extensive example of spring-fed lowland base-rich valley, remarkable for its lack of fragmentation.</li> </ul> <p>Ramsar criterion 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site supports many rare and scarce invertebrates, including a population of the fen raft spider <i>Dolomedes plantarius</i>. This spider is also considered vulnerable by the IUCN Red List.</li> </ul> <p>Ramsar criterion 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site supports many rare and scarce invertebrates, including a population of the fen raft spider <i>Dolomedes plantarius</i>. The diversity of the site is due to the lateral and longitudinal zonation of the vegetation types characteristic of valley mires.<sup>34</sup></li> </ul>
Rex Graham Reserve SAC	2.65	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6210 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>) (* important orchid sites).<sup>35</sup></li> </ul>
River Wensum SAC	307	Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

<sup>34</sup> Redgrave and South Lopham fens Ramsar Information Sheet (RIS). Available at: <https://rsis.ramsar.org/RISapp/files/RISrep/GB513RIS.pdf>

<sup>35</sup> Rex Graham Reserve SAC citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5320741566283776>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3260 Water courses of plain to montane levels with the <i>Ranunculus fluitantis</i> and Callitriche-Batrachion vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1092 White-clawed (or Atlantic stream) crayfish <i>Austropotamobius pallipes</i></li> </ul> <p>Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1016 Desmoulin's whorl snail <i>Vertigo moulinsiana</i></li> <li>1096 Brook lamprey <i>Lampetra planeri</i></li> <li>1163 Bullhead <i>Cottus gobio</i><sup>36</sup></li> </ul>
Roydon Common and Dersingham bog SAC	344	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4010 Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i></li> <li>7150 Depressions on peat substrates of the <i>Rhynchosporion</i></li> </ul> <p>Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4030 European dry heaths<sup>37</sup></li> </ul>
Roydon Common Ramsar	194	Ramsar criterion 1

<sup>36</sup> River Wensum SAC citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5476490443489280>

<sup>37</sup> Roydon Common and Dersingham bog SAC citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/4893101411794944>



Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The site is the most extensive and representative example of valley mire-heathland biotope within East Anglia. It is a mixed valley mire holding vegetation communities which reflect the influence of both base-poor and base-rich water</li> </ul> <p>Ramsar criterion 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The vegetation communities have a restricted distribution within Britain. – It also supports a number</li> <li>■ of acidophilic invertebrates outside their normal geographic range and six British Red Data Book</li> <li>■ invertebrates.<sup>38</sup></li> </ul>
Southern North Sea SAC	3,695,054	<p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1351 Harbour porpoise <i>Phocoena phocoena</i></li> </ul>
The Broads SAC	5865	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 3140 Hard oligo-mesotrophic waters with benthic vegetation of <i>Chara</i> spp.</li> <li>■ 3150 Natural eutrophic lakes with Magnopotamion or Hydrocharition</li> <li>■ 7140 Transition mires and quaking bogs</li> <li>■ 7210 Calcareous fens with <i>C. mariscus</i> and species of <i>C. davallianae</i> (*Priority feature)</li> <li>■ 7230 Alkaline fens</li> </ul>

<sup>38</sup> Roydon Common Ramsar (RIS). Available at: <https://rsis.ramsar.org/RISapp/files/RISrep/GB588RIS.pdf>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 91E0 Alluvial woods with <i>A. glutinosa</i>, <i>F. excelsior</i> (*Priority feature)</li> </ul> <p>Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 6410 Molinia meadows on calcareous, peat or clay-silt soil</li> </ul> <p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 1016 Desmoulin's whorl snail, <i>Vertigo moulinsiana</i></li> <li>■ 1903 Fen orchid, <i>Liparis loeselii</i></li> <li>■ 4056 Little ram's-horn whirlpool snail, <i>Anisus vorticulus</i></li> </ul> <p>Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 1355 Otter <i>Lutra lutra</i><sup>39</sup></li> </ul>

---

<sup>39</sup> The Broads SAC citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/6340387278946304>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
The Wash & North Norfolk Coast SAC	107,718	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 1110 Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time</li> <li>■ 1140 Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide</li> <li>■ 1160 Large shallow inlets and bays</li> <li>■ 1170 Reefs</li> <li>■ 1310 Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand</li> <li>■ 1330 Atlantic salt meadows (<i>Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima</i>)</li> <li>■ H1420 Mediterranean and thermo-Atlantic halophilous scrubs (<i>Sarcocornetea fruticosi</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 1150 Coastal lagoons (* Priority feature)</li> </ul> <p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 1365 Harbour seal <i>Phoca vitulina</i></li> </ul> <p>Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 1355 Otter <i>Lutra lutra</i><sup>40</sup></li> </ul>
The Wash SPA	62,044	<p>This site qualifies under Article 4(1) as it supports the following species: Breeding:</p>

