



Working in partnership with



Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Wiltshire and Swindon Minerals and Waste Development Framework

Waste Site Allocations Development Plan Document: Submission Stage

Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report

December 2011

Enfusion *in association with*
Centre for Sustainability at TRL



Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Wiltshire & Swindon Minerals and Waste Development Framework

Waste Site Allocations Development Plan Document: Submission Stage

Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report

Prepared for: Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council

<i>date:</i>	December 2011	
<i>prepared for:</i>	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council	
<i>prepared by:</i>	Alastair Peattie	Enfusion
<i>quality assurance:</i>	Barbara Carroll Rob Gardner	Enfusion C4S



Treenwood House
Rowden Lane
Bradford on Avon
BA15 2AU
t: 01225 867112
www.enfusion.co.uk

**Wiltshire Council & Swindon Borough Council
Waste Site Allocations: Submission**

Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report

CONTENTS		Page
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1	INTRODUCTION	3
	Requirement for Habitats Regulations Assessment	3
	Guidance for Habitats Regulations Assessment	4
	Consultation	5
	Purpose & Structure of Report	5
2	MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK	6
	Introduction	6
	Waste Core Strategy DPD	6
	Waste Development Control Policies DPD	7
	Waste Site Allocations DPD	7
3	HRA METHOD & FINDINGS FOR THE MINERALS AND WASTE CORE STRATEGIES AND DC POLICIES	11
	HRA of Minerals and Waste Core Strategies	11
	HRA of Minerals and Waste Development Control Policies	14
4	HRA METHOD & FINDINGS FOR THE WASTE SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD	15
	Introduction	15
	Sustainability Impacts of Waste Management Facilities	15
	European Site Sensitivities	22
	Screening Method	25
	Screening Findings	29
	Other Plans and Projects In Combination	31
	Screening Summary	33
	Progression of Core Strategy and Development Control	34
	Recommendations	35
5	CONCLUSIONS, FUTURE WORK	36
	Monitoring and Review	37
TABLES		
1.1	Habitats Regulations Assessment: Key Stages	4
3.1	HRA Screening Tasks and Findings for the Minerals and Waste Core	11

	Strategies	
3.2	Appropriate Assessment Tasks and Findings for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies	13
4.1	Sustainability Impacts of Waste Management Facilities	16
4.2	Assessment Key for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies HRA	26
4.3	Minerals and Waste Core Strategies AA: Summary Assessment Matrix	27
4.4	Distance at which a waste management facility may adversely affect European sites	28
4.5	Waste site allocations within the distance at which a waste management facility may adversely affect European sites	29
4.6	HRA Screening Summary	34

APPENDICES

1. European Site Characterisation
2. Consultation Commentary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 0.1 Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council are jointly preparing their Minerals and Waste Development Framework that sets out strategic planning policy over the period to 2026. To date the Councils have produced a series of Development Plan Documents, including:
- A Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2009); and
 - A Waste Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (adopted September 2009).
- 0.2 This report outlines the methods used and the findings arising from the screening stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment for Wiltshire and Swindon's Waste Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). The screening took forward the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies and Development Control Policies HRA findings and ensured that the recommendations were effectively applied to the Waste Site Allocations DPD. The purpose of the Waste Site Allocations DPD is to provide detailed local expression to the adopted Waste Core Strategy in terms of the identification of sites that the Councils consider will be required in order to meet the forecasts of demand for new waste management capacity.
- 0.3 An HRA Screening Report (April 2011) accompanied the Pre-Submission DPD on consultation for eight weeks in June 2011. This revised HRA Screening Report takes account of changes made to the document since the Pre-Submission consultation period ended in August 2011. The main change to the DPD was the removal of eight sites from consideration as a result of a further land owner survey.
- 0.4 The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy HRA identified that for each European site there was a distance for which it cannot be certain that a likely significant effect will not result from the siting and operation of a mineral and/or waste site. Based on the findings of the HRA for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies, two of the 35 sites proposed in the Waste Site Allocations Submission DPD are within the distance at which a waste management facility may adversely affect a European site. The 2 waste sites and their distance from European sites are as follows:
- CB Skip Hire (Salisbury) is approximately 82m from the River Avon SAC
 - The Former Imerys Quarry (Salisbury) is approximately 250m from the River Avon SAC
- 0.5 These two waste sites were assessed by the Wiltshire County Ecologist to determine the likelihood for the proposed waste management uses to have likely significant effects on European sites. Whilst the potential for adverse effects was identified (including disturbance and changes to water quality and turbidity), it was considered that appropriate site level mitigation is available to mitigate these effects (recommendations include robust site management plans and at

specific sites introducing a planning condition to restrict operations to daylight hours in order to avoid disturbance to otters). The assessment therefore concluded that the development of waste management facilities on the 2 sites will not have likely significant effects on the identified European sites, either alone or in combination.

- 0.6 To address Natural England concerns in relation to the risk of pollution entering the River Avon SAC the HRA also recommends that any proposals for the two sites are accompanied by a surface water management strategy that specifically considers the integration of surface water drainage systems.
- 0.7 The findings of this plan level HRA does not obviate the need for individual waste developments to undertake project level HRA/AA, as the nature and scale of waste management facilities for a particular site will only be known at the planning application stage. This assessment should be revisited in the light of any significant changes to the plan and this screening opinion has been subject to consultation and advice from the statutory body Natural England and other key stakeholders.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council are jointly preparing their Minerals and Waste Development Framework that sets out strategic planning policy over the period to 2026. Enfusion and C4S/TRL were appointed by Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council to undertake Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Wiltshire and Swindon Minerals and Waste Development Framework.
- 1.2 Enfusion is undertaking the SA/SEA and HRA of the Waste DPDs. An HRA Screening Report (April 2011) was produced to accompany the draft Waste Site Allocations DPD at the formal Regulation 27 consultation stage which took place from 13th June to 08th August 2011. This revised HRA Screening Report takes account of changes made to the DPD since the Pre-Submission publication. HRA of the Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Development Framework is an ongoing process, each plan/ stage progressively informing the lower level documents.
- 1.3 Habitats Regulations Assessment is also commonly referred to as Appropriate Assessment (AA) although the requirement for AA is first determined by an initial 'screening' stage undertaken as part of the full HRA. This report details the findings and recommendations of the initial 'screening' stage in the HRA process.

REQUIREMENT FOR HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT

- 1.4 Articles 6 (3) and 6 (4) of the Habitats Directive require AA to be undertaken on proposed plans or projects which are not necessary for the management of the site but which are likely to have a significant effect on one or more Natura 2000 sites either individually, or in combination with other plans and projects.¹ This is transposed into UK law by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended 2011), which requires the application of HRA to all land use plans. The purpose of HRA is to assess the impacts of a land-use plan, in combination with the effects of other plans and projects, against the conservation objectives of a European Site and to ascertain whether it would adversely affect the integrity² of that site. In this report the term 'European sites' will be used when referring to SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites.

¹ Determining whether an effect is 'significant' is undertaken in relation to the designated interest features and conservation objectives of the Natura 2000 sites. If an impact on any conservation objective is assessed as being adverse then it should be treated as significant. Where information is limited the precautionary principle applies and significant effects should be assumed until evidence exists to the contrary.

² Integrity is described as the sites' coherence, ecological structure and function across the whole area that enables it to sustain the habitat, complex of habitats and/or levels of populations of species for which it was classified, (ODPM, 2005).

GUIDANCE FOR HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT

- 1.5 A number of guidance documents have been produced for undertaking HRA at different spatial scales. Key guidance that has informed the approach in this Report is produced by Natural England, 'The Habitats Regulations Assessment of Local Development Documents (D Tyldesley and Associates, Feb 2009).
- 1.6 Based on the available guidance and emergent practice, HRA is approached in three main stages, as shown in the table below. This report outlines the method and findings for stage 1 of the HRA process; the screening.

Table 1.1 Habitats Regulations Assessment: Key Stages

Stage 1	
Screening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify international sites in and around the plan/ strategy area ▪ Examine conservation objectives ▪ Identify potential effects on Natura 2000 sites ▪ Examine other plans and programmes that could contribute to 'in combination' effects
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>If no effects are likely - report that there is no significant effect.</i> ▪ <i>If effects are judged likely or uncertainty exists - the precautionary principle applies, proceed to stage 2</i>
Stage 2	
Appropriate Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collate information on sites and evaluate impact in light of conservation objectives ▪ Consider how plan 'in combination' with other plans and programmes will interact when implemented (the Appropriate Assessment) ▪ Consider how the effect on integrity of sites could be avoided by changes to the plan and the consideration of alternatives ▪ Develop mitigation measures (including timescale and mechanisms)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Report outcomes of AA and develop monitoring strategies</i> ▪ <i>If effects remain, following the consideration of alternatives and development of mitigation measures, proceed to stage 3</i>
Stage 3	
Assessment where no alternatives and adverse impacts remain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify 'imperative reasons of overriding public interest' (IROPI) ▪ Identify/ develop potential compensatory measures
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Difficult test to pass, requirements are onerous and untested to date</i>

CONSULTATION

- 1.7 The Habitats Regulations require the plan making/competent authority to consult the appropriate nature conservation statutory body [Natural England (NE)]. The scope of the screening assessment and structure of the report was agreed with NE in September 2010. NE also provided comments on the HRA Screening Report that accompanied the Pre-submission (Regulation 27) DPD during the consultation which ran from 13th June to 8th August 2011. A table summarising the comments and how these have been addressed is provided in **Appendix 2**. The Habitats Regulations leave consultation with other bodies and the public to the discretion of the plan making authority.

PURPOSE & STRUCTURE OF REPORT

- 1.8 This report documents the process and findings from the screening of the HRA for the Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council Waste Site Allocations DPD. The report builds on and incorporates the findings from the HRA of higher level DPDs, such as the adopted Waste Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPDs, which have informed the development of the Waste Site Allocations DPD and this HRA. Following this introductory section the document is organised into a further four sections:

- **Section 2** - provides background information on the Minerals and Waste Development Framework, outlining the purpose and contents of each DPD.
- **Section 3** - outlines the methods and findings of the HRAs for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies and Development Control Policies.
- **Section 4** - initially identifies the potential impacts of waste management facilities on European sites, as well as the sensitivities of the identified European sites themselves. The section then outlines the method and summarises the findings and recommendations of the screening stage for the Waste Site Allocations DPD.
- **Section 5** - summarises the key conclusion and recommendations of the HRA Screening process.

2.0 MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

2.1 Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council are jointly preparing their Minerals and Waste Development Framework that sets out strategic minerals and waste planning policy over the period to 2026. The framework comprises:

- a portfolio of local development plan documents (DPDs);
- a Local Development Scheme³ (LDS); and
- a Statement of Community Involvement⁴.

