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Part 1 - Introduction

1.1. OVERVIEW

1.1.1. This Area Action Plan (AAP) is being prepared by Waveney District Council and 1st East to promote the regeneration of the Lake Lothing and the Outer Harbour area in Lowestoft. The AAP responds to the specific challenges and opportunities contained within the area and seeks to ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive, co-ordinated and thoughtful manner.

1.2. WHAT IS AN AREA ACTION PLAN?

1.2.1. The AAP will provide a spatial policy framework for the revitalisation of Lake Lothing and the Outer Harbour by identifying opportunities for a range of employment, residential, recreational, community, transport and environmental improvements. It builds on the policies in the adopted Waveney Core Strategy and Sustainable Communities Strategy which provide the overarching strategic framework for the development of Waveney District to 2021 and 2028 respectively. It also seeks to provide detail to complement the district wide Development Management Policies DPD and Proposals Map.

1.2.2. The AAP will establish a detailed planning policy framework to guide the development within the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area to 2025. It contains land allocations and thematic policies covering employment, housing, retail, tourism, flood risk, transport, social infrastructure, heritage, open space and energy efficiency. Planning applications for developments within the AAP area will need to demonstrate compliance with this policy framework in order to be granted approval by the Council.

1.2.3. More specifically the AAP will:
- Set the long term vision and strategy for the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area;
- Set the objectives required to achieve the vision;
- Set out land use proposals and policies to guide development;
- Provide a realistic and viable plan for the implementation of the AAP proposals including phasing and funding etc;
- Be fully embedded within wider strategies, plans and guidance;
- Act as a promotional tool for articulating the vision for the area.

1.3. WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE AAP AND HOW DOES IT RELATE TO OTHER PLANS?

1.3.1. The AAP is being prepared as a statutory Development Plan Document (DPD) as part of Waveney’s Local Development Framework (LDF). Figure 1.3.1 illustrates how the AAP fits within this context.
1.3.2. The AAP will sit beneath the adopted Core Strategy and provide specific planning allocations and designations for the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area. The Core Strategy sets out the total amount of development to be accommodated across Waveney over the plan period up to 2021 (2025 for housing allocations).

1.3.3. **Policy CS05** of the adopted Waveney Core Strategy sets out the objectives for the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan. It states that:

An Area Action Plan for the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area of Lowestoft will be prepared focusing on employment-led regeneration. The objectives of this Plan will be to create:

- a flourishing local economy to provide wealth and at least 1000 jobs;
- employment and transport opportunities in the port, including greater use of the water;
- a high quality, well-designed, mixed use and sustainable built environment, that respects the existing qualities and character of the area, includes the integration of existing businesses wherever possible and makes maximum use of renewable energy technologies;
- a safe and healthy local environment with well designed public and green space;
- improved public access to the waterfront;
- sufficient size, scale and density and the right layout to support basic amenities in the neighbourhood and to minimise use of resources;
- good public transport and other transport infrastructure to reduce the need to travel, with a consequent reduction in congestion;
- buildings, both individually and collectively, that achieve a high standard of design and which can meet different needs over time and minimise the use of resources;
- a well integrated mix of in the region of 1500 decent homes of different types and tenures to support a range of household sizes, ages and incomes;
- good quality local public services including education, health, leisure and community facilities;
- an enhanced role for Lowestoft as a retail centre, including provision of around 21,000sqm of new (comparison) retail floorspace and associated leisure uses in an extension to the town centre in the Lake Lothing area;
- a diverse, vibrant and creative local culture that builds on the strong maritime heritage traditions;
- a better connection between the waterfront and the old industrial areas, the town centre and local communities;
- better connections between the communities north and south of Lake Lothing;
- a vibrant heart to the town for local people and visitors;
- development which is safe in terms of flood risk for its lifetime, and does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere;
- improved flood protection for the heart of Lowestoft;
- support for the tourism economy through the promotion of uses such as hotels, leisure and marina facilities; and
- links between the Broads and the seaside tourism areas.

1.3.4. This policy provides the basis for the AAP. The primary purpose of the AAP is to articulate in greater detail how this policy will be implemented, and to provide a more detailed policy framework to guide the development process.

1.3.5. In addition to Core Strategy Policy CS5 the following policies refer specifically to the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area:

- Policy CS07 Employment which states “The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area will be identified and developed as a strategic employment site through the Area Action Plan in support of port development, employment-led regeneration and economic diversification. A shift towards the provision of a range of sizes of light industrial and business units will be encouraged, including as part of mixed use schemes”.
- Policy CS08 Renewable Energy Cluster states that “a renewable energy cluster and ‘power park’ of around 8 ha will be promoted in the Lake Lothing and harbour area of central Lowestoft, especially focussed on expanding existing development in the Ness Point and outer harbour area”.
- Policy CS09 Knowledge Economy – this states that “land will be identified in the Site Specific Allocations and the Lake Lothing Area Action Plan Documents to meet the further needs of the emerging knowledge economy. This will include educational facilities and their associated uses such as student accommodation. Priority will be given to brownfield sites with good access by public transport, walking and cycling, either in central locations or well connected to existing educational/research establishments”.
- Policy CS10 – Retail, leisure and office development, identifies “the main town centre of Lowestoft as the preference for retail, leisure and office development… and to be of an appropriate scale and character to reflect their role and function”. This policy states that “in the region of 21,000 sq m of new (comparison) retail floorspace plus associated leisure development will be located in the Lake Lothing area in an extension to Lowestoft town centre. Sites will be allocated in the AAP”.
- Policy CS15 Sustainable Transport identifies a range of sustainable transport measures to regenerate Lowestoft. This includes the Lowestoft
Access Project including northern spine road, improvement to Denmark Road and a new road giving access to development sites south of Lake Lothing; a transport interchange at Lowestoft Station; and new cycle/pedestrian crossings of Lake Lothing to increase accessibility between development sites in Lowestoft and the town’s employment sites, services and facilities. This policy also states that “the Council will continue to promote the creation of a third road crossing across Lake Lothing”.

Other Development Plan Documents

1.3.6. In addition to the Core Strategy and the AAP, the Waveney Local Development Framework includes three other Development Plan Documents that are important in decision making, shaping and delivering future development in the District. These include:

- Development management policies – criteria based policies for determining planning applications across the district including affordable housing, open space and renewable energy policies. These policies will be used to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy.
- Site Specific Allocations - identifies land for specific purposes such as housing, employment, shopping and community facilities.
- Gypsy and Traveller Site Specific Allocations - Policy CS12: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation in the Core Strategy provides criteria based approach for the assessment of planning applications for gypsy and traveller accommodation. However, Waveney is required to identify new sites and a further Site Specific Allocations document to meet this need will be produced, due to commence in 2010.

1.3.7. In addition, a Proposals Map illustrates, on an Ordnance Survey base map, the policies and proposals in the Development Plan Documents that relate to specific sites or areas of land, areas of environmental protection and other similar designations. This includes minerals and waste site specific allocations adopted by Suffolk County Council. The AAP provides an area specific proposals map designed to be integrated with the district wide proposals map.

1.3.8. Supplementary planning documents will also be prepared, as and when necessary, to provide additional guidance for specific policies and explain how they will be implemented.

1.4. THE AAP PREPARATION PROCESS

Background

1.4.1. The AAP preparation process to date has been led by Waveney District Council (WDC) in partnership with 1st East, the Urban Regeneration Company (URC) responsible for delivering the transformation of waterfront areas in both Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth. Work commenced on producing masterplans covering waterfront areas in Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth in 2006. Following advice from the Government Office for the East of England (GO East), it was decided to develop these masterplans into statutory Area Action Plans within each Council’s emerging Local Development Framework.
1.4.2. Halcrow and Urhahn were originally commissioned to undertake initial masterplanning and to develop the two AAPs to Preferred Option stage. This parallel process included the following stages:

- Issues and Options public consultation (March – April 2006)
- Preparation of Preferred Option AAP documents
- Preferred Option Consultation (January - February 2007)

1.4.3. The two Preferred Options documents published in January 2007 were based upon extensive baseline research and options testing. Both AAPs were subject to a sustainability appraisal but did not contain specific development policies. Since the Preferred Options Consultation in 2007 there has been significant changes in the context within which the AAPs are to be taken forward, in particular:

- Changes to planning regulations and revision to PPS 12 on Local Spatial Planning that has updated requirements and process for the preparation of Development Plan Documents.
- Changes to other areas of national policy guidance relating to climate change, renewable energy and flood risk.
- The emergence of significant potential for off-shore wind farms in close proximity to Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth.
- The adoption of the East of England Plan as the Regional Spatial Strategy.
- The adoption of the Waveney Core Strategy.
- Progress in the preparation of the Great Yarmouth Core Strategy.
- Changes in the availability of land within the AAP area and new opportunities for development.
- Further evidence base work in relation to housing (in particular the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, affordable housing viability study) flooding (the Waveney Strategic Flood Risk Assessment), renewable energy, sustainable construction, transport and viability.

**Purpose of this document**

1.4.4. In light of these changes, it has been deemed appropriate to undertake a further stage of “Preferred Options” consultation under Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, as amended. This document has been prepared to set out a revised “Preferred Option” for the development of the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area in response to the changing local, regional and national context. This seeks to update the 2007 AAP Preferred Option document with a revised structure to include a series of policies that will be integrated with the wider Waveney Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Development Management DPD and Proposals Map.

1.4.5. The two AAPs are now being prepared to a different timetable with the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour AAP coming forward ahead of Great Yarmouth’s Plan.
This document is intended to provide a focus for consultation and discussion and is not the final AAP. We are looking to stakeholders and the public to provide comment on the proposals to feed into the final AAP document which will be prepared later in the year.

**Timetable**

1.4.6. Following consultation in spring 2010, it is anticipated that a Submission Draft will be prepared by summer 2010 and submitted in Winter 2010/11 for examination in public. Following examination by the Planning Inspectorate, the Council estimates that the AAP will be formally adopted in summer 2011. The AAP preparation process, including both previous steps and future stages, is set out in Figure 1.4.1 below.

1. Issues and Options
   - March - April 2006
   - Consultation with the community and stakeholders on a range of options that could be included in the document.

2. Preferred Options
   - January - February 2007
   - Consultation on the final choice of options that will form the document.

3. Further Preferred Options
   - April 2010
   - Revised final AAP options in light of changes to the national, regional and local planning context.

4. Submission Draft
   - July 2010
   - Preparation of final draft of the AAP to be submitted to the Government with further consultation on it.

5. Submission
   - November 2010
   - Submission of the AAP for Examination

6. Examination in Public
   - March 2011
   - The Planning Inspectorate considers whether the submitted document is acceptable (sound), taking into account any consultation responses.

7. Adoption
   - July 2011
   - If the Planning Inspectorate thinks that the document is acceptable, it will be adopted by Waveney District Council.

**Sustainability Appraisal**

1.4.7. Sustainability appraisal is an assessment of the potential significant social, environmental and economic impacts of development and forms an integral part of the plan-making process. It ensures that all policies and proposals are prepared with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. To this end, all policies have been subject to a sustainability appraisal to assist decision-making and identification of the most sustainable policies. Further information relating to preferred option
1.5. THE AAP STUDY AREA

1.5.1. Figure 1.5.1 illustrate the proposed Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour AAP boundary. The study area comprises predominantly brownfield and industrial land surrounding Lake Lothing, extending from Oulton Broad in the west to the Outer Harbour in the east. The AAP also incorporates brownfield land and open space east of the High Street to the north of the harbour. Figure 1.5.2 provides an aerial view of the AAP area.
1.6. STRATEGIC SITES

1.6.1. The AAP process to date has identified the development of the following strategic sites to be critical in realising the regeneration and revitalisation of the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area:

- Power Park
- Peto Square
- Kirkley Waterfront
- Brooke Peninsula / Sanyo
- East of England Park
- Kirkley Rise

The extent of these strategic sites is illustrated in Figure 1.6.1.
Figure 1.6.1 – Strategic Sites
1.6.2. In addition the following areas present development opportunities during the plan period:

- The Scores (east of historic High Street)
- Lake Lothing West, including Harbour Road Industrial Estate
- Peto Way/Denmark Road Corridor

1.6.3. The remainder of the AAP report is structured as follows:

**Part 2 – AAP Spatial Strategy** - This sets out the overarching vision for Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour, presents key objectives that the AAP seeks to address and outlines an area-concept that defines the structuring principles for the area in terms of land use, development zones, connections and other interventions sought through the AAP.

**Part 3 – Area Wide Policies** - These policies set out how the area wide vision, objectives and concept will be achieved and provides a framework to which all development in the AAP area must accord.

**Part 4 - Strategic Site Proposals** - This identifies planning and design guidelines for development of these key areas and sets out how specific policies will be implemented within the strategic sites.

**Part 5 – Implementation and Delivery** – sets out a strategy outlying how the AAP policies and proposals will be implemented to 2025.

1.6.7. Each of these sections is interrelated. A summary of the structure is set out in Figure 1.6.2
Figure 1.6.2 – AAP Structure
1.5. HOW DO I GET INVOLVED?

1.5.1. Your views are needed to help with assessing the emerging ideas that are presented within this Further Preferred Options report. Your views are sought on:

1. Whether you support the preferred policies identified for inclusion in the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan.

2. Whether you think any other policies or additional criteria should be included or would be a better alternative and if so why.

3. Whether you have any comments on the proposals maps in respect of those designations and boundaries that link to policies in this document.

4. Whether you have any comments on the proposals maps in respect of other environmental protection areas and similar designations.

Please send your comments by [XXXXX] 2010:

Online at www.consult.waveney.gov.uk

Freepost RLYC-ZAYX-LXEL
Planning Policy,
Waveney District Council,
Town Hall,
High Street,
Lowestoft,
Suffolk
NR32 1HS
E-mail: planningpolicy@waveney.gov.uk
Telephone: 01502 523029
Part 2
Spatial Strategy
Part 2 – AAP Spatial Strategy

2.0.1. This section sets out the overarching strategy for the development of Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour, and seeks to present an overview of what this AAP is seeking to achieve across the study area to 2025. The spatial strategy presents an area wide vision, together with a series of themed objectives that will be used to guide the selection of the preferred options and content of the AAP to 2025.

2.0.2. The vision and objectives were formed through consideration of key drivers for change, an analysis of the baseline opportunities and constraints, along with the results of consultation with key stakeholders and the public through the LDF process.

2.0.3. An area development “concept” and series of structuring principles is then set out which sets out how the vision and objectives might be implemented through development across Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour.

2.1 LAKE LOTHING AND OUTER HARBOUR AREA VISION

2.1.1. An area vision has been identified to provide a clear statement as to what Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour will become following the implementation of the AAP policies and proposals. This seeks to distil a series of vision statements set out for the area taken from the following documents:

- Transforming Suffolk – Suffolk’s Community Strategy 2008-2028, Suffolk Strategic Partnership;
- Waveney’s Future - Waveney Sustainable Communities Strategy 2010-2028, Waveney Strategic Partnership;
- The Waveney Core Strategy;
- Previous iterations of the AAP.

2.1.2. Paragraphs 3.15 to 3.21 (p.14) of the adopted Waveney Core Strategy set out the following vision for Lowestoft and the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area:

Lowestoft will be a clean, attractive, vibrant and progressive place to live, work and visit. As the main town, most additional housing development will have taken place here and a broader range of retailing, employment, services and facilities provided for a wide catchment area.

As part of a sub-regional vision with Great Yarmouth, the regeneration of the towns will have been addressed through a complementary and integrated approach to the shared issues of geographically remote and coastal locations, economic and social deprivation. The towns will retain their important District/Borough roles as the main towns but they will also complement each other through their differences. Their sub-regional function will have been
enhanced through improved transport linkages between them and beyond. The synergy of the sub-region will have raised the status and profile of each town.

The Lake Lothing and outer harbour area of Lowestoft will be regenerated with a thriving mix of uses throughout the day and evening, integrated with the seafront and shopping streets to the north and south. There will be public access to the waterfront and public spaces for people to meet and play. Connection between the north and south of the town will have improved and measures to protect against the risk of flooding will be in place. The port will have top quality freight handling and distribution facilities, fabrication, services and facilities for the offshore industry. The port will also have a role as a gateway to Europe for trade and as a hub as part of an integrated transport network.

Ness Point, as the most easterly point in Britain, will have a nationally high profile. It will be an important tourism destination with high quality links to the historic High Street area. The area will provide a nationally important cluster for renewable energy activity and businesses in the form of a Power Park; building on the success of the Gulliver wind turbine and the OrbisEnergy accommodation for renewable energy related companies.

The attraction of the beaches, coast and the Broads will continue to provide an income for the tourism industry. The town will offer a range of indoor and outdoor facilities and high quality accommodation to meet the needs of local people and tourists all year.

Lowestoft will provide an important role in further education and the development of skills. Deprivation will have been reduced in those areas of the town suffering from the highest levels. People will be healthier, with improved access to health facilities and homelessness will have reduced.

Travel within the town will be easier, with a much higher percentage of the population walking and cycling for shorter trips. Public transport will have improved as the status of Lowestoft as a Regional Transport Node is recognised. There will be improved rail and bus links with other urban centres in the region and with London and to national networks. The frequency and quality of bus services within and beyond the town will be good and integrated with rail services. In particular, linkages along the A12 with Great Yarmouth will be strengthened.

2.1.3. The regeneration of the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area will be vital to achieve this town wide vision. In realising the wider objectives for Lowestoft, the following specific vision for the AAP area has emerged:
**Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour AAP Vision**

By 2025 the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area will be an outstanding place to live, work and visit building on its unique location between the North Sea and the Broads. The area will have a strong economy and a supportive culture for business with particular expertise in the renewable energy and environmental sectors both on and off shore.

People will chose to live and work in Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour because of its job opportunities, high quality environment, sense of place and quality of life. The area will boast a variety of housing options to support the needs of a demographically diverse population. Existing and new residents will benefit from high quality amenities including town centre retail, culture, education, leisure and community facilities. The area will boast attractive waterfront areas to both the sea and Lake Lothing, whilst the area will continue to operate as a successful port. Peto Square will provide a heart to Lowestoft, connecting the town centre to the waterfront and sea front and will be a place where people will want to spend time.

The area will benefit from better connections for pedestrians, cyclists and traffic with increased access to the water frontage, permeability across Lake Lothing and throughout the AAP area. There will be strong linkages to other parts of the town and the area will be fully served by public transport that will revolve around an interchange hub at the reconfigured Lowestoft Rail Station. Development in the area will maximise strategic maritime connections between the North Sea and the Broads. Development around Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour will conserve and enhance biodiversity and create wildlife corridors to ease migration and expansion of habitats.

Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour will have led the way in ensuring development is sustainable with buildings that are highly efficient in terms of water, energy and waste. Despite increased risk of flood from climate change the area will be safe for residents and users alike due to a strategic approach to managing and mitigating flood risk across the AAP area.

### 2.2 AAP THEMES AND OBJECTIVES

#### 2.2.1 Employment and Economy

Supporting new employment growth and strengthening the local labour market are fundamental to reversing Lowestoft’s economic fortunes and realising the vision of a town which is a vibrant and attractive place to live and work. Lowestoft is well placed to serve as an operations and maintenance base for existing and planned offshore wind farms in close proximity to the town. The AAP therefore supports the development of an energy business cluster which capitalises on the enormous opportunities associated with investments taking place in the North Sea and East of England including offshore wind, oil and gas, Sizewell power station and future potential for offshore carbon capture, gas storage and wave technologies.

As well as promoting job creation in renewable and related growth sectors, the AAP seeks to safeguard existing port activities and other viable businesses in the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour. In addition, the Waveney Campus proposal aims to bring public sector jobs to the heart of Lowestoft. In order to ensure future job opportunities do not bypass the local population,
enhancing labour market competitiveness through education and training is an important objective of the AAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1 – To generate a flourishing and diverse local economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals within the AAP area will enhance Lowestoft as a location for business with a focus for expansion in environmental and energy businesses leading to the creation of at least 1,000 direct jobs and 3,000 indirect jobs. Existing businesses will be supported with provision for expansion and relocation space within the area and provision will be made for diverse economic sectors encompassing energy and green industries, port activities, manufacturing, tourism, research and training, public sector and finance/professional services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing**

2.2.4. Supporting the delivery of new housing is central to the vision of making Lowestoft a more attractive place to live. Redevelopment of currently underused land provides the opportunity to reconnect Lowestoft with Lake Lothing and to create attractive and vibrant waterfront communities. The AAP therefore supports the regeneration of a number of brownfield sites which have been identified as suitable for residential development.

2.2.5. The mix of units in new developments should reflect local housing needs as identified in the Waveney Strategic Housing Market Assessment, creating new neighbourhoods which cater to households of all ages, sizes and incomes.

2.2.6. While the establishment of new pedestrian and cycle links will contribute to reducing car dependence, providing locally accessible social infrastructure, leisure destinations and retail facilities will be crucial to supporting the emergence of sustainable communities where people can walk and cycle to local destinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2 – To provide an attractive place to live</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area will be an attractive place to live with a new community of some 1,500 homes built to the highest design and environmental standards. A strategic approach to residential development will be taken that makes the most of renewable energy sources. Development will be of sufficient size, scale, density and layout to support a range of neighbourhood amenities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3 – To ensure social inclusivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A range of housing types and tenures will be developed to support a mix of household sizes, ages and incomes. Existing and new residents will benefit from new and enhanced amenities that provide education, skills, health, recreation and leisure facilities to assist in reducing inequalities and ensure the needs of a diverse community are met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Retail**

2.2.7. As the largest centre in Waveney, enhancing Lowestoft’s retail offer will increase the town’s attractiveness to visitors as well as existing residents. To stem the tide of income leakage to larger centres such as Norwich, one of the AAP’s objectives is to encourage a major retail and leisure development at Peto Square. This will increase the range and quality of shops in Lowestoft and extend the town centre southwards, connecting Lowestoft’s historic town centre to the waterfront of Lake Lothing.
Objective 4 – To realise an enhanced retail centre
Lowestoft will be improved as a retail centre with the extension of the historic town centre towards its waterfront. Up to [21,000] sq m of retail and related leisure will be provided as an extension to town centre focussed within the AAP area. The railway station will be reconfigured to be at the heart of a new retail area.

Environment, Heritage and Character

2.2.8. The appeal of Lowestoft as a place to live, work and visit will be influenced by the quality of the town’s built form and open spaces. Securing innovative urban design has a key role to play in enhancing the character, heritage as well as the biodiversity of the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area.

2.2.9. Given the identified shortage in Lowestoft, the AAP aims to protect, restore and increase access to green spaces. Within the study area, open spaces and Lake Lothing itself should promote biodiversity while providing a focus for leisure and recreational activities as part of a wider network of ecologically rich green and blue infrastructure.

Objective 5 – To make the most of the waterfront
The waterfront is Lowestoft’s greatest asset. The role of the Port is changing and the employment function of waterfront locations will be protected and enhanced through development proposals. This will be balanced through appropriate redevelopment for residential, commercial, leisure and tourism activities to assist in reconnecting the historic town to its waterfront. This will provide appropriate levels of public access that will enhance the amenity of the areas as a place to live and visit.

Objective 6 – To create a quality environment
Development proposals must contribute to provision of a well designed, high quality built environment that assists in attracting new businesses and provides an attractive living environment. This will be complimented by the enhancement of ecological habitats and wildlife throughout the AAP area.

Objective 7 – To ensure the highest standards of design
All proposals must be of the highest standards of architectural, landscape and urban design that reflect the town’s culture and maritime heritage. High levels of design quality must be considered in all proposals from inception to completion; Appropriate design measures will be required to ensure that all new buildings are resource efficient from construction through to demolition and can meet different needs over the lifetime of the building.

Objective 8 – To encourage people to visit
Proposals within the AAP will enhance Lowestoft as a successful tourism destination. Connections will be enhanced between the town centre and the beach. Ness Point will be enhanced as a visitor attraction. Connections between the town and the broads will be improved in the west of the area with improved marina facilities and other leisure activities in this location.

Transport, Movement and Linkages

2.2.10. Reducing car dependence is a key factor in promoting the long term sustainability of Lowestoft. Improving existing pedestrian and cycle routes and establishing new links is crucial to making walking and cycling an attractive alternative to the car. The AAP identifies key routes which will be promoted and enhanced over the plan period. Of particular strategic importance, will be to improve connections across Lake Lothing and integrating the study area with the wider urban fabric of Lowestoft.
2.2.11. The AAP also promotes public transport improvements which will also help to tackle reliance on car travel. Nevertheless, a limited number of highways interventions, such as a new southern access road will be vital to reducing traffic congestion and providing access to development sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 9 – To be better connected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals will facilitate better connections within the AAP area and beyond by foot, cycle, road, rail, sea and waterway. Vehicular travel will be reduced through an improved environment for pedestrian and cyclists who will benefit from improved connections across and around Lake Lothing. Vehicular connections will be enhanced to facilitate new development and reduce congestion across the town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 10 – To reduce the need to travel by car</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals must cultivate opportunities to reduce reliance on private cars to move about the area, providing facilities and opportunities to walk or cycle around Lowestoft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Flood Risk**

2.2.12. The assessment of flood risk underpins the whole of the AAP strategy. Although proximity to the waterfront is a key asset of the study area, the associated risk of flooding must be appropriately addressed and mitigated. The AAP adopts the precautionary principal recommended by PPS25 – Development and Flooding. This includes application of the Sequential Test which directs development to areas of lowest flood risk, consideration of the Exception Test where development is recommended in higher risk flood areas, and the use of the Sequential Approach to match development vulnerability to flood risk. The majority of the AAP area is previously developed land in Flood Zone 3, and hence development is justifiable in regeneration terms. The flood risk management hierarchy which includes Assess, Avoid, Substitute, Control and Mitigate has underpinned the AAP process and site selection.

2.2.13. The AAP seeks to identify a strategic approach to flood risk across the entire area and the Council will work closely with developers to co-ordinate a managed approach to address flood risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 11 – A strategic approach to flood risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council will lead a strategic approach to flood risk mitigation in implementing the AAP proposals taking into account the findings of the Cumulative Land Raising Study that supported the Core Strategy. Development within the AAP area will follow the precautionary principal and sequential approach as defined in Planning Policy Statement 25 – Development and Flooding. The Sequential Test has been applied at the local planning level and the AAP identifies that the principles set out in the Exception Test can be met for all strategic sites. This demonstrates that a) there are wider sustainable benefits, b) development is on previously developed land and c) the development is safe. The Sequential Approach will then be applied within each strategic site to consider development vulnerability the level of flood risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Energy, Water and Waste**

2.2.14. Utilising renewable energy, promoting high levels of water and energy efficiency as well as minimising waste will be critical to the area’s sustainability. The AAP sets out performance standards which developers will be expected to comply with in terms of building performance and construction.
methods. Developers will be required to explore the potential for on-site renewable energy as well as the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) into development schemes.

**Objective 12 – To ensure resource efficient development**

Development in the AAP area will minimise carbon emissions through energy efficient design and the incorporation of development driven renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure. All new development will incorporate measures to reduce mains water demand and to minimise waste arising from demolition, construction and operational requirements of development.

**Delivery and Implementation**

2.2.14. In realising the AAP it will be important to ensure that proposals are capable of being implemented and have the support of local stakeholders. The final chapter of the AAP sets out a specific strategy for the delivery and implementation of policies and proposals.

**Objective 13 – To ensure proposals are deliverable**

All proposals must be deliverable from a financial, infrastructure and commercial perspective.

**Objective 14 – To facilitate public and stakeholder support**

AAP proposals will have the broad support of landowners, businesses, residents, community representatives and other local stakeholders.
2.3 URBAN STRUCTURE AND AAP CONCEPT

2.3.1. In realising the vision a consistent approach to the overall urban structure of the AAP area and wider town must be taken to ensure the benefit of development and regeneration is felt across the town, not just within individual sites. Figure 2.1 summarises the main structuring principles and urban concept that underpin the AAP. These have been identified throughout the AAP preparation process and are the result of detailed analysis and masterplanning.

![AAP Structuring Principles](image)

Figure 2.1 – AAP Structuring Principles

2.3.2. All policies and proposals contained within the AAP seek to achieve the above structure and concept principles. In addition the following principles must be inherent to all development within the AAP area:

- **Improving Connections** – the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area will be enhanced through better connections around and across Lake Lothing.

- **Creating a better relationship to the waterfront** – development within the AAP area will exploit waterfront to the North Sea and Lake Lothing through establishment of appropriate areas for public access and improved connections to, and along, water frontages.

- **Gateway to the North Sea and Broads** – the AAP area presents an important area of transition between the North Sea/Europe and the Norfolk Broads. This unique location should be exploited as a location for tourism, and to support off-shore and maritime industries;

- **A Central Activities Focus** – Peto Square acts as an important hub between the town centre to the north, and southern parts of the town. Development
within this location should encourage activity to cross the waterfront and provide an attractive destination where people will want to be;

**Balancing Employment and Other Uses** – The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area remains an important role as an active waterfront with a diverse focus of employment activities. The distribution of land uses must be carefully planned so as not to undermine the ongoing employment potential of the waterfront and ensuring that conflicting land uses are positioned away from each other;

**Supporting the town centre** – retail development should be located in town centre locations and connections should be enhanced between current out-of-centre retail, the town centre and residential/employment uses so as to reduce the need to travel by car;

**Ensuring resource efficiency** – the distribution of land uses should encourage the use of area-wide energy, heat and cooling provision and water efficient technologies through appropriate clustering and concentration of development within strategic sites.