<sup>40</sup> The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5068730392379392>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Little Tern <i>Sterna albifrons</i> - 30 pairs (2% of the British population)</li> <li>■ Common tern <i>Sterna hirundo</i> - 220 pairs (2%);</li> </ul> <p>Over winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Bewick's swans <i>Cygnus cygnus</i> – 130 individuals (3%)</li> </ul> <p>This site also qualifies under Article 4(2) as an internationally important wetland by supporting in winter an average of 163,000 waders and also 51,000 wildfowl; and because it supports on average the following internationally important numbers of individual species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 17,000 dark-bellied brent geese <i>Branta bernicla bernicla</i> (12% of the European wintering population),</li> <li>■ 7,300 pinkfooted geese <i>Anser brachyrhynchus</i> (7%),</li> <li>■ 16,000 shelducks <i>Tadorna tadorna</i> (12%),</li> <li>■ 1,700 pintails <i>Anas acuta</i> (2%),</li> <li>■ 24,000 oystercatchers <i>Haematopus ostralegus</i> (3%),</li> <li>■ 5,500 grey plovers <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i> (7%),</li> <li>■ 500 sanderlings <i>Calidris alba</i> (3%),</li> <li>■ 7,500 knots <i>Calidris canutus</i> (21%),</li> <li>■ 29,000 dunlins <i>Calidris alpina</i> (1%),</li> <li>■ 8,200 bar-tailed godwits <i>Limosa lapponica</i> (1%),</li> <li>■ 3,700 curlews <i>Numenius arquata</i> (1%),</li> <li>■ 4,331 redshanks <i>Tringa totanus</i> (5%), and</li> <li>■ 980 turnstones <i>Arenaria interpres</i> (2%).</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the site qualifies because of its national importance to other migratory birds.</p> <p>Over Winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 3,900 wigeon <i>Anas penelope</i> (2% of the GB wintering population),</li> </ul>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 220 goldeneye <i>Bucephala clangula</i> (1%),</li> <li>■ 130 gadwall <i>Anas strepera</i> (3%),</li> <li>■ 830 common scoters <i>Melanitta nigra</i> (2%), and</li> <li>■ 260 black-tailed godwits <i>Limosa limosa</i> (6%).<sup>41</sup></li> </ul>
The Wash Ramsar	62,212	<p>Ramsar criterion 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The Wash is a large shallow bay comprising very extensive saltmarshes, major intertidal banks of sand and mud, shallow water and deep channels. It is the largest estuarine system in Britain.</li> </ul> <p>Ramsar criterion 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Qualifies because of the inter-relationship between its various components including saltmarshes, intertidal sand and mud flats and the estuarine waters. The saltmarshes and the plankton in the estuarine water provide a primary source of organic material which, together with other organic matter, forms the basis for the high productivity of the estuary.</li> </ul> <p>Ramsar criterion 5 Assemblages of international importance: Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 292,541 waterfowl (5-year peak mean 1998/99-2002/2003)</li> </ul> <p>Ramsar criterion 6</p>

<sup>41</sup> The Wash SAC citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5834437967216640>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<p>Species/populations occurring at levels of international importance. Qualifying Species/populations (as identified at designation): Species with peak counts in spring/autumn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Common redshank <i>Tringa totanus totanus</i> - 6,373 individuals, representing an average of 2.5% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> <li>■ Eurasian curlew <i>Numenius arquata arquata</i> (N. a. arquata Europe) (breeding) - 9,438 individuals, representing an average of 1.1% of the population (5- year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> <li>■ Eurasian oystercatcher <i>Haematopus ostralegus Ostralegus</i> (Europe &amp; NW Africa -wintering) - 15,616 individuals, representing an average of 1.5% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> <li>■ Grey plover <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i> (E Atlantic/W Africa -wintering) 13,129 individuals, representing an average of 5.2% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3 - spring peak)</li> <li>■ Red knot <i>Calidris canutus islandica</i> (W &amp; Southern Africa) (wintering) - 68,987 individuals, representing an average of 15.3% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> <li>■ Sanderling <i>Calidris alba</i> (Eastern Atlantic) - 3,505 individuals, representing an average of 2.9% of the population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> </ul> <p>Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Black-headed gull <i>Larus ridibundus</i> (N &amp; C Europe) - 31,403 individuals, representing an average of 1.57% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> <li>■ Common eider <i>Somateria mollissima mollissima</i> (NW Europe) - 1109 individuals, representing an average of 1.5% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9- 2002/3)</li> </ul>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Bar-tailed godwit <i>Limosa lapponica lapponica</i> (W Palearctic) - 16,546 individuals, representing an average of 13.7% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> <li>■ Common shelduck <i>Tadorna tadorna</i> (NW Europe) - 9,746 individuals, representing an average of 3.2% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> <li>■ Dark-bellied brent goose <i>Branta bernicla bernicla</i> -20,861 individuals, representing an average of 10.4% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> <li>■ Dunlin <i>Calidris alpina alpina</i> (W Siberia/W Europe) -36,600 individuals, representing an average of 2.7% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> <li>■ Pink-footed goose <i>Anser brachyrhynchus</i> (Greenland, Iceland/UK) - 29,099 individuals, representing an average of 10.7% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> </ul> <p>Species/populations identified subsequent to designation for possible future consideration under criterion 6.</p> <p>Species with peak counts in spring/autumn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Black-tailed godwit <i>Limosa limosa islandica</i> (Iceland/W Europe) - 6,849 individuals, representing an average of</li> <li>■ 14.5% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> <li>■ Ringed plover <i>Charadrius hiaticula</i> (Europe/Northwest Africa) - 1,500 individuals, representing an average of 2% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9- 2002/3)</li> </ul> <p>Species with peak counts in winter:</p>



Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>European golden plover <i>Pluvialis apricaria altifrons</i> (Iceland &amp; Faroes/E Atlantic) - 22,033 individuals, representing an average of 2.3% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</li> <li>Northern lapwing <i>Vanellus vanellus</i> (Europe - breeding) - 46,422 individuals, representing an average of 2.3% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)<sup>42</sup></li> </ul>
Waveney and Little Ouse Valley Fens SAC	193	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6410 Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (<i>Molinia caerulea</i>)</li> <li>7210 Calcareous fens with <i>Cladium mariscus</i> and species of the <i>Caricion davallianae</i> * Priority feature</li> </ul> <p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1016 Desmoulin's whorl snail <i>Vertigo moulinsiana</i><sup>43</sup></li> </ul>
Winterton-Horsey Dunes SAC	427	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2150 Atlantic decalcified fixed dunes (<i>Calluno-Ulicetea</i>) * Priority feature</li> <li>2190 Humid dune slacks</li> </ul>

<sup>42</sup> The Wash Ramsar Information Sheet (RIS). Available at: <https://rsis.ramsar.org/RISapp/files/RISrep/GB395RIS.pdf>

<sup>43</sup> Waveney & Little Ouse Valley Fens SAC Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5045953794932736>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2110 Embryonic shifting dunes</li> <li>2120 "Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> ("white dunes")<sup>44</sup></li> </ul>
Haisborough, Hammond and Winterton SAC	146,759	Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1110 Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time</li> <li>1170 Reefs<sup>45</sup></li> </ul>
Benacre to Easton Bavents Lagoons SAC	327	Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1150 Coastal lagoons *Priority feature<sup>46</sup></li> </ul>
Benacre to Easton Bavents Lagoons SPA		This site qualifies under Article 4.1 of the EC Birds Directive by regularly supporting the following species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>bittern <i>Botaurus stellaris</i> – 2 booming males representing 10% of the GB population (5-year mean 1991-1994)</li> <li>marsh harrier <i>Circus aeruginosus</i> – 6 pairs representing more than 6% of GB population (5- year mean 1990–1994)</li> </ul>

<sup>44</sup> Winterton- Horsey Dunes SAC Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/6601602358050816>

<sup>45</sup> Haisborough, Hammond & Winterton SAC Natura 2000 data sheet. Available at: <https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0030369.pdf>

<sup>46</sup> Benacre to Easton Bavents Lagoons SAC Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/4923122327224320>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>little tern <i>Sterna albifrons</i> – 39 pairs representing 1.6% of the GB population (5-year mean 1991-1995).<sup>47</sup></li> </ul>
Nene Washes SAC	83	<p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1149 Spined loach <i>Cobitis taenia</i><sup>48</sup></li> </ul>
Nene Washes SPA	1520	<p>This site qualifies under Article 4.1 of the EC Birds Directive by regularly supporting internationally important populations of the following species: Over Winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bewick's swan <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i> – 1,300 individuals, representing over 7% of the NW Europe population</li> </ul> <p>This site also qualifies under Article 4.2 by supporting nationally important breeding populations of regularly occurring migratory species: In summer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Black-tailed godwit <i>Limosa limosa limosa</i> – 16 pairs (30% of GB population)</li> <li>Gadwall <i>Anas strepera</i> – 25 pairs (5%)</li> <li>Garganey, <i>Anas querquedula</i> – 5 pairs (10%)</li> <li>Shoveler, <i>Anas clypeata</i> – 36 pairs (3%)</li> </ul> <p>The site also qualifies under Article 4.2 by supporting nationally important populations of five migratory species:</p>

<sup>47</sup> Benacre to Easton Bavents Lagoons SAC Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/6155589163941888>

<sup>48</sup> Nene Washes SAC Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/6744036626923520>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<p>In winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Gadwall <i>Anas strepera</i> – 95 (over 1% of the GB population)</li> <li>■ Pintail, <i>Anas acuta</i> – 440 individuals (over 1%)</li> <li>■ Shoveler, <i>Anas clypeata</i> - 110 (over 1%)</li> <li>■ Teal, <i>Anas crecca</i> – 980 (1%)</li> <li>■ Wigeon, <i>Anas penelope</i> – 3,640 individuals (over 1%)<sup>49</sup></li> </ul>
Nene Washes Ramsar	1,517	<p>Ramsar criterion 2 The site supports an important assemblage of nationally rare breeding birds. In addition, a wide range of raptors occur through the year. The site also supports several nationally scarce plants, and two vulnerable and two rare British Red Data Book invertebrate species have been recorded.</p> <p>Ramsar criterion 6 – species/populations occurring at levels of international importance. Qualifying Species/populations (as identified at designation): Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Tundra swan <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i> (NW Europe) - 694 individuals, representing an average of 2.3% of the population</li> </ul> <p>Species/populations identified subsequent to designation for possible future consideration under criterion 6.</p>