WASTE CORE STRATEGY DPD

2.2 In July 2009, Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council adopted the Waste Core Strategy DPD, which sets out the spatial vision, key objectives and overall principles for the development of sustainable waste management facilities up to 2026.

2.3 The Core Strategy addresses how new waste facilities will be delivered to meet the associated projected growth in waste resulting from housing and employment development proposed in Local Development Frameworks (LDFs). The Core Strategy contains six policies (WCS1 to 6) that set out the strategic direction and context for waste planning in Wiltshire and Swindon over the Plan period. In addition, a seventh policy (WCS7: Waste DPD Implementation, Monitoring and Review) sets out the Councils' commitment to delivering a 'plan, monitor and manage' approach to bringing forward and implementing sustainable waste management facilities in a timely and appropriate manner.

2.4 The Core Strategy policies steer future waste development in the following areas:

- Strategic-scale facilities to be located as close as practicable and within 16km of the Strategically Significant Cities and Towns (SSCTs) of Swindon, Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury, as outlined in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (proposed for revocation) (policy WCS2);
- Only local-scale sites to be located in AONBs and in the immediate vicinity to the New Forest National Park; and

³ Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council prepare separate Local Development Schemes that, for the purposes of Minerals and Waste planning complement one another.

⁴ Again, Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council have prepared separate Statements of Community Involvement. These documents have been used to inform and guide the consultation activity undertaken to date.

- Policy WCS3 contains a detailed matrix setting out where the Councils consider each facility type can be located within the areas set out in the two bullet points above.

WASTE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES DPD

- 2.5 In September 2009, Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council adopted the Waste Development Control Policies DPD, which sets out policies to assist with the process of determining planning applications for new or expanded waste management facilities.
- 2.6 The DPD outlines the key criteria that will be used to assess whether a planning application should be permitted. The first policy (WDC1) is broad in nature and bridges the gap between the Waste Core Strategy DPD and the Development Control Policies DPD. The document then addresses the impacts that can be generated from waste management developments - issues such as amenity, visual aspects, noise and light emissions, vibration, transport, air emissions and climate change, the water environment, contaminated land and agricultural land. Policy WDC2 addresses the need to reduce impacts associated with these issues.
- 2.7 In addition, the final section of the document outlines how the Councils intend to implement and monitor the policies contained in the Development Control Policies DPD in line with Policy WCS7 of the Waste Core Strategy DPD. As identified in paragraph 2.3, WCS7 sets out the Councils commitment to delivering a 'plan, monitor and manage' approach to bring forward and implement sustainable waste management.

WASTE SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

- 2.8 The purpose of the Waste Site Allocations DPD is to provide detailed local expression to the adopted Waste Core Strategy in terms of the identification of sites that the Councils consider will be required in order to meet the forecasts of demand for new waste management capacity.

Development and Consultation March 2006 - May 2010

- 2.9 The Councils published and consulted on a 'long-list' of potential sites during an initial 'Issues and Options' phase of work in March 2006. A total of 57 sites were considered to have potential to accommodate future waste management development. This included 21 sites allocated for strategic-scale development; and 36 sites allocated for local-scale uses.
- 2.10 In early 2009, the Council's determined that it was necessary to revise the waste site selection and appraisal process given the length of time

since the publication and subsequent consultation on the Issues and Options Report. The site selection and appraisal method developed a progressive 'sieving' process where areas of land (including alternatives put forward for consideration by waste operators, as well as interested landowners) are assessed against a set of objectives and indicators within an appraisal matrix to determine their potential to accommodate the different types of future waste management development.

- 2.11 Enfusion and C4S worked with the Councils to ensure that SA/SEA and HRA objectives were incorporated into the revised site selection and site appraisal method. As part of this work it was first considered necessary to undertake a review of the Waste Site Appraisal Process, which was carried out by Enfusion in March 2009. The review provided recommendations for how SA and HRA could be integrated more effectively into the site appraisal process. This included the suitability of using Sustainability Threshold Assessment during the Exclusionary Objective Stage and a compatibility analysis of the exclusionary and discretionary objectives against SA objectives.
- 2.12 Changes to the waste site appraisal objectives and matrices were then made as a result of the findings and recommendations of the review process. This included the revision of the Exclusionary and Discretionary Objectives to ensure that SA/SEA and HRA issues have been considered. The revised waste site selection and site appraisal method, including the revised SA Framework was consulted on from 11th May to 22nd June 2009.
- 2.13 To assist in the preparation of the Pre-submission draft Waste Site Allocations DPD, an additional period of informal consultation was then undertaken in January 2010. This consultation provided an opportunity for targeted stakeholders to comment on a revised and refreshed list of potential site options and indicative waste uses. Although many of the sites (and potential uses) remain unchanged since their inclusion in the original 'Issues and Options' consultation document in 2006, a small number of additional sites were put forward. A number of sites were also removed due to issues such as availability, viability and/or at the landowners' request.
- 2.14 The Waste Site Allocations DPD - Additional Informal Consultation Document contained 52 sites considered potentially suitable for accommodating waste uses within the Plan area. The document identified a number of issues for each potential site that would require further detailed assessment. This further detailed assessment work was carried out by consultants in early 2010, with the findings presented in the Joint Waste Site Allocations Site Survey Report published in May of the same year. Surveys and assessments were carried out on the 52 potential waste sites - presented in the additional informal consultation - for the following specialist fields:

- Cultural Heritage;

- Landscape/ Visual Impact;
- Noise;
- Air Quality/ Odour;
- Water Environment;
- Contaminated Land; and
- Transport.

2.15 Following the findings and recommendations of the Joint Waste Site Allocations Site Survey Report, and further reviews by the Councils of the available evidence to determine deliverability, seven site options were removed from further consideration. This left a total of 43 sites potentially suitable for inclusion in the Waste Site Allocations DPD.

Pre-submission Document

2.16 The site appraisals using the revised method and further detailed assessments all informed the development of the Pre-submission draft Waste Site Allocations DPD, which was published for consultation in June 2011. The document distinguished between two different types of site - strategic and local. Strategic waste management facilities are large and/ or more specialist facilities that will operate in a wider strategic manner by virtue of spatial scale, high tonnage of waste managed, specialist nature of the waste managed and/ or a wider catchment area served. They are generally considered to include the following:

- Waste treatment facilities such as energy from waste, mechanical biological treatment, pyrolysis, gasification, anaerobic digestion and in-vessel composting;
- Strategic materials recovery facilities (MRFs) e.g. collecting, separating, sorting and bulking a wide range of waste materials prior to transfer (includes waste from black box collections) received from a wide area;
- Strategic composting facilities; e.g. on large waste management sites receiving inputs from a wide area; and
- Landfill/ landraise facilities.

2.17 Strategic facilities will be located to principally serve Swindon, Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury and thereby offer additional capacity to manage waste arisings from these areas and their associated catchment. In this sense they will practically serve larger areas of the County and the Borough.

2.18 The Pre-submission document identified that if these specialist or strategic sites cannot adequately meet smaller scale local needs (eg for reasons of proximity to sources of waste; or local environmental constraints), it may be more appropriate for similar waste management operations to be undertaken at a smaller, more localised scale. These facilities will help to provide local solutions for collecting, sorting, bulking, transferring and treating wastes as well as

complementing the County, Borough and Regional level solutions provided by strategic waste management facilities.

2.19 Local-scale waste management facilities will be expected to handle waste sourced from a limited geographical catchment and include the following:

- Household recycling centres - public facilities, where household waste can be taken for recycling;
- Local recycling facilities, e.g. collecting, storing and bulking particular waste materials prior to transfer, can also include metal recycling, car de-pollution and Waste, Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) facilities;
- Local scale materials recovery facilities - as strategic but receives waste from a limited geographical area.
- Waste transfer stations, where waste is deposited, stored and then transferred in larger loads to a waste treatment or disposal facility;
- Inert waste recycling and transfer facilities, e.g. the sorting, screening or crushing of inert material prior to transfer;
- Local-scale composting e.g. on farms or small waste management sites receiving inputs from limited geographical sources.

2.20 The Pre-submission DPD contained 43 sites considered to be suitable to accommodate future waste management uses by the Councils.

Submission Document

2.21 After the eight week consultation period for the Pre-Submission DPD a further landowner survey was undertaken to determine if the 43 sites contained within the Pre-submission DPD were still viable and deliverable. Based on the survey, 8 sites were removed from further consideration. The Submission DPD therefore contains 35 sites that the Councils consider to be suitable and deliverable to accommodate future waste management uses.

3.0 HRA METHOD & FINDINGS FOR THE MINERALS & WASTE CORE STRATEGIES AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS

3.1 This Section outlines the method used and findings of the HRAs for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies and Development Control Policies DPDs.

HRA OF MINERALS AND WASTE CORE STRATEGIES

Screening

3.2 A HRA screening report for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies was produced in April 2007. It was considered appropriate to undertake a joint HRA screening for the DPDs, as both were at similar stages of development. This helped to ensure consistency between the waste and minerals site allocation processes in relation to impacts on European sites. The HRA screening involved the tasks presented in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1 HRA Screening Tasks and Findings for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies

HRA Screening Stage 1: Key Tasks	HRA Screening Findings
<p>Task 1</p> <p>Identification of Natura 2000 sites & characterisation</p>	<p>The screening identified 22 European sites within the influence of the Core Strategies, 11 within and 11 outwith the Plan area.</p>
<p>Task 2</p> <p>Strategy review and identification of likely impacts</p>	<p>A review of the DPDs identified a number of potential environmental impacts that could arise from waste and minerals activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Emissions/ particulates ■ Dust ■ Noise/ Light ■ Odour ■ Litter ■ Liquid Pollutant ■ Spores/non-native release ■ Land take/ Habitat fragmentation ■ Topography alterations (change to landscape form) ■ Contamination/ accumulation of toxic substances ■ Attraction of vermin/ invasion/ alien species ■ Restoration potential for wildlife ■ Alteration of hydrology

HRA Screening Stage 1: Key Tasks	HRA Screening Findings
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Potential for combustion
<p style="text-align: center;">Task 3</p> <p>Consideration of other plans and programmes</p>	<p>Key plans considered in combination included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West 2006-2026 ■ South West Regional Waste Strategy 2004-2020 ■ South West Regional Housing Strategy 2005-2016 ■ Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2006/7 – 2010/11 ■ Swindon Borough Council Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 ■ Relevant Local Development Documents, Wiltshire/ Swindon and neighbouring authorities as necessary ■ Other Minerals and Waste Local Plans/ Local Development Frameworks produced by neighbourhood planning authorities
<p style="text-align: center;">Task 4</p> <p>Screening Assessment</p>	<p>Of the 22 European sites considered, 16 were screened out from more detailed AA as they were unlikely to be significantly affected by the Waste plans. The six remaining European sites (including three sites with multiple designations) were progressed to the next stage of the HRA process; the AA. The European sites considered by the screening to require AA were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC ■ New Forest SAC, SPA & Ramsar ■ North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC ■ Porton Down SPA ■ River Avon SAC ■ Salisbury Plain SAC & SPA

Appropriate Assessment

- 3.3 As for the screening, the AA stage of the HRA for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies was undertaken jointly, to ensure consistency. The AA Report was produced in February 2008 and accompanied the Core Strategies on Submission. The AA tasks and findings are presented in Table 3.2 below.