### 2.4 SUMMARY OF AAP POLICIES AND PROPOSALS

#### 2.4.1. A summary of AAP policies and proposals is provided in Table 2.4.1 below and the AAP proposals map provided as Figure 2.4.1 which illustrates the policy context for the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area. This provides a summary of the detailed area wide policies (set out in Part 3) and strategic site proposals (set out in Part 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Theme</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Policy Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Spatial Development Strategy** | **Employment and Economy**  
  The establishment of hub for energy related sectors at Power Park.  
  Support to the protection, enhancement, expansion and relocation of existing and new businesses within existing employment areas and other mixed use areas.  
  Protection and enhancement of port operations. | EMP 1-4    |
|                               | **Housing and Community**  
  Provision of in the region of 1,500 new homes within the AAP area, with residential development focussed within a new sustainable urban neighbourhood within the south west of the AAP area and applying the precautionary principle and sequential approach to flood risk in considering residential areas.  
  Housing built to a range of tenures, types and densities responding to diverse population needs.  
  Housing built to high standards of sustainability.  
  Appropriate social and community facilities to support existing and new residential communities. | HC 1-3     |
|                               | **Retail, Leisure and Tourism**  
  Provision of an enhanced town centre facilities for shopping, leisure and tourism through expansion within Peto Square.  
  Establishment of hubs for tourism and leisure activities within the AAP area. | RLT 1-2    |
|                               | **Environment, Heritage and Character**  
  Development built to the highest standards of urban design with enhanced public realm throughout the area; | EHC1-4     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Theme</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Policy Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial Development Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Connections to the waterfront enhanced, with increased public access in appropriate locations and enhancement of the historic scores to the east of the High Street; Historic buildings and conservation areas to be enhanced through development; New and existing areas of open space to be provided to meet the requirements of residents and visitors; Areas of high ecological value to be protected and enhanced. Linkages to be enhanced between the built up and natural area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport, Movement and Linkages</strong></td>
<td>A sustainable approach to transport in the AAP area focussing upon reducing the need to travel by car and improving pedestrian, cycle and public transport facilities and connections between development sites; Southern access road to be created to the south of Lake Lothing to facilitate development of Kirkley Waterfront, Sanyo and Brooke Peninsula Sites. The railway station to be enhanced as an interchange and potentially relocated to facilitate the expansion of the town centre towards the waterfront. Development to be subject to travel planning and transport assessment.</td>
<td>TMC1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Risk Management</strong></td>
<td>A strategic approach to flood risk management through application of precautionary principle and sequential approach to development within the flood zone. Development to respond to flood issues and mitigate risk to future users through appropriate defence and design solutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water, Energy and Waste</strong></td>
<td>Development within AAP to utilise on-site energy generation facilities; Development to minimise use of water Development will minimise the amount of waste generated through demolition, construction and operation of buildings.</td>
<td>WEW1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Site Proposals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Park</strong></td>
<td>The establishment of an energy hub located around the outer harbour and existing industrial area north of Hamilton Dock around existing OrbisEnergy building.</td>
<td>SSP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peto Square</strong></td>
<td>Connection between town centre, railway station and southern side of Lake Lothing through expansion of town centre uses.</td>
<td>SSP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kirkley Waterfront</strong></td>
<td>Development of employment facilities at Waveney Campus providing office and R&amp;D facilities. Potential expansion area for Power Park to include waterfront activities. Residential development to front Waveney Drive as part of a wider Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood.</td>
<td>SSP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo</strong></td>
<td>Creation of new sustainable urban neighbourhood including housing, social and community facilities, open space, marina and retirement village.</td>
<td>SSP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East of England Park</strong></td>
<td>Enhancement of Ness Point as a leisure and tourism destination.</td>
<td>SSP5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kirkley Rise</strong></td>
<td>Extension of residential, retail, business and community uses to Kirkley District Centre and improved connections to the wider AAP area</td>
<td>SSP6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Sites</strong></td>
<td>Further potential for residential at Oswald’s Boatyard, the Scores and employment development in the Denmark Road/Peto Way corridor</td>
<td>SSP7-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Summary of AAP Policies and Proposals
Figure 2.4.1 – AAP Proposals Map
Part 3
Area Wide Policies

Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour AAP
Part 3 – Area Wide Policies

3.0.1. A series of detailed policies for the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area have been refined in order to realise the vision, objectives and urban concept set out in Part 2.

3.0.2. The spatial development strategy sets out the policies under the following themes that reflect the area-wide objectives:

- **Economy and Employment** – identification and protection of locations for economic growth, business development and innovation, public sector and port employment;

- **Housing and Community** – the locations, types and densities for urban housing developments within the AAP area and provision for supporting facilities and amenities;

- **Retail, Leisure and Tourism** – locations for shopping, leisure and tourism activities;

- **Environment, heritage and character** – protecting and enhancing the quality and character of the AAP area in terms of urban design, public realm, heritage assets, waterfront to ensure a place where people want to live, work and visit;

- **Transport, movement and linkages** – accessibility within and to the AAP area by public transport, walking, cycling, private car and water;

- **Flood Risk Management** – the strategic approach to reducing and mitigating flood risk in the AAP area

- **Water, energy and waste** – potential for inclusion of renewable energy provision, reducing the use of water and reducing waste.
3.1 Economy and Employment

3.1.1. The East of England Plan (2008) requires the Waveney Local Development Framework to include policies to assist in securing the growth of 5,000 jobs from 2001 to 2021 and the Policy CS05 of the Core Strategy states that at least 1,000 new jobs should be created within the AAP area. In parallel to this the Policy CS05 states that the AAP must include provision for new housing, retail and other facilities within the area to support the wider economic regeneration of the town.

3.1.2. The AAP therefore has an important role in balancing allocations for employment and other uses within the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area. This section sets out a series of policies to support the economic development of the area, whilst balancing the requirement for other uses. According to the definition in PPS4, economic development includes development within B class uses as well as public and community uses and main town centre uses. Although it is acknowledged that development of uses outside the B classes creates jobs, ‘employment’ in this section refers specifically to B1, B2 and B8 uses. Employment associated with retail, tourism and leisure is dealt with in Section 3.3.

Employment Sites

3.1.5. Policy CS07 of the Core Strategy identifies the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area as a strategic employment site where port development, employment led regeneration and economic diversification will be promoted. This is further supported by Policy DM08 of the Development Management Policies DPD. The AAP seeks to identify the most appropriate locations for employment whilst considering other competing uses.

EMP 1 – Employment Sites

Employment sites identified within the AAP proposals map will be protected and enhanced for B1 (light industrial), B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution). Development will be promoted within this location that enables relocation and expansion of local businesses, including any existing business that require relocation or expansion space. In accordance with the ‘town centre first’ principle, applications for large B1 office uses will need to demonstrate that no suitable sites are available within the town centre boundary. Where no suitable town centre sites are available, B1 office development will be permitted in employment areas, as illustrated in the AAP proposals map.

Where development requires existing businesses to be relocated the Council and 1st East will work with owners to relocate to appropriate premises in employment sites or mixed use areas defined within the AAP area, or other locations within the sub-region.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PPS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PPS4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Regional Policy |
• East of England Plan Policies E1, E2, E3, E4
• East of England Sub Regional Policy GYL1

Waveney Core Strategy Policies
• CS07
• CS08
• CS09
• CS10

Waveney Development Management Policies DPD
• DM08

Evidence Base Documents / Studies
• Great Yarmouth and Waveney Employment Land Study (January 2006)
• Relocation Strategy
• PowerPark Demand & Need Report (July 2009)

Alternative Options Considered
The Preferred Options AAP (2007) considered extensive redevelopment of employment and port activities for residential and commercial uses. The AAP set out support to existing industries (energy, port, transport, food processing and tourism), and development of knowledge and environmental economy.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMP 1 – Employment Sites</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Previous Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: The policy will help to prevent loss of employment sites to other uses. Safeguarding designated sites for employment and commercial uses protects viable businesses and provides a focus for job-creation. Redevelopment of employment land proposed in the previous policy is unlikely to replicate the number of viable jobs in the area. No policy may lead to conflict between incompatible uses.

Environmental: Protection of existing employment sites may prevent the need to provide greenfield land for employment use, which could indirectly conserve biodiversity. Through the redevelopment of brownfield sites, there may be potential to remediate contaminated land and protect habitats. Furthermore, retaining employment in the town centre may help to reduce car dependency and greenhouse gas emissions as a result. Although high levels of design standards would be encouraged, additional employment uses will require additional resource use in terms of water / minerals usage which will need to be managed. Without a policy in place, or by pursuing a policy of mixed-use redevelopment, negative impacts (such as noise pollution) may arise from the close proximity of port activities and residential uses.

The precautionary principle of PPS25 has been advocated and applied to sites within the AAP, whereby the majority of new development should be concentrated in areas of lowest flood risk. Nevertheless, the preferred option still proposes development in areas at high risk of flooding. As such, in accordance with Policy FRM1, developments will be required to adequately demonstrate how flood risk has been mitigated (e.g. through land raising; SUDS) and how resilience during flood events has been maximised (e.g. safe access/egress points; habitable rooms above ground floor).
certain locations, developments may also be required to incorporate defences which help to reduce flood risk elsewhere in Lowestoft.

**Economic:** The preferred policy is likely to encourage economic growth and attract investment by protecting and encouraging employment uses in an existing accessible location. There may be multiplier effects arising from increased personal incomes which help to enhance the town centre's vitality and viability. Failure to protect sites for employment use or encouraging mixed-use redevelopment may prevent Lowestoft from fully capitalising on employment opportunities in offshore energy.

**Energy Business Cluster**

3.1.6. Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy sets out the requirement to promote an energy cluster and PowerPark within the AAP area in order to support the expansion in off-shore renewable energy. The establishment of the OrbisEnergy Centre and the ‘Gulliver’ wind turbine provides an initial catalyst for expansion of the sector in Lowestoft and it is anticipated that a cluster of businesses will be developed as part of the proposed PowerPark at the existing Beach Industrial Estate and Outer Harbour area with potential for further expansion across the AAP area. The PowerPark Demand and Need Report, undertaken on behalf of 1st East, sets out in detail the potential for fostering such an energy-based economic cluster in this location. The report identified that through the development of a complimentary mix of energy sectors, there is potential to create 950 direct and almost 4,000 indirect jobs.

**EMP 2 – Energy Business Cluster**

The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area will become a hub for a complimentary mix of energy sectors including:

2. Offshore marine energy Research and Development (R&D).
3. Existing traditional marine and underwater engineering facilities.
4. Mixed use area with a blend of other energy activities that do not require significant land or quay space. These include:
   a. Carbon Capture Storage (CCS) - including potential research and development/operations and maintenance facilities to support carbon capture storage in geological formations under the North Sea;
   b. Support to the nuclear industry (in particular the construction of future phases of the Sizewell plant).
   c. Gas storage - operations and maintenance for offshore gas storage facilities.
5. Possible on-site training centres to supply the energy sectors

**Key Policy Links and Evidence Base**

**National Policy**
- PPS4

**Regional Policy**
- East of England Plan Policies E1, E2, E3, E4
- East of England Sub Regional Policy GYL1

**Waveney Core Strategy Policies**
- CS07
- CS08
Alternative Options Considered
The previous Preferred Options AAP (January 2007) set out proposals for mixed use redevelopment of existing port uses in the current PowerPark site. The intention was to facilitate greater public access to the waterfront and provide a new marina, restaurants, shops as well as 80 residential units. This option has been discounted due to deliverability constraints linked to the economic downturn and objections raised by a variety of stakeholders and landowners during consultation.

Recent investment in the port of Lowestoft reflects the job opportunities associated with supporting the offshore and renewable energy sector and developments such as the Greater Gabbard wind farm and the Government’s Phase 3 Offshore Wind Programme. Current PowerPark proposals reflect a more concerted commitment to capitalising on these growth sectors and delivering high quality new employment growth in Lowestoft.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMP 2 – Energy Business Cluster</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: Supporting the renewable energy sector will increase the range of employment opportunities available in Lowestoft. The policy supports the inclusion of education and training facilities, which may help to tackle social exclusion by increasing skill levels. Without increased skills in the local labour market, the jobs may not directly benefit local people. Mixed use redevelopment of the area or a lack of policy are unlikely to fully realise the huge regeneration opportunities in supporting the growing offshore energy sector.

Environmental: Supporting the growth of the renewable energy sector will help to reduce contributions to climate change. Although Power Park is relatively accessible on foot or by bicycle, there may be an increase in traffic associated with the expansion of job opportunities. Policies TML1 - TML7 will help to minimise use of private cars to access Power Park. In addition, the energy cluster may place more pressure on water and mineral resources due to more intensive use of land and the likely increases in population linked to job opportunities. These impacts will need to be managed and mitigated through the incorporation of sustainable design and SUDS. The previous policy or a lack of policy will fail to realise the environmental benefits linked to the renewables sector.

Economic: There is huge growth potential in supporting offshore renewables in the North Sea. Capitalising on these opportunities will create jobs directly and also benefit local supply chain businesses indirectly. There may be increased spending in the town centre as a result of increases in disposable income. With no policy, or the previous preferred option, these benefits are unlikely be fully realised.
### Mixed Use Employment Areas

3.1.7. A key objective of the AAP is to create high quality mixed use areas within the AAP area with a balance of residential, commercial and employment activities. The potential for development of a greater number of B1 office and light industrial premises has been identified as a requirement through the 2006 Employment Study. The AAP seeks to encourage appropriate business activity as part of mixed use schemes, providing such uses are compatible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMP 3 – Mixed Use Employment Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office and light industrial (B1) uses will be permitted as part of mixed use development as illustrated on the AAP proposals map. Such uses will be permitted provided they do not undermine the amenity of other uses. In accordance with the ‘town centre first’ principle, applications for large B1 office uses will need to demonstrate that no suitable sites are available within the town centre boundary. Where no suitable town centre sites are available, B1 office development will be permitted in employment areas, as illustrated in the AAP proposals map.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

**National Policy**
- PPS1
- PPS4

**Regional Policy**
- East of England Plan Policies E1, E2, E3, E4
- East of England Sub Regional Policy GYL1

**Waveney Core Strategy Policies**
- CS07
- CS08
- CS09
- CS10

**Waveney Development Management Policies DPD**
- DM08

### Evidence Base Documents / Studies

- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Employment Land Study (January 2006)
- Relocation Strategy

### Alternative Options Considered

The previous Preferred Options AAP (2007) involved more extensive mixed use redevelopment of port employment land for residential and office use. This Revised Options document is associated with greater safeguarding of port activities, with mixed use permitted in a limited number of sites.
Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMP 3 – Mixed Use Employment Areas</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Previous Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: Incorporating employment sites within mixed use developments provides locally accessible job opportunities which may help to reduce social exclusion. In addition, such a mix of uses may help to encourage footfall at different times of day, increasing natural surveillance and reducing opportunities for crime. With no policy, employment uses may be in more remote locations and places more likely to be 'dead' at certain times of day.

Environmental: Providing employment within mixed use developments may help to encourage walking and cycling, reducing car dependence and greenhouse gas emissions. Without such a policy, walking and cycling may be considered an unattractive commuting option due to the segregation of uses.

Economic: The preferred policy will help to create locally accessible employment opportunities. The previous option included mixed use development of areas of Power Park. Although this may create employment opportunities, they are unlikely to be of comparable quantity and quality to those created in renewable energy.

Port Activities

3.1.8. Currently owned by Associated British Ports (ABP), the Port of Lowestoft is an important regional and local asset. The Port services traffic to and from the industrial heartlands of Northern Europe, Scandinavia and the Baltic states. Lowestoft has experienced a significant increase in throughput in recent years, and offers a wide range of facilities for container, bulk and general-cargo handling. It also serves as a major centre for servicing the offshore oil and gas industry, and the construction and shipment of wind-energy turbines. Extensive ship-repair facilities, including a dry dock, are located at the port, together with a modern fish market with fish-auction and processing facilities. The port also includes an increasingly popular marina function. ABP’s land ownership currently covers the following areas:

- Outer Harbour including Hamilton Dock, Waveney Dock, Trawl Dock (Inner North Pier) and Yacht Marina (Inner South Pier)
- Inner Harbour (Lake Lothing) comprising Town Quay, South Quay, Silo Quay, North Quay, Shell Quay and Lowestoft Haven Marina.

3.1.9. The 2007 Preferred Option AAP advocated “managed transition” of Port Activity, particularly within the Inner Harbour. This met with significant objections from ABP and is not considered an appropriate way forward within the AAP. The revised Preferred Option AAP therefore seeks to facilitate the protection and enhancement of Port Activities (particularly in supporting the Renewable Energy Business Cluster proposals), together with appropriate redevelopment of redundant port land for alternative development. Development at Peto Square and to the south side of Lake Lothing will mean that the port area is increasingly surrounded by different land uses that do not
have an industrial or freight purpose. The challenge is to minimise conflict between the new and the established land uses.

EMP4 – Port Activities
Existing port activities including container, bulk and general-cargo handling, offshore oil, gas and wind energy, ship repair and fishing industry will be protected and enhanced through development.

Extensive ship-repair facilities, including a dry dock, are located at the port, together with a modern fish market with fish-auction and processing facilities. The port also boasts a popular marina which features a range of modern facilities.

Port operators should use the latest available technology, equipment and business practices to minimise unnecessary noise and other issues.

New development next to or opposite port areas should utilise the layout, use and environmental credentials of buildings to design away these potential conflicts.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

National Policy
- PPS4

Regional Policy
- East of England Plan Policies E1, E2, E3, E4
- East of England Sub Regional Policy GYL1

Waveney Core Strategy Policies
- CS07

Waveney Development Management Policies DPD
- DM08

Evidence Base Documents / Studies
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Employment Land Study (January 2006)
- Relocation Strategy
- PowerPark Demand & Need Report (July 2009)

Alternative Options Considered
The previous Preferred Options AAP (2007) proposed extensive redevelopment of employment and port activities for residential and commercial uses. Feedback during consultation, as well as the economic downturn, have highlighted that such an approach was neither acceptable nor economically viable. Furthermore, recent investment in the port of Lowestoft reflects opportunities in supporting the offshore and renewable energy industry and developments such as the Greater Gabbard wind farm. Current proposals reflect a more concerted commitment to capitalising on these growth sectors and delivering high quality employment growth in Lowestoft.
Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMP4 – Port Activities</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Previous Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact**

- **++**: Major Positive
- **+**: Minor Positive
- **-**: Minor Negative
- **-**: Major Negative
- **0**: Neutral
- **+/-**: Uncertain

**Social**: The preferred option will have a positive impact by safeguarding viable businesses, helping to support local communities. The previous option would involve redevelopment of waterfront areas, possibly resulting in a net loss of employment. No policy may result in conflict between uses.

**Environmental**: The preferred option will help to retain the maritime heritage of Lowestoft. Compared to the previous policy’s support for consolidating port uses, the protection of port activities may have a negative impact on water and air quality unless environmental safeguards are put in place. Nevertheless, the previous option may increase Lowestoft’s exposure to climatic events by promoting vulnerable uses such as housing in areas of highest flood risk.

**Economic**: The preferred option will help to support indigenous growth and investment. Notwithstanding the fact that the previous policy may result in a net loss of employment, the majority of employment created by that option is likely to be low skilled. No policy may cause conflict between different site users, particularly between industry and housing.
3.2 Housing and Community

3.2.1. Fundamental to the Government’s aim of creating more balanced and sustainable communities is the provision of a mix of housing types and tenures. New developments should therefore include a mix of market and affordable units as well as variety of housing types to suit different households such as families with children, older people and single person households. The level of housing provision should be supported by robust evidence of both housing need and market demand, as set out in Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs). Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) are also required to take account of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs) which provide evidence of the availability of suitable land for new residential development.

3.2.2. Within Lowestoft, Waveney’s 2007 SHLAA identifies Lake Lothing and the key strategic sites set out in the AAP as a ‘broad location’ for new residential development with a capacity of approximately 1,500 units.

3.2.3. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment for Waveney and Great Yarmouth (September 2007) explores trends in household formation in the sub region, highlighting in particular a growth in the number of smaller households. The report stresses that the typical household in the sub-region are singles, couples or other adults without children. New development should respond to these trends in household formation and place greater emphasis on smaller 1 and 2 bedroom properties which provide opportunities for first-time buyers and older people who may wish to downsize. Waveney is characterised by an ageing population with a significant growth in the proportion of people aged over 65 within the district’s population. The changing housing needs are often inadequately met by the district’s elderly housing stock, which are often difficult and expensive to adapt. As such, the SHMA highlights the need to give greater consideration to delivering more accessible, adaptable ‘Lifetime Homes’ as well as sheltered accommodation.

3.2.4. The SHMA also stresses that although house prices remain relatively low in the context of the wider region, comparatively low incomes mean affordability is a crucial housing issue. The SHMA indicates that house prices in Waveney have risen dramatically, by 173% over the 10 year period up to 2006. The relatively slow delivery of affordable housing is manifested in the assessment’s analysis of housing need, which estimates that in the five years following the SHMA, there will be an annual shortfall of 225 affordable homes. The majority of identified affordable housing need in Waveney is for smaller properties, typically 1 bedroom (40.2%) and 2 bedroom (42%) accommodation. Just over 15% of households in need require 3 bedroom accommodation with a further 3% requiring larger properties.

3.2.5. The Development Management Policies DPD sets out the policy framework for housing mix and affordable housing.
3.2.6. The evidence base for the Development Management Policies DPD includes an Affordable Housing Viability Report which indicated that the 2007 AAP proposals (discussed below) would be viable depending on two distinct phases (pre and post-2017), assumptions regards grant levels per person (broadly £59,000 per unit) and a reduced level of affordable housing of 20% to 2017 with a 35% target for the rest of the plan period. Brooke Peninsula required £20,000 grant per person to 2017 and then minimal grant to achieve these levels, while Kirkley Waterfront required £30,000 grant per person to 2017, £10,000 per person in 2017 and them minimal grant for the remainder of the plan period. The assumptions of infrastructure projects needed to unlock the AAP sites for development or to mitigate the impacts of development on the strategic sites are broadly similar to those identified in section 5 of the AAP and the assumptions of land values, development costs, fees and rates of return remain valid for the purposes of reviewing the further preferred options for the AAP.

HC1 – Housing in the AAP Area

The strategic sites in the AAP should contribute approximately 1,500 homes towards the district wide targets for housing completions to 2025.

New developments should provide a range of housing choices in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types in accordance with local needs. The strategic sites should contribute a balance of housing choices and housing sizes which will contribute to the district wide requirements but reflect the housing needs, site characteristics and housing markets relevant to the strategic sites.

Housing mix and tenure will be developed in accordance with the policies set out within the Development Management Policies DPD. Proposals will be expected to deliver a minimum of 20% affordable housing in the early phases of the plan period to 2017 with an indicative affordable housing split of 90% social rented and 10% intermediate. In the latter stages of the plan period to 2025 proposals will be expected to deliver a minimum of 35% affordable housing again with an indicative affordable housing split of 90% social rented and 10% intermediate. Proposals will need to demonstrate that these minimums have been tested and justify any variations in approach.

All housing within these sites will be developed to densities of between 40 and 90 units/hectare taking account of site characteristics and surrounding land uses. Proposals will be expected to deliver a broad balance of 60% smaller sized accommodation (1-2 bedrooms), with a preference for 2 bedroom units and 40% of units as 3 bedrooms or larger. The balance should be responsive to the site characteristics and housing markets relevant to the strategic sites.

All new development should be built to high standards of design and sustainability, with all residential buildings within the AAP area seeking to achieve a minimum of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Policy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Regional Policy |
|-----------------|---|
| East of England Plan Policies H1, H2, ENV7 |  |
| East of England Sub Regional Policy GYL1 |  |

Waveney Core Strategy Policies

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waveney Development Management Policies DPD
- DM16
- DM17
- DM18

Evidence Base Documents / Studies
- Sub-Regional Housing Strategy for Great Yarmouth and Waveney – 2005 and beyond (October 2004)
- Waveney Housing Strategy (January 2004)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Housing Market Assessment (September 2007)
- Waveney Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (November 2007)
- Assessment of 5 Year Supply of Housing Land (March 2009)
- Affordable Housing Policy Financial Viability Study (September 2009)

Alternative Options Considered
The previous version of the AAP did not set out an approach to housing mix and tenure within the area. The Issues and Options Development Management Policies DPD asked whether the Council should require a mix of housing based upon an assessment of local need, or whether the market should dictate the housing mix. Over 90% of respondents considered that a housing mix policy is required and this is included as Policy DM17. The AAP policy seeks to set out a further level of detail for the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area. The alternative would be to have no policy.

The previous version of the AAP identified a net density of 60 units/hectare across the AAP with potential for higher densities in town centre or waterfront locations. The Development Management Policies DPD also includes a policy on Housing Density (DM16) stating that a minimum of 50 units/hectare will be sought in urban areas (Policy DM16). The Development Management Policies considered alternative approaches at Issues and Options stage which concluded that density should be flexible and more related to surrounding development. This is sought within the AAP where a range of densities is proposed depending upon site characteristics.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−/−</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: By seeking a mix of housing types, tenures and sizes, the preferred option will help to address local housing needs and create an attractive and inclusive community. Social infrastructure provision will improve access to key services for local people. Having no policy will mean there is no guarantee that housing needs will be addressed through new development. Additionally, without a policy covering the three housing sites, social infrastructure requirements may not be considered at the strategic level resulting in inadequate provision.

Environmental: The preferred policy's incorporation of Code for Sustainable Homes targets will help to minimise waste, water use and energy consumption. Having no policy would make Code for Sustainable Homes targets more difficult to enforce.

The provision of easily accessible social infrastructure within the community will also reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with motorised transport. Nevertheless, transport policies and interventions will need to be implemented to ensure there is not an adverse traffic impact on the local road network. Without a policy to coordinate housing development across the sites, energy requirements would not be dealt with in a strategic way, reducing the viability of on-site renewables.

The precautionary principle of PPS25 has been advocated and applied to
sites within the AAP, whereby the majority of new development should be concentrated in areas of lowest flood risk. Nevertheless, the preferred option still proposes development in areas at high risk of flooding. As such, in accordance with Policy WE1, developments will be required to adequately demonstrate how flood risk has been mitigated (e.g. through land raising; SUDS) and how resilience during flood events has been maximised (e.g. safe access/egress points; habitable rooms above ground floor). In certain locations, developments may also be required to incorporate defences which help to reduce flood risk elsewhere in Lowestoft. The previous option will increase future vulnerability to flood risk by proposing a greater proportion of housing in FZ3a.

**Economic:** The introduction of a residential population close to the town centre will help to revitalise the town centre, with increased spending and more constant footfall enhancing the viability of shops and the evening economy.

### Housing Distribution

3.2.7. The 2007 Preferred Options AAP identified capacity for approximately 1,460 houses within the URC boundaries with Brooke Peninsula, Peto Square, Fishers’ Wharf and Kirkley Waterfront as intervention areas with potential for new residential development, distributed as follows:

- Fishers’ Wharf: ~180
- Peto Square: ~380
- Kirkley Waterfront: ~350
- Brooke Peninsula: ~500

3.2.8. Since 2007 development proposals within the AAP have altered. In particular proposals for the PowerPark which supersede the Fisher’s Wharf proposals outlined in the 2007 Preferred Option, whilst the sites previously occupied by Sanyo and Jeld Wen to the south of Lake Lothing have become available for development. The Government has also revised its advice on planning for flood risk in PPS 25 in which the sequential approach to development is advocated.

3.2.9. The sequential test should locate a development site within the lowest possible flood risk area within the AAP, and the exception test should be performed for the site as a whole in relation to the overall AAP. Within sites identified as at a high risk of flooding, this approach is taken in order to locate the most vulnerable land uses in areas which are at the lowest level of flood risk.

3.2.10. The potential now exists to create a sustainable urban neighbourhood in an area to the south west of the AAP area. This is considered to have the following advantages over the previous approach:

- This location is sequentially preferable to the previous approach to dispersed housing with parts of the area outside of Flood Risk Zone 3, and greater potential for flood mitigation through land raising and improved defences;
Concentration of residential development in this location would assist in delivering the access improvements required to deliver development to the south of Lake Lothing;

The potential exists to ensure supporting infrastructure is delivered to support residential development including education, community facilities, open space and on-site renewables/combined heat and power systems through greater critical mass of development;

The new residential neighbourhood provides potential for greater integration with existing neighbourhoods to the south and north of Lake Lothing.

3.2.11. The AAP advocates a comprehensive approach to the planning of this area in order to ensure benefits of development are maximised. It is therefore recommended that a comprehensive development brief and design guide is produced for the area. Further development principles are contained in Section 4.