<sup>49</sup> Nene Washes SPA Citation. Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/6652903360036864>

Site Name	Site Size (Ha)	Summary of reasons for designation summarised on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form or Ramsar Information Sheet
		<p>Species with peak counts in spring/autumn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Black-tailed godwit <i>Limosa limosa islandica</i> (Iceland/W Europe) - 482 individuals, representing an average of 1.3% of the population</li> </ul> <p>Species with peak counts in winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northern pintail <i>Anas acuta</i> (NW Europe) - 1848 individuals, representing an average of 3% of the population <sup>50</sup></li> </ul>


---

<sup>50</sup> Nene Washes Ramsar Information Sheet (RIS). Available at: <https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/RIS/UK11046.pdf>



# Appendix C

## In-Combination Assessment





## Tables C-1 - Plans, Policies and Programmes with the Potential for In-Combination Effects Regional and Adjoining Counties Plans

<b>England's Economic Heartland Transport Strategy<sup>51</sup></b>
<b>Status:</b> The strategy was subject to formal consultation which closed on 6 October 2020 <sup>52</sup>
<b>HRA findings:</b> Screening undertaken and it has not been possible to categorically demonstrate that the EEH Transport Strategy will not have any effects upon European sites and detailed Appropriate Assessment is considered necessary for schemes at a project-level to satisfy the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.
<b>In-combination:</b> Given the strategic nature of this screening assessment and the uncertainties surrounding the timing and effects of other county/regional level plans and projects, it is not practicable at this stage to identify all the possible plans and projects that may act 'in-combination' or to consider the specific nature of likely effects arising.

<b>Suffolk County Council LTP3</b>
<b>Status:</b> Adopted for years 2011 - 2031 <sup>53</sup>
<b>HRA findings (2011):<sup>54</sup></b> The HRA Screening Report determines that it is unlikely to have significant effects on the European Sites considered either alone or in combination with other plans and policies identified.
<b>In-combination:</b> There are no likely in-combination effects of the Suffolk Local Transport Plan 3 with the Norfolk LTP4 Strategy.

<sup>51</sup> England's Economic Heartland Draft Transport Strategy (2020). Available at: <http://www.englandseconomicheartland.com/Pages/transport-strategyconsult.aspx> [Accessed 27 August 2020].

<sup>52</sup> England's Economic Heartland Draft Transport Strategy - HRA Screening report (2020) Available at: <http://www.englandseconomicheartland.com/Documents/App%20G%20Info%20to%20inform%20habitats%20regulations%20screening.pdf> [Accessed on 27 August 2020].

<sup>53</sup> Suffolk County Council LTPS3 (2011) Available at: <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/transport-planning/transport-planning-strategy-and-plans/> [Accessed 26 August 2020].

<sup>54</sup> Suffolk LTP3 HRA Screening report (2011). Available at: <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/Roads-and-transport/public-transport-and-transport-planning/LTP-Strategic-HRA.pdf> [Accessed 26 August 2020].

### Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority LTP4

**Status:** This Local Transport Plan for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough 2019 – 2035 replaces the Interim Local Transport Plan, which was published in June 2017<sup>55</sup>.

#### HRA findings (May 2019)<sup>56</sup>:

This HRA screening considered that the proposed Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority LTP4, either alone or in-combination, is not likely to have a significant effect on any European site or their associated features.

**In-combination:** There are no likely in-combination effects of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority LTP4 with the Norfolk LTP4 Strategy.

### Lincolnshire County Council LTP4<sup>57</sup>

**Status:** This 4th Lincolnshire Local Transport Plan (LTP4) covers the 10-year period 2013/14 to 2022/23

#### HRA findings

The proposals included in the Lincolnshire LTP4 have been screened for their potential to have significant impacts on Habitats Sites. The following effects arising from the LTP4 may give rise to potential impacts:

Changes in air quality through pollution; Increases in noise and light levels (as a result of vehicles, construction or new infrastructure); and

Changes in soil or water chemical composition (through road spray and construction activities).

*“No significant impacts to Habitats Sites will directly result from the implementation of the LTP4. However, based on the findings of the HRA screening Lincolnshire Local Transport Plan 4 process, it is possible that significant impacts could arise from some specific schemes or projects implemented in accordance with the LTP4. There is also potential for multiple plans to have in-combination effects with schemes implemented in accordance with the LTP4. Because of this uncertainty, the potential for schemes to affect Habitats*

<sup>55</sup> Local Transport Plan for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (2019). Available at: <https://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Transport/Draft-LTP.pdf> [Accessed 26 August 2020].