Table 3.2 Appropriate Assessment Tasks and Findings for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies

Appropriate Assessment Stage 2: Key Tasks	
Task 1 Scoping and Additional Information Gathering	Further information was gathered on those European sites that the screening considered to require AA. In particular, additional information was sought regarding environmental conditions that support the integrity of the sites, vulnerabilities of the designated habitats and a more detailed analysis of plans that may act 'in-combination' was undertaken.
Task 2 AA - Assessing the Impacts	The impact assessment element of the AA took forward the initial work on the assessment of likely significant effects completed at the screening stage. The assessment focused on those sites where the screening had identified possible significant effects as well as those cases where the precautionary principle had been applied because uncertainty existed, either through limited availability of data and/or due to potential 'in combination' effects. The AA focused on whether the impacts identified at screening could potentially affect the conservation objectives at each site.
Task 3 Considering Mitigation Measures	Potential for significant effect was identified with regard to two European sites (North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC and the River Avon SAC) and this related primarily to site specific hydrological connectivity. The AA noted the need for robust policy wording and also suggested mitigation measures to be incorporated into subsequent DPDs and planning consents as appropriate. This included the avoidance of development at sites where hydrological connectivity [and the associated risk to the designated site interest feature] is proven.
Task 4 Concluding the AA - Conclusions and Recommendations	The assessment found that the Waste Core Strategy provides strong policy protection for designated sites and the spatial intent for waste sites, as directed by the strategy, will lead to no significant effect on the integrity of 6 European sites considered [Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC, New Forest SAC/SPA/Ramsar, Porton Down SPA, River Avon SAC & Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA]. Recommendations made focused on the need for lower level DPDs and site level design, construction and operation to be cognisant of the sensitivities of the designated site interest features.

HRA OF MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

- 3.4 A HRA screening for the Minerals and Waste Development Control Policies was produced in July 2008. Similar to the Core Strategies it was considered appropriate to undertake a joint HRA screening for the DC Policies, as both were at similar stages of development. The screening of the DC Policies involved the same tasks as those identified for the screening of the Core Strategies in Tables 3.1 and 3.2.
- 3.5 The findings and conclusions of the HRA/AA for the Core Strategies were used to inform the screening of the DC Policies. The assessment considered whether the DC Policies could have a significant effect on the European sites previously identified (through the Core Strategies HRA) as potentially affected by minerals and waste developments.
- 3.6 The screening reviewed the DC Policies [in the light of information arising from the Core Strategies HRA] to identify whether they may have an effect on European sites. The screening concluded that there were no likely significant impacts that would arise as a result of DC policy implementation that were not previously addressed through the HRA of the Core Strategies. In particular, the screening assessment noted that environmental protection measures had been effectively integrated throughout the DC policies, and that this approach takes forward recommendations made in relation to specific European sites at the conclusion of the Core Strategies HRA.
- 3.7 Key issues identified for consideration at the site allocations stage included water quality and hydrological connectivity, which were identified as being particularly relevant to the integrity of several SACs as identified in the AA of the Core Strategies.

4.0 HRA METHOD & FINDINGS FOR THE WASTE SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

INTRODUCTION

- 4.1 This Section outlines the method and findings of the screening stage of the HRA for Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council's Waste Site Allocations DPD. This screening is being reported separately from the HRA for the Minerals Site Allocations as the DPDs are at different stages of development.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES

- 4.2 Waste management facilities have the potential to generate a range of environmental and sustainability effects. All facilities will be subject to generic issues of land take and impacts such as emissions and potential contamination from accidental spills associated with transportation and processing. The following Table 4.1, provides a summary of the potential impacts and benefits arising from the different types of waste management facilities.

Table 4.1 Sustainability Impacts of Waste Management Facilities⁵⁶

Waste Management Type - Description	Waste Management Type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sustainability Impacts ■ Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits
Household Recycling Centre (HRC)	
<p>Recycling centres are where householders may take waste free of charge to be recycled or disposed of. Only household waste is permitted and trade waste is not accepted.</p>	<p>Sustainability Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Potential for a significant increase in both noise and vibration as a result of increased traffic and/or machinery. ■ Increase in traffic and/or machinery use can negatively impact local air quality. ■ Potential for increased dust, odours and fume levels due to increased traffic and as a result of the on site operations. ■ Potential for a negative impact on biodiversity as increased levels of traffic, dust and therefore atmospheric pollution may affect water quality and/or habitats. <p>Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Provides somewhere for recycling of larger items which would not be accepted by kerbside recycling collection (e.g. fridges, washing machines). ■ Accessible to local residents and a wider local catchment. ■ Recycling reduces the need for raw materials as the life of existing materials are being extended. ■ Recycling leads to a reduction of energy use, for example; 95% less energy is needed to make a recycled aluminium can than it does to make one from virgin materials. ■ Recycling helps to reduce the habitat damage, pollution and waste associated

⁵ The following websites were used for reference: www.wrap.org.uk; <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/>; www.Defra.gov.uk

⁶ This report was also used as a reference source: Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Core Strategy (March, 2008), and can be viewed here: http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/planninganddevelopment/planningpolicy/mineralsandwastepolicy.htm#waste_core_strategy

<p>Waste Management Type - Description</p>	<p>Waste Management Type:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sustainability Impacts ■ Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits
	<p>with the extraction of raw materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It supports initiatives designed to raise awareness in local communities of personal responsibilities associated with waste generation and management. ■ Divert waste from landfill and maximise recycling performance.
<p>Materials Recovery Facility/Waste Transfer Station (MRF/WTS)</p>	
<p>MRFs are designed to separate co-mingled recyclables into their individual material streams and prepare them for sale into the commodity markets. Waste transfer stations are often used as places where local waste collection vehicles will deposit their waste cargo prior to loading into larger vehicles for transportation to the relevant site (Landfill, recycling etc). Some facilities combine MRF and WTS on an individual site.</p>	<p>Sustainability Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Potential for an increase in noise and vibration as a result of increased traffic and operations. ■ Traffic and operations could potentially lead to an increase in atmospheric pollution. ■ Potential for an increase in odour, dust and fume levels from operations on site. <p>Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Potential for job creation. ■ Reducing waste to landfill.
<p>Local Recycling (LR)</p>	
<p>LR facilities collect, store and bulk particular waste materials prior to transfer. They can also include metal recycling, car de-pollution and Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) facilities.</p>	<p>Sustainability Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Potential for a limited increase in both noise and vibration as a result of increased traffic (increase likely to be to a lesser extent that HRC). ■ Increase in traffic levels can lead to higher levels of atmospheric pollution ■ Potential for an increase in emissions from operations. ■ Potential for an increase in levels of vermin, pests, light pollution and litter but not to a great extent as LR tends to be housed indoors. <p>Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits</p>

<p>Waste Management Type - Description</p>	<p>Waste Management Type:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sustainability Impacts ■ Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Kerbside collections increase the ease of recycling for residents, therefore encouraging its use. ■ Reduce waste to landfill. ■ Reduce use of raw materials. ■ Reduce energy use.
<p>Inert Waste Recycling and Transfer (IWR/T)</p>	
<p>IWR/T is the processing, screening, blending and crushing of inert wastes to produce quality recycled aggregates.</p> <p>The Landfill Directive describes inert waste as a material that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Does not undergo any significant physical, chemical or biological transformations; 2) Does not dissolve, burn or otherwise physically or chemically react, biodegrade or adversely affect other matter with which it comes into contact in a way likely to give rise to environmental pollution or harm to human health; and 3) Total leachability and pollutant content and the ecotoxicity of its leachate are insignificant and, in particular, do not endanger the quality of any surface water or groundwater. 	<p>Sustainability Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Potential for increase noise and vibration due to operational machinery and increased traffic levels from transfer of inert waste to and from the facility. ■ Potential for increased dust levels, which may affect surrounding receptors depending on the direction and strength of wind. ■ There is the potential for an increase in atmospheric pollution due to increased dust and traffic levels. <p>Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Inert waste is often suitable for recycling and as such leads to a reduction in the need for further new raw materials. ■ Reduction in energy usage as inert waste can simply be crushed to produce recycled aggregates. ■ Job creation from processing and transfer of inert waste to recycled aggregates. ■ Reduces environmental impacts of large-scale raw material extraction by reusing existing materials.
<p>Outdoor Composting (C)</p>	
<p>Composting is the controlled breakdown of organic matter by microbes in the presence of air. The process</p>	<p>Sustainability Impacts</p>

Waste Management Type - Description	Waste Management Type:
<p>produces carbon dioxide, water, heat and compost. Compost products can then be used in horticulture, gardens and landscaping to help provide the ideal conditions for plants to grow.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sustainability Impacts ■ Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Can lead to an increase in odours, release emissions and contaminants. ■ Potential for an increase in litter and vermin on the site which can have a limited adverse effect on people living/working in close proximity to the site. ■ Composting can produce potentially harmful bio-aerosols and spores. Therefore the Environment Agency requires that if operations are within 250 metres of workplaces or dwellings they must carry out a Site Specific Bio-aerosol Risk Assessment (SSBRA) in support of their application. <p>Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Contributes to the reduction of landfill waste. ■ Produces a valuable source of organic matter otherwise lost from the natural environment. ■ Provides a peat replacement in horticulture and gardening. ■ Allows various scales of production (can be both commercial scale or in residents back gardens). ■ Relatively low set up costs in comparison to other waste management options.
Waste Treatment Facility (T)	
<p>Waste Treatment Facilities manage waste through a number of different methods;</p> <p><i>Mechanical Biological Treatment</i> combines a sorting facility with a form of biological treatment such as composting or anaerobic digestion.</p> <p><i>Anaerobic Digestion</i> is a series of processes in which microorganisms break down biodegradable material in the absence of oxygen to manage waste and produce</p>	<p>Sustainability Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Potential for an increase in noise and vibration due to increased traffic and machinery use depending on the scale of the operations. ■ Increased atmospheric pollution from emissions release and dust due to increased traffic and operations. ■ Potential for an increase in vermin, litter, light pollution and pests. ■ Potential for increased odour (A biofilter in treatment buildings can remove odours at 90% efficiency for anaerobic digestion). ■ There have been questions about the possible health effects from incinerator