3.2.12. The remaining residential units not provided as part of the Sustainable Urban Community should be developed as part of mixed use or individual site schemes in locations identified on the proposals map. The AAP seeks to prioritise development in areas of lowest flood risk and has therefore identified additional development sites in order of preference following the sequential test set out in PPS 25.

HC2 – Distribution of Housing Sites

A sustainable urban neighbourhood comprising a minimum of 1,250 units will be developed to the South of Lake Lothing on the Brooke Peninsula, Sanyo and Kirkley Waterfront sites. Development within this location will include a range of housing types and tenures, social and community facilities, and complimentary employment uses built to a range of densities across the site from 40 to 90 units to the hectare.

The area will be subject to comprehensive site masterplanning to include provision for site access, on-site energy, heat and cooling systems, flood mitigation measures (including SUDs and Green Roofs) and should seek to achieve a minimum of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5.

This will include careful consideration as to how the site can be integrated with existing communities at Oulton Broad, as well as pedestrian and cycle linkages to the town centre and other parts of the AAP area. Housing mix and tenure will be developed in accordance with the recommendations in the Waveney SHMA as well as policies set out within the Development Management Policies DPD.

Further principles and guidance for this area is contained in Section 4 of the AAP.

Outside the sustainable urban neighbourhood, additional housing within the AAP area should be located in the following locations as illustrated on the proposals map, subject to appropriate flood risk assessment and mitigation (in order of flood related sequential preference):

- The “Scores” area, East of High Street
- Kirkley Rise
- Oswald’s Boatyard/Western Lake Lothing
- Peto Square

Peto Square and the ‘Scores’ area should be developed to higher densities and with a higher proportion to smaller...
sized accommodation (1-2 bedrooms), with a preference for 2 bedroom units, to reflect the housing needs, site characteristics and housing markets relevant to these sites. The sustainable urban neighbourhood and Kirkley Rise should be developed with a unit size mix which when combined delivers the 60% smaller sized accommodation and 40% family sized accommodation set out in policy HC1.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

National Policy
- PPS1
- PPS3
Regional Policy
- East of England Plan Policies H1, H2, ENV7
- East of England Sub Regional Policy GYL1
Waveney Core Strategy Policies
- CS11
- CS02
Waveney Development Management Policies DPD
- DM16
- DM17
- DM18

Evidence Base Documents / Studies
- Sub-Regional Housing Strategy for Great Yarmouth and Waveney – 2005 and beyond (October 2004)
- Waveney Housing Strategy (January 2004)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Housing Market Assessment (September 2007)
- Waveney Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (November 2007)
- Assessment of 5 Year Supply of Housing Land (March 2009)
- Affordable Housing Policy Financial Viability Study (2009)

Alternative Options Considered

Previous AAP preferred options (January 2007) allocated housing across more sites within the AAP area, including Peto Square and Fisher’s Wharf (now PowerPark). In line with the sequential approach to flood risk planning, this revised options document seeks to focus residential development outside areas of greatest flood risk. Since 2007, the Sanyo site has become available which provides significant potential for residential development, with parts of the site away from Flood Zone 3.

This revised option seeks to concentrate residential development in an area of lesser flood risk, close to existing residential communities. By concentrating residential development in a single location the potential for a comprehensive approach to residential resource requirements, access and community facilities can be taken.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.U.N.</th>
<th>The Scores Area</th>
<th>Kirkley Rise</th>
<th>Ousegate Boatyard</th>
<th>W Lake Lothing</th>
<th>Peto Square</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>−/+</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>−/+</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>−/+</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>0/−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social:** By seeking a mix of housing types, tenures and sizes, the preferred option will help to address local housing needs and create an attractive and inclusive community. Social infrastructure provision will improve access to key services for local people. Having no policy will mean there is no guarantee that housing needs will be addressed through new development. Additionally, without a policy covering the three housing sites, social infrastructure requirements may not be considered at the strategic level resulting in inadequate provision.
Environmental: The preferred policy's incorporation of Code for Sustainable Homes targets will help to minimise waste, water use and energy consumption. Having no policy would make Code for Sustainable Homes targets more difficult to enforce.

The provision of easily accessible social infrastructure within the community will also reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with motorised transport. Nevertheless, transport policies and interventions will need to be implemented to ensure there is not an adverse traffic impact on the local road network. Without a policy to coordinate housing development across the sites, energy requirements would not be dealt with in a strategic way, reducing the viability of on-site renewables.

The precautionary principle of PPS25 has been advocated and applied to sites within the AAP, whereby the majority of new development should be concentrated in areas of lowest flood risk. Nevertheless, the preferred option still proposes development in areas at high risk of flooding. As such, in accordance with Policy WE1, developments will be required to adequately demonstrate how flood risk has been mitigated (e.g. through land raising; SUDS) and how resilience during flood events has been maximised (e.g. safe access/egress points; habitable rooms above ground floor). In certain locations, developments may also be required to incorporate defences which help to reduce flood risk elsewhere in Lowestoft. The previous option will increase future vulnerability to flood risk by proposing a greater proportion of housing in FZ3a.

Economic: The introduction of a residential population close to the town centre will help to revitalise the town centre, with increased spending and more constant footfall enhancing the viability of shops and the evening economy.
Social and Community Infrastructure

3.2.13. Social and Community Infrastructure includes schools, libraries, youth and community services, police and emergency services, cultural facilities, places of worship and health care facilities. The inclusion of 1,500 additional homes is likely to have significant implications for development within the AAP area with an increase in population and change in demographic make up of the area. It is anticipated that development will require a new primary school and it is proposed that a facility be provided as part of wider proposals for the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood. This could be used for other out-of-hours community facilities. In addition further social and community facilities are anticipated to be provided as part of developments at Oswald’s Boatyard and Kirkley Rise.

HC3 – Social and Community Infrastructure

All residential development should be supported by an appropriate provision of social infrastructure, including education, health and other community facilities.

The following social and community infrastructure will be sought in the AAP area during the plan period:

- Primary school and flexible community uses as part of a new Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood, South of Lake Lothing;
- Replacement library provision at Oswald’s Boatyard;
- Provision of new community health facility at Kirkley Rise

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

National Policy
- PPS1
Regional Policy
- East of England Plan Policies SS2, C2
Waveney Core Strategy Policy
- CS04
- CS14
Waveney Development Management Policies DPD
- DM15

Evidence Base Documents / Studies

- Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Social Infrastructure Assessment (AECOM, April 2010)

Alternative Options Considered

Previous iterations of the AAP made no specific provision for social and community infrastructure.
## Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HO3 - Social and Community Infrastructure</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social:** The preferred policy will help to increase access to social infrastructure. Walking and cycling to local destinations may improve peoples’ general health. Having no policy may result in inadequate and inaccessible provision.

**Environmental:** The provision of easily accessible social infrastructure within the community will also reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with motorised transport. Having no policy will have limited environmental impacts.

**Economic:** No significant economic impacts were identified.

### Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>Major Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Minor Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Major Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Retail, Leisure and Tourism

3.3.1. National planning policy recognises that vibrant town centres help to create jobs, attract investment and generate income. Town centres that are easily accessible, attractive and well-designed, with a range of shops, entertainment facilities and cultural amenities are catalysts for economic growth, providing a focus for business, social engagement and community pride. As the main shopping centre within the district of Waveney, Lowestoft is identified as a Major Town Centre in the retail hierarchy set out in the East of England Plan. This designation reflects that although there may be a leakage of spending to larger centres such as Norwich, Lowestoft nevertheless plays an important role in serving everyday needs of residents in the immediate catchment. As such Lowestoft town centre will be the focus for the majority of Waveney’s new retail floorspace over the Plan Period.

3.3.2. The Great Yarmouth Borough and Waveney District Retail and Leisure Study (August 2006) identifies more capacity for comparison good retail over the same period, which should be concentrated in larger towns such as Lowestoft. In addition, the study suggests there is scope to strengthen Lowestoft’s evening economy, including higher quality bars and restaurants, which would help to increase the town centre’s attractiveness to visitors. Policy CS10 in the adopted Waveney Core Strategy states that approximately 21,000 sq m of new comparison retail floorspace as well as new leisure development will be allocated within the AAP as part of the southern expansion of the town centre towards Lake Lothing. The 2006 study concluded that there is limited capacity for additional convenience retail floorspace in the period to 2016, however there is will be a requirement to provide local convenience retail as part of major new housing development.

3.3.3. Previous versions of the AAP set out significant potential for retail development south of the town centre, facilitated by the relocation of the railway station and in the area adjacent to Trawl Dock and Waveney Dock. Since the last version of the AAP in 2007 further feasibility work has been undertaken regarding the relocation of the station and the proposals for PowerPark which has led to a significant reduction in the amount of land available for a southern town centre expansion.

3.3.4. In revising the AAP a capacity testing exercise has been undertaken to understand the potential for retail and leisure focussed development in the Peto Square strategic site. This has identified a maximum likely potential of approximately 17,500 sq m floorspace that may be accommodated within the Peto Square area as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the area. Further details upon site development principles are contained within Section 4.
**RLT 1 – Retail within the AAP Area**

Up to [17,500] sq m of commercial floorspace (use class A1-A5) will be accommodated as part of a town centre expansion in the Peto Square strategic site within the AAP area. This may be brought forward in association with other future town centre expansion schemes.

Further small scale retail schemes will be brought forward to support the sustainable urban neighbourhood within the Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo strategic site. Retail will also be permitted as part of small-scale expansion of the Kirkley Neighbourhood Retail Centre.

No retail development will be permitted within the AAP area that has an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre in accordance with the tests set out under PPS4.

**Key Policy Links and Evidence Base**

- **National Policy**
  - PPS1
  - PPS4
- **Regional Policy**
  - East of England Plan Policy SS6, E5
- **Waveney Core Strategy Policy**
  - CS10
- **Waveney Development Management Policies DPD**
  - DM10
  - DM11

**Evidence Base Documents / Studies**

- Great Yarmouth Borough and Waveney District Retail and Leisure Study (August 2006)
- AECOM/DTZ Peto Square Capacity Exercise (April 2010)

**Alternative Options Considered**

The January 2007 Preferred Options AAP sought to focus new retail development (up to 21,000 sq m) at Peto Square and at Fisher’s Wharf (now PowerPark site). This was based upon assessment of three different options for this area based upon different layouts and quantities of development. Based upon the town centres first principle this remains the preferred option for concentration of retail floorspace, potentially balanced with other town centre sites or incremental redevelopment of units on the High Street. Major retail proposals outside of the town centre are not considered appropriate following the PPS4 sequential approach, with the exception of local retail at Kirkley and to support the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood. The other alternative would be to provide retail within non-town centre locations as has been the recent pattern of retail development in Lowestoft. This approach is inconsistent with national policy and would further undermine the vitality and viability of the existing centre.

**Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RET 1 – Retail within the AAP Area</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Out of Centre Retail</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social:** The preferred option will help to reduce social exclusion by focussing retail development in areas most accessible by public transport. There will be some employment creation, although the majority is likely to be low skilled. Encouraging out of centre retail directly, or indirectly by not having a policy, may exclude people who do not own a car.

**Environmental:** The preferred option will help to reduce contributions to climate change and traffic congestion by focussing retail in the accessible town centre. Out of town retail would encourage car dependency and increase greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change.
The precautionary principle of PPS25 has been advocated and applied to sites within the AAP, whereby the majority of new development should be concentrated in areas of lowest flood risk. Nevertheless, the preferred option still proposes development in areas at high risk of flooding. As such, in accordance with Policy WE1, developments will be required to adequately demonstrate how flood risk has been mitigated (e.g. through land raising; SUDS) and how resilience during flood events has been maximised (e.g. safe access/egress points; habitable rooms above ground floor). In certain locations, developments may also be required to incorporate defences which help to reduce flood risk elsewhere in Lowestoft.

**Economic:** The preferred option will have a major positive effect on revitalising the town centre by increasing the range of shops in Lowestoft and connecting the town’s heart with the waterfront. The out of town option is likely to undermine the town centre’s viability.

### Leisure and Tourism

3.3.5. The adopted Waveney Core Strategy states that tourism was worth £198 million to the local economy in 2006 and supports approximately 10% of the district’s jobs. Policy GYL1 recognises the strategic importance of tourism to Lowestoft’s in terms of creating jobs and promoting regeneration, stating that Local Development Documents should facilitate the emergence of a more diverse tourist offer.

3.3.6. The Waveney Sunrise Coast Tourism Strategy (2006) establishes an agenda for developing sustainable tourism in Waveney which draws on the district’s unique assets. The Strategy highlights Lowestoft’s seafront, with its long sandy beach backed by an esplanade, gardens and impressive waterfront architecture, as the town’s key asset.

3.3.7. The Strategy recognises the role of the AAP in supporting the transformation of the Lake Lothing Area and stresses that tourism-related development should be a key component of regeneration initiatives going forward, particularly along Lowestoft seafront and at Oulton Broad.

3.3.8. To support a strengthened tourism sector additional commercial leisure facilities will be required. The Great Yarmouth Borough and Waveney District Retail and Leisure Study (August 2006) sets out scope to strengthen Lowestoft’s evening economy, including higher quality bars and restaurants, which would help to increase the town centre’s attractiveness to visitors.
RLT 2 – Leisure and Tourism

New tourism and leisure facilities should capitalise on proximity to existing assets such as Ness Point, the beachfront and proximity to the Broads. The following areas will become a focus for leisure and tourism activities within the AAP area:

- Peto Square / Bascule Bridge Waterfront
- East of England Park
- Brooke Peninsula to Mutford Bridge Waterfront
- Oswald’s Boatyard
- PowerPark (potential for energy sector related visitor centre)

Within these areas development that provides tourist facilities will be prioritised including tourist information, guest accommodation, and other ancillary uses such as cafes, bars and restaurants. These areas will be prioritised for landscape and public realm enhancements and public access to the waterfront.

Development that enhances the tourism potential of the water will be supported through the AAP including provision for water taxis and boat tours, and the use of boats for cafes, bars and restaurants within appropriate locations within the AAP area.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

National Policy
- Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism (May 2006)

Regional Policy
- East of England Plan Policies SS9, E6
- East of England Plan Sub Regional Policy GYL1

Waveney Core Strategy Policy
- CS13

Waveney Development Management Policies DPD
- DM10
- DM11

Evidence Base Documents / Studies

- Great Yarmouth Borough and Waveney District Retail and Leisure Study (August 2006)

Alternative Options Considered

The previous AAP Preferred Option (2007) sought to diversify the tourism offer through a range of proposals including a tourism focus upon the outer harbour into the town centre, the establishment of the East of England Park with marina related activities to the west of Lake Lothing. The revised preferred option seeks to retain these principles, although removes the focus from the outer harbour in order to facilitate the wider economic potential of this location as a working harbour.
### Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RLT 2 – Leisure and Tourism</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact
- **++**: Major Positive
- **+**: Minor Positive
- **-**: Minor Negative
- **--**: Major Negative
- **0**: Neutral
- **+/−**: Uncertain

**Social**: Encouraging new tourist facilities may help to eliminate social exclusion through the provision of new employment opportunities. The previous option involves more extensive tourist development which may result in a loss of employment in other sectors.

**Environmental**: The East of England Park proposals seek to capitalise more fully on the distinctive Ness Point landmark. No policy may mean this feature remains under-utilised. Increasing visitor numbers may put pressure on Lowestoft’s road network, water resources and existing habitats. These elements will need to be carefully managed to minimise potential for negative environmental impacts.

**Economic**: The preferred option will generate employment directly and bring increased spending into Lowestoft by improving the town’s visitor offer. The previous option will reduce the land available at PowerPark and could compromise Lowestoft’s ability to fully capitalise on opportunities arising in offshore energy. No policy could also lead to a conflict of uses, particularly in the Outer Harbour.
3.4 Environment, Heritage and Character

3.4.1. A key priority of the Waveney Core Strategy is to protect and enhance the quality and character of Lowestoft and the AAP area in terms of urban design, public realm, heritage assets and connections to the waterfront. This is essential in ensuring an environment is created where business will want to locate and invest, people will want to live and work, that will be attractive to tourists and visitors. By ensuring new development is created to the highest standards of design, emphasised through high quality and consistent public realm and landscape that makes the most of heritage and local character, and provides places for play and biodiversity. A series of area specific policies have been refined that seek to ensure that these aims are integrated into all development within the AAP area.

Design in the AAP Area

3.4.2. The Core Strategy and Policy DMO2 of the Development Management Policies DPD sets out a strong policy approach to ensuring good quality design is included in all new development. The AAP seeks to ensure these principles are integrated into all development within the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area with a sympathetic approach is taken in designing all new development that is reflective of the areas strong identity and character.

3.4.3. There has been significant investment in public realm improvements to the town centre and Waveney Sunrise regeneration area, as well as small scale schemes within the AAP area. However, much of the AAP area is characterised by poor quality public realm and landscape. All new development must ensure that high quality public realm is provided that unifies the area in terms of materials and details and seeks to overcome poor signage and barriers to movement.

Waterfront Connections

3.4.4. In November 2009 the Marine and Coastal Access Bill received Royal Assent to become an Act of Parliament. This legislation reflects the national strategic importance given to increasing access to the country’s coastal and waterfront areas. To this end, the Act places a duty on the Secretary of State and Natural England to secure “the English Coastal Route”, a long-distance, publically accessible route around the coast of England.

3.4.5. This strategic ambition is reflected at the local level. Policy CS05 of the adopted Waveney Core Strategy, which sets out the key objectives for the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour AAP, seeks to improve public access to the waterfront. Accordingly, a primary objective of the AAP from the outset has been to reconnect the town to its waterfront. The 2007 AAP Preferred Option
sought to provide unrestricted public access to the waterfront, as well as the development of vibrant mixed use developments on the waterfront. This approach was subject to significant objections from port operators who expressed concern about the operational implications of a fully accessible waterfront.

3.4.6. The Revised Preferred Option seeks to encourage waterfront access in managed locations, with other areas safeguarded for waterfront employment activities. The following locations are therefore considered appropriate as foci for public access to the waterfront in the AAP area as defined on the proposals map:

- The area around Bascule Bridge as part of the development of Peto Square;
- A waterfront pedestrian and cycle link connecting the south bank of Lake Lothing and Mutford Bridge;
- New public spaces within Kirkley Waterfront and Brooke Peninsula;
- South Pier;
- PowerPark
- East of England Park

3.4.7. The AAP seeks to encourage high quality connections from other parts of the town and AAP area to these waterfront locations through appropriate public realm and design initiatives and all new development is expected to have regard to this ambition.

### EHC 1 – Design in the AAP Area

The Council will require the highest standard of design in all new development in accordance with the principles set out in Policy DM02 in the Waveney Development Management DPD. The design of new development will be required to:

- Contribute to the character of sites taking into account local context; as described in the Lowestoft URC Area Cultural Heritage Assessment
- Protect and enhance the character of the North and South Lowestoft Conservation Areas;
- Be integrated with existing areas of the town north and south of Lake Lothing;
- Include appropriate signage and wayfinding to key locations within the AAP area;
- Provide landmark buildings at key locations within strategic sites.
- Make best possible use of, and increase access to waterfront areas at locations that do not restrict employment provision or port operations;
- Ensure new streets, routes and spaces are orientated to provide vistas to the waterfront;
- Provide a more sympathetic boundary treatment to the port land (currently steel railings). Particularly within the Conservation Area;
- Animate pedestrian routes with “active frontages” comprising employment activities, shops, cafes, bars, restaurants (with outdoor seating);
- Ensure Sustainable Drainage Systems are well integrated into the design of new development as part of a strategic approach to flood risk management;
- Protect and enhance the historic scores which connect the High Street to the sea front;
- Provide well designed soft and hard landscaping, with appropriate planting including native species;
- Incorporate living walls and roofs into new development as attractive visual features within development that assist in flood attenuation and enhancing biodiversity;
- Secure increased waterfront access and environmental improvements around Bascule Bridge, the area between Brooke Peninsula and Mutford Lock Bridge; and
• Have regard to, and help deliver the Government’s commitment to a continuous and clear public right of way around the entire English coast.

In accordance with the Public Realm Strategy set out in the 2004 Lowestoft Design Guide, the Council will seek to promote a high quality, well designed and well connected landscape and public realm that is consistent across the AAP area.

**Key Policy Links and Evidence Base**

- National Policy:
  - PPS1

- Regional Policy:
  - East of England Plan Policy ENV7

- Waveney Core Strategy Policy:
  - CS02

- Waveney Development Management Policies DPD:
  - DM02

**Evidence Base Documents / Studies**

- South Lowestoft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, Scott Wilson, June 2007
- North Lowestoft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, Scott Wilson, June 2007
- Lowestoft URC Area, Suffolk, Cultural Heritage Assessment for EEDA, Scott Wilson, September 2006

**Alternative Options Considered**

This policy was informed by Core Strategy Policy CS02 and Development Management DPD Policy DM02 to ensure a consistent approach to high quality design across all the strategic AAP sites. The policy has been included to ensure a strong approach to design is included within the AAP area and takes forward principles established within the 2007 AAP Preferred Option.

**Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EHC 1 – Design in the AAP area</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social:** By promoting proposals within the 2004 Lowestoft Design Guide, the preferred policy will help to increase peoples’ satisfaction with the urban landscape, promoting the Lowestoft’s built environment as a focus for local pride. Having no policy would not fully emphasise the importance of good design in the determination of development proposals in the AAP area, although design policies in the Development Management DPD should prevent negative impacts.

Enhancing connections to and along the waterfront will improve the quality of where people live by maximising Lowestoft’s existing assets. These connections will increase the accessibility of services, leisure activities and employment opportunities, which may help address social exclusion. Without a policy, the waterfront areas may remain unattractive and underutilised.

**Environmental:** By making the town’s waterfronts more attractive and accessible, the preferred policy will enhance Lowestoft’s distinctive maritime character. In addition, new connections will encourage walking and cycling to local destinations which will help to reduce contributions to climate change. Unless carefully managed, the construction of these connections may have a negative impact on
water quality. Without a policy, the waterfront areas will remain unattractive and underutilised.

**Economic:** Good design may help to maximise the impacts of regeneration and encourage inward investment. No policy is unlikely to have a significant impact as good design is encouraged in Waveney’s Development Management Policies DPD.

The preferred policy will increase the town centre’s appeal and accessibility for visitors and residents. By promoting unrestricted access to the waterfront, the previous policy may have led to conflicts between port activities and other users and hindered job growth.

**Heritage Assets**

3.4.8. National government guidance set out in PPG15, currently being revised via PPS15, seeks to ensure there is effective protection for all aspects of the historic environment through the planning process. The guidance emphasises the role of the historic environment in creating local distinctiveness and that successful conservation can play a vital role in promoting economic development and regeneration. The guidance requires development plans to set out policies specifically relating to the safeguarding Conservation Areas, listed buildings and buildings of local significance.

3.4.9. The AAP seeks to ensure that the North and South Lowestoft Conservation Areas are protected and enhanced through development, whilst balancing any conflicting issues between development and conservation of the heritage environment. The towns historic maritime character should be protected through development with assets such as the historic Scores enhanced in order to increase connections between the town centre and waterfront.

3.4.10. A Cultural Heritage Study (2006) has been prepared for the AAP area which highlights potential risks as well as opportunities to enhance identified assets through sensitive regeneration. The study includes a ‘Historic Townscape Assessment’ which provides a detailed character assessment of five distinctive zones, making reference to specific listed buildings, conservation areas, and locally significant buildings, as well as street, town and riverscapes. The document concludes that the AAP area contains significant heritage assets and states that masterplanning must take into account the heritage setting of the medieval town, the 19th and 20th century port and improvements to Lake Lothing as well as the eastern most part of the Norfolk Broads.

3.4.11. The area of Lake Lothing and the Outer Harbour is considered to be an area of high archaeological potential. The Outer Harbour Area incorporates part of the medieval and early post-medieval town core, which is recorded as an area of archaeological importance in the Historic Environment Record (HER no. LWT 040). There is high potential for encountering important medieval occupation deposits within this area.
3.4.12. Lake Lothing is recorded in the HER as the remnants of a possible medieval turbary (HER no: LWT 154). There are also a number of recorded archaeological sites and find spots within and surrounding the Lake Lothing Area. However, the area has been subject to only piecemeal archaeological investigation, in response to new development, and not to systematic archaeological survey.

3.4.13. The County Archaeologists considers the AAP are as having good potential for the discovery unknown archaeological sites and features in view of its topographic location overlooking Lake Lothing and that any extensive development causing significant ground disturbance has potential to damage any archaeological deposit that exists.

3.4.14. The area also has a more recent significant marine industry. Any redevelopment should also include an assessment of the importance both of any surviving individual structures and the broad layout and context of the industrial development within these areas.

EHC 2 – Heritage Assets

New development will reflect, protect and enhance the historic character of Lowestoft. Development within the Lowestoft North and South conservation area will be required to be of high standards of urban design that is complimentary to the heritage environment.

The character and setting of listed buildings within the AAP area will be enhanced and protected by development.

Development proposals should seek to retain and re-use existing listed or locally listed buildings, or their facades unless it can be demonstrated that redevelopment would produce substantial benefits for the community in accordance with policy guidance set out in PPG15.

Proposals involving the demolition of non-listed buildings within the conservation areas will be considered if proposals will enhance the overall quality of the conservation areas and bring about positive socio-economic benefits.

The redevelopment of Strategic Sites will require archaeological desk-based assessment, trial trenching and palaeo-environmental assessment, in order to establish the full archaeological implications of any proposals prior to the determination of planning applications. The results of this work will enable the archaeological resource (both in quality and extent) to be accurately quantified.

Any below ground heritage assets identified within the AAP area must be protected in situ and/or by record. This will ensure that heritage is adequately protected, and any potential built and below-ground heritage constraints are identified early in the pre-application planning stage of any development.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

- National Policy
  - PPG15, PPG16, PPS25
  - Draft PPS15
- Regional Policy
  - East of England Plan Policy ENV6, ENV7
- Waveney Core Strategy Policy
  - CS14
  - CS17
Evidence Base Documents / Studies

- Lowestoft URC Area Cultural Heritage Assessment (September 2006)
- South Lowestoft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, Scott Wilson, June 2007
- North Lowestoft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, Scott Wilson, June 2007
- Historic Environment Records

Alternative Options Considered

Previous versions of the AAP set out the requirement for old buildings of merit to be retained and converted where possible acknowledging the importance of the historic townscape. This position is retained through the inclusion of this policy.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: The preferred option will protect conservation areas, listed buildings and other historic assets and is likely to have a positive impact on peoples’ satisfaction with the built environment, enhancing its role as a focus for local pride. Having no policy may result in loss or damage to heritage assets as well as unsympathetic design within new development.

Environmental: The preferred option will help to protect listed buildings and enhance conservation areas, contributing to the overall quality of the townscape. Having no policy could result in the deterioration or loss of heritage character.

Economic: Protecting and enhancing Lowestoft’s heritage may help to boost the town’s appeal to visitors. Having no policy may have a negative impact on tourism and investment if heritage is lost as a result.
Meeting Open Space Needs

3.4.15. Stressing the importance of high quality, well-managed open spaces in terms of conservation, biodiversity, promoting healthy lifestyles and as a focus for community activities, national government planning policy seeks to protect and enhance open space and recreation facilities. PPG17 promotes the creation of high quality open spaces which are accessible and well-suited to the needs of the communities they serve. The Waveney Open Space Needs Assessment conducted in 2006 highlighted the deficiency of green spaces and play space for children across Lowestoft. Creating high quality open spaces as part of new developments whilst promoting the improvement and accessibility of existing open spaces is therefore a key component of the AAP.

3.4.16. Policy DM25 of the Development Management Policies and supporting text sets out requirements for open space provision within the district. All residential development within the AAP must ensure that these standards are met, and that new and enhanced open spaces meet the requirements of the existing communities, as well as future residents. Open Spaces must be designed to the highest standards and include a range of activities for a diverse population.

3.4.17. The AAP currently contains significant existing open space at East of England Park (north of the Birds Eye factory) which is currently poorly maintained with few facilities. Development within the AAP will seek to enhance this space.

3.4.18. An area of private open space forms part of the Jeld Wen site and is identified within the AAP proposals currently used as football pitches. This space is included within the Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo Strategic Site and should be considered as part of a future strategic masterplan for this area. The space is outside of the flood zone and therefore presents a sequentially more acceptable location for residential development within the strategic site and consideration should be given to developing the area for residential development or other sensitive uses. However, it will be expected that a like-for-like reprovision will be provided within the strategic site in a location with higher flood risk. This may also form part of site-wide attenuation measures. Further guidance is provided within Section 3.

EHC 3 – Open Space

The following areas of open space will be protected and enhanced within the AAP to become publicly accessible areas for recreation.

- East of England Park
- Playing fields adjacent to Jeld Wen (or like-for-like reprovision within the Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo site).

All strategic sites will provide appropriate areas of open space to serve site users. This will include formal squares, pocket parks and other incidental areas. Street furniture including seating, signage, bins and public art will be included into the design of these spaces.