<sup>56</sup> Local Transport Plan for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough HRA Screening report (2019). Available at: <https://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Transport/Cambridgeshire-and-Peterborough-LTP-Strategic-HRA-Rev-C.pdf> [Accessed 26 August 2020].

<sup>57</sup> Lincolnshire Local Transport Plan (LTP4) (2013). Available at: <https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/downloads/file/1924/local-transport-plan-2013-14-2022-23> [Accessed 26 August 2020].

*Sites included within the HRA should be considered again when carrying out further HRA work at the project level or when preparing more detailed lower tier plans.”*

**In-combination:** There are no likely in-combination effects of the Lincolnshire Local Transport Plan with the Norfolk LTP4 Strategy.

## In-County Plans/Strategies

### Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan<sup>58</sup>

**Status:** Adopted

#### HRA findings (July 2019)<sup>59</sup>

Following the review of the proposed policies within the Preferred Options consultation document of the M&WLP, there were no policies identified which could result in likely significant effects on a European designated site.

**In-combination:** There are no likely in-combination effects of the Norfolk Mineral and Waste Local Plan 2022-2036 with the Norfolk LTP4 Strategy.

### Broads Authority Local Plan

**Status:** The Local Plan for the Broads was adopted by the Broads Authority on 17 May 2019<sup>60</sup>

#### HRA findings<sup>61,62</sup>:

<sup>58</sup> Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review. Available at: <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/policy-performance-and-partnerships/policies-and-strategies/minerals-and-waste-planning-policies/norfolk-minerals-and-waste-local-plan-review> [Accessed 27 August 2020].

<sup>59</sup> Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review – HRA Draft 2019. Available at: <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/-/media/norfolk/downloads/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/policy-performance-and-partnerships/policies-and-strategies/minerals-and-waste-planning/draft-habitats-regulations-assessment.pdf?la=en&hash=0DD11633B698DD7D429D385D92820C17FB54DFF1> [Accessed 27 August 2020].

<sup>60</sup> Broads Authority Local Plan (2019). Available at: <https://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/planning/planning-policies/development> [Accessed 26 August 2020].

<sup>61</sup> Broads Authority Local Plan – HRA report (2019). Available at: [https://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0021/257151/Local-Plan-for-the-Broads-HRA-Modifications-stage-080119.pdf](https://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0021/257151/Local-Plan-for-the-Broads-HRA-Modifications-stage-080119.pdf) [Accessed 26 August 2020].

<sup>62</sup> Broads Authority Local Plan - HRA Addendum (2019). Available at: [https://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0031/259591/Broads-Local-Plan-Habitats-Regulation-Report-Addendum-APPENDIX-3-ba-170519.pdf](https://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0031/259591/Broads-Local-Plan-Habitats-Regulation-Report-Addendum-APPENDIX-3-ba-170519.pdf) [Accessed 26 August 2020].

After public examination the final changes proposed by the Inspector and the Broads Authority led to the HRA concluding that there will be no likely significant effects on European sites as a result of the Local Plan for the Broads.

**In-combination:** There are no likely in-combination effects of Local Plan for the Broads with the Norfolk LTP4 Strategy, but lower tier or project level HRAs will be necessary and these will need to focus on recreation pressures as a key factor.

### North Norfolk District Local Plan

**Status:** The Council undertook a major consultation exercise on its emerging First Draft Local Plan and a range of supporting documents between 7 May and 28 June 2019. The feedback from this consultation is currently being considered.<sup>63</sup>

#### HRA findings:

The initial screening of policies and allocations identified recreation pressure as a key theme for more detailed assessment at the appropriate assessment stage<sup>64</sup>. The appropriate assessment has commenced but there are further evidence gathering and assessment requirements for the next iteration of the HRA. The appropriate assessment is in its early stages and highlights the current work in place to develop a strategic recreation mitigation strategy, and progress will be reviewed to inform the next iteration.

**In-combination:** There are no likely in-combination effects of Local Plan for the Broads with the Norfolk LTP4 Strategy, but lower tier or project level HRAs will be necessary and these will need to focus on recreation pressures as a key factor.

### Broadland District, Norwich Borough and South Norfolk District Councils Local Plan (Greater Norwich Local Plan)

**Status:** Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk Council are working together with Norfolk County Council to prepare the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP). The Local Plan documents fit into a hierarchy with broad, strategic policies at the top and more detailed policies interpreting the strategic approach at a district or smaller area level.

<sup>63</sup> North Norfolk District Local Plan (2019). Available at: <https://www.north-norfolk.gov.uk/tasks/planning-policy/local-plan-new/> [Accessed 26 August 2020].

<sup>64</sup> North Norfolk District Local Plan – HRA report (2019). Available at: <https://www.north-norfolk.gov.uk/media/5030/first-draft-local-plan-interim-habitats-regulations-assessment.pdf> [Accessed 26 August 2020].