Waste Management Type - Description	Waste Management Type:
<p>energy.</p> <p><i>Energy from Waste</i> is the process of burning waste in order to generate energy (e.g. electricity or steam). There are a number of different EfW methods; Mass burn, Pyrolysis, Gasification, Fluidised Bed Combustion.</p>	<p>emissions of dioxins and other gases. No evidence has been found of damage to human health around incinerators.</p> <p>Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Renewable source of energy. ■ May be located near to urban centres, minimising transport impacts. ■ Reduce reliance on fossil fuels, which would assist in reducing overall CO₂ emissions ■ Plant design can be flexible to allow for increase in capacity or changes to processes. ■ Plant design can be integrated with other waste management sites/processes. ■ Reducing the amount of waste requiring disposal to land.
Landfill (L)	
<p>Landfill is a site for the disposal of waste materials by burial and is the oldest form of waste treatment. The terms Landfill and Landraise are used interchangeably, however landfill usually relates to burial and landraise to piling of waste.</p>	<p>Sustainability Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Potential for a significant impact on noise and vibrations due to the scale of operations leading to increased machinery use and traffic. ■ Increased odour and atmospheric pollution from the operation and the potential increase in traffic numbers. ■ Significant increases in vermin and pests likely. ■ Potential for disturbance of habitats in close vicinity and surrounding area. ■ Potential for significant pollution of local soils and ground water. ■ Becoming an increasingly expensive option due to rising taxes, increasing maintenance costs and scarcity of suitable sites. ■ In the UK an estimated 20% of methane comes from landfill. Methane is 20 times more powerful than CO₂ as a greenhouse gas.

<p>Waste Management Type - Description</p>	<p>Waste Management Type:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sustainability Impacts ■ Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits
	<p>Sustainability/ Environmental Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Has historically been a low cost option. ■ Can be a way of restoring old quarries and mineral workings. ■ Modern engineered landfills can utilise the higher quality methane to produce power.

EUROPEAN SITE SENSITIVITIES

- 4.3 The significance of impacts generated by waste management facilities will be dependent on the sensitivity of the designated habitats and/ or species of the European sites. A summary of the sensitivities of each European site is provided below, the information is determined from the detailed site characterisations provided in Appendix 1.

Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC

- 4.4 Development pressures could lead to the loss or decline in quality of linear features (such as hedgerows and tree lines) which the bats use as flight lines. Connectivity of woodland, hedgerows, linear habitat and field boundary features are important as lesser horseshoe bats tend to feed in wooded areas and use linear features to navigate their way between roosts and foraging habitat.
- 4.5 Bats can also be negatively impacted by the disturbance to roosting/hibernation sites from light and noise pollution caused by new development. The disused mines that make up the SAC are important because of a number of factors, including a freedom from significant disturbance. These disused stone mines are of key importance to greater horseshoe bats because of a combination of temperature and humidity conditions, suitable access for the bats and lack of pollution and infilling.

New Forest SAC, SPA & Ramsar

- 4.6 Inappropriate management has led to a decline in ancient semi-natural woodland by 40% since 1945, and many of the areas, which remain, are no longer of nature conservation importance due to management. Land managers are addressing these issues through the emerging SAC Management Plan, the proposed National Park, and supplementary funding for restoration. Actions are being taken to carry out restoration measures over the next 20-50 years. Appropriate management of the SAC and RAMSAR habitats are key to maintaining populations of woodlark and Dartford warbler and this is achieved through the grazing, cutting and burning of gorse and heather to provide a diverse age structure and prevent succession to woodland.
- 4.7 Most of the valley mires in the Forest have been damaged in the past by drainage, which has caused drying out of the peat layers. Prevention of further erosion has already been tackled on some sites but a more extensive programme of infilling drainage ditches is currently being discussed with the landowners and commoners. The work to restore valley mires systems is expected to influence these bird populations in time. The SAC wetland habitats are potentially at threat from draining for improved grazing and forestry.
- 4.8 The New Forest is subject to recreational pressure, disturbance has been shown to adversely affect populations of woodlark elsewhere,

which are protected under the SPA and RAMSAR. However, the population in the New Forest is currently at a high level and steps are being taken to deal with recreational pressures. A recent decline in waders, redshank, lapwing, curlew and snipe may in part be due to the effects of walkers and particularly those with dogs. The Forestry Commission is carrying out an exercise to educate the dog-walking public during the nesting season. The increase in disturbance could also have an adverse effect on the habitats and species designated under the New Forest SAC.

North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC

- 4.9 The lowland hay meadow is dependent on traditional agricultural practices of hay-cutting with aftermath cattle grazing or seasonal cattle grazing. These management requirements are addressed in the National Nature Reserve (NNR) management plan and in a site management statement concerning the private land, which stipulates an appropriate regime. Development pressures could potentially lead to a change in grazing patterns, which could adversely impact the site.
- 4.10 It is imperative that a damp environment be maintained on the site. Adjacent extraction and renovation of gravel workings are a potential threat to water levels and are subject to monitoring and mitigation measures. NE have also indicated that the site is being adversely affected by recreational pressure (footfall is changing the nature of the habitat).

Porton Down SPA

- 4.11 The SPA interest is dependent on the chalk grassland habitat. The structure and composition of vegetation is important to provide a mosaic of suitable habitats for nesting, feeding and roosting by stone curlews. They require open stoney ground with sparse vegetation and bare soil, with short to medium height vegetation. Stone curlew nest in short-sward grassland over thin, stony, free draining soils.
- 4.12 The site forms the ranges of the Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, which is used for military training activities. This in turn may lead to the disruption of habitats and breeding grounds. The site is divided in two by the A30. North of this lies the MOD site, whilst land to the south is predominantly privately owned. The area has potential to be affected by air and noise pollution.
- 4.13 The privately owned area is arable with a more formal network of hedgerows and trees. The area is at risk if farming were to be intensified, which would lead to further amalgamation and enlargement of fields and the breakdown of traditional field boundaries. There is also a risk of scrub invasion. Management and operational issues continue to be dealt with through a working Integrated Land Management Plan and a generic consent, which is periodically reviewed.

- 4.14 Potentially the impact of tall structures – communications masts, transmitters and future renewable energy developments (wind turbines) could all have a major impact on the habitats and species.

River Avon SAC

- 4.15 The River Avon System is considered to be one of the most biodiverse in lowland Britain, with exceptionally rich flora, fish and invertebrate fauna. Currently much of the system is considered to be at risk from reduced flows and therefore abstraction of water for public supply and agricultural use could potentially alter water levels. Land use in the catchment, disposal of sewage effluents and management of watercourses for fishery, agricultural and other uses can all impact on the water quality. These factors can have a number of potential negative effects including increased nutrient levels leading to eutrophication, for example.
- 4.16 Historical modifications for mills, water meadows and more recently land draining can all lead to changes in sediment process within the river resulting from channel modification. Artificial barriers could also have a potential negative impact on the SAC. They may take the form of weirs, barrages or intakes/off-takes that entrain characteristic species.
- 4.17 At present the most directly influential factor on the Upper Avon is salmonid fishery management (including bank stabilisation, fish stocking, control of predators/competitors, weed cutting and bank vegetation cutting). On the lower Avon management is more directed to land drainage, through manipulation of water flows and weed cutting, although fishery management is carried out. The operation of hatches, sluices etc has a significant influence throughout the system.

Salisbury Plain SAC & SPA

- 4.18 The SAC comprises three landholdings: a military training area, a military research area and a NNR. This large expanse of lowland grassland (the largest area of open chalk grassland in north-west Europe), which comprises the SPA and SAC, has not been subject to intensive farming methods, as the interests of all three sites require low intensity grazing. The grassland is robust and when dry is able to sustain considerable training pressure. The SPA interest is dependent on the chalk grassland habitat.
- 4.19 Management practices need to be supported in order to prevent agricultural intensification. At present a lack of management is a problem in some places on the training area. Military training requirements constrain ideal conservation management (including grazing and scrub management) and have led to the establishment of extensive plantations, which, over time, may pose a threat to the open

grassland landscape and its ecology. The military training requirements, conservation management requirements and other land use issues have been brought together in an Integrated Land Management Plan (ILMP). The ILMP will address many issues including sustainability of military activities and management such as more extensive grazing, scrub management and removal of plantations not essential for military training.

- 4.20 Changes in military use, particularly use of increased numbers of vehicles and construction of roads and tracks to accommodate those vehicles have the potential to damage the qualifying interests through disturbance, but are subject to prior assessment and are being strategically addressed through an integrated land management plan. Additionally there is a risk that future development (road and track construction) could lead to an increase in habitat loss for protected bird species.
- 4.21 Salisbury Plain has both chalk grassland and dry calcareous grassland, which provide natural habitat for the Marsh fritillary butterfly. There is the risk that the loss or fragmentation of these habitats through inappropriate management and/or land take could impact the Marsh fritillary.

SCREENING METHOD

- 4.22 The HRA Report for the Wiltshire and Swindon Minerals and Waste Core Strategies (February 2008) noted that different minerals and waste activities have different likelihoods of causing impacts and that the degree and mechanism of the impact depends on the specific European site sensitivities. In addition, it was recognised that the location of the activity relative to the European site will influence the likelihood of significant effect. The HRA Report also acknowledges that distance in itself is not a definitive guide to the likelihood or severity of an impact as factors such as the prevailing wind direction, river flow direction, and groundwater flow direction will all have a bearing on the relative distance at which an impact can occur. The assessment therefore considered minerals and waste activities (and their potential impacts) at a range of distances:
- Within the European site
 - 0 - 500m from the European site
 - 500m - 2km from the European site
 - 2km - 10km from the European site
 - 10km+ from the European site
- 4.23 The HRA for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies took a risk based approach to determining effect on integrity, which considered available information on the European sites; the inherent uncertainties highlighted through the screening and AA method; and the limitations

of effects prediction where the precise location of activities is unknown. The likelihood of significant effect was categorised as:

- Certain (> 95%)
- Likely (50-95%)
- Unlikely (5-50%)
- Extremely unlikely (0-5%)

4.24 Using this risk based approach the assessment focused on whether the impacts of waste management activities identified at screening could potentially affect the conservation objectives at each site. The findings of the assessment were captured in data proformas. An example of the assessment key and the findings are presented below.