All new residential development should provide adequate open space for existing and future residents having regard to Policy DM25 of the Development Management Policies.
Large residential development proposals within the area should include, or contribute towards the following types of open space within the AAP area:

- Equipped sites for children’s/ youth play, kick-about areas, formal sports pitches and courts and ancillary facilities.
- Allotments and other food growing areas;
- Small and medium size parks for informal recreation, seating, dog walking etc.

These areas will include appropriate play and recreational provision to serve the entire AAP areas and surrounding neighbourhoods. These areas will also include areas for habitat enhancements.

**Key Policy Links and Evidence Base**

- National Policy
  - PPG17
- Regional Policy
  - East of England Plan Policy ENV1
- Waveney Core Strategy Policy
  - CS14
  - CS04
- Waveney Development Management Policies DPD
  - DM25

**Evidence Base Documents / Studies**

- Waveney Open Space Needs Assessment (July 2006)
- Waveney Open Space Strategy (December 2007)

**Alternative Options Considered**

The 2007 AAP Preferred Option identified the potential for enhanced open space at East of England Park and Brooke Peninsula. The inclusion of this policy seeks to provide a specific policy in the AAP to compliment Policy DM25. No alternative option has been considered.

**Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Social**: By protecting and enhancing identified open spaces and requiring developments to contribute to new provision, the preferred policy will enhance the quality of the urban fabric for residents and increase opportunities for pursuing healthy lifestyles. In order to maximise their use and reduce fear of crime, open spaces should incorporate Secure By Design principles. Without a policy, open space provision would depend on Development Management policies, with no recommendations for improving specific open spaces.

- **Environmental**: The policy provides the basis for establishing a green infrastructure network which supports a diverse range of flora and fauna as well as providing the backdrop for human leisure and recreation. By retaining water and reducing runoff, protecting open spaces may reduce vulnerability to climatic events. Without this policy, the impacts are uncertain, with more reliance on generic, district-wide Development Management policies.

- **Economic**: High quality open spaces provide a focus
for regeneration and improve the setting for local businesses. Improved open spaces may help encourage investment and attract new residents to Lowestoft.

**Biodiversity and Habitats**

3.4.13. Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM29 of the Development Management Policies set out policies to protect and enhance biological and geographical features across the district in order to safeguard valuable habitats, species and geology. The Waveney District Biodiversity Audits undertaken in 2007 identify the following areas within the AAP of biological importance within or adjacent to the AAP area:

- Broads SAC
- Outer Thames Estuary pSPA
- Area between Brooke Peninsula and Kirkley Waterfront (recently designated a County Wildlife Site)
- The Outer Harbour Kittiwake colony (a County Wildlife Site)
- Ness Point (a County Wildlife Site)
- Rustyback Fern (a County Wildlife Site)
- Leathes Ham (a County Wildlife Site adjacent to AAP area)

3.4.14. The Core Strategy seeks to maintain a network of habitats and wildlife corridors to facilitate movement of wildlife populations and allow species to adapt to climate change. Likewise, it will be important to ensure that all new development within the AAP area has regard to existing habitats and consider the potential for the creation of new wildlife areas as part of the sustainable development of area wide proposals.

**EHC 4 – Design for Biodiversity and Habitats**

Development within the AAP area should protect and enhance county wildlife sites and local nature reserves within and adjacent to the AAP area (as identified within Figure 3.1).

All new development should consider the potential for habitat creation through provision of appropriate open space and planting and green/brown roofs. This will be particularly important in the development of derelict brownfield sites where habitats may have been established.

The AAP will seek to facilitate local green and blue corridors to act as ecological networks within the study area. This should include provision of planting along road corridors and the railway to assist in habitat creation and migration, linkages between areas of open space, and the enhancement of waterside areas for habitat creation.

**Key Policy Links and Evidence Base**

- National Policy
  - PPS9
- Regional Policy
  - East of England Plan Policies ENV1, ENV2, ENV3,
  - Waveney Core Strategy Policy
  - CS16
Waveney Development Management Policies DPD
- DM27
- DM29

Evidence Base Documents / Studies
- Lowestoft Biodiversity Audit (December 2007)
- Landscape Character Assessment (April 2008)
- Core Strategy Habitats Screening Report (January 2008)
- Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plans
- Biodiversity Audits

Alternative Options Considered
The previous AAP Preferred Options (2007) did not consider an alternative approach to Biodiversity and Habitats.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EHC 7: Design for Biodiversity and Habitats</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social:** The preferred policy will improve the quality of places where people live by creating a species rich and varied environment. No policy may result in a deterioration of habitats and a loss of biodiversity, although this should be prevented by Development Management Policy DM29.

**Environmental:** The preferred policy will promote the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity by protecting existing habitats and encouraging the establishment of new ones. Like Policy EH6, the policy may help to reduce vulnerability to climate change by limiting the number of hard surfaces which lead to rapid runoff during flood events. Without this policy, the impacts are uncertain, with more reliance on generic, district-wide Development Management policies.

**Economic:** Direct economic impacts are likely to be insignificant although there may be a positive effect on residual land values.
Figure 3.4.1 – Biodiversity and Habitats

**County Wildlife sites:**
1. Harbour Kittiwake Colony
2. Ness Point
3. Lothdings Ham
4. Brooke Peninsula

- Pre-emptive ecological corridors
- Lake Lothing ecological corridor
3.5 Transport, Movement and Linkages

3.5.1. Development proposals within the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area will have significant implications in terms of travel and transport requirements for the people living, working and visiting the area. In order to support the AAP proposals and reduce the impact that traffic congestion could have on them, measures will need to be introduced that reduce reliance on the car for journeys within the town and to improve the sustainable transport network. The Lowestoft Transport Strategy identifies that a key characteristic of travel in the town is that 80% of the people who work in Lowestoft also live there, with the remaining 20% mostly coming from the surrounding Waveney and Great Yarmouth sub-region, with the majority of journeys being locally based and relatively short; however, although 2/3 of all journeys are less than 5km, 55% of them being made by car, 12% by cycling and only 4% by bus.

3.5.2. Lake Lothing creates a significant barrier to movement within the AAP area and across the wider town. This splits the town in two with the main employment area located to the northern side and a sizable population to the south. Crossing Lake Lothing constrains the transport options within the town, with two lifting bridges crossing at the eastern and western ends of the town and so forming bottlenecks where several roads merge into one. The only crossings of the river for pedestrians are footpaths as part of the bridges, with no separate provision. Both of the bridges are also heavily trafficked and have narrow footpaths. The only off-road crossing of Lake Lothing for cyclists is at the Oulton Broad Mutford Lock Bridge, otherwise there is no separate provision and so cyclists can be intimidated by having to use the narrow carriageway crossing or riding illegally/pushing their cycle on the footway with pedestrians.

3.5.3. Policy CS15 in the Waveney Core Strategy states that the District Council will work with strategic stakeholders to put in place the necessary transport infrastructure to facilitate the regeneration of Lowestoft, including a long-term ambition to create a third vehicular crossing over Lake Lothing. Other key priorities in the AAP area include:

- Increasing pedestrian and cycle links to and along the waterfront and increasing the accessibility of employment and leisure uses in the town centres
- Completion of an east-west spine road to connect key development sites south of Lake Lothing to the wider urban fabric of Lowestoft
- Provision of accessible retail facilities and social infrastructure within easy walking distance of major new development sites
Sustainable Transport

3.5.4. National planning policy set out within PPG13 encourages local authorities should use planning and land use policies to promote accessible development that encourages the use of sustainable modes of transport (including walking, cycling and public transport) as a priority alternative to the car. The Lowestoft Transport Strategy prepared by Suffolk County Council sets out a long-term framework for transport planning in Lowestoft and seeks to reduce over-reliance on car use for short, local journeys within the town.

3.5.5. Development proposals within the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area will seek to reduce reliance on car use for journeys within the AAP area through the promotion of a range of sustainable transport modes in accordance with the Lowestoft Transport Strategy.

3.5.6. There will be limited public funding for new transport infrastructure during the plan period and the Council will seek to ensure that new development within the AAP area contributes to provision of an overall network of improved cycle, pedestrian and public transport routes as proposed in the AAP and illustrated in Figures 3.5.1 and 3.5.2.

3.5.7. The Council will seek to ensure that new development will have an acceptable impact on and relationship to, existing infrastructure, and that suitable additional infrastructure is provided where necessary.

TML1 – Sustainable Transport Infrastructure

Within the AAP area development and transport will be planned in order to reduce the need to travel and provide a comprehensive network for cyclists, pedestrians and public transport that covers the entire AAP area, with strong linkages to other parts of the town and sub-region.

Development proposals will be assessed in terms of impact on the road network, traffic capacity, highway safety, environmental impact of traffic generated, pedestrian and cycle accessibility and availability and access to public transport. The Council will require mitigation measures to be provided to the satisfaction of the highway authority where necessary.

Developers will either make direct provision of the necessary transport infrastructure relating to their site, or will contribute to an overall fund for provision of identified transport improvements within the AAP area. A mixture of the two approaches may also be acceptable.

Contributions will be negotiated between the developer and the Council, taking into account viability of development at the time.

All new development must include provision to reduce reliance on private car use to include secure cycle storage, showering facilities and car clubs.

The Council will also ensure that provision for new transport technologies are included as part of new developments such as electric car charging points.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

- National Policy
- PPS1
Evidence Base Documents / Studies

- Lowestoft Transport Strategy (October 2007)
- Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2006 – 2011
- AAP Proposals Transport Assessment (TBC)
- Emerging site-specific Traffic Impact Assessments (Power Park; Peto Sq)

Alternative Options Considered

The 2007 AAP Preferred Option identified movement by all non-car modes as a fundamental aim of the AAP. No further options have been considered.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TML1 – Sustainable Transport</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social:** The preferred policy will increase opportunities for walking and cycling to local destinations which will improve health and wellbeing. The policy will help to increase access to local services and tackle the exclusion of households who do not have access to a car. Without a policy in place, car dependency is more likely to be designed into the urban fabric.

**Environmental:** The policy seeks to address car dependency and in doing so, will help to reduce emissions that contribute to climate change, improve air quality and reduce traffic. Without this policy context, these environmental benefits are less likely to come about.

**Economic:** The preferred policy will help to revitalise the town centre by increasing the safety and cleanliness of the pedestrian environment.

Pedestrian and Cycle Network

3.5.8. In reducing the need to travel by car, the potential exists within the AAP area to enhance facilities for pedestrians and cyclists through the creation of new routes, connections and provision of appropriate facilities. The Council will ensure that all new development provides high quality routes and facilities for pedestrians and cyclists either within the scheme, or through contributions.
TML2 – Pedestrian and Cycle Network Improvements

Development will provide a support a comprehensive network for cyclists and pedestrians that covers the entire AAP area, with strong linkages to other parts of the town. This will include the reallocation of road space, crossing facilities and new pedestrian/cycling bridges across Lake Lothing at Peto Square and Brooke Peninsula. Pedestrian and cycle linkages will be enhanced to Lowestoft, Oulton Broad South and Oulton Broad North stations to assist in promoting rail as a transport mode. The following facilities will be sought by the Council during the AAP plan period (as illustrated in Figure 3.5.1):

- New pedestrian and cycle crossings across Lake Lothing between Brooke Peninsula and the North Quay area, and to the west of the existing Bascule Bridge in the defined zones illustrated in Figure 3.5.1. These should be designed to include the following characteristics as requested by AAP:
  - 30-35 metres high
  - 20 metres dredging channel width to accommodate 17 metre dredger.
  - Or 24 hour maintenance and operation of swing/ lift bridge and 20 metres width channel.
- Lake Lothing waterfront pedestrian and cycle route, following the southern shore of Lake Lothing between Bascule Bridge and Mutford Bridge;
- Improved footways along the following new/upgraded vehicular routes to include appropriate width for pedestrians, cycles and mobility scooters:
  - New routes within Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo/Kirkley Waterfront sites
  - PowerPark as part of improved public realm
  - Denmark Road/Peto Way corridor
- Secure cycle parking at the following key destinations:
  - Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo (adjacent to new community and retail facilities)
  - Kirkley Waterfront (adjacent to all new employment development)
  - Kirkley Rise (adjacent to new community facilities)
  - Peto Square (within new public space)
  - Station (as part of interchange facilities)
  - PowerPark (adjacent to all new employment development)

Pedestrian and cycle routes will be constructed using high quality materials following the palette established within the Lowestoft Design Guide (May 2004). New cycle routes will provide safe connections with the existing cycle network in the town (in particular Sustrans route 30 and the coastal path).

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

- National Policy
  - PPS1
  - PPG13
- Regional Policy
  - Regional Transport Strategy (East of England Plan Policies T1 – T15)
- Waveney Core Strategy Policy
  - CS15
  - CS04

Evidence Base Documents / Studies

- Lowestoft Transport Strategy (October 2007)
- Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2006 – 2011
- AAP Proposals Transport Assessment (TBC)
- Emerging site-specific Traffic Impact Assessments (Power Park; Peto Sq)
Alternative Options Considered

The 2007 AAP Preferred Option identified movement by all non-car modes as a fundamental aim of the AAP. No further options have been considered.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TML2 - Pedestrian and Cycle Network Improvements</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social:** The preferred policy will increase opportunities for walking and cycling to local destinations which will improve health and wellbeing. The policy will help to increase access to local services and tackle the exclusion of households who do not have access to a car. Without a policy in place, car dependency is more likely to be designed into the urban fabric.

**Environmental:** The policy seeks to address car dependency and in doing so, will help to reduce emissions that contribute to climate change, improve air quality and reduce traffic. Without this policy context, these environmental benefits are less likely to arise.

**Economic:** The preferred policy will help to revitalise the town centre by increasing the safety and cleanliness of the pedestrian environment.
Figure 3.5.1 – Pedestrian and Cycle Network Improvements
Public Transport Network

3.5.9. The Lake Lothing/Outer Harbour Area is currently served by Lowestoft Central Railway Station, with Oulton Broad North and Oulton South Stations serving the western area. The area is also served by a number of bus routes. Despite this the Lowestoft Transport Strategy identifies that despite the majority of journeys in the town being locally based (2/3 of all journeys are less than 5km), only 4% are by bus, and less than 1% by rail.

TML3 – Public Transport Network

Development in the AAP area should seek to improve the public transport network in the AAP area by introducing the following measures:

- The creation of an enhanced rail/bus/taxi/cycle interchange at Lowestoft Station with sheltered waiting facilities, seating and real-time information;
- Provision of sheltered waiting facilities, seating and real-time information at key transport nodes identified within Figure 3.5.2;
- Introduction of high frequency shuttle bus services connecting strategic sites within the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour AAP area and wider town/sub-region;
- The introduction of bus priority measures within strategic sites and at key junctions within the AAP area;
- The promotion of increased frequency rail routes to Norwich and Ipswich;
- The promotion of water-borne public transport such as water taxis.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

National Policy
- PPS1
- PPG13

Regional Policy
- Regional Transport Strategy (East of England Plan Policies T1 – T15)
- Waveney Core Strategy Policy
- CS15
- CS04

Evidence Base Documents / Studies

- Lowestoft Transport Strategy (October 2007)
- Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2006 – 2011
- AAP proposals Transport Assessment (TBC)
- Emerging site-specific Traffic Impact Assessments (Power Park; Peto Sq)
- Lowestoft Station and North Peto Square – Feasibility Study of Development Options (October 2009)

Alternative Options Considered

The 2007 AAP Preferred Option identified movement by all non-car modes as a fundamental aim of the AAP. No further options have been considered.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TML3 - Public Transport Network</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: By improving the quality and frequency of services, the preferred policy will increase the relative attractiveness of public transport. The policy will help to increase access to local services and tackle the exclusion of households who do not have access to a car. Without a policy in place, car dependency is less likely to be addressed comprehensively. In addition, if public transport capacity does not expand as Lowestoft's population increases, access may deteriorate.
Environmental: The policy seeks to address car dependency and in doing so, will help to reduce emissions that contribute to climate change, improve air quality and reduce traffic. Without this policy context, these environmental benefits are less likely to arise. Congestion in particular is likely to get worse without transport improvements as Lowestoft's population increases.

Economic: The preferred policy will help to revitalise the town centre by reducing congestion. New links and better services will help to connect people with places of employment as well as facilitating smoother operation of supply chains.
Figure 3.5.2 – Public Transport Network Improvements
Lowestoft Station

3.5.10. Lowestoft Station is located at a strategic location within the AAP area, close to the town centre and Bascule Bridge. The Suffolk Rail Strategy (February 2007) contains a long term priority to increase frequency of train services to and from Lowestoft, and considerable potential exists to enhance rail facilities within the town. Previous versions of the AAP have investigated the potential to move the station in order to facilitate expansion of the town centre.

3.5.11. Since the production of the 2007 AAP Preferred Option 1st East has commissioned the Lowestoft Station and North Peto Square Feasibility Study of Development Options which investigated different options to move the station. This sets out a preferred approach that would see the station building move 40 metres to the south and 80 metres to the west, utilising the area of disused sidings. This would then provide a significant development site with potential linkages to the waterfront.

TML4 – Lowestoft Station

Lowestoft Station will be improved to include the following facilities:
- New ticket hall and waiting area;
- Covered platforms
- Bus/Taxi interchange with sheltered waiting facilities

The Council will support the relocation of the Lowestoft Station from its existing location by approximately 40 metres to the south and 80 metres west, in order to release a significant parcel of land for redevelopment in North Peto Square between Denmark Road and Commercial Road.

Extending Katwijk Way southwards across existing railway lands to Commercial Road will provide a new entrance to the Port land and facilitate the development of the station site, and land between Commercial Road and the waterfront for town centre uses.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

- National Policy
  - PPS1
  - PPG13
- Regional Policy
  - Regional Transport Strategy (East of England Plan Policies T1 – T15)
- Waveney Core Strategy Policy
  - CS15
  - CS04

Evidence Base Documents / Studies

- Lowestoft Transport Strategy (October 2007)
- Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2006 – 2011
- AAP proposals Transport Assessment (TBC)
- Suffolk Rail Strategy (February 2007)
- Emerging site-specific Traffic Impact Assessments (Power Park; Peto Sq)
- Lowestoft Station and North Peto Square – Feasibility Study of Development Options (October 2009)

Alternative Options Considered

A feasibility study prepared by consultants in October 2009 considered a total of 11 different development options for Lowestoft Station and North Peto Square. The ‘40:80’ option was deemed to strike the optimum balance between commercial viability, technical feasibility and acceptability in the eyes of key stakeholders and landowners.
The previous Preferred Options AAP (January 2007) proposed relocating the station 400 metres to the west of its existing location. This proposal met with strong objections from both the public and technical stakeholders. Moving the station so far from the town centre was deemed to be commercially unacceptable, operationally disruptive and technically unproven.

### Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TML4 – Lowestoft Station</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Previous Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Social:
The preferred 40:80 development will enable the creation of a transport interchange which may increase the accessibility of town centre facilities. The previous option would reduce the accessibility of the town centre and waterfront by rail. No policy would have little social impact.

#### Environmental:
The 40:80 proposal may help to reduce traffic congestion around the station and Bascule bridge. The relocation could involve the loss of heritage if the original station building / frontage is not retained. The relocation may also lead to the loss of buildings within a conservation area as part of the Peto Square proposals. By moving the station so far from the town centre, the previous policy option would damage local heritage character. No policy would have little environmental impact.

#### Economic:
The preferred 40:80 proposal would enable a significant retail development which would help to revitalise the town centre and improve connections with Lake Lothing's waterfront. No policy will have little economic impact directly but may limit the growth potential of the town centre.

### New Streets and Vehicular Routes

3.5.12. In order to facilitate development a series of road improvements will be required dependant on securing appropriate levels of funding from central government and developments within the town. These improvements are set out within the Lowestoft Transport Strategy. As a long term ambition for the town a third crossing has been identified to provide a further vehicular connection across Lake Lothing. This is expected to come forward beyond the AAP plan period and will be subject to further feasibility work by the highways authorities. However, it will be expected that developers will work with the Council to ensure that proposals will not restrict the future potential for a new crossing.

3.5.13. In creating new vehicular routes and streets to access new development exemplary standards of design should be utilised to integrate new streets with surrounding areas and to provide a safe, human scale environment. Manual for Streets (2007) was produced by the Department of Transport and seeks to reduce the impact of vehicles on residential streets through intelligent and proactive design that gives a high priority to the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport. Development in the AAP area must ensure these principles are embedded into the design of residential streets from the outset of design.
TML5 – New Streets and Vehicular Routes

All new streets will be developed to include high quality space and crossing provision for pedestrians and cyclists. Residential streets will be designed in accordance with the principles set out within the Manual for Streets.

The Lake Lothing Southern Access Road will be developed in order to facilitate the development of Kirkley Waterfront, Brooke Peninsula and Sanyo. All development within this location will be required to contribute to this provision.

An indicative route for the Southern Access Road is provided within Figure 3.5.3. A final route will be defined as part of a development brief to be prepared for the area prior to any planning application being determined.

Support will be given to a new access into ABP land north of Lake Lothing (currently via Commercial Road). The potential for new access via Harbour Road, or a new railway crossing will be supported by the Council in bringing forward the redevelopment of Peto Square.

Development within the AAP area will support improvements to the alignment of Denmark Road/Peto Way corridor as set out in the Lowestoft Transport Strategy to include improved pedestrian and cycle provision and to reduce the impact on properties fronting the road.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

- National Policy
  - PPS1
  - PPG13
- Regional Policy
  - Regional Transport Strategy (East of England Plan Policies T1 – T15)
- Waveney Core Strategy Policy
  - CS15
  - CS04

Evidence Base Documents / Studies

- Lowestoft Transport Strategy (October 2007)
- Technical Note – Lowestoft Highway Scheme Option Testing (April 2007)
- A12 Lowestoft Study – Lake Lothing Third Crossing Feasibility Study (February 2009)
- AAP proposals Transport Assessment (TBC)
- Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2006 – 2011
- Emerging site-specific Traffic Impact Assessments (Power Park; Peto Sq)]

Alternative Options Considered

The Lowestoft Transport Strategy identifies the potential for a southern access road in order to facilitate the redevelopment of the area south of Lake Lothing. This also considers the potential for a third crossing. Whilst the third crossing is unlikely to come forward during the AAP, there will be a requirement to provide a number of new road connections to facilitate development. The Council and 1st East will continue to work with Suffolk County Council and the Highways Agency during the AAP preparation process to further define these routes.
### Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TML5 – New Streets and Vehicular Routes</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social**: The key routes set out in the preferred policy will promote better access to services by existing and future residents of Lowestoft. Without these routes, access to services may deteriorate as the population of the town increases.

**Environmental**: The routes identified in the policy will help accommodate transport demands associated with future growth in Lowestoft. Without new routes, traffic levels are likely to increase.

**Economic**: Without these routes, development will be more isolated from the surrounding urban fabric of Lowestoft.
Figure 3.5.3 – New Streets and Vehicular Route Improvements
Parking in the AAP area

3.5.14. Parking standards for the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour AAP are countywide Suffolk Advisory Parking Standards adopted in 2002. These may be subject to review during the plan period. Car parking standards are expressed as maximum standards whereas cycle parking standards are expressed as minimum standards. Residential parking standards are intended to provide adequate parking in private homes, but avoiding inefficient use of land or developments being dominated by parked vehicles. There may be scope for reducing residential parking provision within the AAP area if brought forward in accordance with AAP Policies TML1, 2 and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TML6– Parking in the AAP area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council will seek to maintain adequate levels of public car parking to support the town centre and employment areas. The potential may exist for a new car park to serve the station and town centre as part of the Peto Square proposals, providing access issues can be overcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking in new development will be minimised as far as is practical through the incorporation of the following measures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More efficient use of existing car parks (as illustrated in Figure 3.5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusion of car clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved access to existing car parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balancing car parking needs with the need to minimise reliance on car travel in accordance with the approach set out in the approach to Sustainable Transport as set out in AAP Policies TML 1, 2, 3 and 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Policy Links and Evidence Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PPS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PPG13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Transport Strategy (East of England Plan Policies T1 – T15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waveney Core Strategy Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CS15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CS04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Base Documents / Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lowestoft Transport Strategy (October 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2006 – 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AAP proposals Transport Assessment (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emerging site-specific Traffic Impact Assessments (Power Park; Peto Sq)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lowestoft Station and North Peto Square – Feasibility Study of Development Options (October 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Options Considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 2007 AAP Preferred Option advocated the application of the council’s parking standards as set out in the Development Control Policies DPD. The current approach takes a similar approach but goes further by setting out potential measures to minimise car dependence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TML6 - Parking in the AAP Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred Option</strong></td>
<td><strong>No Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>Major Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Minor Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−−</td>
<td>Major Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social:** By encouraging car clubs and minimising spaces in residential development, the preferred policy will help to tackle the exclusion of households who do not have access to a car. Without a policy in place, car dependency is unlikely to be addressed as extensively although Suffolk County Council parking standards will prevent negative impacts.

**Environmental:** By encouraging car clubs and minimising spaces in residential development, the policy seeks to address car dependency and in doing so, will help to reduce emissions that contribute to climate change, improve air quality and reduce traffic. Without this policy context, these environmental benefits are less likely to arise although Suffolk County Council parking standards will prevent negative impacts.

**Economic:** The preferred policy will help to revitalise the town centre by increasing the safety and cleanliness of the pedestrian environment and ensuring accessibility. The policy will help to ensure employment areas are attractive to prospective businesses.

### Transport Assessment and Travel Plans

**3.5.15.** Where a new development is likely to have significant transport implications, a Transport Assessment should be prepared and submitted by the developer with a planning application for the development. It will then be used to determine whether the impact of the development on transport is acceptable. It identifies what measures will be taken to deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the scheme and to improve accessibility and safety for all modes of travel, particularly for all modes of travel, particularly for alternatives to the car such as walking, cycling and public transport.

**3.5.16.** Workplace and school travel plans are intended to promote more sustainable transport choices for journeys to work or school, for example by walking, cycling, public transport, car sharing, pool cars or home working. The Regional Transport Strategy encourages the use of workplace travel plans and Suffolk County Council is promoting travel planning for schools and major employers. The Council will encourage the use of Travel Plans to ensure that genuine travel choices are available to and from proposed major developments. Conditions may be attached to planning permissions requiring occupiers to implement Travel Plans with agreed targets. Preparation of these plans will be required for all non-residential developments over the thresholds for Transport Assessments.
Proposals for major development in the AAP area will be accompanied by a Transport Assessment demonstrating how the proposal seeks to minimise the need to travel and encourage journeys by sustainable modes. The Transport Assessment should also demonstrate what infrastructure or service improvements are needed if the development cannot be accompanied within the existing transport network. The local planning authority will determine whether planning applications in the AAP area require a submission of a Transport Assessment, based upon Department for Transport guidance.

Unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority, all proposals for non-residential development in the AAP must be accompanied by a Travel Plan which encourages the use of sustainable modes of travel and enables agreed modal split targets to be achieved. Planning permission, where necessary, will be subject to planning obligations and/or planning conditions to secure the implementation of the travel plan.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

National Policy
- PPS1
- PPG13

Regional Policy
- Regional Transport Strategy (East of England Plan Policies T1 – T15)
  Waveney Core Strategy Policy
- CS15
- CS04

Evidence Base Documents / Studies
- Lowestoft Transport Strategy (October 2007)
- Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2006 – 2011
- Emerging site-specific Traffic Impact Assessments (Power Park; Peto Sq)

Alternative Options Considered
The 2007 AAP Preferred Option identified movement by all non-car modes as a fundamental aim of the AAP. No further options have been considered.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

**Social:** By requiring the submission of a TA and Travel Plans, the preferred policy will ensure that opportunities to promote sustainable transport choices are explored from an early stage. This will help to increase access to local services and tackle the exclusion of households who do not have access to a car. Without a policy in place, car dependency is more likely to be designed into the urban fabric.

**Environmental:** The policy seeks to address car dependency and in doing so, will help to reduce emissions that contribute to climate change, improve air quality and reduce traffic. Without this policy context, these environmental benefits are less likely to arise.

**Economic:** By encouraging sustainable transport modes, the preferred policy will help to revitalise town centres by increasing the safety and cleanliness of the pedestrian environment.
3.6 Flood Risk Management

Overview

3.6.1. The Core Strategy and Development Management DPDs identify that Waveney District will be disproportionately affected by climate change, rises in river and sea levels, frequent summer droughts and winter flooding. The Council is seeking to mitigate and adapt to climate change through a combined approach to planning policy and other delivery mechanisms. Development within the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area will be particularly affected by the future effects of climate change due to its coastal location and presence of Lake Lothing, placing much of the AAP area within flood zones 2 or 3. The AAP therefore seeks to adopt a strategy approach to managing future risks from flooding.

3.6.2. National guidance on development within areas at risk of flood is set out within PPS 25. This seeks to ensure development should not be undertaken in areas at risk of flood unless the “Sequential Test” and “Exception Test” can be demonstrated, and where development is acceptable a “Sequential Approach” to site level development should be adopted.