For the Greater Norwich area (which includes South Norfolk), the adopted **Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk** (JCS) is at the top of the hierarchy. The JCS was adopted in March 2011, with amendments adopted in January 2014<sup>65</sup>.

#### **HRA status<sup>66</sup>:**

It is ascertained that the Greater Norwich Local Plan Strategy v8.1 would have no adverse effect upon the integrity of any European site acting alone, subject to the following outstanding matters

Satisfactory completion of the Green Infrastructure and Recreational Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (Section 5) to achieve a tariff-based payment taken from residential, and other relevant accommodation e.g. tourist accommodation, that will be used to fund a mixture of mitigation measures, most likely consisting of: soft and hard mitigation measures at the designated natural sites themselves to increase their resilience to greater visitor numbers.

the provision of suitable alternative natural green space (SANGs), which would be large enough to meet a range of needs and sufficiently well publicised for effective mitigation.

The current Broadland District Council Development Management DPD policy EN3 may be considered as a precedent for housing growth in the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan, although consideration will need to be given to new evidence emerging as part of plan production.

Implementation of a wider programme of Green Infrastructure Improvements in accordance with current and emerging project plans so that residents of existing and proposed housing have an alternative to European sites for regular routine activities such as dog walking

Satisfactory completion of the Water Cycle Study (Section 5)

Clarification of Policy 6, Section 5, 'Habitats Regulations Assessments will be required for small scale tourism accommodation within 1km, and for larger scale tourism accommodation within 10km, of a European site. Habitats Regulations Assessment will also be required for tourism, leisure, cultural and environmental activities which would utilise European sites'. (Section 10.2)

It is recommended that road schemes, not allocated or promoted by the Greater Norwich Local Plan but mentioned in the plan, receive stronger recognition from the plan with respect to protection of European sites.

<sup>65</sup> Greater Norwich Local Plan (2014). Available at: [https://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/sites/default/files/JCS\\_Adopted\\_Version\\_Jan\\_2014.pdf](https://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/sites/default/files/JCS_Adopted_Version_Jan_2014.pdf) [Accessed 26 August 2020].

<sup>66</sup> Greater Norwich Local Plan – HRA report (2014). Available at: <https://gnlp.oc2.uk/docfiles/46/GNLP%20Reg%2018%20HRA%20Final.pdf> [Accessed 26 August 2020].

**In-combination:** There are no likely in-combination effects of GNLP with the Norfolk LTP4 Strategy, but lower tier or project level HRAs will be necessary and these will need to focus on recreation pressures as a key factor.

## Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan

Status: The Borough Council's Local Plan<sup>67</sup> currently consists of the two documents; the Core Strategy (CS) adopted in July 2011 and the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMP) adopted in September 2016. As part of the adoption of the SADMP the borough council agreed to review both documents to create one single plan document that would look over the longer term to 2036.

### Policy LP24 Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)<sup>68</sup>

In relation to Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) monitoring and mitigation the Council has endorsed a Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy including:

1. *Project level HRA to establish affected areas (SPA, SAC, Ramsar sites) and a suite of measures including all/some of:*
  - a. *provision of an agreed package of habitat protection measures, to monitor recreational pressure resulting from the new allocations and, if necessary, mitigate adverse impacts before they reach a significant threshold, in order to avoid an adverse effect on the European sites identified in the HRA. This package of measures will require specialist design and assessment, but is anticipated to include provision of:*
    - i. *a monitoring programme, which will incorporate new and recommended further actions from the Norfolk visitor pressure study (2016) as well as undertaking any other monitoring not covered by the County-wide study.*
    - ii. *enhanced informal recreational provision on (or in close proximity to) the allocated site [Sustainable Accessible Natural Greenspace], to limit the likelihood of additional recreational pressure (particularly in relation to exercising dogs) on nearby relevant nature conservation sites. This provision will be likely to consist of an integrated combination of:*
      - A. *informal open space (over and above the Council's normal standards for play space);*

<sup>67</sup> Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan (2019). Available at: [https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/homepage/19/planning\\_policy\\_and\\_local\\_plan](https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/homepage/19/planning_policy_and_local_plan) [Accessed 25 August 2020].

<sup>68</sup> Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan – HRA reports (2019). Available at: <http://consult.west-norfolk.gov.uk/portal/lpr2019/lpr2019?pointId=ID-5170764-POLICY-LP24-HABITATS-REGULATIONS-ASSESSMENT-HRA-> [Accessed 26 August 2020]. and Available at: [file:///C:/Users/ukarh003/Downloads/HR02\\_20150911\\_AA\\_revision\\_Final.pdf](file:///C:/Users/ukarh003/Downloads/HR02_20150911_AA_revision_Final.pdf) [Accessed 26 August 2020].