Table 4.2 Assessment Key for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies HRA

Summary Assessment Matrices: Key	
Likelihood of effect	Certain (>95%)
	Likely (50-95%)
	Unlikely (5-50%)
	Extremely unlikely (0-5%)
Impact Types	Created by Waste Facilities only
	Created by Minerals Facilities only
	Created by Waste and Minerals Facilities
	Not applicable

Table 4.3 Minerals and Waste Core Strategies AA: Summary Assessment Matrix

Summary Assessment Matrix: Site Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats									
Impact type	Code	Potential impacts on conservation objectives (Conservation Objectives Codes as in assessment tables)	Could it cause a significant effect	Positive (P) or Adverse (A)	Within SAC	0-500m	500m-2km	2-10km	10km+
Emissions / Particulates	A	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Unlikely	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely
Dust	B	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Unlikely	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely
Noise / Light	C	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Likely	Likely	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely
Odour	D	None	N						
Litter	E	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Unlikely	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely
Liquid pollutant / Water pollution	F	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Unlikely	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely
Spores (non-native) release	G	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely
Land take / Habitat fragmentation	H	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Certain	Likely	Likely	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely
Topography alterations	J	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Likely	Likely	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely
Contamination / Accumulation of toxic substances	K	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Unlikely	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely
Attraction of vermin / invasive / alien species	L	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Unlikely	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely
Restoration potential for wildlife	M	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	P	Likely	Likely	Likely	Likely	Unlikely
Alteration of hydrology	N	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely
Potential for combustion	O	Potential impacts on AB1.1	Y	A	Unlikely	Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely	Extremely Unlikely

- 4.25 The findings for each European site identified a distance for which it cannot be certain that a likely significant effect will not result from the siting and operation of a mineral and/or waste site. The method of distance identification has been applied for the HRA Screening of the Waste Site Allocations DPD and accordingly to the European sites scoped into the assessment.

Table 4.4 Distance at which a waste management facility may adversely affect European sites

European sites scoped into HRA Screening	Distance at which a waste management facility may adversely affect a European site as determined by the findings of the AA for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies
Bath & Bradford on Avon Bat SAC	Less than 500m (unless resulting in habitat fragmentation or land take in the surrounding area)
New Forest SAC	Less than 2km
New Forest SPA	Less than 500m
New Forest Ramsar site	Less than 500m
North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC	Less than 2km
Porton Down SPA	Less than 500m
River Avon SAC	Less than 2km
Salisbury Plain SAC	Less than 500m
Salisbury Plain SPA	Less than 500m

- 4.26 In June 2010 the Wiltshire County Ecologist carried out a Test of Likely Significance Effect on waste site allocations that fell within the distances identified in Table 4.4 above, which are based on the findings of the AA for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies. The Test of Likely Significance Effects took the format of a pro forma, which is used by Wiltshire Council's Ecologists for all planning applications that have the potential to result in an adverse effect on a European site. The pro forma is accepted by Natural England as suitable procedure for this purpose. This work is appended to the Ecological Site Briefings (Feb 2011) undertaken as part of the evidence base for the Waste Site Allocations DPD.

SCREENING FINDINGS

4.27 The Waste Site Allocations Submission DPD contains 35 sites considered potentially suitable to accommodate future waste management facilities. None of these sites are either within or immediately adjacent to a designated European site. However, based on the findings of the HRA for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies, two of the 35 proposed waste sites are within the distance at which a waste management facility may still adversely affect a European site. The waste site allocations within these distances are presented in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5 Waste site allocations within the distance at which a waste management facility may adversely affect European sites

European sites scoped into HRA Screening	Distance at which a waste management facility may adversely affect a European site as determined by the findings of the AA for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies	Sites proposed in the Waste Site Allocations Submission DPD
Bath & Bradford on Avon Bat SAC	Less than 500m (unless resulting in habitat fragmentation or land take in the surrounding area)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None
New Forest SAC	Less than 2km	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None
New Forest SPA	Less than 500m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None
New Forest Ramsar site	Less than 500m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None
North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC	Less than 2km	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None
Porton Down SPA	Less than 500m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None
River Avon SAC	Less than 2km	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CB Skip Hire, Salisbury - approximately 82m from River Avon SAC ■ The Former Imerys Quarry, Salisbury - approximately 250m from the River Avon SAC
Salisbury Plain SAC	Less than 500m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None
Salisbury Plain SPA	Less than 500m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None

4.28 The waste site allocations that met the distance criteria set out in the HRA Report for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies were subject to a Test of Likely Significant Effects by the Wiltshire County Ecologist in June 2010. A summary of the assessment and findings for each site are provided below.

CB Skip Hire, Salisbury

- 4.29 The site is approximately 82 metres to the north of the River Avon SAC at its nearest point and is considered suitable to accommodate a Materials Recovery Facility, Waste Transfer Station, Local Recycling, Inert Waste Recycling/ Transfer and Outdoor Composting. The Test of Likely Significant Effects identified that there is the potential for a waste management facility at this site to have the following impacts:
- **Changes in water chemistry** - run off from the site could cause changes in water chemistry, particularly if the site is used for composting or where waste materials are stored prior to treatment.
 - **Increased turbidity** - silt run off from the site could result in increased turbidity and fish deaths from gill damage.
 - **Pollution of watercourse** - spillage of fuels etc, could reach the watercourse via run off in wet weather or during flood events, causing oxygen depletion and poisoning of faunal and floral species.
 - **Suffocation** - wind borne dust and litter deposition, particularly on slow-flowing backwater stretches, may result in suffocation of macrophytes and invertebrate species in extreme cases. Plastics in litter can become ingested by fish, becoming caught in the gills and blocking digestive tracts resulting in fish deaths.
 - **Disturbance** - light spillage onto the SAC may result in disturbance to otters (and possibly to fish migration during the spawning season) if operations continue during hours of darkness, since the site is within the normal diurnal range for otters.
- 4.30 The site is in flood zone 1 and is unlikely to be affected by flood events; therefore the potential for materials and substances to be picked up and carried into the river is negligible. A robust management plan for site operation will address potential issues relating to run off and dust deposition and operational hours can be restricted by condition to avoid disturbance to the otters. The assessment concluded that the development of a waste management facility on the site would not have likely significant effects either alone or in combination on the River Avon SAC. No mechanism was identified for development at this site to act in combination with other plans and projects.

The Former Imerys Quarry, Salisbury

- 4.31 The site is approximately 250m north of the nearest part of the River Avon SAC and is considered suitable to accommodate a Household Recycling Centre, Materials Recovery Facility, Waste Transfer Station, Local Recycling and a Waste Treatment Facility (local scale). The Test of Likely Significant Effects identified that there is the potential for a waste management facility at this site to have the following impacts:

- **Changes in water chemistry** - run off from the site could cause changes in water chemistry, particularly where waste materials are stored prior to treatment.
- **Increased turbidity** - silt run off from the site could result in increased turbidity and fish deaths from gill damage.
- **Pollution of watercourse** - spillage of fuels etc, could reach the watercourse via run off in wet weather or during flood events, causing oxygen depletion and poisoning of faunal and floral species.
- **Suffocation** - wind borne dust and litter deposition, particularly on slow-flowing backwater stretches, may result in suffocation of macrophytes and invertebrate species in extreme cases. Plastics in litter can become ingested by fish, becoming caught in the gills and blocking digestive tracts resulting in fish deaths.
- **Disturbance** - light spillage onto the SAC may result in disturbance to otters (and possibly to fish migration during the spawning season) if operations continue during hours of darkness, since the site is within the normal diurnal range for otters.

4.32 The site is in flood zone 1 and has no hydrological connectivity with the SAC so is unlikely to cause impact as a result of flood events carrying materials or substances into the watercourse. In addition, the site is sufficiently far from the SAC so that disturbance from noise or light, or deposition of dust is unlikely to be an issue. Air pollution is unlikely to impact on the SAC since the operations within the waste facility will be required to meet strict licensing criteria and the location of the site - to the north of the SAC - means that prevailing winds will not carry air borne pollutants onto the SAC from the waste site. The assessment concluded that the development of a waste management facility on the site would not have likely significant effects either alone or in combination on the River Avon SAC. No mechanism was identified for development at this site to act in combination with other plans and projects.

OTHER PLANS AND PROJECTS IN COMBINATION

4.33 It is a requirement of Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive that HRA examines the potential for plans and programmes to have a significant effect either individually or 'in combination' with other plans and programmes (PPs). In practice the 'in-combination' test is most relevant in situations where the effects of the plan or project alone are unlikely to have a significant effect, but when combined with the effects of other plan or project, would be likely to be significant. Identifying and assessing other PPs requires a pragmatic approach (given the extensive range of PPs underway in the region). For this screening, the consideration of other PPs has focused on those likely to lead to significant infrastructure/ development changes with related impacts.

- 4.34 The potential for other plans and projects to act in combination with future waste management facilities has been an ongoing consideration for the HRA of each Waste DPD (Core Strategy, Development Control Policies and Waste Site Allocations). The plans and programmes considered to have the potential to act in combination with the Waste Site Allocations DPD are:

Development Plans:

- Swindon Borough Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2026 (March 2011)
- Vale of White Horse District Council Core Strategy Preferred Options Report (February 2009)
- West Berkshire Proposed Submission Core Strategy (February 2010)
- West Oxfordshire Draft Core Strategy (January 2011)
- Cotswold District Core Strategy Second Issues and Options Consultation Paper (December 2010)
- Wiltshire 2026: Planning for Wiltshire's Future (2009)
- North Dorset District Council Draft Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (March 2010)
- Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council Core Strategy Options (October 2010)
- New Forest District Council Core Strategy (adopted October 2009)
- New Forest National Park Core Strategy (adopted December 2010)
- Test Valley Borough Draft Core Strategy and Development Management DPD and Designations DPD (November 2011)
- South Gloucestershire Council Core Strategy Submission Publication Draft (March 2011)
- Bath and North East Somerset Council Draft Core Strategy Submission (May 2011)
- Mendip District Council Draft (Preferred Options) Core Strategy (February 2011)
- South Somerset District Council Core Strategy Draft (October 2010)

Transport:

- Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011 - 2026
- Swindon Local Transport 3 (2011 - 2026)
- West Berkshire Local Transport Plan 2011 - 2016 Consultation Draft
- Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 3 2011 - 2030
- Gloucestershire County Council draft Local Transport Plan 3 2011 - 2026
- Hampshire County Council Local Transport Plan 3 2011 - 2031
- Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Local Transport Plan 3 2011 - 2026
- Somerset County Council Future Transport Plan 2011 - 2026

Waste and Minerals:

- Wiltshire and Swindon Minerals Core Strategy 2006 - 2026 (adopted 2009)

- Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Core Strategy 2006 - 2026 (adopted 2009)
- Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy: Minerals and Waste Planning Strategies Consultation Drafts (September 2011)
- Gloucestershire County Council Waste Core Strategy Submission (September 2011)
- Gloucestershire County Council Minerals Core Strategy - Preferred Options (Jan 2008)
- Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton and New Forest National Park Minerals and Waste Draft Plan (November 2011)
- Somerset County Council Waste Core Strategy Pre-Submission (October 2011)
- Somerset County Council Minerals Local Plan (adopted April 2004)
- Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Revised Draft Minerals Core Strategy (July 2011)
- Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Local Plan (adopted June 2006)

Water:

- River Basin Management Plan South West River Basin District (December 2009)
- The Bristol Avon Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (April 2005)
- Hampshire Avon Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (March 2006)
- Thames Water Revised Draft Water Resource Management Plan (September 2009)
- Wessex Water Services Ltd Water Resource Management Plan (June 2010)
- Southern Water (October 2009) Water Resource Management Plan

- 4.35 The assessment did not identify any mechanisms for the development of waste management facilities at the sites (which met the distance criteria set by the HRA of the Core Strategy) to act in combination with other plans and projects. The assessment also identified that there are a number of suitable mitigation measures available to address potential impacts of waste management facilities at the proposed sites.