Flood Risk and the PPS25 Sequential Test

3.6.3. The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour AAP area is defined by its proximity to both the coast and Lake Lothing. As such, flood risk is a key consideration which will affect the viability of regeneration and development proposals. PPS25, published shortly before the Preferred Options AAPs, sets out guidance for managing flood risk through the planning and development process. It advocates the use of the sequential test, which aims to steer development to areas at lowest flood risk. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Core Strategy provide the basis from which to apply the sequential test and provide a justification for redevelopment of the area. The SFRA defines the extents of the flood zones for the area that it covers. There are four classifications for flood zones, as defined in PPS25:

| Zone 1 | Low probability (less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding in any year). |
| Zone 2 | Medium probability (between 1 in 100 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river flooding or between 1 in 200 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of sea flooding in any year). |
| Zone 3a | High probability (1 in 100 or greater annual probability of river flooding in any year or 1 in 200 or greater annual probability of sea flooding in any given year). |
| Zone 3b | High probability (1 in 20 or greater annual probability of flooding). Is classified as functional floodplain. |
Flood risk is illustrated in Figure 3.6.1.

Figure 3.6.1 - Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Flood Risk Areas

3.6.4. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Waveney initially indicated that the majority of the AAP area falls within Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b, with flood risk increasing over the next century due to the impacts of climate change including anticipated sea level rise. The Cumulative Land Raising Study provides an addendum to the SFRA and clarified, with agreement from the Environment Agency, that despite having a 1 in 20 annual flood probability, the area did not serve as a functional flood plain and a classification of Flood Zone 3a is more appropriate.

The PPS25 Exception Test

3.6.5. Development of uses defined as highly or more vulnerable in PPS25, including housing, is generally not permitted in Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, PPS25 also introduces the ‘Exception Test’ which establishes the principles that vulnerable development types may be acceptable within high flood risk zones in certain exceptional circumstances. Through the application of the Exception Test, vulnerable land uses may be permitted if the developer:

- Can demonstrate that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk,
- Locates development on previously-developed land or, if it is not on previously developed land, that there are no reasonable alternative sites on developable previously-developed land; and
- Prepares a Flood Risk Assessment which demonstrates that the development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce overall flood risk.
3.6.6. AAP proposals have been subjected to the PPS 25 sequential and exception tests as set out within the Core Strategy. This identified that development of new housing within Flood Zones 2 and 3a inside the AAP area would be acceptable based on its contribution to regeneration objectives of the AAP and Core Strategy Policy CS05. Policy CS03 of the Waveney Core Strategy permits the. Outside the boundaries of the AAP, Policy CS03 does not permit the allocation of land for vulnerable uses in Flood Zones 2 and 3a.

The Sequential Approach

3.6.7. All sites within the AAP must be developed using the sequential approach. The sequential approach seeks to direct the uses of highest vulnerability within a site to the areas of lowest flood risk within a site.

3.6.8. Extensive flood modelling was undertaken as part of the SFRA which included modelling of breaches to the flood defences. Flood depth and flood velocity hazard maps generated from this modelling exercise is included in Appendix 1. Figure A23 from the SFRA is reproduced as Figure 3.6.2 and demonstrates the extent of high, medium, low and no Hazard within the AAP area based upon existing conditions with no improvement to defences. These maps demonstrate site level flood risks based upon a range of flood scenarios and must inform site level design and planning.
A strategic approach to Flood Risk Management

3.6.9. The SFRA stresses the role of SUDS in reducing flood risk, stating that developments within Lowestoft should aim to mimic green field runoff rates by incorporating SUDS into development designs to limit runoff to surrounding areas. In addition, steps should be taken to improve the tidal outfall systems to limit tide locking.

3.6.10. The SFRA and accompanying cumulative land raising study set out the potential for a range of strategic mitigation measures to address flood risk within the AAP strategic sites, in particular land raising and upgrading of existing flood defences.

3.6.11. This identified and undertook breach modelling based upon locations for land raising It also provided an assessment of, and potential for the upgrade of existing flood defences. The cumulative land raising study concluded that land raising has little impact on the remaining flood cell. It also stated that whilst some of the AAP sites at present may be at risk of tidal flooding from a 1 in 20 scenario due to insufficient defences, they do not operate as functional floodplain and should instead of Flood Zone 3b be classified as Flood Zone 3a at risk of tidal flooding from a 1 in 20 scenario.

3.6.12. Although many of the AAP proposals have been altered since the SFRA and Cumulative Land Raising study were undertaken it is considered that these studies provide sufficient evidence to support AAP proposals. Figure 3.6.2 illustrates locations for potential land raising, or other attenuation measures, as well as locations for upgraded defences. In particular the new Southern Access Road may provide the potential to form part of the flood defence system.

The Shoreline Management Plan

3.6.13. A shoreline management plan (SMP) has been produced for Lowestoft Ness to Landguard Point (Sub-Cell 3c). This was published in January 2007.

3.6.14. The SMP recommendeds that future development in locations adjacent to the shoreline (in particular PowerPark) should recognise increased risk of flooding caused by climate change and that floor levels and the type of development should be appropriately considered. The space behind the existing defences should be maintained to allow for defence raising. Given this on-going risk of flooding, even if only on more extreme events, there is a need to continue to provide flood warning for the area and to maintain an emergency plan for the area.

FRM1 – Flood Risk and Emergency Planning

All development within the AAP will require a site specific Flood Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 25. The Environment Agency will be a statutory consultee for those developments that are located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and those greater than 1 hectare in size (in Flood Zone 1). Due to the sensitivities relating to development and flood risk in the AAP area, the Environment Agency may also wish to be consulted on sites which are located in Flood Zone 1 and are less than 1 hectare in size. This is in order to keep a strategic overview of development and flood risk in the AAP area.

Potential locations for strategic flood risk mitigation measures are included in Figure 3.6.2. New development must
provide contributions to ensure flood defences are maintained and upgraded as appropriate in accordance with the SFRA and Shoreline Management Plan (Sub-Cell 3C).

All development within the Flood Zones 2 and 3 must incorporate flood mitigation measures to protect the site and existing development, whilst ensuring high standards of urban design. The Flood Risk Assessments for those developments located within Flood Zone 1 should concentrate on the safe disposal of surface water. All Flood Risk Assessments must consider cumulative impacts of development and demonstrate that development does not increase off site flood risk.

Developments within the AAP area should demonstrate application of the precautionary principle and the sequential approach within the site. Development will be required through planning applications to demonstrate that the following considerations have been taken into account in bringing development forward.

Proposals must demonstrate how flood risk is to be mitigated through inclusion of appropriate mitigation measures to include:
- Land raising
- Incorporation of secondary flood defences
- Sustainable drainage systems

At the detailed design stage, developers should demonstrate how buildings have been designed to maximise resilience flood events through:
- The incorporation of safe escape routes to areas outside high flood risk areas in accordance with table 13.1 of FD2320/TR2 (http://www.hydres.co.uk)
- Situating habitable uses above the flood level
- Positioning service meters and electrical sockets above likely flood levels
- Use of appropriate flood-resilient materials.

All development within the Flood Zone must be accompanied by a flood evacuation plan to be produced in accordance with the LPA emergency planner.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

National Policy
- Planning and Climate Change: Supplement to PPS1
- PPS25
- PPS25 Practice Guide (December 2009)
- Defra/EA R&D project FD2320 “Flood Risk Assessment Guidance for New Development”

Regional Policy
- East of England Plan Policy WAT4

Waveney Core Strategy Policy
- CS03
- CS04

Waveney Development Management Policies DPD
- DM06
- DM07

Evidence Base Documents / Studies
- Waveney and Suffolk Coastal District Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (February 2008)
- Cumulative Land Raising Study – Addendum to the SFRA (June 2008)
- The Sequential Approach to Flood Risk in Lowestoft (February 2008)
- Shoreline Management Plan for Kelling to Lowestoft Ness
Alternative Options Considered

The 2007 AAP Preferred Option identified Flood Risk as a key consideration within the AAP Spatial Strategy. This Policy has been refined in consultation with the Environment Agency and an alternative approach has not been considered.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

Social: The preferred policy will ensure that new housing is of a high quality and resilient to the likely impacts of climate change.

Environmental: Without a policy, developments may come forward which increase Lowestoft's exposure to and reduce resilience to flooding. Nevertheless, the AAP allocates development sites in areas of high flood risk and the preferred policy therefore seeks to ensure flood risk is minimised and resilience during flood events is maximised.

Economic: The preferred policy is likely to increase costs for developers. Nevertheless, by providing a comprehensive approach to flooding across the entire AAP area, the preferred policy may help to increase developer certainty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRM1 – Flood Risk and Emergency Planning</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.6.2 – Potential Flood Risk Management Measures
3.7 Water, Energy and Waste

3.7.1. Tackling climate change is a key Government priority for the planning system as set out in PPS1Planning and Climate Change - Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 which sets out how planning should contribute to reducing emissions and stabilising climate change and take into account the unavoidable consequences.

3.7.2. Development within the AAP must seek to support these central principles of sustainable development and provide measures to ensure that development reduces carbon emissions through the provision of efficient building design and renewable technologies.

Energy Requirements within the AAP Area

3.7.3. Policies DM03 and DM04 of the Waveney Development Management Policies DPD set out the following targets to reduce carbon emissions within development:

- 215 GWh of renewable energy by 2020 (around 30% of total electricity demand)
- 157 GWh of renewable heat by 2020 (around 12% of total heat demands)
- At least Code for Sustainable Homes Code Level 4 for all new homes by 2013
- All non-residential development to achieve BREEAM “Very Good” Certification
- All new buildings to achieve a 15% reduction in residual CO2 emissions after Building Regulations Part L compliance has been demonstrated.

3.7.4. Development within the AAP area is well placed to assist in meeting these targets and a co-ordinated approach is appropriate in considering how these targets should be met. The AAP seeks to facilitate this through the identification of an area specific policy.

3.7.5. The Waveney Renewable Energy and Sustainable Construction Study models the evolving energy profile of Waveney over time until 2025. This identifies a changing energy profile for the AAP area, due to the improvement and changes in consumer behaviour in existing buildings and due to the addition of energy demand from new development in the area.

3.7.6. New development will increase energy demands within the AAP area. Part L of the Building Regulations requires that buildings meet minimum energy efficiency standards. These standards have been applied to the quantum and assumed mix of housing. In addition, increased energy performance in line with the proposed changes to Building Regulations Part L
requirements which will take effect in 2010, 2013 and 2016 have been taken into consideration, along with the expected changes to Regulations affecting non-residential buildings leading up to zero carbon in 2019. Similarly, CIBSE TM46 benchmarks were used to model energy demand of future non-residential buildings, with a 25% reduction to account for the higher energy efficiency standards in new buildings compared to the existing buildings which the benchmark figures were derived from. The study states that wind energy will play a particularly important role in meeting the renewable energy targets, and given the District’s established connection to the wind energy industry, wind energy could be an important cornerstone of the economy in the future.

Although there is potentially sufficient wind resource to meet Waveney’s renewable electricity requirements, localised factors may limit deliverability and as such should not be solely relied upon. Biomass CHP could also be an important part of the renewables mix, particularly in the AAP area where existing heat densities could be utilised to develop heat networks supplied by CHP units.

3.7.8. Compiling the various key energy opportunities across the District for renewable and low carbon energy, the study sets out an ‘Energy Opportunities Plan’ for Lowestoft. This is illustrated in Figure 3.7.1 below:

![Figure 3.7.1 – Energy Opportunities Plan (Source: Waveney Renewables and Sustainable Construction Study)](image)

3.7.9. The analysis of resource potential in Waveney District has shown that there is significant potential to be exploited, which will allow Waveney District
to meet or exceed its proportion of the national renewable energy targets. Wind power and utilization of biomass for CHP or heating are highlighted as key opportunities. The AAP seeks to support the optimization of these opportunities through a policy approach for the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area.

### WEW1 – Energy Requirements within the AAP Area

All development within the AAP area will be required to explore the potential for on-site renewable energy generation.

Within the main strategic sites (Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo/Kirkley Waterfront/Peto Square/Power Park) developers must deliver the equivalent of the energy requirements of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 (in residential buildings) and BREEAM excellent (in other buildings) unless these technologies can be proven technically unsuitable or commercially unviable. Investigations should be based on opportunities identified in the Renewable Energy and Sustainable Construction Study.

Within the strategic sites opportunities should be sought to provide linked district heating networks to serve development sites within the AAP area. These will be designed to take advantage of the diversity of energy loads from the different proposed building uses. This process will be supported by 1st East and Waveney District Council. Where a CHP system is delivered on-site, all buildings are required to connect.

An energy strategy and delivery plan must be submitted alongside any planning application for development within the AAP area outlining expected carbon reductions and the viability of exceeding District-wide energy targets on-site.

### Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS1 Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of England Plan Policies ENV7, ENG1, ENG2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waveney Core Strategy Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waveney Development Management Policies DPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidence Base Documents / Studies

- Waveney and Great Yarmouth Water Cycle Study – Scoping Report (March 2009)
- Renewable Energy and Sustainable Construction Study (November 2009)

### Alternative Options Considered

The 2007 AAP Preferred Option identified the potential for new developments to promote the development of renewable energy solutions. This is supported through policies within the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD. An alternative approach has not been considered.
## Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEW1 – Energy Requirements within the AAP Area</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social: The preferred policy will help to improve the quality of new housing and commercial buildings in the AAP area. It will help address social exclusion associated with fuel poverty. Without a policy, improvements in thermal efficiency will depend on building regulations.

### Environmental: The preferred policy will bring about significant environmental benefits. Lower energy demands will help to reduce emissions which contribute to climate change and improve air quality. Without a policy, environmental performance of developments in the AAP area will depend on building regulations.

### Economic: The preferred policy may be associated with higher costs for developers which may inhibit investment. Overhead costs linked to energy use may be reduced for the end user of new buildings. No policy is unlikely to have a significant economic impact.

### Water Efficiency and Quality

The Environment Agency has classified the area managed by Essex and Suffolk Water, which includes Waveney District as one of the most water stressed areas in England (joint first in order of most stressed). Receiving an average annual rainfall less than 600mm, the East of England is the direst region of England and Wales. In comparison, the national average is around 900mm. Taking evaporation into consideration, which can be as much 450mm, means that the level of rainfall restoring aquifers is limited, particularly in times of prolonged drought.

In 2004, the average water consumption per person in Waveney was 154lts per day. The Waveney DC & Great Yarmouth BC – Joint Water Cycle Strategy scoping report (2009) provides a useful baseline and summary of water resources in relation to the impact on proposed growth in the area.

The main water supply in Waveney is surface water abstraction from the River Waveney at Shipmeadow. This is supplemented by a number smaller of groundwater abstraction points. It is the Environment Agency’s view that the River Waveney is over-abstracted and that there is no potential for increasing abstraction from the Chalk aquifer at depth and any abstraction from the shallower Crag layer will only be permitted for non-consumptive purposes such as spray irrigation. The potential for future ground water resource development in this area is therefore severely limited (Scott Wilson, 2009).
The Water Cycle Study concludes that 'overall the Resource Zone covering the Waveney and Great Yarmouth areas both have surplus resources until 2021. Beyond this date with the planned growth, the supply zones will go into supply deficit and this deficit will increase as growth continues until 2025. Therefore, further resources and/or demand management measures will be required beyond 2021.

The Water Cycle Study and Core Strategy identifies capacity constraints to the sewage network in Lowestoft. Development within the AAP area must ensure that such capacity issues are considered in development in accordance with the Water Framework Directive.

**WEW2 – Water efficiency and quality**

Developers must explore the potential to implement water recycling measures on a building or site wide scale to significantly reduce mains water demand as part of all new development within the AAP.

Within the main strategic sites (Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo/Kirkley Waterfront/Peto Square/Power Park) developers must deliver infrastructure to reduce mains water consumption to the equivalent requirement of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 (in residential buildings) and BREEAM excellent (in other buildings) unless these strategies can be proven technically unsuitable or commercially unviable. Investigations should be based on opportunities identified in the area-wide water strategy for the AAP.

Opportunities should be sought to link together development within the AAP with site-wide recycled water networks, taking advantage of the diversity of water sources and uses on-site. This process will be supported by 1st East and Waveney District Council. Where a recycled water network is delivered on-site, all buildings are required to connect.

All development must also consider implications upon the sewage network in Lowestoft, ensuring that capacity is sufficient and in cases where this is not the case appropriate contributions will be required to upgrade the network. Development must ensure that no deterioration in water quality occurs and where possible an improvement will be sought.

A water strategy and delivery plan should be submitted alongside any planning application for development within the AAP area outlining expected mains water demand reductions and the viability of exceeding District-wide water targets on-site.

**Key Policy Links and Evidence Base**

- **National Policy**
  - PPS1
  - Planning and Climate Change: Supplement to PPS1
  - Water Framework Directive
- **Regional Policy**
  - East of England Plan Policies WAT1, WAT2, WAT3
  - Waveney Core Strategy Policy
  - CS02
  - CS04
  - Waveney Development Management Policies DPD
  - DM02
  - DM04

**Evidence Base Documents / Studies**

- Waveney and Great Yarmouth Water Cycle Study – Scoping Report (March 2009)
- Renewable Energy and Sustainable Construction Study (November 2009)
Alternative Options Considered

The 2007 AAP Preferred Option set out requirements for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and Water Conservation. Since 2007 further work has been undertaken in preparing the Core Strategy and Development Management DPDs. The policy approach has been refined in accordance with these documents and has been subject to discussions with the Environment Agency. An alternative approach has not been considered.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEW2 – Water efficiency and quality</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social:** By requiring Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 and BREEAM ‘Excellent’, the preferred policy will improve the quality of new housing and commercial buildings in the AAP area. Without a policy, improvements will depend on Development Management policies.

**Environmental:** The preferred policy will promote more efficient use of water than Development Management Policy DM04. Improvements in water quality will have additional benefits in terms of promoting biodiversity. Having no policy would mean the water efficiency of buildings is determined by Development Management policies. Achieving the highest standards of water efficiency is vital given the existing stress on water supply.

**Economic:** The preferred policy may be associated with higher costs for developers which may inhibit investment. No policy may inhibit future growth as water supplies are strained further.

3.6.4 - Waste

In 2001, the household waste recycling rate in Waveney was approximately 5%. The Audit Commission’s Best Value Performance Indicators (2007/08) demonstrate the improvements that have been made since then as Waveney now recycles nearly 27% of waste, putting Waveney easily into the top quartile for English authorities for recycling performance. Although data is not available for Waveney specifically, most household waste, around 54% in Suffolk is still landfilled. As part of the wider sustainable approach to development within the AAP area it is important that new schemes consider the implications of waste and recycling from the outset. As such a policy has been refined to ensure waste is fully considered in the AAP area at design, construction and post-construction and demolition stages.
WEW3– Waste

Development in the AAP area must use sustainable construction materials that are recycled or locally sourced. Development within the AAP area should seek to minimise the production of waste and reuse demolition materials from within the AAP area where practicable. Recycling facilities must be provided during construction and as an integral part of new developments in the AAP area.

All applications for development in the AAP area should be accompanied by a Demolition and Site Waste Management Plan demonstrating how waste will be managed and recycled during the demolition and construction phases.

Key Policy Links and Evidence Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PPS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning and Climate Change: Supplement to PPS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site Waste Management Plans Regulations (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• East of England Plan Policies WM1, WM2, WM5, WM6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suffolk Waste Core Strategy (consultation draft, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CS02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CS04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waveney Development Management Policies DPD

| • DM02 |
| • DM04 |

Evidence Base Documents / Studies

| • Renewable Energy and Sustainable Construction Study (November2009) |

Alternative Options Considered

The 2007 AAP Preferred Option did not include waste as part of its spatial strategy. The inclusion of a policy specific to the AAP area has been identified as a requirement by the Environment Agency. No alternative option have been considered.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WE4 - Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: No significant social impacts identified.

Environmental: The preferred policy supports reduced waste and re-use of materials during the construction process. No policy may have a detrimental effect because no plans for making best use of resources are required.

Economic: The preferred policy may be associated with higher costs for developers which may inhibit investment. No policy is unlikely to have a significant economic impact.
Part 4
Strategic Site Proposals
Part 4 – Strategic Site Proposals

4.0.1. This section sets out planning and urban design guidelines for the development of strategic sites identified through the AAP preparation process.

4.0.2. These guidelines aim to set out and achieve the following objectives:
- Demonstrate how AAP policies are to be implemented on an area specific basis;
- Provide guidelines for significant development and change, to make the best and most efficient use of brownfield land;
- To ensure that future opportunities in the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area are fully exploited and demonstrate sustainable principles; and
- Establish urban design principles to ensure connectivity and quality across the AAP area and beyond.

4.0.3. Strategic sites are illustrated in Figure 1.6.1. It should be noted that the boundaries of each area are intended to be flexible and there will inevitably be overlap in development principles, parameters and characteristics.

4.0.4. Each strategic site has been identified as having significant opportunities for development and change. Each site represents land that is suitable and likely to become available for redevelopment during the period to 2025. In accordance with the Core Strategy housing figures relate to the period 2007 to 2025, whilst employment figures relate to the period to 2021. For each site, expectations are set out relating to land use, access and urban design. Leading and supporting uses are specified to direct the nature of mixed use development. These are accompanied by notes on options and dependencies. The capacity of each site will depend on context, access, layout and scale proposals.

4.0.5. The Evidence Base includes a site capacity assessment that sets out a suitable development mix for each strategic site. This provides broad assumptions taking into consideration suitable density and plot ratio calculations.
4.1 PowerPark

4.1.1. PowerPark comprises the area south of Ness Point and west of Battery Green Road and includes Hamilton Dock, Waveney Dock, along with parts of Trawl Dock and Outer Harbour. Much of the site is occupied by the Beach Industrial Estate.

Current Character

4.1.2. The Beach industrial estate currently comprises a mixture of industrial, office and retail wholesale premises. The Waveney 2009 Industrial Land Survey identifies some 113 occupied units within the area, with a further 10 vacant units. The largest employer is Birds Eye which occupies some 10ha (excluded from the strategic site area). Much of the estate is poorly maintained with an ageing building stock. The recently opened OrbisEnergy Centre lies at the heart of the estate with frontage to the North Sea in a high quality, modern building. Adjacent to the OrbisEnergy Centre is the Gulliver demonstrator wind turbine which at 80 metres tall presents a significant local landmark.

4.1.3. The outer harbour docks area lies to the south of Hamilton Road. Much of this area is in the ownership of ABP. The PowerPark demands and needs study identifies the following activities currently being undertaken in the docks:

- Waveney Dock – land to the east currently leased by SLP the north west corner is occupied by the fishing industry, the south west corner is to be taken by Great Gabbard Offshore Wind (GGOW).
- Trawl Dock – this is a common user area. GGOW is to have some priority berthing.
- The Hamilton Peninsula is to be used by GGOW for approximately two years and then may become available. The end of the peninsula has an oil pipeline which is currently not used but is leased with berth space used by others.
- The North Pier has a range of users and is currently used for the construction of an off-shore gas rig.
- Hamilton Dock is the focus for fishing activities. There are presently less than 20 inshore fishing craft, with some 49 berths for leisure craft.
Development Opportunities

4.1.4. The 2007 AAP Option identified this area as East of England Park, to the north, which included the existing Beach Industrial Estate. The area to the south was previously identified as “Fishers Wharf” and included proposals for non-employment uses including residential, retail and leisure.

4.1.5. Since 2007 further work has been undertaken which identifies significant potential for a cluster of businesses focused upon the energy sector.

4.1.6. 1st East has commissioned a series of technical studies to help inform the development of the PowerPark. The following studies have now been completed and include: a land contamination study, services and utilities assessment, land ownership research, and an initial assessment of transport requirements. A flood risk assessment is also in development.

4.1.7. The PowerPark Demand and Needs Study by BVG associates outlines the key energy sectors the PowerPark should target and what their demands and needs are likely to be. This study sets out the following vision for the area as set out in AAP Policy EMP 2.:

A centre of excellence in marine engineering focusing on a mix of:

1. Offshore wind Operations and Maintenance (O&M)
2. Offshore marine Research and Development (R&D) and prototyping.
3. Existing traditional marine and underwater engineering facilities on site.
4. Blend of other energy activities that do not require significant land or quay space. These include
   - Carbon Capture Storage (CCS) – potential research and development/operations and maintenance facilities to support carbon capture storage in geological formations under the North Sea;
   - Support to the nuclear industry (in particular the construction of future phases of the Sizewell plant);
   - Gas storage – operations and maintenance for offshore gas storage facilities.
5. Possible on-site training centres to supply the energy sectors

4.1.9. The study states that based upon industry estimates an additional 950 direct and almost 4,000 indirect jobs will be created by 2020. Each new direct job is assumed to create four indirect jobs in local supply chain, hospitality and other fields. The study identifies that economic benefit from offshore wind operations and maintenance is expected to be worth £3 billion to the sub-regional economy by 2020. However, it notes that full economic benefits cannot be fully predicted at present due to the immaturity of the market.

4.1.10. 1st East are building on this report by co-ordinating studies which will outline: a more detailed analysis of the spatial requirements, when each part of the energy sector will require land, the financial implications of relocating
companies and the potential delivery mechanisms. These documents will come forward as the AAP progresses towards examination.

4.1.11. This information will form the basis of a master plan which 1st East is leading on behalf of key stakeholders. The aim is to suggest the most appropriate location for different parts of the energy industry which will be located at the PowerPark. This report is due to be completed in June 2010 and will incorporate the key information from all other studies.

4.1.12. Further momentum has been established through a brochure for the PowerPark which aims to attract companies from the energy sector particularly those associated with the development of the Round 3 allocations for offshore wind. This has successfully attracted the interest of potential operators.

Delivery and Implementation

4.1.13. The development of PowerPark will be led by private sector investment. The Council and 1st East will assist through co-ordination of development.

4.1.14. The development of PowerPark must ensure that existing businesses are not adversely affected and where necessary are assisted in relocating to other parts of Lowestoft (or the sub-region). A relocation strategy is being undertaken and will inform subsequent iterations of the AAP.

Flood Constraints

4.1.15. As illustrated in Figure 3.6.1 and 3.6.2 much of the site falls within Flood Zone 3 with pockets identified as being in areas of high hazard. The Cumulative Land Raising study provides an assessment of current flood defences. The study notes that at present the site is defended by the Lowestoft Ness Seawall along the North Sea coastline running north of the AAP area and the northern pier extension. The docks area is protected by a combination of steel sheet piling with concrete capping backed by paved areas, combined with areas of slightly raised ground near the inner north pier of Trawl Basin. In the Waveney dock area the banks are protected by steel sheet piling with concrete capping backed by paved concrete. The Hamilton Dock shoreline is protected by a combination of concrete walls, steel and timber piling with concrete capping.

4.1.16. The Cumulative Land Raising study identifies the following potential to reduce flood risk through the redevelopment of this area:

- A raised walkway combined with a retaining wall backed by partial land raising and linked to other defences is proposed along the dock fronts.
- Raising crest level of sea wall to ensure a minimum level of 4.7m AOD along the entire coastline;
- Construction of an earth embankment parallel to Hamilton Dock to prevent flood water from Hamilton dock from inundating the site from the south
- Construction of a second earth embankment within the East of England Park to prevent floodwater entering the site from the north.
• The study suggests that land raising of the site in its entirety would not be a viable option due to cost.
• Further consideration will be given to addressing flood risks as part of site masterplanning to take place ahead of the AAP submission version.

### SSP1 - PowerPark Proposals

The PowerPark site will provide up to 26 ha of reconfigured employment land and associated uses (B1, B2, B8) to become the focus for the energy industry within Lowestoft.