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B. <i>landscaping, including landscape planting and maintenance;</i></li> <li>C. <i>a network of attractive pedestrian routes, and car access to these, which provide a variety of terrain, routes and links to the wider public footpath network.</i></li> <li>iii. <i>contribution to enhanced management of nearby designated nature conservation sites and/or alternative green space;</i></li> <li>iv. <i>a programme of publicity to raise awareness of relevant environmental sensitivities and of alternative recreational opportunities.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Notwithstanding the above suite of measures the Borough Council will levy an interim Habitat Mitigation Payment of £50 per house to cover monitoring/small scale mitigation at the European sites.</i></li> </ul>	<p>In-combination: There are no likely in-combination effects of GNLP with the Kings Lynn and West Norfolk LTP4 Strategy, but lower tier or project level HRAs will be necessary and these will need to focus on recreation pressures as a key factor.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Breckland Local Plan</b></p>
<p><b>Status:</b> The Breckland Local Plan<sup>69</sup> was adopted on 28 November 2019.</p>
<p><b>HRA findings:</b></p> <p>Measures to strengthen the Local Plan were recommended in the likely significant effects screening table, under each appropriate assessment theme, and in text revisions for environmental policies ENV02 and ENV 03 (at Publication stage and again during Examination).</p> <p>The required measures that have now enabled a conclusion of no adverse effects on site integrity are comprehensive. All recommendations made within the HRA report have been fully incorporated into the Local Plan enabling a conclusion of compliance with the requirements of the legislation.<sup>70</sup></p> <p>Key impact and mitigation themes are:</p>

<sup>69</sup> Breckland Local Plan documents (2019) Available at: <https://www.breckland.gov.uk/article/12118/Local-Development-Plan-Document-> [Accessed 26 August 2020].

<sup>70</sup> Breckland Local Plan – HRA report (2019). Available at: <https://www.footprint-ecology.co.uk/reports/Liley%20and%20Hoskin%20-%202019%20-%20Habitats%20Regulations%20Assessment%20of%20the%20Breckland%20L.pdf> [Accessed 26 August 2020].



Impacts of built development on Stone Curlew - Mitigation measures now well established and incorporated into the Local Plan through the Stone Curlew Buffer zones but are updated in light of new data.

Recreation disturbance to SPA birds - A measure not yet fully progressed from the Core Strategy HRA. Securing adequate recreation provision at new development, and working with partners to appropriately manage recreation, particularly at accessible forest sites. Commitment to be included in ENV 3.

Urbanisation effects on SAC and SPA habitats - A measure not yet fully progressed from the Core Strategy HRA. framework committed to within Policy ENV 3 for working with relevant partners to protect and restore the most urban heath sites, with a requirement for developers to contribute to measures within the framework where development may lead to increased recreation use of urban heaths.

Additional measures in sensitive areas of focussed growth (Thetford, Swaffham, Mundford). - Informed by recent additional evidence gathering in conjunction with Norfolk LPAs. Policy ENV 3 to include requirement for additional focussed measures at Thetford, Swaffham and Mundford.

Air quality and road improvements - Measures remain consistent with Core Strategy HRA – no road improvements promoted within 200m of Breckland SAC, and within 1500m of Breckland SPA. Air quality protection measures and monitoring needs should be reviewed in order to put in place better protective measures to prevent deterioration.

Water supply, water quality and wastewater discharge, flood risk - The WCS update provides some assurances of European site protection, but it is recognised that the Council needs to work with partners to find sustainable solutions for Dereham. Additional policy strengthening is required. The Flood Risk Assessment update includes measures incorporated into policy, but policy wording needs to secure the full suite of recommendations.

**In-combination:** There are no likely in-combination effects of Local Plan for the Brecklands with the Norfolk LTP4 Strategy, but lower tier or project level HRAs will be necessary and these will need to focus on recreation pressures as a key factor.

## Great Yarmouth Local Plan – Core Strategy

**Status:** <sup>71</sup> Adopted on 21 December 2015 for years 2013 -2030 now in Review. The Final Draft Local Plan Part 2 was published for consultation between Friday 28 February and

<sup>71</sup> Great Yarmouth Local Plan (2015). Available at: [https://www.great-yarmouth.gov.uk/media/1884/Adopted-Local-Plan-Core-Strategy-December-2015/pdf/Local\\_Plan\\_Core\\_Strategy\\_Adopted\\_2015\\_NF.pdf](https://www.great-yarmouth.gov.uk/media/1884/Adopted-Local-Plan-Core-Strategy-December-2015/pdf/Local_Plan_Core_Strategy_Adopted_2015_NF.pdf) [Accessed 26 August 2020].

Friday 22 May 2020. The consultation was rerun between Monday 1 June and Monday 13 July 2020

#### **HRA findings<sup>72</sup>:**

An interim HRA has been prepared for the Draft Plan stage and awaits public consultation. The conclusion of no adverse effects on European site integrity is made having regard for the current implementation of the Great Yarmouth Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy. The Draft Plan assessed for this HRA includes the Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy within the Local Plan LPP2 at Appendix 4, giving weight to its function as part of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan, and additional certainty of strategy delivery. The strategy is in its initial stages of implementation, with developer contributions as outlined in the strategy document initially being collected from large applications.