SCREENING SUMMARY

- 4.36 Table 4.6 summarises the results of the HRA screening, considering the effect of the Waste Site Allocations DPD, alone and in-combination with other plans and projects for each European site. The assessment should be revisited in the light of any significant changes to the plan.

Table 4.6 HRA Screening Summary

European Sites	Designation	AA required alone? ✗ No ✓ Yes ? Uncertain	AA required in combination? ✗ No ✓ Yes ? Uncertain
Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats	SAC	✗	✗
The New Forest	SAC, SPA & Ramsar	✗	✗
North Meadow and Clattinger Farm	SAC	✗	✗
Porton Down	SPA	✗	✗
River Avon	SAC	✗	✗
Salisbury Plain	SAC & SPA	✗	✗

4.37 The findings of this plan level HRA does not obviate the need for individual waste developments to undertake project level HRA/AA where specific sensitivities have been identified and it is considered there is potential for significant effect on one or more European Sites. The findings of this HRA/AA should be used to inform any future assessment work.

PROGRESSION OF MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK HRA

4.38 The HRA for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies made recommendations for policy, management and mitigation measures based on the findings of the Appropriate Assessment (AA). The recommendations related to the known sensitivities of the sites assessed and the likelihood of significant impacts arising from minerals and waste activities. The HRA Screening for the DC Policies DPD found that these recommendations had been effectively progressed through the development of DC Policies.

4.39 The selection and appraisal of waste site allocations has followed a progressive 'sieving' process where areas of land have been assessed against a set of objectives to determine their potential to accommodate different types of future waste management development. This includes objectives to ensure that sites proposed in the Waste Site Allocations DPD adhere to Core Strategy Policies that direct the location of future waste management facilities.

4.40 Future waste development will also have to adhere to the criteria set out in the adopted DC Policies DPD. The DC Policies seek to address impacts generated from waste management developments, such as impacts on amenity, visual aspects, noise and light emissions, vibration, transport, air emissions and climate change, the water environment,

contaminated land and agricultural land. These impacts have also been considered through the waste site selection and appraisal process to ensure that the most suitable sites are put forward from the land that is available.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.41 A number of mitigation measures were identified for the sites assessed as part of the work (Test of Likely Significant Effects) undertaken by a Wiltshire County Ecologist. The recommendations for the sites are as follows:

CB Skip Hire, Salisbury

- The operational management of the site will need to meet necessary criteria for the relevant waste management licence issued by the Environment Agency (EA).
- A robust management plan should address bunding of fuels, litter control and control of airborne dust particles, particularly from a composting facility.
- Where appropriate, a planning condition should be imposed to restrict operation to daylight hours in order to avoid disturbance to otters.

The Former Imerys Quarry, Salisbury

- The operational management of the site will need to meet necessary criteria for the relevant waste management licence issued by the Environment Agency (EA).

- 4.42 Further to the mitigation measures outlined above, it is also recommended that any proposals for the sites are accompanied by a surface water management strategy that specifically considers the integration of surface water drainage systems. This addresses NE concerns (**Appendix 2**) with regard to the potential risk of pollutants entering the River Avon SAC.

- 4.43 As previously mentioned in paragraph 4.37, it may be necessary for project level HRA to be carried out at particular sites as the precise nature and scale of waste management facility will only be known at the planning application stage. It is possible that in the light of project level HRA further mitigation measures may be necessary.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS, FUTURE WORK

- 5.1 This report outlines the methods used and the findings arising from the screening stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment for Wiltshire and Swindon's Waste Site Allocations DPD. The screening took forward the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies and Development Control Policies HRA findings and ensured that the recommendations were effectively applied to the Waste Site Allocations DPD.
- 5.2 In consultation with NE, nine European sites were scoped into the HRA Screening for the Waste Site Allocations DPD based on the findings of the HRA for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies. These findings also influenced the method used for this HRA Screening.
- 5.3 The Waste Site Allocations Submission DPD contains 35 sites considered potentially suitable to accommodate future waste management facilities. None of these sites are either within or immediately adjacent to a designated European site; however, based on the findings of the HRA for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies, two of the 35 proposed waste sites are within a distance to European sites at which a waste management facility may still have adverse effects.
- 5.4 These two sites were assessed by the Wiltshire County Ecologist to determine the likelihood for waste management facilities to have significant effects on European sites. The assessment concluded that the development of waste management facilities on these sites will not have likely significant effects on the identified European sites, either alone or in combination. It was considered that appropriate site level mitigation is available to address the potential impacts of waste management facilities on European sites. A number of mitigation measures, such as a robust site management plan and restricting the operation of facilities to daylight hours, were identified for waste development at the sites.
- 5.5 To address Natural England concerns in relation to the risk of pollution entering the River Avon SAC the HRA also recommends that any proposals for the two sites are accompanied by a surface water management strategy that specifically considers the integration of surface water drainage systems.
- 5.6 The findings of this plan level HRA does not obviate the need for individual waste developments to undertake project level HRA/AA, as the nature and scale of waste management facilities for a particular site will only be known at the planning application stage. This assessment should be revisited in the light of any significant changes to the plan and this screening opinion has been subject to consultation and advice from the statutory body Natural England and other key stakeholders.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

- 5.7 While monitoring in relation to plans or projects is not specified by the Habitats Directive⁷ it is good practice, and guidance suggests that monitoring the effects of plan implementation in relation to any issues identified by the HRA is undertaken. Monitoring is an established requirement of the planning system and monitoring for biodiversity is advised by Government, who include changes to the status of European Sites as a core indicator in examining the effects of local plan implementation on biodiversity⁸. European sites are, by definition, the key biodiversity resources within the Plan area and monitoring should be employed in support of the HRA findings and mitigation recommendations.
- 5.8 The SA/SEA Adoption Statements for the Waste Core Strategy and Development Control Policies set out targets and suggested indicators for monitoring. Those relevant to HRA include indicators that monitor the potential effects on biodiversity as well as increased water consumption and pollution levels. It is appropriate that monitoring for HRA is aligned with the SA/SEA requirements, and that this links to the authorities' Annual Monitoring Reports on the implementation of their spatial plans.
- 5.9 This HRA report forms part of the overall evidence base for the Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council Minerals and Waste Development Framework (Core Strategies, Development Control Policies and Site Allocations DPDs) and provides a record of how plans are consistent with national planning policy on biodiversity protection.

⁷ Article 11 requires that 'Member States shall undertake surveillance of the conservation status of the natural habitats and species referred to in Article 2 with particular regard to priority natural habitat types and priority species. In England this surveillance is undertaken by NE in their statutory nature conservation role.

⁸ Local Development Framework Monitoring: A Good Practice Guide, ODPM, 2005.

Appendix 1: European Site Characterisations

Special Areas of Conservation

Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC	
Location Grid Ref	ST834688
JNCC Site Code	UK0012584
Size (ha)	107.16
Qualifying Features	<p>Annex II Species primary reason for selection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 1304 Greater horseshoe bat (<i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i>) ■ 1323 Bechstein`s bat (<i>Myotis bechsteini</i>) <p>Annex II Species qualifying feature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 1303 Lesser horseshoe bat (<i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i>)
Conservation Objectives	<p>The Conservation Objectives below are for Box Mine SSSI, which is a component SSSI within Bath and Bradford-on-Avon Bats SAC, along with Brown`s Folly SSSI, Combe Down and Bathampton Down Mines SSSI and Winsley Mines SSSI</p> <p>The Conservation Objectives for this site are, subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats and geological features in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is designated (SSSI, SAC, SPA, Ramsar) as individually listed in Table 1.</p> <p>Habitat Types represented (Biodiversity Action Plan categories)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Inland Rock ■ Broadleaved, Mixed and Yew Woodland <p>Geological features (Geological Site Types)</p>

Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC						
	n/a					
	(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.					
	Standards for favourable condition are defined with particular reference to the specific designated features, and are based on a selected set of attributes for features which most economically define favourable condition.					
Condition Assessment	No condition assessment is currently available for the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC, therefore, the condition status of the component SSSIs are provided below.					
	% Area meeting PSA¹ target	% Area favourable	% Area unfavourable recovering	% Area unfavourable no change	% Area unfavourable declining	% Area destroyed / part destroyed
	Box Mine SSSI condition summary ² (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Brown's Folly SSSI condition summary ³ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	75.01%	24.99%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Winsley Mines SSSI condition summary ⁴ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Combe Down and Bathampton Down Mines SSSI condition summary ⁵ (compiled 01 November 2010).						
100.00%	98.56	1.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
Vulnerabilities	Disturbance - Bats can be negatively impacted by the disturbance to roosting/hibernation sites from light and					

¹ PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.

² Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1005600>

³ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1002510>

⁴ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1005675>

⁵ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1005602>

Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC	
	<p>noise pollution caused by new development. The disused mines that make up the SAC are of key importance because of a number of factors, including a freedom from significant disturbance. As some of the mines are unstable, there is a danger of collapse or subsidence. An environmental assessment is being prepared for the Combe Down Mines stabilisation project.</p> <p>Pollution and pesticides - These disused stone mines are of key importance to greater horseshoe bats because of a combination of temperature and humidity conditions, suitable access for the bats and lack of pollution and infilling. All British bat species have suffered marked population decline over the last forty years due partly to poisoning from persistent toxic chemicals used in treating structural timbers and partly because of destruction of insect prey by modern pesticides.</p> <p>Habitat Loss and Fragmentation - Development pressures could lead to the loss or decline in quality of linear features (such as hedgerows and tree lines) which the bats use as flight lines. Connectivity of woodland, hedgerows, linear habitat and field boundary features are important as lesser horseshoe bats tend to feed in wooded areas and use linear features to navigate their way between roosts and foraging habitat.</p>

New Forest SAC	
Location Grid Ref	SU225075
JNCC Site Code	UK0012557
Size (ha)	29262.36
Qualifying Features	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 3110 Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains (<i>Littorelletalia uniflorae</i>) ■ 3130 Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the <i>Littorelletea uniflorae</i> and/or of the Isoëto-Nanojuncetea ■ 4010 Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i> ■ 4030 European dry heaths ■ 6410 Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (<i>Molinion caeruleae</i>) ■ 7150 Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion ■ 9120 Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with Ilex and sometimes also Taxus in the shrublayer (<i>Quercion robori-petraeae</i> or <i>Illici-Fagenion</i>) ■ 9130 Asperulo-Fagetum beech forests ■ 9190 Old acidophilous oak woods with <i>Quercus robur</i> on sandy plains ■ 91D0 Bog woodland ■ 91E0 Alluvial forests with <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> (<i>Alno-Padion</i>, <i>Alnion incanae</i>, <i>Salicion albae</i>) <p>Annex II habitats qualifying feature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 7140 Transition mires and quaking bogs ■ 7230 Alkaline fens <p>Annex II Species primary reason for selection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 1044 Southern damselfly (<i>Coenagrion mercuriale</i>) ■ 1083 Stag beetle (<i>Lucanus cervus</i>) <p>Annex II Species qualifying feature:</p>

New Forest SAC	
Conservation Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 1166 Great crested newt (<i>Triturus cristatus</i>) <p>The Conservation Objectives below are for the New Forest SSSI. The SPA and Ramsar Site boundaries are the pre-1996 SSSI boundary less the main roads. The SAC includes most of The New Forest SSSI as well as Landford Bog SSSI, Langley Wood and Homan’s Copse SSSI, Loosehanger Copse and Meadows SSSI, Roydon Woods SSSI and Whiteparish Common SSSI.</p> <p>The Conservation Objectives for this site are, subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats and geological features in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is designated (SSSI, SAC, SPA, Ramsar) as individually listed in Table 1.</p> <p>Habitat Types represented (Biodiversity Action Plan categories)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Broadleaved, yew and mixed woodland ■ Acid grassland ■ Neutral grassland ■ Fen, Marsh and Swamp ■ Dwarf shrub heath ■ Standing open water and canals <p>Geological features (Geological Site Types)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ INLAND OUTCROPS AND STREAM SECTIONS (EO) ■ DISUSED QUARRIES, PITS AND CUTTINGS (ED) ■ UNIQUE MINERAL, FOSSIL OR OTHER GEOLOGICAL SITE (IM) ■ ACTIVE PROCESS GEOMORPHOLOGICAL SITES (IA) <p>(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.</p> <p>Standards for favourable condition are defined with particular reference to the specific designated features, and are based on a selected set of attributes for features which most economically define favourable</p>

New Forest SAC						
	condition.					
Condition Assessment	No condition assessment is currently available for the New Forest SAC, therefore, the condition status of the component SSSIs are provided below.					
	% Area meeting PSA ⁶ target	% Area favourable	% Area unfavourable recovering	% Area unfavourable no change	% Area unfavourable declining	% Area destroyed / part destroyed
	Roydon Woods SSSI condition summary ⁷ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Whiteparish Common SSSI condition summary ⁸ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	93.11%	1.27%	91.84%	6.90%	0.00%	0.00%
	Loosehanger Copse and Meadows SSSI condition summary ⁹ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Langley Wood and Homan's Copse SSSI condition summary ¹⁰ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	98.87%	0.00%	98.87%	1.13%	0.00%	0.00%
	The New Forest SSSI condition summary ¹¹ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
98.69%	33.18%	65.51%	0.34%	0.96%	0.01%	
Landford Bog SSSI condition summary ¹² (compiled 01 November 2010).						

⁶ PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.

⁷ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1003197>

⁸ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1003134>

⁹ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1005817>

¹⁰ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1003920>

¹¹ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1003036>

¹² Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1003189>

New Forest SAC						
	100.00%	27.76%	72.24%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Vulnerabilities	<p>Drainage - Potential threat to wetland habitats from draining for improved grazing and forestry.</p> <p>Site Level Management - Afforestation of heathland habitats with conifers and other non-native species and essential grazing by commoners' animals is vulnerable to current economic trends. Inappropriate Management has led to a decline in ancient semi-natural woodland by 40% since 1945, and many of the areas which remain are no longer of nature conservation importance due to management. Land managers are addressing these issues through the emerging SAC Management Plan, through the proposed National Park, and through supplementary funding for restoration, e.g. LIFE funding. Actions are being taken to carry out restoration measures over the next 20-50 years.</p> <p>Disturbance - Increase in recreational or other activities are likely to damage features of interest.</p>					

North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC	
Location Grid Ref	SU014934
EU Site Code	UK0016372
Size (ha)	104.88
Qualifying Features	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 6510 Lowland hay meadows (<i>Alopecurus pratensis</i>, <i>Sanguisorba officinalis</i>)
Conservation Objectives	<p>The Conservation Objectives below are for North Meadow SSSI, which is wholly contained in North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC.</p> <p>The Conservation Objectives for this site are, subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats and geological features in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is designated (SSSI, SAC, SPA, Ramsar).</p> <p>Habitat Types represented (Biodiversity Action Plan categories)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Lowland neutral grassland <p>Geological features (Geological Site Types)</p> <p>(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.</p> <p>Standards for favourable condition are defined with particular reference to the specific designated features, and are based on a selected set of attributes for features which most economically define favourable condition.</p>
Condition Assessment	No condition assessment is currently available for the North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC, therefore, the condition status of the component SSSIs are provided below.

North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC						
	% Area meeting PSA ¹³ target	% Area favourable	% Area unfavourable recovering	% Area unfavourable no change	% Area unfavourable declining	% Area destroyed / part destroyed
	North Meadow, Crickdale SSSI condition summary ¹⁴ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Clattinger Farm SSSI condition summary ¹⁵ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Vulnerabilities	<p>Grazing Patterns - The habitat is dependent on traditional agricultural practices of hay-cutting with aftermath cattle grazing or seasonal cattle grazing. These management requirements are addressed in the NNR management plan and in a site management statement concerning the private land which stipulates an appropriate regime.</p> <p>Reduced water levels - A damp environment must be maintained. Adjacent extraction and renovation of gravel workings are a potential threat to water levels and are subject to monitoring and mitigation measures.</p> <p>Recreational disturbance - increased footfall is changing the nature of the habitat.</p>					

¹³ PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.

¹⁴ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1002417>

¹⁵ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1002547>

River Avon SAC	
Location Grid Ref	SU124339
JNCC Site Code	UK0013016
Size (ha)	498.24
Qualifying Features	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 3260 Water courses of plain to montane levels with the <i>Ranunculon fluitantis</i> and <i>Callitricho-Batrachion</i> vegetation <p>Annex II Species primary reason for selection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 1016 Desmoulin's whorl snail (<i>Vertigo moulinsiana</i>) ■ 1095 Sea lamprey (<i>Petromyzon marinus</i>) ■ 1096 Brook lamprey (<i>Lampetra planeri</i>) ■ 1106 Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) ■ 1163 Bullhead (<i>Cottus gobio</i>)
Conservation Objectives	<p>The Conservation Objectives below are for the River Avon SSSI for which a large % is a component of the River Avon SAC. Other component SSSIs of this SAC are the River Till, Jones Mill and areas of Lower Woodford and Porton Meadows.</p> <p>The Conservation Objectives for this site are, subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats and geological features in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is designated (SSSI, SAC, SPA, Ramsar) as individually listed in Table 1.</p> <p>Habitat Types represented (Biodiversity Action Plan categories)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rivers & streams ■ Lowland neutral grassland ■ Fen, mash and swamp (including wet woodland)

River Avon SAC						
	<p>Geological features (Geological Site Types) n/a</p> <p>(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.</p> <p>Standards for favourable condition are defined with particular reference to the specific designated features, and are based on a selected set of attributes for features which most economically define favourable condition.</p>					
Condition Assessment	No condition assessment is currently available for the River Avon SAC, therefore, the condition status of the component SSSIs are provided below.					
	% Area meeting PSA¹⁶ target	% Area favourable	% Area unfavourable recovering	% Area unfavourable no change	% Area unfavourable declining	% Area destroyed / part destroyed
	River Till SSSI condition summary ¹⁷ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	River Avon System SSSI condition summary ¹⁸ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	11.28%	3.27%	8.01%	85.24%	3.49%	0.00%
	Jones' Mill SSSI condition summary ¹⁹ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Lower Woodford Water Meadows SSSI condition summary ²⁰ (compiled 01 November 2010).						
100.00%	93.40%	6.60%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	

¹⁶ PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.