The site will be developed in accordance with the following planning design principles:

- The site will be developed incrementally over time following principles to be established through detailed masterplanning process.
- The entire site will remain in employment use (EMP1).
- The Council and its partners will ensure that existing occupiers displaced by new development will be relocated within the AAP area, district or sub-region depending upon individual requirements (EMP1).
- The majority of Waveney Dock, Hamilton Dock and Trawl Dock will be utilised by off-shore energy activities (EMP2);
- The fishing port will be preserved and enhanced within the site, either in its current location or Trawl Dock to provide a visible connection to the town centre (EMP4,EHC1).
- Land mark buildings of high architectural quality will be encouraged at gateways into the site including the area between Trawl Dock and Bascule Bridge, and at the Whapland Road/Hamilton Road junction (EHC1)
- Landscaping and public realm will be improved throughout the site, in particular the quality of public realm for pedestrians and cyclists (EHC1, TML1, TML2);
- Development of the site will include appropriate provision for cyclists including secure cycle storage. All new commercial buildings will include showering facilities for employees.(TML2)
- Wayfinding and orientation facilities will be provided for visitors to the site, potentially including a visitors centre related to the energy sector and including provision of clear signposting between the site, town centre and Ness Point (EHC1, RLT2),
- Proposals will include appropriate open space for future users (EHC3);
- The Outer Harbour Kittiwake Colony and Ness Point County Wildlife sites will be protected and enhanced. Development deemed to have an adverse impact on these habitats will not be permitted (EHC4).
- The area will be served by new, or existing bus routes and will include sheltered waiting facilities in convenient locations;(TML3)
- Attention should be given to improving visibility of the waterfront to publicly accessible areas. This should include appropriate treatment to the dockside boundary currently fenced with metal railings. (EHC1)
- Proposals should respect the history and cultural heritage of the area and enhance connections into the Lowestoft North and South conservation areas. Features such as the historic smoke house at the junction of Newcome Road and Wilde Street, Wind Turbine and historic buildings surrounding the docks should be utilised as key features in the design and orientation of the site. (EHC2).
- All new development will be subject to site specific Flood Risk Assessment and proposals must demonstrate how flood risk is to be mitigated through inclusion of appropriate design measures such as land raising, incorporation of secondary flood defences and SUDs. At the detailed design stage developers will be required to demonstrate how buildings have been designed to maximise resilience flood events (FRM1).
- All development within Flood Zone 2 and 3 must be accompanied by a flood evacuation plan to be produced in accordance with the LPA emergency planner (FRM1).
- All new buildings will be designed to ensure energy, water and waste efficiency (policies WEW 1-3)
- Site wide masterplanning will consider the potential for district energy, heat and cooling systems (WEW1);
- All new development will be required to contribute to the following items of infrastructure:
  - Improved site-wide public realm and boundary treatments
  - Public transport improvements
  - Upgraded flood defences
  - On site renewable energy systems.
Policy Links and Evidence Sources

- Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008)
- Cumulative Land Raising Study (2008)
- PowerPark Demand and Need Study (2009)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Employment Land Study (2006)
- Lowestoft Cultural Heritage Study (2006)

Alternative Options Considered

The previous Preferred Options AAP (January 2007) set out proposals for mixed use redevelopment of existing port uses in the area surrounding Waveney Dock and Trawl Dock. The intention was to facilitate greater public access to the waterfront and provide a new marina, restaurants, shops as well as 80 residential units. Prior to this, two options were considered during Issues and Options stage. The options incorporated varying amounts and locations of land for mixed use development, marine activities, support for the fishing industry and marina development.

The 2007 preferred option has now been discounted due to deliverability constraints linked to the economic downturn and objections raised by a variety of stakeholders and landowners during consultation. Recent investment in the port of Lowestoft reflects the job opportunities associated with supporting the offshore and renewable energy sector and developments such as the Greater Gabbard wind farm. Current PowerPark proposals reflect a more concerted commitment to capitalising on these growth sectors and delivering high quality new employment growth in Lowestoft.

All options in terms of potential energy sector uses and some mixes of those uses were scoped and objectively tested by DWL/BVG in the BVG Phase 1 Demand and Need work against agreed criteria and an overall objective of establish the best uses in term of the best developing a long term sustain economic development all energy cluster. The best positioning of the PowerPark with the sub-regional overall energy portfolio was also a key consideration.

In assessing the preferred approach, the following alternatives have been considered:

- Option 1 – Preferred Option
- Option 2 – Retention of beach industrial estate, redevelopment of docks for retail, residential, tourism and leisure activities (2007 Preferred Option)
- Option 3 – No AAP policy.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSP 1 - PowerPark</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option</td>
<td>Previous Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social: The PowerPark proposals will increase the range of employment opportunities available in Lowestoft. The proposals support the inclusion of education and training facilities, which may help to tackle social exclusion by increasing skill levels. Without increased skills in the local labour market, the jobs may not directly benefit local people. Mixed use redevelopment of the area, as proposed in the previous AAP, or a lack of policy are unlikely to fully realise the huge regeneration opportunities in supporting the growing offshore energy sector.

Environmental: Supporting the growth of the renewable energy sector will help to reduce contributions to climate change. Although PowerPark is relatively accessible on foot or by bicycle, there may be an increase in traffic associated with the expansion of job opportunities. Policies TML1 - TML7 will help to minimise use of private cars to access Power Park. In addition, the PowerPark proposals may place more pressure on water and mineral resources due to more intensive use of land and the likely increases in population linked to job opportunities. These impacts will need to be managed and mitigated through the incorporation of sustainable design and SUDS. The previous proposals or a lack of policy will fail to realise the environmental benefits linked to the energy sector.

Economic: There is huge growth potential in supporting offshore energy in the North Sea. Capitalising on these opportunities will create jobs directly and also benefit local supply chain businesses indirectly. There may be increased spending in the town centre as a result of increases in disposable income. With no policy, or the previous preferred option, these benefits are unlikely be fully realised.
Figure 4.1.1 - PowerPark - extent of site

Figure 4.1.2 - PowerPark - Planning and Design Principles
4.2 Peto Square

Overview

4.2.1. Peto Square represents the areas immediately north and south of Bascule Bridge. The extent of the strategic site contains the following features:

- Lowestoft Rail Station
- Station Square
- Commercial Road Area (including former Aldi site and ABP land extending to town quay)
- Belvedere Road/South Quay

Current Character

4.2.2. The Peto Square strategic site contains significant historic townscape and is at an important location, providing the main south-north link over Lake Lothing in the form of Bascule Bridge. This area was the focus of town development undertaken by Samuel Morton Peto from the 1840’s onward to improve the maritime facilities within the town and provide a herring market. The area is characterised by its mixture of building types, uses, and open spaces. It forms the southern terminus of the retail centre of London Road North and the entrance to the Inner Harbour and Lake Lothing. Harbour structures predominate around the Bascule Bridge, whilst commercial structures flank these to the north and south. All of these structures date from the mid-19th century onwards.

4.2.3. The area contains a number of secondary town centre related service, retail and catering businesses that relate to the seaside/tourism economy. The area is in a poor condition and dominated by the effects of through traffic. Much of the area is designated within the Lowestoft South Conservation Area and many of the Victorian era buildings are now listed buildings or recognised as being of local historic interest. Despite this the majority of buildings are in poor internal and external condition and are generally underutilised. The townscape of this zone has been damaged by the demolition of buildings around the bascule bridge in the 1970s and 1980s, resulting in often disparate and incoherent streetscapes. This has been exacerbated by insensitive alterations to historic buildings, disuse and poor maintenance, further degrading streetscape quality.

4.2.4. The following buildings are of particular note within the strategic site:

- Railway Station - built in 1855 by the Lucas Brothers, Lowestoft is the most easterly railway station in the UK. Much of the original historical structure remains although many of the original buildings are under-utilised and in poor condition. It retains one of the last original British Rail enamel signs in situ on its frontage. Much of the lands surrounding the station, including station platforms and goods sidings are significantly underutilised.

- **The Turret Buildings.** on the east side of Station Square, were constructed in 1891 as three separate residences with shops at ground-floor level. This collection of buildings is presently in poor external repair with low grade retail uses at ground floor.

- **Commercial Road/19-21 Station Square** – comprises a 19th Century terrace of much altered residential buildings located to the north of Commercial Road with commercial frontages increasing towards Station Square. These buildings have been subject to considerable alterations over time with little original character remaining. Many buildings to the west of the terrace are in a poor state of repair.

- **7-13 Station Square** – a run of three storey buildings facing the outer harbour, these buildings are locally listed with residential accommodation above commercial units. A row of poor quality single storey commercial units are attached to the north of the row.

- **The Grade II listed Custom House** is located to the northwest of the Bascule Bridge and dates from 1831. The building is understated in design, being formed by a long range with transept overlooking the inner harbour. The Customs House has a close physical and historical relationship with the harbour, and is particularly notable for predating the Peto improvements. Now in use as offices, the building has suffered some damage to its historic context with the demolition of buildings to the west, the presence of large, unrelieved tarmac surfaces and very unsympathetic metal railings. These alterations have served to isolate the Customs House from Station Square and marginalise the building.

4.2.5. Recent development has included an Aldi Supermarket and surface car park, south of Commercial Road which is now vacant.

4.2.6. Station Square and the area around Royal Plain has been subject to considerable public realm investment in recent years. A pedestrian linkage has recently been created to the rear of buildings on Belvedere Road providing an improved access between Bascule Bridge and the Asda site. However, the remainder of the area is of very poor environmental quality with significant areas of underutilised port land, poor pedestrian and cycle environment and high levels of severance caused by traffic (in particular around Bascule Bridge).
Opportunities

4.2.7. Significant development opportunities exist within Peto Square. In particular reconfiguration of the railway station and area around commercial road provides a significant opportunity to create a sustainable town centre extension that will connect the existing primary retail area to the water front. This could include new transport interchange, town centre retail, waterfront leisure and hotel activities. It would also facilitate a strong pedestrian/cycle link between the town centre and southern parts of the town through the construction of a new pedestrian/cycle bridge parallel to Bascule Bridge.

4.2.8. The potential to relocate the railway station was raised through the initial versions of the AAP which proposed moving the station some 400m to the west and sought to incorporate a significant amount of retail and residential accommodation. Up to 20,000 sq m of retail was proposed in Peto Square and Fishers Wharf through the relocation of the station, based upon need identified within the Great Yarmouth and Waveney Retail Study (2006)

4.2.9. Since the 2007 AAP Rail Estate was commissioned by 1st East to undertake further feasibility work to investigate relocating the station. This scoped and objectively appraisals 14 options against criteria and costed them and set out a preferred option that would involve the station facilities shifting 40 metres to the south and 80 metres to the South.

4.2.10. In parallel to the AAP a capacity exercise for the Peto Square area has been undertaken which has sought to investigate the potential for retail and leisure based development within this area. Further work is in progress to identify the future retail requirements within Lowestoft as part of an update to the 2006 retail study.

Delivery and Implementation

4.2.11. The development of Peto Square will require significant investment from both public and private sectors. With limited public sector funding available in coming years it will be important that the public sector facilitate a partnership approach in leading the design and development of this site. The AAP should form the basis for a future development brief that will set out clear principles for the site.

4.2.12. The Council and 1st East will work closely with ABP, Network Rail and the Aldi site owners as principal land owners and other development partners to refine a scheme for the site that makes the most of its strategic location. Further details on implementation and delivery are set out in Section 5.

Flood Risk Constraints

4.2.13. Depth and hazard modelling undertaken as part of the SRFA and reproduced as Appendix 1 illustrates that much of the Peto Square site is currently within an area of High flood hazard. In applying the PPS25 sequential test to the AAP area residential development would therefore be more appropriately located in alternative locations than Peto Square, due to high levels of flood hazard and difficulties in providing safe means of escape. For this reason Peto Square is no longer identified as a preferred location for residential development.
4.2.14. The Cumulative Land Raising Study identifies that the site and adjacent ABP land is protected by sheet and timber piling with concrete capping backed by concrete areas with crest level varying between 2.8 AOD and 3.4 AOD. A similar defence protects the area to the south, although the study identifies that parts of this stretch are in poor condition. The study identifies the following improvements to the flood defence:

- Riverside walkway combined with an embankment with a retaining wall, backed by partial land raising linked to higher grounds;
- The height of the retaining wall should be constructed at 4.7m AOD.

SSP2 - Peto Square Proposals

Peto Square will become a central focus for retail, leisure and commercial activity at the heart of Lowestoft, comprising the following development:

- Up to [17,500] sq m retail, leisure, hotel and tourism development comprising A1, A3, A4, A5 uses along with other leisure facilities (RLT1) in the area between Denmark Road and North Quay;
- New railway station facilities at location 80 metres west and 40 metres south of the existing station with associated passenger facilities and reconfigured platforms (TML4);
- New transport interchange adjacent to the railway station with facilities for taxi pick up/drop off, secure covered cycle storage, bus waiting and real time information (TML3, TML4);
- Development of south quay for commercial and port related activities (EMP4).

The site will be developed in accordance with the following site specific criteria:

- New development must provide public access to the waterfront area between Bascule Bridge and Town Quay to the North, and Bascule Bridge and South Quay to the south and provision of a direct link from Katwijk Way to the waterfront (EHC1);
- The site should include landmark buildings to assist in the legibility of the site. These may be located at the waterfront and facing Station Square, although must respect retained historic buildings (EHC1).
- Efforts should be taken to remove the steel railings that mark the port boundary. Where these are necessary consideration should be given to alternative design and treatments that reflect the character of the area (EHC1).
- New public realm treatments should be integrated with existing areas of public realm at Royal Plain/Seafront and Station Square. This should in providing clear pedestrian/cycle legibility and wayfinding through the area (EHC1);
- New public spaces should be created through the site. In particular spaces adjacent to the waterfront should be designed to provide hubs for a range of events and activities including markets, performing arts, al fresco eating and drinking etc (EHC3);
- Development must be phased in appropriate manner over the plan period. This potentially would see the area south of Commercial Road being brought forward as an initial phase, with later phases subject to station reconfiguration;
- Development must bring the Custom House and surrounding area into active reuse (EHC2);
- Development must as far as is practicable incorporate heritage buildings and structures. Developers will be required to work with English Heritage and Waveney conservation officers to secure appropriate uses for existing heritage buildings (EHC2).
- New buildings must take account of the historic context and building vernacular for this part of Lowestoft (EHC1, EHC2);
- Development should incorporate new public spaces on the waterfront and within the scheme (EHC3);
- New development should seek to incorporate new wildlife habitats as part of roof space or other ancillary uses (EHC4);
- Development should provide new car parking facilities for the town centre and station if required (TML6);
- Development should facilitate improved access to the ABP Port, currently accessed via Commercial Road (TML5).
- New development should contribute to improved pedestrian/cycle crossing over Lake Lothing as part of new dedicated bridge or reconfigured Bascule Bridge (TML2);
- Development should facilitate improved pedestrian connections through the site, with safe, direct linkages to the town centre, Kirkley area, Royal Plain/South Beach, and new pedestrian/cycle route along south bank of Lake Lothing (TML2);
- New development should ensure any flood vulnerable uses (in particular residential, hotel accommodation) is not provided at ground floor and incorporate safe means of escape into the design of buildings (FRM1).
- Development must include measures to reduce flood risk to include where appropriate building design that responds to flood risk issues, land raising and/or quay raising (FRM1);
- All development applications must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRM1).
- Site wide masterplanning will consider the potential for district energy, heat and cooling systems, and potential to link into wider systems (e.g. town centre or PowerPark) (WEW1);
- All new buildings will be designed to ensure energy, water and waste efficiency (WEW 1-3).

Policy Links and Evidence Sources

- Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008)
- Cumulative Land Raising Study (2008)
- Great Yarmouth Borough and Waveney District Retail and Leisure Study (August 2006)
- Lowestoft Cultural Heritage Study (2006)
- Lowestoft Station and North Peto Square – Feasibility of Development Options (Rail Estate) (October 2009)
- AECOM/DTZ Peto Square Capacity Exercise (April 2010)

Alternative Options Considered

The previous Preferred Options AAP (January 2007) considered three options with different layouts and quantities of development and different treatments of open space, in response to the (now replaced) Local Plan which sought to achieve a balance between employment, retail and tourism uses in the area. The 2007 Preferred Option was considered most likely to promote successful mixed use regeneration in a vibrant town centre extension, to encourage public access to the waterfront and, to provide an attractive setting for restoration of the heritage assets present. In terms of the station, the 2007 Preferred Option proposed relocating the station 400 metres to the west of its existing location. This proposal met with strong objections from both the public and technical stakeholders with perceptions that moving the station so far from the town centre was deemed to be commercially unacceptable, operationally disruptive and technically unproven.

In assessing the preferred approach, the following alternatives have been considered:

- Option 1 – Preferred Option
- Option 2 – 2007 Preferred Option comprising residential, retail, leisure and station relocated by 400m
- Option 3 – Limited development comprising redevelopment of Lidl site and area around Customs House (potentially forming a first phase of the wider scheme)
- Option 4 – No AAP policy.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSP 2 - Peto Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>±/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: The preferred option will help to reduce social exclusion by focussing retail development in areas most accessible by public transport. There will be some employment creation, although the majority is likely to be low.
skilled. High density residential development will help to support the viability and vibrancy of the town centre. Residential development may help to address local housing needs and create attractive and inclusive communities. The previous option would reduce the accessibility of the town centre and waterfront by rail. No policy may lead to out of centre retail, thereby excluding people who do not own a car.

Enhancing pedestrian and cycle connections between the town centre and south Lowestoft will increase the accessibility of services, leisure activities and employment opportunities, which may help address social exclusion. There may be health benefits if there is a resultant increase in walking and cycling to local destinations. Increasing access to the waterfront will improve the quality of Lowestoft’s urban environment and potentially provide a focus for community pride. Like the preferred option, the limited development option would help to extend the town centre southwards but would not lead to as extensive improvements in accessibility. The 2007 preferred option would reduce the accessibility of the town centre through the more drastic relocation solution.

Environmental: Both the preferred and previous option will help to reduce car dependency and associated contributions to climate change and traffic congestion by focussing retail in the town centre. The preferred proposals involve the loss of some heritage buildings. This may be offset by the preferred policy’s requirement to incorporate existing heritage features into schemes and involve English Heritage and Waveney conservation officers in securing appropriate uses for existing heritage buildings such as the Customs House. By moving the station so far from the town centre, the previous policy option would definitely damage local heritage character. No policy would have little environmental impact.

The preferred option proposes development in areas at high risk of flooding, including retail and a hotel which are classified as a vulnerable uses. As such, in accordance with Policy FRM1, Peto Square proposals will be required to demonstrate that the most vulnerable uses have been located in the areas of the site at lowest risk of flooding. In addition, proposals must adequately demonstrate how flood risk has been mitigated (e.g. through land raising; SUDS) and how resilience during flood events has been maximised (e.g. safe access/egress points; habitable rooms above ground floor). Developments may also be required to incorporate defences which help to reduce flood risk elsewhere in Lowestoft.

Economic: The preferred option will have a major positive effect on revitalising the town centre by increasing the range of shops in Lowestoft and connecting the town’s heart with the waterfront. The previous option would have reduced accessibility by rail and was not deemed to be commercially or technically viable. The limited development option would have similarly positive impacts but not fully realise the extent of opportunities presented at Peto Square.
4.3 Kirkley Waterfront

Overview

4.3.1. Kirkley Waterfront covers the area to the north of Waveney Drive. It stretches from an inlet in the east to the open space and County Wildlife Site adjacent to the Jeld Wen site in the west covering an area of some 25 hectares.

Current Character

4.3.2. The site is presently characterised by underutilised industrial land. The majority of the site is occupied by Jeld Wen, a timber company with very low employment density who are due to vacate the site in Summer 2010. The eastern portion of the site focuses upon Riverside Road and has been the subject of initial redevelopment with much of the site cleared. The only historic building that exists within this location is the former office of the East Anglian Ice Works which dates from the late 19th or early 20th century and is in poor condition. This area has seen with some newer development including the Honda car dealership, Riverside Enterprise Centre and a Crèche (now vacant).

4.3.3. The site has extensive waterfront, some of which is operational (in particular that occupied by Jeld Wen). To the west of Jeld Wen is an area of open space, some of which is private recreation grounds and a significant area to the north, fronting Lake Lothing, is a recently designated County Wildlife Site.

Development Opportunities

4.3.7 The 2007 AAP Preferred Option proposed the redevelopment of the area to provide modern industrial and business premises linked by a new spine road. Longer term proposals included residential development along the waterfront and along Waveney Drive. Whilst residential is still an attractive component, it is unlikely to be suitable on the waterfront due to its importance for potential importance for employment and likely flood risks.

4.3.8. A major proposal in the Riverside Road part of the site was for Waveney Campus. This sought to provide a new location for Waveney and Suffolk Councils and CEFAS and has planning permission. This proposal has now been withdrawn, although the potential for office-based development in this location remains. Much of the land for Waveney Campus has been assembled and is now owned by Waveney District Council and EEDA. The Employment Land Study (2006) identifies that the Riverside Business Park only provides enough land for in town office development to meet immediate requirements and that more land is needed for high quality employment uses. The area around Riverside Road therefore remains a suitable location for office-led employment, with the potential for a greater mix of uses on the Jeld Wen site.
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Delivery and Implementation

4.2.11. Development of Kirkley Rise will be private sector led following the principles set out within the AAP. The Council will facilitate a partnership approach to ensure that the site is developed to a high standard.

Flood Constraints

4.3.4. Figure 3.6.1 demonstrates that much of the site is in Flood Zone 3 whilst breach modelling for this site illustrated in Appendix 1 demonstrates that parts of the site are within ‘high hazard’ areas. The Cumulative Land Raising Study provides the following summary of flood defences for Kirkley Waterfront:

- Combination of steel sheet and timber piling with concrete capping backed by paved areas;
- Abrupt differences is quay crest levels some in excess of 0.5 metres;
- An area of undefended land exists immediately west of Riverside Business Park. This consists of sand and shingle beach backed by raising ground levels with a crest level of approximately 3.2m.

4.3.5. As Figure 3.6.1 illustrates parts of the site are outside of Flood Zone 3 and is therefore preferable for residential development to other parts of the AAP for residential development. In applying the PPS25 sequential approach to development within the Kirkley Waterfront site it would appear that the southern and western part of Kirkley Waterfront is sequentially preferable to other parts of the site (and wider AAP area) due to its relatively lower hazard risk (as illustrated in Appendix 1).

4.3.6. Development of the site will require significant flood mitigation measures. The Cumulative Land Raising Study identified the following potential to manage flood risks within the strategic site in order to facilitate the former Waveney Campus proposals:

- Land raising the western part of the site. The potential may exist to land raise in other parts of the site, as well as improvements to existing defences.
- Partial raising the site at Waveney Campus facilitating development on the raised section of the site, with floodwater allowed on the lower areas.
- The lower areas would be used for less vulnerable uses such as car parking and landscaping.
- An alternative would be to construct a pedestrian route along the entire south bank frontage of Lake Lothing to Brooke Peninsula in the west and Peto Square in the east. The height of the wall would need to be set to a minimum of 4.7m AOD. This would ensure that a sufficient level of protection could be maintained along the waterfront whilst providing safe public access to the water frontage. The route will need to be connected to the high lying grounds on Horn Hill Road, which falls outside of the...
• floodplain to prevent floodwater entering from the east. The pedestrian route would also need to be linked to the defences in front of the Brook Marina to prevent floodwater entering from the west.

The Cumulative Land Raising Study did not consider land raising beyond the Waveney Campus site, although there may be further potential to the west. There may also be scope to utilise the proposed new highways network to form part of the flood defence.

SSP3 – Kirkley Waterfront Proposals

Kirkley Waterfront will be developed to provide the following uses:
• Residential comprising some 250 units at densities of approximately 50 units per hectare, as part of proposals for a sustainable urban neighbourhood (HC1, HC2);
• 12 ha of employment comprising:
  ▪ Predominantly B1 office floorspace, research and development and workshop space) in area surrounding Riverside Road and adjacent to residential areas;
  ▪ Waterfront employment to providing dock and mooring facilities and ancillary uses. (EMP1-4)

The site will be developed in accordance with the following principles (illustrated in Figure 4.3.2):
• The site should be configured around a legible street pattern that incorporates key views and provides good quality walking and cycling environments, using high quality materials consistent with the wider town (EHC1, TML2, TML5).
• Residential development should be constructed to densities of approximately 50 units per hectare and include predominantly terrace, town house and mews house typologies (HC1).
• Residential development should include provision for private courtyards and gardens, as well as communal areas of open space (EHC3).
• Housing should provide frontage to the area of open space to the west and Waveney Drive to the south (EHC1).
• Development should respect and connect with the existing residential community to the south and provide a high quality residential frontage along Waveney Drive. (HC1).
• Buildings should seek to provide attractive frontages along the proposed southern access route and Waveney Drive (EHC1)
• The area should provide appropriate wayfinding measures to assist in moving visitors between the seafront and broads area (EHC1).
• Employment development should consider neighbouring residential uses and should include appropriate landscaping and screening. Surface car parking should be appropriately screened through high quality site landscaping (EHC1).
• Development proposals must not adversely affect the adjacent County Wildlife Site. Development should include provision to encourage wildlife habitats such as green/brown roofs and conservation areas within green spaces (EHC4).
• Development should include provision to encourage wildlife habitats such as green/brown roofs and conservation areas within green spaces (EHC4).
• Large areas of surface car parking should be avoided if possible (TML6).
• The development of the site will include good quality, safe pedestrian and cycle routes to provide quick linkages to the town centre, employment areas and other parts of Lowestoft (TML2).
• Development of the site will require the construction of the new southern access road to which all development within the site should contribute to (TML5).
• All residential streets will be designed in accordance with Manual for Streets principles and be integrated with existing neighbourhoods (TML5).
• The site will include new bus connections to provide quick access to the town centre and employment areas, with a central public transport “node” created at a central location on the Southern Access Route. This will benefit from sheltered waiting facilities with real-time information (TML3).
• Secure cycle parking must be included within new developments and at a central transport node (TML2).
- As much of the site is within Flood Risk Zone 3 all new buildings must be designed to ensure risk of flood is mitigated with safe means of escape. This should include early engagement with the Environment Agency and LPA emergency planners to assist in the design process (FRM1).
- Buildings should be subject to creative design solutions that ensure buildings are functional and attractive whilst safe from flood risks. Residential uses should be as far as possible located outside of Flood Zone 3 (FRM1).
- Development will be protected through land raising and strengthened flood defences. The southern access road may provide potential to act as a further mode of defence FRM1).
- The potential for SUDs will be considered across as part of comprehensive site masterplanning to potentially include swales which may form part of open space/wildlife networks (FRM1, EHC3).
- All new buildings will be designed to ensure energy, water and waste efficiency (WEW 1-3).
- Buildings should be orientated towards the south to maximise solar gain and energy efficiency (WEW1).
- All buildings must be designed to ensure water efficiency and incorporate measures for rainwater harvesting and recycling (WEW3).

All new development will be required to contribute to the following items of infrastructure:
- New primary school
- Southern Access Route
- New pedestrian and cycle routes and facilities
- Public transport improvements
- Pedestrian and cycle bridge link
- Flood defences
- On site renewable energy systems.

Policy Links and Evidence Sources
- Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008)
- Cumulative Land Raising Study (2008)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Employment Land Study (January 2006)
- Lowestoft Cultural Heritage Study (2006)
- Sub-Regional Housing Strategy for Great Yarmouth and Waveney – 2005 and beyond (October 2004)
- Waveney Housing Strategy (January 2004)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Housing Market Assessment (September 2007)
- Waveney Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (November 2007)
- Waveney District Urban Housing Capacity Study (November 2002)
- Assessment of 5 Year Supply of Housing Land (January 2008)
- Affordable Housing Policy Financial Viability Study (2009)

Alternative Options Considered
The Kirkley Waterfront proposals in the 2007 Preferred Options AAP document were compared with the existing “do-nothing” option in the (now replaced) Waveney Local Plan, which designated the site for employment purposes. The 2007 Preferred Option proposed more mixed uses than the Local Plan, including Waveney Campus, 350 new homes, new transport links and a high quality business park. This combination of uses and interventions was considered most likely to promote successful mixed use regeneration and to contribute to economic growth.

The current option gives more consideration to flood risk and seeks to concentrate the most vulnerable uses such as housing in areas identified in the SFRA as being of lower flood risk.

In assessing the preferred approach, the following alternatives have been considered:
- Option 1 – Preferred Option
- Option 2 – 2007 Preferred Option comprising residential and employment mixed use, with waterfront housing
- Option 3 – Employment only redevelopment
- Option 4 – Residential only redevelopment
- Option 5 – No policy

### Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSP 3 - Kirkley Waterfront</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: By retaining a focus on employment, both the preferred and previous 2007 option have the potential to address social exclusion through the creation of new jobs. Without training and education programmes, however, new opportunities may bypass the most excluded members of society. No policy may result in piecemeal development and result in schemes / uses which are poorly integrated. Focussing solely on employment uses could potentially generate greater job numbers than the more mixed approach set out in the preferred and previous options. However, it is unlikely that there is sufficient demand for such a large quantum of employment uses and may undermine employment elsewhere in Lowestoft.

By seeking a mix of housing types, tenures and sizes as part of a Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood, the preferred option and residential only option will help to tackle local housing needs and create an attractive and inclusive community. The proposed housing density will help to support the viability of, and encourage walking to, community facilities. Without a policy, development is less likely to take a strategic approach to housing needs, social infrastructure and open space provision as part of a wider Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood.

Environmental: By proposing a mix of employment both the preferred option and 2007 option may reduce car dependency and associated traffic congestion / greenhouse gas emissions. Both options involve the development of vulnerable uses (residential) in areas of high flood risk. However, the preferred option requires that the most vulnerable uses be located in the areas of lowest flood risk and incorporate features to maximise resilience to flooding. The previous option, by proposing waterfront housing is likely to have increased Lowestoft's exposure to flooding and climate change. Similarly the residential only option would increase vulnerability to flooding by involving housing development in areas of the site at higher risk of flooding. The employment-only and residential-only options, in proposing large areas of single-use development are more likely to increase car dependence, encourage ‘dormitory’ patterns of commuting and limit opportunities for walking and cycling to work.