**In-combination:** There are no likely in-combination effects **of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan** with the Norfolk LTP4 Strategy, but lower tier or project level HRAs will be necessary and these will need to focus on recreation pressures as a key factor.

#### **The Great Yarmouth Transport Strategy and Implementation Plan <sup>7374</sup>**

**Status:** The Great Yarmouth Transport Strategy sets out the transport vision for Great Yarmouth, highlighting the challenges and opportunities along with the transport infrastructure that needs to be delivered within the short, medium and long-term to enable growth to come forward sustainably as well as supporting existing local communities. Adopted 2020.

**HRA:** No HRA information is available for this Strategy and Implementation Plan. A number of policies for infrastructure improvements are set out in the Strategy and Implementation Plan and these are largely urban-based schemes and unlikely to have adverse effects on Habitats Sites. However, two schemes are listed which have potential for LSE on the Breydon Water SPA and SAC and the Southern North Sea pSAC: the Third River Crossing and the A47 Acle Straight Duelling. The former has been subject to HRA (see relevant projects below), but the latter will likely require HRA screening when details of the scheme are known. In the latter case a lower tier HRA will be required.

<sup>72</sup> Great Yarmouth Local Plan – HRA report (2015). Available at: [https://www.great-yarmouth.gov.uk/media/3097/Draft-Habitats-Regulations-Assessment-2018/pdf/Draft\\_Habitat\\_Regulations\\_Assessment\\_2018.pdf](https://www.great-yarmouth.gov.uk/media/3097/Draft-Habitats-Regulations-Assessment-2018/pdf/Draft_Habitat_Regulations_Assessment_2018.pdf) [Accessed 26 August 2020].

<sup>73</sup> Great Yarmouth Transport Strategy (2019). Available at: [https://norfolk.citizenspace.com/consultation/great-yarmouth-transport-strategy/user\\_uploads/2019-09-16-gyts-draft.pdf](https://norfolk.citizenspace.com/consultation/great-yarmouth-transport-strategy/user_uploads/2019-09-16-gyts-draft.pdf) [Accessed 20 August 2020].

<sup>74</sup> Great Yarmouth Transport Strategy and implementation Plan (2019). Available at: [file:///C:/Users/ukarh003/Downloads/Gt%20Yarmouth%20transport%20strategy%20and%20implementation%20plan%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/ukarh003/Downloads/Gt%20Yarmouth%20transport%20strategy%20and%20implementation%20plan%20(2).pdf) [Accessed 20 August 2020].

**In-combination:** It is uncertain whether there will be in-combination effects on Habitats Sites as result of the A47 Acle Straight Duelling Scheme, but this will be assessed at the lower tier HRA work for this scheme. The Third River Crossing proposals were not considered likely to give rise to significant effects on Habitats Sites.

### The King's Lynn Transport Strategy and Implementation Plan<sup>75</sup>

**Status:** The strategy aims to support sustainable economic growth in King's Lynn by improving travel choices for all, whilst also bettering air quality and protecting historic areas. Adopted 2020.

**HRA:** No HRA information is available for this Strategy and Implementation Plan. A number of policies for infrastructure improvements are set out in the Strategy and Implementation Plan and these are largely urban-based schemes and unlikely to have adverse effects on Habitats Sites. However, two schemes are listed which have potential for LSE: the A149 Duelling and the West Winch Road Improvements schemes. Both will require consideration for HRA at project or lower tier level.

**In-combination:** It is uncertain whether there will be in-combination effects on Habitats Sites as result of the two schemes listed above, but this will be assessed at the lower tier HRA work for these schemes if pre-screening recommends further assessment.

## Relevant projects

### Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing<sup>76</sup>

**Status:** The Third River Crossing is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project and is currently under construction.

**HRA findings:** The Scheme was not considered to have the potential to give rise to other adverse effects on any European site, alone or in combination with other schemes.

**In-combination:** In combination with other developments, the Scheme proposals are not considered likely to give rise to significant effects on European Sites, their qualifying resources or conservation objectives. The assessment that has been undertaken has considered the construction and operation phases. There are no effects that would be

<sup>75</sup> The King's Lynn Transport Strategy and Implementation Plan Documents (2020). Available at: [https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20010/regeneration/696/kings\\_lynn\\_transport\\_study\\_and\\_strategy](https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20010/regeneration/696/kings_lynn_transport_study_and_strategy) [Accessed 20 August 2020].

<sup>76</sup> Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing HRA report (2019). Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR010043/TR010043-000551-6.11%20Habitat%20Regulations%20Assessment.pdf> [Accessed 24 August 2020].

such that, in combination with those from other developments, would cause such effects to arise during any phase of the Scheme.



62-64 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB2 1LA

**wsp.com**

WSP UK Limited makes no warranties or guarantees, actual or implied, in relation to this report, or the ultimate commercial, technical, economic, or financial effect on the project to which it relates, and bears no responsibility or liability related to its use other than as set out in the contract under which it was supplied.