Economic: The preferred option will create new investment opportunities and help to broaden the employment structure of Lowestoft. Without a policy, development is less likely to take a strategic approach to employment provision as part of a wider Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood. The employment only option could potentially encourage investment and support indigenous growth, but such a large quantum of employment development is unlikely to be justified and may undermine employment elsewhere in Lowestoft. The residential only option on the other hand may constrain employment growth.
4.4 Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo

Overview

4.4.1. Brooke Peninsula and Sanyo provide a substantial area that is currently occupied by predominantly under utilised or unoccupied industrial buildings. The site has considerable access constraints and is abutted by existing residential property along Victoria Road.

Current Character

4.4.2. Brooke Peninsula was previously occupied by Brooke Marine who developed the site for boat building in the early 20th Century. Since vacating the site in the 1980s the site has been used as a business park with a number of small and medium sized businesses occupying the former boat yard buildings. The site is poorly maintained, under utilised and employment densities are low. The site covers an area of some 12.2 hectares.

4.4.3. Sanyo occupied two sites on either side of School Road comprising some 9.3 hectares of land. Both sites are currently vacant. The site to the east of School Lane includes an area of open space with a number of mature trees. To the north of the Sanyo site on School Lane is land owned by ABP and adjacent employment premises. This includes a range of employment premises including Silk Cutters House, NWES start-up units and recently built office accommodation, as well as activities related to the Haven Marina. It is proposed that these uses are retained and incorporated into redevelopment proposals for the area.

4.4.4. Also included within the strategic site is Nelson Wharf, which is an industrial site currently occupied by SCA and used for storage of paper recycling; industrial buildings off Stanley Road which may provide scope for redevelopment.
Development Opportunities

4.4.5. Brooke Peninsula was identified in the 2007 AAP Preferred Option for residential led mixed use development including commercial and light industrial employment opportunities, taking advantage of the marine, engineering and leisure sector development in the town.

4.4.6. Since 2007, the Sanyo factory to the south has become vacant leaving a substantial development site. The intervention area has therefore been extended to include this site, along with other areas of underutilised industrial land to the west of Sanyo with a view to encouraging a comprehensive approach to the redevelopment of the area in order to create a “Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood”.

4.4.7. The Brooke Peninsula site has been subject to detailed masterplanning by the land owner and has been subject to pre-application discussions with the LPA. Extension of the proposed residential allocation is subject to further discussions with the land owners and other interested parties.

4.4.8. Development of the site should not preclude the future construction of a Lake Lothing Third Crossing. One potential route would connect the site to Peto Way. The Council will work with developers to ensure that the potential for a third crossing is compatible with proposed development.

Flood Constraints

4.4.9. In parallel with Kirkley Waterfront, Figure [3.6.1] demonstrates that much of the site is in Flood Zone 3 whilst breach modelling for this site illustrated in Appendix 1 demonstrates that parts of the site are within ‘high hazard’ areas. The Cumulative Land Raising Study notes the site is currently subject to the following flood defence issues:

- Steel sheet pile quay backed by a concrete pavement with a crest level of 3.36 m along the Brooke Peninsula frontage;
- Undefended sand and shingle beaches to the east and west of the peninsula;
- An earth embankment with a crest level of 2.5m AOD lies further west of the School Road Quay.

4.4.10. As Figure 3.6.1 illustrates parts of the site to the south are outside of Flood Zone 3 and is therefore preferable for residential development to other parts of the AAP for residential development. In applying the PPS25 sequential approach to development within the Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo site it would appear that the southern areas is sequentially preferable to other parts of the site (and wider AAP area) due to its relatively lower hazard risk (as illustrated in Appendix 1). In particular the area of private recreational space adjacent to the Jeld Wen site is outside of the main flood hazard areas, whilst the Sanyo building occupies an area at high risk of flood hazard. In applying the sequential approach to the site, the open space would be preferable for housing or other sensitive development, whilst the Sanyo site may be more appropriate for replacement open space.
4.4.11. Development of the site will require significant flood mitigation measures and the Cumulative Land Raising Study identified the potential for land raising the Brooke Peninsula area by 4.7 m OAD for all areas with residential frontage. The potential may exist to land raise in other parts of the site, as well as improvements to existing defences. There may be further scope to utilise the proposed new highways network to form part of the flood defence.

**SSP4 - Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo Proposals**

Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo will be redeveloped as part of a Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood providing the following uses:

- Approximately 1,100 residential units built to densities of between 50 and 90 units/hectare including terrace, mews and townhouse typologies and apartments.
- Enhanced open space (2 ha) utilising existing recreational ground adjacent to Jeld Wen, or a like-for-like provision in areas at higher risk of flood.
- Retention of County Wildlife Site
- Mixed use employment to include office, research and development and light industrial uses.
- Continuing care retirement community
- Primary School (1.7ha)
- Marina facilities
- Retail, restaurants, bars, cafes as active ground floor uses
- Hotel

The development of the site will be developed in accordance with the following planning and design principles, illustrated in Figure 4.5.2:

- Development of the site should seek to ensure that current employment activities within the Brooke Business Park can be relocated on site as far as practicable (EMP1).
- Development should retain the existing business facilities and marina facilities on School Lane (EMP1)
- The site should be configured around a legible street pattern that incorporates key views and provides good quality walking and cycling environments, using high quality materials consistent with the wider town (EHC1, TML2, TML5).
- Development should provide activity along the waterfront. This may include the provision of parks, squares, play areas and active frontages such as cafes, shops and workspace (EHC1).
- A community hub should be created at the heart of the development with primary school, local shops, community facilities and other residential amenities. This should be accessible to new and existing residents living south of Lake Lothing. This should provide an activity focus at the centre of the site (HO3, RLT1)
- A new primary school should be constructed to provide a central focus for development. The school should front the main access route and provide appropriate space for setting down/picking up. The school should be designed to enable out-of-hours activities. Appropriate play space should be provided in a secure area to the rear. Provision has been made to include a pitch. (HO3)
- New open spaces should be included to provide a network linked to the waterfront and other areas of green space. This may be as part of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System for the site (EHC3).
- The playing fields adjacent to Jeld Wen should be retained, either in situ, or as a like-for-like provision in parts of the site at greater flood risk. (EHC3).
- Streets and spaces will be designed to provide good quality walking and cycling environments, providing direct access to the waterfront using high quality materials consistent with the wider town (TML2).
- New streets should be configured to connect with existing roads, in particular Heath Road, School Road, Nelson Wharf and Stanley Road. This should provide a tightly defined urban grain that mirrors the surrounding residential area. Streets should be orientated to maximise views to the waterfront (ENV1, TML5).
- The area provides potential to become a hub for tourism and should include hotel, restaurants, bars and
Development proposals must not adversely affect the adjacent County Wildlife Site. The Southern Access Road will be required to cross this site and must include appropriate mitigation and re-provision. Development should include provision to encourage wildlife habitats such as green/brown roofs and conservation areas within green spaces (EHC4).

Development should facilitate the construction of a new pedestrian/cycle bridge to link Brooke Peninsula to the north of Lake Lothing (TML2).

Secure cycle parking must be included throughout the site (TML2).

The site will include new bus connections to provide quick access to the town centre, with a central public transport “node” created adjacent to the new primary school. This will benefit from sheltered waiting facilities with real-time information (TML3).

Development of the site will require the construction of the new southern access road to which all development within the site should contribute to. (TML5)

All residential streets will be designed in accordance with Manual for Streets principles and be integrated with existing neighbourhoods (TML5).

Development should seek to ensure a potential third crossing could be constructed to the west of the site in the future.

Buildings should be subject to creative design solutions that ensure buildings are functional and attractive whilst safe from flood risks. Residential uses should be as far as possible located outside of Flood Zone 3 (FRM1).

Development will be protected through land raising and strengthened flood defences. The southern access road may provide potential to act as a further mode of defence FRM1).

The potential for SUDs will be considered across as part of comprehensive site masterplanning to potentially include swales which may form part of open space/wildlife networks (FRM1, EHC3).

All new buildings will be designed to ensure energy, water and waste efficiency (WEW 1-3).

Buildings should be orientated towards the south to maximise solar gain and energy efficiency (WEW1).

All buildings must be designed to ensure water efficiency and incorporate measures for rainwater harvesting and recycling (WEW3).

All new development will be required to contribute to the following items of infrastructure:

- New primary school
- Southern Access Route
- New pedestrian and cycle routes and facilities
- Public transport improvements
- Pedestrian and cycle bridge link
- Flood defences
- On site renewable energy systems

Policy Links and Evidence Sources

- Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008)
- Cumulative Land Raising Study (2008)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Employment Land Study (January 2006)
- Lowestoft Cultural Heritage Study (2006)
- Sub-Regional Housing Strategy for Great Yarmouth and Waveney – 2005 and beyond (October 2004)
- Waveney Housing Strategy (January 2004)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Housing Market Assessment (September 2007)
- Waveney Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (November 2007)
- Waveney District Urban Housing Capacity Study (November 2002)
- Assessment of 5 Year Supply of Housing Land (January 2008)
- Affordable Housing Policy Financial Viability Study (2009)
Alternative Options Considered

The Local Plan previously allocated Brooke Peninsula for employment use. The 2007 AAP document considered two options with a different emphasis on waterfront housing and employment uses. The 2007 Preferred Option sought to achieve an innovative and high quality, predominantly residential development, but with some commercial and office provision and was considered most likely to promote successful regeneration of the area and to transform perceptions of the town.

The further preferred option seeks to retain the principles established in the 2007 AAP Preferred Option, with the inclusion of surrounding sites to ensure a comprehensive approach is taken to the development of the area.

In assessing the preferred approach, the following alternatives have been considered:

- Option 1 – Preferred Option
- Option 2 – 2007 Preferred Option comprising residential led mixed use on Brooke Peninsula only and Sanyo site retained for employment
- Option 3 – Employment only across entire site
- Option 4 – Residential only across entire site
- Option 5 – No policy

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSP 4 - Brooke Peninsula / Sanyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: By seeking a mix of housing types, tenures and sizes, the preferred proposals and residential only option will help to address local housing needs and create an attractive and inclusive community. Social infrastructure provision will improve access to key services for local people. By protecting and enhancing open spaces, the preferred policy will enhance the quality of the urban fabric for residents and increase opportunities for pursuing healthy lifestyles. There may be job opportunities linked to proposed restaurants, bars and marina facilities, although employment is likely to be low skilled. The previous option retained the Sanyo site for employment use which may provide local job opportunities, although with the site now vacant, the long term viability of the site for employment use is unclear. Furthermore, allocating the Sanyo site for residential use will enable the AAP to concentrate the majority of housing in areas of lower flood risk. Focussing solely on employment uses could potentially generate greater job numbers than the more mixed approach set out in the preferred and previous options. However, it is unlikely that there is sufficient demand for such a large quantum of employment uses and may undermine employment elsewhere in Lowestoft. Without a policy, development is less likely to take a strategic approach to housing needs, social infrastructure and open space provision as part of a wider Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood.

Environmental: New and enhanced green infrastructure will support a diverse range of flora and fauna as well as providing the backdrop for human leisure and recreation. By retaining water and reducing runoff, open spaces may reduce vulnerability to climatic events. Without this policy there may be deterioration of habitats and loss of species. The provision of easily accessible social infrastructure within the community will also reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with motorised transport. Nevertheless, transport policies and interventions will need to be implemented to ensure there is not an adverse traffic impact on the local road network as the population increases. The employment-only and residential-only options, in proposing large areas of single-use development are more likely to increase car dependence, encourage ‘dormitory’ patterns of commuting and limit opportunities for walking and cycling to work.

The preferred option proposes development of vulnerable uses in areas at high risk of flooding. As such, in
accordance with Policy FRM1, developments will be required to adequately demonstrate how flood risk has been mitigated (e.g. through land raising; SUDS) and how resilience during flood events has been maximised (e.g. safe access/egress points; habitable rooms above ground floor). Developments may also be required to incorporate defences which help to reduce flood risk elsewhere in Lowestoft. The preferred option's allocation of Sanyo for residential development rather than employment use will enable the concentration of a greater proportion of housing in lower flood risk areas while the previous option would necessitate developing more housing in areas of higher flood risk. Similarly the residential only option would increase vulnerability to flooding by involving housing development in areas of the site at higher risk of flooding.

**Economic:** The introduction of a residential population in central Lowestoft will help to revitalise the town centre, with increased spending and more constant footfall enhancing the viability of shops and the evening economy. New marina and leisure development on the waterfront will help to enhance Lowestoft's tourist offer and bring greater spending to the town. Without a policy, development would be largely left to the market and the strategic issue of flood risk may prevent development coming forward. The employment only option could potentially encourage investment and support indigenous growth, but such a large quantum of employment development is unlikely to be justified and may undermine employment elsewhere in Lowestoft. The residential only option on the other hand may constrain employment growth.
4.5 East of England Park

Overview and Development Opportunities

4.5.1. The East of England Park was identified in the 2007 AAP Preferred Options. This identified the potential to create a major new contemporary park adjacent to the seafront walkway to celebrate the eastern most point of England and to provide a new cultural/events space for Lowestoft and connect to the existing, quality, public areas around the Ravine. It would incorporate a neglected underutilised open space around the Birds Eye factory and current industrial land around the eastern most point, further south.

Current Character

4.5.2. Located between the beachfront and Whapload Road, the site is characterised by underutilised and poorly maintained open space. The site also incorporates Ness Point, the most easterly place in the UK. A lack of east-west pedestrian connections, as well as impermeable industrial land uses to the south both contribute to the site being poorly integrated into the surrounding urban fabric.
SSP5 - East of England Park – Proposals

The East of England Park will be created as a high quality landscaped area that celebrates its location as the most easterly point in the UK. The Park will seek to include the following features:

- Use of landscaping and public art to soften the visual impact of the Birds Eye factory
- Cultural events field
- Play facilities
- Incorporation of historic drying racks
- Bold curving steps and ramps onto concrete promenade providing better access to the sea front
- Link to the Ravine and the Yarmouth Road through existing neglected woodland.
- Use of high quality sculpture, lighting, banners to animate the seafront
- Pavilion/café/orientation facilities at Ness Point
- CCTV
- Signage and way finding measures to integrate the park with the wider town.

Policy Links and Evidence Sources

- AAP Policies EMP 4, ENV1-5, FR1, WEW1-3
- Great Yarmouth Borough and Waveney District Retail and Leisure Study (August 2006)
- Lowestoft Cultural Heritage Study (2006)

Alternative Options Considered

The Waveney Local Plan sought to balance employment and leisure uses, recognising both the potential for a high quality seafront park and the importance of employment uses to the south. In the Preferred Options AAP (January 2007), the East of England Park site boundary extended further south, incorporating employment uses associated with the Birdseye factory alongside proposals for a new park. This option has been discounted in favour of consolidating the proposed energy cluster at PowerPark and the leisure function of the East of England Park. Consequently, these employment uses are now incorporated within the PowerPark site.

In assessing the preferred approach, the following alternatives have been considered:
- Option 1 – Preferred Option
- Option 2 – No policy

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSP 5 - East of England Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social**: By enhancing an underutilised and poor quality open space, the preferred policy and previous policy will enhance the quality of the urban fabric for residents and increase opportunities for pursuing healthy lifestyles. By making the most of Ness Point, the park could provide a focus for community engagement and civic pride. In order to maximise their use and reduce fear of crime, open spaces should incorporate Secure By Design principles. Without a policy, there will be little impact on the identified shortage of high quality open spaces in Lowestoft.
Moreover, an opportunity to improve Lowestoft’s visitor offer may be missed.

**Environmental:** By retaining water and reducing runoff, the provision of a new high quality park may reduce vulnerability to climatic events. The proposals will conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes. With no policy, there will be limited impact on this currently unattractive and underutilised space.

**Economic:** The proposals may enhance Lowestoft’s visitor offer, bringing increased spending to the town and local businesses. By enhancing the setting of PowerPark, the East of England Park may improve investment prospects in the energy sector. The previous option involves a larger area of
Figure 4.6.1 East of England Park Extent of site

Figure 4.5.2 - East of England Park - Planning and Design Principles
4.6 Kirkley Rise

Overview

4.6.1. The area around Kirkley Rise has been identified as a strategic site due to its potential for significant change and its strategic location between Kirkley District Shopping Centre, South Peto Square and Kirkley Waterfront. The site extends south of Horn Hill and is bounded by Clifton Road and Salisbury Road to the south.

Current Character

4.6.2. This site is currently a mix of employment, car parking, and residential uses. AKD engineering is the main site occupier, occupying the western extent of the identified area. Waveney District Council has recently invested in a surface car park at the centre of the site.

4.6.3. The Horn Hill frontage presents some development potential with a vacant site at the junction of Kirkley Rise. There is also a petrol filling station, car dealership, mechanics, light industrial units and a row of terraced houses along Horn Hill.

4.6.4. Further industrial premises lie along Freemantle Road which links the car park to London Road South including SSDM who are prominent in this location. To the south of this lies a vacant site which provides a potential development opportunity to link with London Road South.

4.6.5. Kirkley Rise presents a new access road from Horn Hill. The site is also accessible from London Road South. Good pedestrian and cycle links are required to link Kirkley with the attractions of the esplanade and the beach. National Cycle Route 30 which links Lowestoft to Kings Lynn passes through the site utilising former a former railway track bed.
Development Opportunities

4.6.6. Parts of the strategic site are presently allocated in the Waveney Interim Local Plan as follows:

- Policy R2 identifies the area immediately south of Horn Hill for mixed use development comprising housing/commercial/open space
- Policy S2 of the Waveney Interim Local plan allocates the area surrounding Clifton Road/Economy Road for mixed use development comprising leisure, retail and community uses.
- Policy E2 seeks to retain the western part of the site for employment.

4.6.7. The 2007 AAP Preferred Option identified it as a small scale intervention area (Clifton Road/Horn Hill) and identified the site as having opportunities for mixed use development of retail uses (an extension to Kirkley District Shopping Centre), leisure activities and an enhanced community facility. The AAP made reference to a new link road off Horn Hill which has since been constructed, but is currently blocked off to vehicular traffic.

4.6.8. Waveney District Council has undertaken considerable work in identifying potential redevelopment potential for this site which has sought to provide an expansion area for Kirkley district centre. Proposals have included new health centre, market, residential and employment floorspace.

Flood Constraints

4.6.9. Figure [3.6.1] demonstrates that much of the site is in Flood Zone 3 whilst breach modelling for this site illustrated in Appendix 1 demonstrates that parts of the site are within ‘high hazard’ areas.

4.6.10. The cumulative land raising study identifies that the site is protected by the same defences as Peto Square south, as well as the newer defences and land raising constructed as part of the ASDA development and land immediately east of ASDA.

4.6.11. The study identifies a large difference in quay crest height between South Quay and ASDA. The study identifies that floodwater is likely to overtop the low lying defences and inundate the low lying areas flowing towards the site via the low lying car park and cycle path.

4.6.12. Hydraulic modelling undertaken as part of the SFRA and Cumulative Land Raising Study identified that flood levels within this location will drop as a result of the partial land raising at the Waveney Campus site and South Peto Square. The third scenario of the hydraulic modelling demonstrates that the Horn Hill site does have a flow path through it, that if raised results in some minor increases in flood depth elsewhere. To ensure this flow path is maintained further detailed modelling of the site may be required, with the cycle path proposed at its existing level to maintain the existing flow paths to the wider flood cell area. The study identifies that land raising may be appropriate at the southern half of the site but this would need to be examined in greater detail as part of any proposed development for the site.
SSP6 - Kirkley Rise – Proposals

The following development will be sought within Kirkley Rise in accordance with the principles set out in Figure 4.6.1:

- Redevelopment of the area west of London Road for residential, retail and commercial uses (provided flood risk issues are addressed and a sequential approach to site development is adopted). This may include the long term redevelopment of the car park site for the above uses.
- Development of Horn Hill frontage for employment-led mixed uses.
- Residential/employment in sites adjacent to Kirkley Rise/Horn Hill;
- Employment will be retained within existing sites.
- The area may provide potential for new tourism facilities (including hotels, guest houses, restaurants and bars) to compliment the existing tourist area at Kirkley.

The area will be developed in accordance with the following principles:

- Development should seek to retain existing employment uses as far as possible (EMP1)
- Development will provide enhanced connections and greater activity between the Kirkley retail area and wider Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour AAP area (EHC1).
- The potential for utilising older buildings of architectural merit within the site should be investigated when designing schemes (EHC2).
- Open space for residents and site users must be integrated into all new schemes within this location (EHC3).
- The potential for a decked area of open space above the existing surface car park could be integrated as a design feature for any development within this location (EHC1, EHC3).
- Development should include provision to encourage wildlife habitats such as green/brown roofs and conservation areas within green spaces. The old railway line, now used as a cycle route should be enhanced as a wildlife corridor (EHC4).
- The development of the site will include good quality, safe pedestrian and cycle routes to provide quick linkages to the town centre, employment areas and other parts of Lowestoft (TML2).
- Secure cycle parking must be included throughout the site (TML2).
- Current car parking provision contained within the surface car park should be retained in this location, potentially as part of a decked mixed use scheme. The use of this car park should be intensified as a key southern car park serving Kirkley, South Beach and Peto Square (TML6)
- All residential streets will be designed in accordance with Manual for Streets principles (TML5)
- A sequential approach to site planning should be taken following PPS25 principles. All new buildings must be designed to ensure risk of flood is mitigated with safe means of escape. This should include early engagement with the Environment Agency and LPA emergency planners to assist in the design process.(FRM1)
- New buildings should be designed to ensure energy efficiency and on-site energy, heat and cooling systems (WEW1)
- All buildings must be designed to ensure water efficiency and incorporate measures for rainwater harvesting and recycling (WEW2).
- Waste arising from development should be minimised during demolition, construction and operational phases (WEW3).

Policy Links and Evidence Sources

- Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008)
- Cumulative Land Raising Study (2008)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Employment Land Study (January 2006)
- Lowestoft Cultural Heritage Study (2006)
- Sub-Regional Housing Strategy for Great Yarmouth and Waveney – 2005 and beyond (October 2004)
- Waveney Housing Strategy (January 2004)
Alternative Options Considered

This site was not included as a Strategic Site in previous iterations of the AAP. It was considered suitable for a mix of employment, residential, leisure and community uses which is retained within the revised proposals and follows the principles established within the Interim Waveney Local Plan (2004).

In assessing the preferred approach, the following alternatives have been considered:

- Option 1 – Preferred Option
- Option 2 – Focus upon employment/industrial intensification
- Option 3 – No policy.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSP 6 - Kirkley Rise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: Residential development will assist with addressing local housing needs and creating inclusive communities. Incorporating and retaining employment sites will provide locally accessible job opportunities which may help to reduce social exclusion. In addition, such a mix of uses may help to encourage footfall at different times of day, increasing natural surveillance and reducing opportunities for crime. The preferred option will enhance connections to and along the waterfront from the Kirkley neighbourhood. Without a policy, the waterfront areas may remain unattractive and underutilised. The employment focus option may undermine employment elsewhere in Lowestoft and would not bring about the same attractive connections to the waterfront.

Environmental: The retention of employment uses and new provision as part of the mixed use proposals will encourage walking to work, helping to reduce traffic and greenhouse gas emissions associated with motorised transport. The preferred option proposes development of vulnerable uses in areas at high risk of flooding. As such, in accordance with Policy FRM1, developments will be required to adequately demonstrate how flood risk has been mitigated (e.g. through land raising; SUDS) and how resilience during flood events has been maximised (e.g. safe access/egress points; habitable rooms above ground floor). Developments may also be required to incorporate defences which help to reduce flood risk elsewhere in Lowestoft.

Economic: Increasing the residential population in central Lowestoft will help to revitalise the town centre, with increased spending and more constant footfall enhancing the viability of shops and the evening economy. New tourist development proposed under the preferred option will help to enhance Lowestoft’s tourist offer and bring greater spending to the town. These benefits may not be realised through the employment focus option, which may also undermine employment elsewhere in Lowestoft.
Figure 4.6.1 - Kirkley Rise - extent of site

Figure 4.6.2 - Kirkley Rise - Planning and Design Principles
4.7 Other Development Sites

Overview

4.7.1. A range of smaller-scale sites are also proposed within the AAP. Development within these areas must have regard to the vision, objectives and policy framework set out within the AAP.

The Western End of Lake Lothing

4.7.2. This area currently has a much smaller scale and a more mixed character than the rest of Lake Lothing, with a strong emphasis on marine related industries. The Harbour Road Industrial Estate is a particular focus for these activities to the north. The AAP proposes to retain and build on these positive features, with small scale regeneration with the opportunity to build on the existing maritime heritage linked to skills development with the International Boat Building Training College.

4.7.3. The Interim Local Plan (2004) identified the south-western end of Lake Lothing west of Sanyo between Victoria Road, Stanley Road and Bridge Road for tourism, marine and residential uses including up to 113 new homes. It noted that this area has significant access constraints. It is considered that the construction of a southern access route may enable development in this area to come forward as a future phase of the sustainable urban neighbourhood and the area is therefore identified as a location for employment/tourism/residential mixed use development under the AAP policies contained in Part 3.

SSP7 – Western End of Lake Lothing

The following uses will be permitted area between Stanley Road and Bridge Road, south of Lake Lothing provided access, impact upon the broads and flood risk issues can be overcome:

- Waterfront tourism
- Small-scale residential (up to 113 new homes in accordance with Interim Local Plan allocation)
- Employment, with a focus on marine

The site should be developed in accordance with the following principles:

- Development should exploit the sites key gateway location between Lake Lothing and Oulton Broad.
- All new building should be of the highest architectural quality and maximise the potential of the waterfront position;
- The scheme must ensure public access to the waterfront through inclusion of marina, café/restaurant or bars at the waterfront
- The scheme should be brought forward as part of a later phase of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood and will require provision of the New Southern Access road.
- The scheme should provide open space within the site for the benefit of future residents and should contribute to improvements to off-site open space
- As this is a flood risk area, buildings will be required to include appropriate mitigation measures. This should include creative design solutions that ensure buildings are functional and attractive.
- Development should include provision to encourage wildlife habitats such as green/brown roofs and areas of...
green spaces.
- Secure cycle parking must be included within the site.
- Development should seek to ensure a potential third crossing could be constructed to the west of the site in the future.
- Development will be protected through land raising and strengthened flood defences.

Development will be required to contribute to the following items of infrastructure:
- Off-site schools provision
- Public realm and open space
- Off-site open space contributions
- Flood defences

**Policy Links and Evidence Sources**
- Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008)
- Cumulative Land Raising Study (2008)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Employment Land Study (January 2006)
- Lowestoft Cultural Heritage Study (2006)
- Sub-Regional Housing Strategy for Great Yarmouth and Waveney – 2005 and beyond (October 2004)
- Waveney Housing Strategy (January 2004)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Housing Market Assessment (September 2007)
- Waveney Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (November 2007)
- Waveney District Urban Housing Capacity Study (November 2002)
- Assessment of 5 Year Supply of Housing Land (January 2008)
- Affordable Housing Policy Financial Viability Study (2009)
- Waveney Interim Local Plan (2004)

**Alternative Options Considered**
This site was not included as a Strategic Site in previous iterations of the AAP. It was identified for small scale regeneration. The site was previously allocated within the Interim Local Plan. In assessing the Preferred Approach, the following alternatives have been considered:
- Option A – Preferred Option
- Option B – Retain existing uses
- Option C – No AAP Policy.

**Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSP 7 - Western End of Lake Lothing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social**: Residential development will assist with addressing local housing needs and creating inclusive communities. Marine focussed employment and tourism uses will create locally accessible job opportunities which may help to reduce social exclusion. Retaining existing uses could potentially protect jobs but on the other hand, may prevent the creation of new ones.

**Environmental**: The preferred option proposes development of vulnerable uses in areas at high risk of flooding. As such, in accordance with Policy FRM1, developments will be required to adequately demonstrate how flood risk has been mitigated (e.g. through land raising; SUDS) and how resilience during flood events has been maximised (e.g. safe access/egress points; habitable rooms above ground floor). Developments may also be required to incorporate...
defences which help to reduce flood risk elsewhere in Lowestoft.

**Economic:** Encouraging waterfront tourism will help to enhance Lowestoft's visitor offer and bring greater spending to the town. This will have a positive impact on local businesses and investment prospects. Retaining existing uses could support indigenous business growth but on the other hand, may hinder new investment.

**Oswald’s Boatyard**

4.7.4. The Oswald’s Boatyard site provides a short term opportunities to facilitate development within the western area. This site is currently occupied by a disused boat yard, 2 cottages, a tanning centre and library. The site is presently allocated in the Waveney Interim Local Plan for residential, library and tourism facilities. A planning application was submitted in 2006 for 85 flats and 8 housing association units with new library and community facilities. The application was subsequently withdrawn. The site has considerable flood risk issues and was included in the Cumulative Land Raising Study as a location for land raising. Development in this area will be acceptable providing the flood risk issues can be overcome.

4.7.5. The site was assessed as part of the Cumulative Land Raising Study which identified that the shoreline in front of the site is surrounded by higher ground elevations to the north, west and east, with only the southern boundary of the site along Lake Lothing identified as a low lying area.

4.7.6. The study concludes that due to small scale of this site, and high ground surrounding the site, land raising the quay crest between the Railway Bridge and Mutford Bridge is likely to be sufficient for providing the required level of protection for the development of this site. An alternative option would be to construct a defence wall along the Lake Lothing frontage tying in to the higher ground on the east and west of the site.

**SSP8 – Oswald’s Boatyard**

Oswald’s Boatyard will be developed for up to 93 high density residential units, replacement library and community facilities provided flood risk issues can be overcome. The site will be developed in accordance with the following principles:

- Creation of a landmark building at a key gateway location between Lake Lothing and Oulton Broad.
- All new building should be of the highest architectural quality and maximise the potential of the waterfront position;
- The scheme must ensure public access to the waterfront, including the provision of library, community facilities and ground flood tourism uses fronting the water;
- The scheme should include mooring facilities for a waterbus;
- The scheme should provide open space within the site for the benefit of future residents and should contribute to improvements to off-site open space
- Buildings will be designed to maximum heights of 10 storeys.
- As this is a flood risk area, buildings will be required to include appropriate mitigation measures. This should include creative design solutions that ensure buildings are functional and attractive.
- The area should provide potential to become a hub for tourism and should include hotel, restaurants, bars and marina to exploit the location between the North Sea and the Broads..
- Development should include provision to encourage wildlife habitats such as green/brown roofs and areas of green spaces.
- Secure cycle parking must be included within the site.
• Development should seek to ensure a potential third crossing could be constructed to the west of the site in the future.
• Development will be protected through land raising and strengthened flood defences.

Development will be required to contribute to the following items of infrastructure:
• Off-site schools provision
• New library and community facility
• Off-site open space contributions
• Flood defences

Policy Links and Evidence Sources
• Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008)
• Cumulative Land Raising Study (2008)
• Great Yarmouth and Waveney Employment Land Study (January 2006)
• Lowestoft Cultural Heritage Study (2006)
• Sub-Regional Housing Strategy for Great Yarmouth and Waveney – 2005 and beyond (October 2004)
• Waveney Housing Strategy (January 2004)
• Great Yarmouth and Waveney Housing Market Assessment (September 2007)
• Waveney Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (November 2007)
• Waveney District Urban Housing Capacity Study (November 2002)
• Assessment of 5 Year Supply of Housing Land (January 2008)
• Affordable Housing Policy Financial Viability Study (2009)
• Waveney Interim Local Plan (2004)

Alternative Options Considered
The site was previously allocated in the Interim Local Plan (2004) for 50 residential units and community uses. This site was not included as a Strategic Site in previous iterations of the AAP. It was considered suitable for a mix of employment, residential, leisure and community uses which is retained within the revised proposals.

In assessing the preferred approach, the following alternatives have been considered:
• Option 1 – Preferred Option
• Option 2 – Local Plan allocation (lower residential density)
• Option 3 – No development;
• Option 4 – No policy.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSP 8 - Oswald’s Boatyard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social: Residential development will assist with addressing local housing needs and creating inclusive communities. Social infrastructure provision will improve access to key services for local people. The lower density residential option may not involve the critical mass to ensure the viability of new community facilities. No development would mean a new library would not be delivered.

Environmental: The preferred option proposes development of vulnerable uses in areas at high risk of flooding. As such, in accordance with Policy FRM1, developments will be required to adequately demonstrate how flood risk has been mitigated (e.g. through land raising; SUDS) and how resilience during flood events has been maximised (e.g. safe access/egress points; habitable rooms above ground floor). The development of a landmark building of high
architectural quality and distinctiveness of the townscape. The ‘no development’ option would involve no increase in exposure to flood risk.

**Economic:** Increasing the residential population in central Lowestoft will help to revitalise the town centre, with increased spending and more constant footfall enhancing the viability of shops and the evening economy. The low density and no development options will not have significant economic impacts.

**The Scores**

4.7.7. The area east of the historic high street is characterised by a network of alleyways which are important historic features that linked the town with the original fishing port. The AAP seeks to improve linkages within this area between the High Street and key intervention areas including the East of England Park, PowerPark and Peto Square. Residential development will be favoured in this location to assist in the wider regeneration of this highly attractive location.

**SSP9 – The Scores**

Small scale residential and employment development will be supported in the “Scores” area east of the historic High Street. It is estimated that the area has capacity for up to \( x \) units. The site will be developed to fully respect the historic character of the area and should seek to retain the existing employment uses as far as possible.

**Policy Links and Evidence Sources**

- Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008)
- Cumulative Land Raising Study (2008)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Employment Land Study (January 2006)
- Lowestoft Cultural Heritage Study (2006)
- Sub-Regional Housing Strategy for Great Yarmouth and Waveney – 2005 and beyond (October 2004)
- Waveney Housing Strategy (January 2004)
- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Housing Market Assessment (September 2007)
- Waveney Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (November 2007)
- Waveney District Urban Housing Capacity Study (November 2002)
- Assessment of 5 Year Supply of Housing Land (January 2008)
- Affordable Housing Policy Financial Viability Study (2009)

**Alternative Options Considered**

This site was not included as a Strategic Site in previous iterations of the AAP. It was considered suitable for a mix of employment, residential, leisure and community uses which is retained within the revised proposals.

In assessing the preferred approach, the following alternatives have been considered:

- Option 1 – Preferred Option
- Option 2 – Comprehensive employment development
- Option 3 – Comprehensive residential development
- Option 4 – No policy.
Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSP 9 - The Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social:** Residential development will assist with addressing local housing needs and creating inclusive communities. The town centre location will improve access to key services and retail facilities for residents. The mix of uses proposed under the preferred option may increase the accessibility of job opportunities.

**Environmental:** The town centre location will encourage walking to destinations and reduce car dependency and emissions which contribute to climate change. Enhancing the historically important Scores will contribute to the heritage character of the town centre. The preferred option proposes development of vulnerable uses in areas at high risk of flooding. As such, in accordance with Policy FRM1, developments will be required to adequately demonstrate how flood risk has been mitigated (e.g. through land raising; SUDS) and how resilience during flood events has been maximised (e.g. safe access/egress points; habitable rooms above ground floor). The residential only option may increase vulnerability to flooding by necessitating housing development in areas of the site at higher risk of flooding.

**Economic:** The preferred option and residential only option would increase the residential population in central Lowestoft. The associated increased spending and more constant footfall would enhance the viability of shops and the evening economy. The employment only option could potentially encourage investment and support indigenous growth, but may undermine employment elsewhere in Lowestoft. The residential only option on the other hand may constrain employment growth.

**Peto Way/Denmark Road Corridor**

4.7.8. This area has seen considerable investment in recent years facilitated by the construction of Peto Way which provides a primary route into the AAP area from the North. This has included the development of the North Quay retail park and the Quay View Business Park.

4.7.9. There remain several potential development sites in this location including areas between the road and the railway line, and north of the North Quay retail park. Further retail development is not considered appropriate in this location, however employment B1, B2, B8 uses are considered appropriate and may provide a suitable location for businesses requiring relocation from PowerPark and Brooke Peninsula.

**SSP10 – Peto Way/Denmark Road Corridor**

Approximately 3.2 ha of space within the vicinity of Peto Way/Denmark road corridor is allocated for employment development comprising B1, B2 and B8 uses as illustrated on the AAP proposals map. This location will be used as priority relocation space for businesses that will be displaced by other strategic site proposals as set out in the Area Action Plan.

**Policy Links and Evidence Sources**

- Great Yarmouth and Waveney Employment Land Study (January 2006)
- Emerging Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Employment Relocation Strategy
Alternative Options Considered

This site was not included as a Strategic Site in previous iterations of the AAP. It was considered suitable for a mix of employment, residential, leisure and community uses which is retained within the revised proposals.

In assessing the preferred approach, the following alternatives have been considered:

- Option 1 – Preferred Option
- Option 2 – Further retail development
- Option 3 – No policy.

Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSP 10 - Peto Way / Denmark Rd Corridor</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Further retail</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social:** The preferred proposals will assist employment creation directly and indirectly, by supporting development at PowerPark. By enabling existing businesses to relocate, the proposals will help ensure there is a net increase in employment as PowerPark is developed out. No policy may undermine both existing businesses and the delivery of PowerPark proposals. Further retail in this out of centre location may exclude people who do not own a car.

**Environmental:** Supporting the growth of the renewable energy sector will help to reduce contributions to climate change. The further retail option would encourage car dependency and increase greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change.

**Economic:** The preferred proposals support existing businesses and will encourage investment. With no policy, jobs may be lost in existing businesses and relocation may be more complicated as well as less expedient. The further retail option is likely to undermine the town centre’s viability and vitality.
Part 5
Delivery and Implementation
Part 5 – Delivery and Implementation

The AAP vision will only be realised through the co-ordinated implementation of the 14 key objectives and their related AAP policies, principally through the delivery of the main Strategic Sites.

This section seeks to demonstrate the delivery of the AAP policies and proposals. It sets out the following:

- Partnership approach
- Strategic site and infrastructure requirements
- Funding mechanisms
- Planning tools
- Indicative development programme
- Implementation and Monitoring Framework

5.1 A PARTNERSHIP APPROACH

The delivery and implementation of the AAP will be phased over a number of years to 2025. It will be essential to ensure that the Council and 1st East continue to work in partnership with a range of stakeholders in the public, private and community/voluntary sectors. The success of the AAP will depend upon effective co-ordinated delivery, with the Council playing a central role as plan maker and development control authority.

It will require considerable resources to realise the AAP vision. Partnership working with a clear process and good communication among the partners and with stakeholders will be required to keep all parties up to date and involved in the progress of the AAP as a whole and projects for individual sites. It will therefore be essential to maintain the momentum and communication links established during the preparation process.

**IMP1 – A Partnership Approach**

The Council will establish an AAP implementation steering group comprising 1st East, EEDA, the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) and Suffolk County Council responsible for realising the AAP vision, objectives, policies and proposals to 2025. WDC and the steering group will work in partnership with a range of stakeholders in the public, private and community/voluntary sectors including:

- Land owners, site developers and their consultants
- Local businesses
- ABP
- Highways Agency
- Lowestoft Chamber of Commerce
- Network Rail/Train Operating Company
- Rail users group
5.2 STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS

The realisation of the AAP vision will entail significant investment in infrastructure to benefit existing local residents and businesses and to ensure Lowestoft continues to be an attractive place to invest, work, live and visit. Without this infrastructure new development will not be brought forward and the opportunity to regenerate the Lake Lothing in a comprehensive way will be put at risk.

Table 5.1 below summarises infrastructure requirements required for the AAP proposals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Site</th>
<th>Infrastructure Requirement</th>
<th>Responsible Agencies</th>
<th>Infrastructure classification</th>
<th>Indicative Phasing (Short term, 5-10 years; Medium Term &gt;10 years)</th>
<th>Inter-dependencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All residential sites</td>
<td>Indicative requirement for 1.7 forms of entry Secondary School provision</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>To be refined through site-specific development briefs and planning applications. To be monitored across the AAP area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-site infrastructure projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkley Waterfront, Brooke Peninsula, Sanyo Site</td>
<td>East - West Access Road</td>
<td>1st East Suffolk County Council Highways Agency</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>East-West Access Road detailed feasibility study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North -South Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>1st East Waveney District Council</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Site</td>
<td>Infrastructure Requirement</td>
<td>Responsible Agencies</td>
<td>Infrastructure classification (critical to unlock site or essential to be delivered alongside sites)</td>
<td>Indicative Phasing (Short term, &lt;5 years; Medium Term 5-10 years; Long Term &gt;10 years)</td>
<td>Inter-dependencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicative requirement for 1.2 forms of entry Primary School provision</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>To be refined through site-specific development briefs and planning applications. To be monitored across the AAP area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicative requirement for 280sq.m Primary Healthcare space and 60sq.m Dental Surgery floorspace</td>
<td>Suffolk NHS Trust</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>To be refined through site-specific development briefs and planning applications. To be monitored across the AAP area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicative requirement for 215sq.m flexible Community Space and 90sq.m Library floorspace</td>
<td>Waveney District Council</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>To be refined through site-specific development briefs and planning applications. To be monitored across the AAP area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual-site infrastructure projects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Park</th>
<th>Upgraded dock facilities</th>
<th>1st East ABP</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>A Relocation Strategy to identify affected business and appropriate relocation assistance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peto Square</td>
<td>Station relocation</td>
<td>1st East Network Rail National Express ABP</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>A detailed feasibility study on relocating the station undertaken in partnership with the responsible agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New pedestrian /cycle bridge</td>
<td>1st East</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>A detailed design study for the bridge configuration, lifting/swinging arrangements etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table indicates:
- the required infrastructure project and the site or sites(s) that it relates to;
- the responsible agencies that will bring the project forward (either providing the infrastructure or coordinating its delivery);
- whether the project is critical to unlock the strategic site or site(s) for development or whether it is an essential item that will be needed as the development is built out;
- the phasing of the project; and
- any dependencies with other initiatives or parallel work that are important to delivering the project.

**IMP2 – Strategic Infrastructure**

The Council will work to ensure that the timely delivery of the following strategic infrastructure within the AAP area to facilitate the wider regeneration of Lowestoft:

- An indicative requirement for 1.7 forms of entry Secondary School provision
- East - West Access Road
- North -South Pedestrian Bridge across Lake Lothing
- Upgraded dock facilities
- Station relocation at Peto Square
- New pedestrian /cycle bridge at Peto Square

All other local and essential types of infrastructure are the key responsibility of developers to coordinate in partnership with the Council or the relevant infrastructure provider.

**5.3 DELIVERY AND FUNDING MECHANISMS**

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a voluntary mechanism that allows local authorities in England and Wales to levy a standard charge on most types of new development, to fund the infrastructure needed to support development in their area. The regime for this new charge is due to start in April 2010. A CIL system will have the following characteristics:

- CIL will take the form of fixed standard charges, levied as pounds per square metre of floor space.
- CIL charging schedules will be published, and developers will be able to readily predict the size of their potential liability, perhaps months or years in advance of development. This should help developers plan ahead. It will also speed up the planning process.
- Draft CIL charging schedules will be subject to consultation with local stakeholders and developers, and they can be adopted only after a CIL charging schedule examination, involving independent testing by an examiner with appropriate qualifications and experience. CIL charging schedules will provide greater transparency over the amount different developers are required to pay.
- CIL charging authorities will be required to monitor the use of CIL and provide regular reports to ensure that people can understand how contributions from developers are helping to make their local communities more sustainable and that developers can see how their contributions through CIL are being used to support the development of the area.
- CIL will be levied on most types of new development in a local authority area, thus broadening the range of developments being asked to contribute something towards local infrastructure.
- CIL will make it easier for charging authorities to address the cumulative impact of developments, ensuring developers cannot free-ride on others in the community, but rather make a fair contribution towards larger items of infrastructure.

While CIL is expected to make a significant contribution to infrastructure funding, it will not replace existing mainstream funding. Core public funding will continue to bear the main burden. Local authorities will need to utilise CIL alongside other funding streams to deliver infrastructure plans locally.

In simple terms a CIL is derived in the following way:
1. Councils will need an infrastructure planning process in place, based on the development plan vision for the area, to enable them to identify the likely infrastructure requirements and costs as the basis for the CIL charging schedule.
2. Deducting the sums likely to be available from mainstream funding programmes will result in the shortfall to be raised from CIL.
3. A viability assessment will be required to test the how realistic the results are, together with a sensitivity analysis relating market conditions to deliverability.
4. A charging schedule can then be prepared, based on the range of developments liable for CIL.

This AAP identifies the infrastructure which is required to unlock the strategic sites within the AAP area. This is not the only infrastructure that will be required in order to unlock development in the District as a whole, neither are development receipts or a potential CIL levied on the AAP strategic sites the only development contributions which could be pooled towards delivering the necessary district, sub-regional and regional infrastructure that will be needed to deliver the comprehensive development plan vision for the area. The AAP does not attempt to determine a Section 106, or tariff or potential CIL level for the AAP area and strategic sites as this must be determined as part of the wider district-wide processes. The AAP makes a positive contribution towards this process by identifying the critical and essential infrastructure that are required, the phasing of when it is required, the key agencies who are responsible for helping to secure this infrastructure and the potential development trajectory which is both unlocked by, and could potentially contribute towards, delivering this infrastructure.

**IMP3 – Delivery and Funding Mechanisms**

Policy CS04 (Infrastructure) in the adopted Core Strategy has priority regards developer contributions and any potential CIL arrangements.

The AAP implementation steering group will be expected to work with the District Council, the Local Strategic Partnership, Suffolk County Council and other partners to address the infrastructure needs in the AAP area in the context of the settlement strategy set out in the Core Strategy.

Developers within the AAP area should demonstrate the infrastructure requirements that are needed to
support and service the proposed development with reference to table x.x. above which identified indicative infrastructure needs. In line with Core Strategy Policy CS04 they will need to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority or infrastructure provider, that adequate capacity either exists or that provision will be made to meet the necessary infrastructure requirements within an appropriate time scale.

Developers will be expected to work in partnership across the strategic sites to demonstrate coordinated infrastructure delivery and ensure that any subsequent or third-party developers who assume responsibility for site-specific delivery are also signed-up to this partnership way of working. 1st East will work with the developer interests to facilitate this coordination.

5.4 PLANNING TOOLS

To ensure that development meets the vision and objectives set out within the AAP, Waveney District Council as local planning authority will control the nature and quantum of development through the planning process. Development of strategic sites will be required to comply with the development principles set out within the AAP.

The AAP provides a clear policy framework for the promotion of a comprehensive approach to enable the delivery of key community facilities and infrastructure and create a well connected neighbourhoods. To deliver the proposals outlined in the AAP, a more detailed level of design development is required before site development can commence. The following documents will need to be prepared, either by the AAP implementation steering group or by developers of the strategic sites working together in partnership, submitted to, and approved by, Waveney District Council either at or before the planning application stage in addition to the standard requirements for planning application(s):

- Detailed masterplan and design codes/ detailed design principles;
- Detailed phasing and delivery strategy;
- Street hierarchy plan and detailed design of key highways infrastructure;
- Public transport strategy;
- Landscape strategy;
- Energy strategy; and
- A community facilities strategy.

IMP4 – Planning Tools

All development proposals will be required to adhere to the principles and requirements outlined in the above documents to ensure coordination between development schemes and the delivery of strategic objectives.

A comprehensive approach will be required to development of the strategic sites to ensure a high quality of design, an integrated layout and the timely delivery of social, economic, environmental and physical infrastructure improvements.

Planning applications within the AAP area will not be considered unless the strategic documents listed below have been prepared and approved by the council. All development proposals will be required to be in accordance with the policies and guidance set out in the AAP.

The following documents will need to be approved by the council at or before the planning application stage.
They cover AAP-wide issues which require further detailed work to ensure a comprehensive development:

- Detailed masterplan and design codes/ detailed design principles;
- Detailed phasing and delivery strategy;
- Street hierarchy plan and detailed design of key highways infrastructure;
- Public transport strategy;
- Landscape strategy;
- Energy strategy; and
- A community facilities strategy.
5.5 INDICATIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Table 5.3 below summarises the housing trajectory information for the strategic sites based on reasonable assumptions of average build out rates and the likely lead-in periods required to unlock key sites through strategic infrastructure. The trajectory also indicates that likely housing numbers that would be delivered in the short, medium and long-term periods which correspond to the phasing periods used for the infrastructure costs assessment.

The short-term development trajectory is limited to development in Kirkley Rise, Oswald’s Boatyard and early phases of the Brooke Peninsula site prior to delivery of the East-West Access Road. In the medium and long terms the main strategic sites are delivering housing numbers, but at a realistic rate of delivery with a high rate of delivery in 2016-2017 when the number of homes released to the market would be just under four per week in the AAP area. It should be remembered that this is in addition to housing delivery in the rest of the district and care should be taken not to exceed the likely rate of take-up by the market and affordable housing providers. At the affordable housing policy levels set out in Policy HC1 this trajectory would deliver 110 affordable homes to 2017 and 326 affordable homes to 2025.

5.6 IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING FRAMEWORK

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires local planning authorities to produce an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) every year to assess the delivery of the council’s planning documents and implementation of its policies. The Monitoring Framework overleaf identifies the key indicators and targets to be monitored for the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour area in
order to ensure the delivery of a high quality, sustainable mixed use community.

Waveney District Council will monitor the implementation of the AAP and assess the extent to which the objectives and policies are being achieved. Where targets are not being met, the council will explain why and set out what steps are to be taken to correct this [in the AMR].
### 5.7 IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Responsible Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To generate a flourishing and diverse local economy</td>
<td>EMP1 – Employment Sites EMP2 – Renewable Energy Business Cluster EMP 3 – Mixed Use Employment Areas EMP4 – Port Activities HC3 – Social and Community Infrastructure SSP1 – Power Park Proposals SSP3 – Kirkley Waterfront Proposals</td>
<td>1,000 jobs delivered by 20XX Increased proportion of jobs in Lowestoft in the renewable energy sector Increased skill levels in the local labour market</td>
<td>• sqm commercial / office floorspace delivery • Number and percentage of employees by employment division • Unemployment rate • Long-term unemployment • Average earnings • Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) • Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type • Business formation rate • Business start up and closures • Net change in total number of VAT registered businesses • Proportion of the population with no qualifications • Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher</td>
<td>WDC 1st East SCC EEDA ABP Lowestoft Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To provide an attractive place to live</td>
<td>HC1 – Housing in the AAP HC2 – Distribution of Housing HO3 – Social and Community Infrastructure EHC 1 – Urban Design EHC 3 – Open Space EHC 4 – Design for Biodiversity and Habitats SSP4 - Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo Proposals SSP3 – Kirkley Waterfront</td>
<td>Delivery of approximately 1,500 new homes Provision of a variety of housing types An increased proportion of the local population have access to key facilities Open space deficiency</td>
<td>• % of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood • Housing completions in AAP area • Ha. of new open space • Local satisfaction with quality of open spaces • Distance to key services • % of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes • % of school children travelling to school by sustainable modes • Number of applications referred to applicants on</td>
<td>WDC 1st East Design Review Board SCC Developers CABE English heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. To ensure social inclusivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>grounds of design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSP6 - Kirkley Rise – Proposals</td>
<td>• Affordable housing completions in AAP area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lifetime homes completions in AAP area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recorded crime per 1000 of population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distance to key services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Household demographic profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proportion of the population with no qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC1 – Housing in the AAP area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC3 – Social and Community Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHC 1 – Urban Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TML1 – Sustainable Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP1 – Power Park Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP3 – Kirkley Waterfront Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP4 - Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP6 - Kirkley Rise – Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Delivery of a variety of housing types, tenures and sizes
- Public realm and open spaces encourage inclusive access to local facilities
- Increased skill levels in the local labour market

### 4. To realise an enhanced retail centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>grounds of design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RET 1 – Retail within the AAP Area</td>
<td>• Number and % vacant units in town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP2 – Peto Square Proposals</td>
<td>• sqm of new retail floorspace in town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• sqm of new entertainment / leisure / cultural floorspace in town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1st East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lowestoft Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Enhanced vitality and viability of Lowestoft's town centre
- Provision of xx,xxx sqm new retail floorspace
- Retail core extended southwards

### 5. To make the most of the waterfront

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>grounds of design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHC 1 – Urban Design</td>
<td>• Implementation of proposed new waterside linkages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHC2 – Landscape and Public Realm</td>
<td>• Public footfall at key points on waterfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHC 3 – Waterfront Connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP1 – Power Park Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP2 – Peto Square Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP4 - Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP5 – East of England Park Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Delivery safe and attractive connections to and along waterfront areas
- Historic scores protected and enhanced

### 6. To create a quality environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>grounds of design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHC 1 – Urban Design</td>
<td>• WDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHC 2 – Heritage Assets</td>
<td>• Conservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Delivery of all new development sites to high
- • No. of applications which involve Conservation Area or listed building enhancements
| EHC 3 – Open Space | Delivery of all new development sites to high standards of design | • No. of buildings on at risk register  
• % of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood  
• Air quality  
• Water quality in Lake Lothing  
• Groundwater quality  
• Reported condition of County Wildlife Sites  
• Achievement of habitat action plan targets  
• Achievement of species action plan targets  
• Implementation of proposed public realm and open space enhancements  
• Ha. of new open space  
• Local satisfaction with quality of open spaces |
| EHC 4– Design for Biodiversity and Habitats | standards of design  
Heritage assets and maritime character safeguarded and enhanced  
Open space deficiency reduced through new provision  
Quality of existing open spaces improved  
Protect and enhance natural habits; increase biodiversity | • Number of applications referred to applicants on grounds of design  
• % new dwellings meeting Code for Sustainable Homes level 5  
• %non-residential buildings meeting BREEAM Excellent  
• % of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood  
• Fear of crime |
| EHC 1 – Urban Design | Delivery of all new development sites to high standards of design | • Number of visitors to Lowestoft  
• Numbers employed in tourism-related employment  
• Implementation of East of England Park proposals  
• Implementation of Brooke Peninsula proposals  
• Implementation of Peto Square proposals |
| SSPs 1 - 10 | • 1st East  
• SCC  
• English Heritage  
• Natural England  
• Environment Agency  
• CABE  
| EHC 2 – Heritage Assets | Completion of leisure / marina development within Brooke Peninsula.  
East of England park delivered with Ness Point enhanced as a destination  
Delivery of Peto Square enhances Lowestoft's retail | • WDC  
• 1st East Design Review Board  
• SCC  
• CABE  
| RET2 – Leisure and Tourism | • 1st East  
• SCC  
• Choose Suffolk  
• Broads Authority  
| RET 1 – Retail within the AAP Area | • WDC  
• 1st East Design Review Board  
• SCC  
• CABE  
| SSP2 – Peto Square Proposals | • WDC  
• 1st East Design Review Board  
• SCC  
• CABE  
| SSP4 - Brooke Peninsula/Sanyo | • WDC  
• 1st East Design Review Board  
• SCC  
• CABE  
| SSP5 – East of England Park Proposals | • WDC  
• 1st East Design Review Board  
• SCC  
• CABE  
| • 1st East  
• SCC  
• English Heritage  
• Natural England  
• Environment Agency  
• CABE |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offer</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Collaborators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. To be better connected</strong></td>
<td>TML1 – Sustainable Transport  TML4 – New Streets and Vehicular Routes  TML5 – Lowestoft Station</td>
<td>Completion of Southern Access Route, Third Crossing and relocation of Lowestoft Station which enables development at Peto Square, Brooke Peninsula, Sanyo and Kirkley Waterfront  Completion of proposed pedestrian and cycle routes</td>
<td>Traffic volumes at key locations  Footfall along key pedestrian routes  Number of proposed schemes implemented / under construction  WDC  1st East  SCC  Highways Agency  Network Rail  Rail operator  Sustrans  Rail User Groups  Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. To reduce the need to travel by car</strong></td>
<td>TML1 – 7 SSPs 1 - 6</td>
<td>Completion of new pedestrian routes and cycle links  New development well served by public transport</td>
<td>Number of recommended linkages implemented / under construction  Distance to key services  % of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes  % of school children travelling to school by sustainable modes  Footfall along key pedestrian routes  Public transport ridership  WDC  1st East  SCC  Highways Agency  Network Rail  Rail operator  Sustrans  Rail User Groups  Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. A strategic approach to flood risk</strong></td>
<td>FRM1 – Flood Risk and Emergency Planning SSPs 1 - 10</td>
<td>Flood risk minimised within the AAP area, with vulnerable uses delivered in areas of lowest flood risk  Reduction of flood risk outside AAP area  Design of developments minimises vulnerability in</td>
<td>Number of planning applications with  WDC  1st East  SCC  Environment Agency  ABP  Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. To ensure resource efficient development</strong></td>
<td><strong>13. To ensure proposals are deliverable</strong></td>
<td><strong>14. To facilitate public and stakeholder support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE1 – Energy Requirements within the AAP Area</td>
<td>IMP2 – Strategic Infrastructure</td>
<td>IMP1 – A Partnership Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE2 – Water efficiency and quality</td>
<td>IMP3 – Delivery and Funding Mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE3 – Waste SSPs 1 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All new homes Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5</td>
<td>Successful delivery of all proposed developments</td>
<td>Broad support for developments from landowners, businesses, residents, community representatives and other local stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% new dwellings meeting Code for Sustainable Homes level 5</td>
<td>Housing completions</td>
<td>Population surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% non-residential buildings meeting BREEAM Excellent</td>
<td>Social infrastructure delivered</td>
<td>Planning application representations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water consumption</td>
<td>Physical infrastructure delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled</td>
<td>sqm retail floorspace delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of gas – domestic use per consumer and total commercial / industrial use</td>
<td>sqm commercial floorspace delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of electricity – domestic use per consumer and total commercial / industrial use</td>
<td>sqm leisure / entertainment / cultural floorspace delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% non-residential buildings meeting BREEAM Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE3 – Waste SSPs 1 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other new development rated as BREEAM Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- WDC
- 1st East
- SCC
- Environment Agency
- Developers
Appendix 1

SFRA Depth Hazard Modelling Plans