¹⁷ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=2000431>

¹⁸ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=2000183>

¹⁹ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1004402>

²⁰ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1000015>

River Avon SAC						
	Porton Meadow SSSI condition summary ²¹ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	71.39%	1.45%	69.94%	7.80%	20.81%	0.00%
Vulnerabilities	<p>Channel modification - Historical modifications for mills, water meadows and more recently land draining can all lead to changes in sediment process within the river resulting from channel modification.</p> <p>Water Quality - Land use in the catchment, disposal of sewage effluents and management of watercourses for fishery, agricultural and other uses can all impact on the water quality. These factors can have a number of potential negative effects including increased nutrient levels leading to eutrophication, for example.</p> <p>Water Levels - Currently much of the system is considered to be at risk from reduced flows and therefore abstraction of water for public supply and agricultural use could potentially alter water levels.</p> <p>Artificial barriers - May take the form of weirs, barrages or intakes/off-takes that entrain characteristic species.</p>					

²¹ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:
<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdrt18&category=S&reference=1003914>

Salisbury Plain SAC	
Location Grid Ref	SU077497
JNCC Site Code	UK0012683
Size (ha)	21438.1
Qualifying Features	<p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 5130 <i>Juniperus communis</i> formations on heaths or calcareous grasslands ■ 6210 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>) ■ 6211 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>) (important orchid sites) <p>Annex II Species primary reason for selection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 065 Marsh fritillary butterfly <i>Euphydryas</i> (<i>Eurodryas</i>, <i>Hypodryas</i>) <i>aurinia</i>
Conservation Objectives	<p>The Conservation Objectives for this site are, subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats and geological features in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is designated (SSSI, SAC, SPA, Ramsar) as individually listed in Table 1.</p> <p>Habitat Types represented (Biodiversity Action Plan categories)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Lowland calcareous grassland ■ Standing open water and canals <p>Geological features (Geological Site Types) n/a</p> <p>(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.</p> <p>Standards for favourable condition are defined with particular reference to the specific designated features, and are based on a selected set of attributes for features which most economically define favourable condition.</p>

Salisbury Plain SAC						
Condition Assessment	No condition assessment is currently available for the Salisbury Plain SAC, therefore, the condition status of the component SSSIs are provided below.					
	% Area meeting PSA²² target	% Area favourable	% Area unfavourable recovering	% Area unfavourable no change	% Area unfavourable declining	% Area destroyed / part destroyed
	Salisbury Plain SSSI condition summary ²³ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	14.34%	85.66%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Parsonage Down SSSI condition summary ²⁴ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	78.81%	21.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Porton Down SSSI condition summary ²⁵ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
100.00%	14.85%	85.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
Vulnerabilities	<p>Grazing Management - The site comprises three landholdings: a military training area, a military research area and a National Nature Reserve. This large expanse of lowland grassland has not been subject to intensive farming methods, as the interests of all three sites require low intensity grazing. Management practices need to be supported in order to prevent agricultural intensification. At present a lack of management is a problem in some places on the training area.</p>					
	<p>Disturbance - Changes in military use, particularly use of increased numbers of vehicles and construction of roads and tracks to accommodate those vehicles have the potential to damage the qualifying interests, but are subject to prior assessment and are being strategically addressed through an integrated land management plan.</p>					
	<p>Habitat Loss and Fragmentation - Salisbury Plain has both chalk grassland and dry calcareous grassland, which</p>					

²² PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.

²³ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdrt18&category=S&reference=1006531>

²⁴ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdrt18&category=S&reference=1004185>

²⁵ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdrt18&category=S&reference=1003140>

Salisbury Plain SAC	
	provide natural habitat for the Marsh fritillary butterfly. There is the risk that the loss or fragmentation of these habitats through inappropriate management and/or land take could impact the Marsh fritillary.

Special Protection Areas

The New Forest SPA	
Location (Lat and Long)	50 49 32 N, 01 39 22 W
JNCC Site Code	UK9011031
Size (ha)	28002.81
Qualifying Features	<p>ARTICLE 4.1 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC)</p> <p>During the breeding season the area regularly supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i> - 8.8% of the GB breeding population ■ <i>Lullula arborea</i> - 29.5% of the GB breeding population. ■ <i>Pernis apivorus</i> - 12.5% of the GB breeding population. ■ <i>Sylvia undata</i> - 33.6% of the GB breeding population. <p>Over winter the area regularly supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>Circus cyaneus</i> - 2% of the GB population. <p>ARTICLE 4.2 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC)</p> <p>During the breeding season the area regularly supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>Falco subbuteo</i> - 5% of the population in Great Britain ■ <i>Phylloscopus sibilatrix</i> - at least 2% of the population in Great Britain
Conservation Objectives	See the Conservation Objectives for the New Forest SAC.
Condition Assessment	No condition assessment is currently available for the New Forest SPA, therefore, the condition status of the component SSSIs are provided below.

The New Forest SPA						
	% Area meeting PSA ²⁶ target	% Area favourable	% Area unfavourable recovering	% Area unfavourable no change	% Area unfavourable declining	% Area destroyed / part destroyed
	New Forest SSSI condition summary²⁷ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	98.68%	33.18%	65.50%	0.34%	0.97%	0.01%
Vulnerabilities	<p>Recreation and disturbance - The site is subject to recreational pressure. Recreational pressures and disturbance has been shown to adversely affect populations of woodlark elsewhere. However, the population in the New Forest is currently at a high level. Steps are being taken to deal with recreational pressures. A recent decline in waders; redshank, lapwing, curlew and snipe may in part be due to the effects of walkers and particularly those with dogs. The Forestry Commission is carrying out an exercise to educate the dog-walking public during the nesting season.</p> <p>Site Level Management - Appropriate management of the habitat is key to maintaining populations of woodlark and Dartford warbler and this is achieved through the grazing, cutting and burning of gorse and heather to provide a diverse age structure and prevent succession to woodland.</p> <p>Most of the valley mires in the Forest have been damaged in the past by drainage which has caused drying out of the peat layers. Prevention of further erosion has already been tackled on some sites but a more extensive programme of infilling drainage ditches is currently being discussed with the landowners and commoners. The work to restore valley mires systems is expected to influence these bird populations in time.</p>					

²⁶ PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.

²⁷ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdrt18&category=S&reference=1003036>

Porton Down SPA	
Location (Lat and Long)	51 07 55 N, 01 40 34 W
JNCC Site Code	UK9011101
Size (ha)	1562.32
Qualifying Features	<p>ARTICLE 4.1 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC)</p> <p>During the breeding season the area regularly supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Stone Curlew (<i>Burhinus oedicanus</i>) - 10.6% of the GB breeding population
Conservation Objectives	<p>The Conservation Objectives below are for Porton Down SSSI, which is one of three SSSIs in Salisbury Plain SAC. Porton Down SPA is a subset of Porton Down SSSI.</p> <p>The Conservation Objectives for this site are, subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats and geological features in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is designated (SSSI, SAC, SPA, Ramsar) as individually listed in Table 1.</p> <p>Habitat Types represented (Biodiversity Action Plan categories)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Lowland calcareous grassland ■ Broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland <p>Geological features (Geological Site Types) n/a</p> <p>(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.</p> <p>Standards for favourable condition are defined with particular reference to the specific designated features, and are based on a selected set of attributes for features which most economically define favourable condition.</p>
Condition Assessment	No condition assessment is currently available for the Porton Down SPA, therefore, the condition status of the

Porton Down SPA						
	component SSSIs are provided below.					
	% Area meeting PSA ²⁸ target	% Area favourable	% Area unfavourable recovering	% Area unfavourable no change	% Area unfavourable declining	% Area destroyed / part destroyed
	Porton Down SSSI condition summary ²⁹ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	14.85%	85.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Vulnerabilities	<p>The site forms the ranges of the Defence Science and Technology Laboratory which is an agency of the Ministry of Defence, and military training activities take place. The SPA interest is dependant on the chalk grassland habitat, which is an SAC (Salisbury Plain) in its own right.</p> <p>Site Level Management - On the whole, the existing land use is compatible with maintaining the SPA interest and the habitat is generally robust to ground disturbance, provided this is kept to an acceptable level.</p> <p>During the Salisbury Plain LIFE Natura Project a significant proportion of scrub was managed and now an ongoing scrub management programme continues, albeit at a lower level, to prevent significant loss of grassland to scrub. Management and operational issues continue to be dealt with through a working Integrated Land Management Plan and a generic consent, which is periodically reviewed.</p> <p>Habitat Loss - Chalk grassland in Britain is a habitat which has declined by more than 80% in the last 50 years, largely through agricultural intensification, land management should ensure this does not occur within the SPA.</p> <p>Disturbance - There is a risk that development or increased recreational and other activities would disturb the flora and fauna.</p>					

²⁸ PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.

²⁹ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/ssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdrt18&category=S&reference=1003140>

Salisbury Plain SPA						
Location (Lat and Long)	51 15 14 N, 01 53 11 W					
JNCC Site Code	UK9011102					
Size (ha)	19688.88					
Qualifying Features	<p>ARTICLE 4.1 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC)</p> <p>During the breeding season the area regularly supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>Burhinus oedicanus</i> - 14.5% of the GB breeding population <p>Over winter the area regularly supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>Circus cyaneus</i> - 0.7% of the GB population <p>ARTICLE 4.2 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC)</p> <p>During the breeding season the area regularly supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>Coturnix coturnix</i> - 20% of the population in Great Britain ■ <i>Falco subbuteo</i> - 1.2% of the population in Great Britain 					
Conservation Objectives	See the Conservation Objectives for Salisbury Plain SAC.					
Condition Assessment	No condition assessment is currently available for the Salisbury Plain SPA, therefore, the condition status of the component SSSIs are provided below.					
	% Area meeting PSA³⁰ target	% Area favourable	% Area unfavourable recovering	% Area unfavourable no change	% Area unfavourable declining	% Area destroyed / part destroyed
	Salisbury Plain SSSI condition summary³¹ (compiled 01 November 2010).					

³⁰ PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.

Salisbury Plain SPA						
	100.00%	14.34%	85.66%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Vulnerabilities	<p>Salisbury Plain SPA is the largest area of open chalk grassland in north-west Europe. It is owned by the Ministry of Defence and used intensively for military training. The grassland is robust and when dry is able to sustain considerable training pressure. Other land uses include agriculture, forestry and recreation.</p> <p>Site Level Management - Military training requirements constrain ideal conservation management (including grazing and scrub management) and have led to the establishment of extensive plantations, which, over time, may pose a threat to the open grassland landscape and its ecology. The military training requirements, conservation management requirements and other land use issues have been brought together in an Integrated Land Management Plan (ILMP). The ILMP will address many issues including sustainability of military activities and management such as more extensive grazing, scrub management and removal of plantations not essential for military training.</p> <p>Disturbance - Changes in military use, particularly use of increased numbers of vehicles and construction of roads and tracks to accommodate those vehicles have the potential to damage the qualifying interests, but are subject to prior assessment and are being strategically addressed through an integrated land management plan.</p> <p>Habitat Loss - Additionally there is a risk that future development (road and track construction) could lead to an increase in habitat loss.</p>					

³¹ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:
<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdrt18&category=S&reference=1006531>

RAMSAR

The New Forest RAMSAR						
Location (Lat and Long)	50 49 32 N, 01 39 22 W					
JNCC Site Code	UK11047					
Size (ha)	28002.81					
Qualifying Features	<p>Ramsar criterion 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valley mires and wet heaths are found throughout the site and are of outstanding scientific interest. The mires and heaths are within catchments whose uncultivated and undeveloped state buffer the mires against adverse ecological change. This is the largest concentration of intact valley mires of their type in Britain. <p>Ramsar criterion 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site supports a diverse assemblage of wetland plants and animals including several nationally rare species. Seven species of nationally rare plant are found on the site, as are at least 65 British Red Data Book species of invertebrate. <p>Ramsar criterion 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mire habitats are of high ecological quality and diversity and have undisturbed transition zones. The invertebrate fauna of the site is important due to the concentration of rare and scarce wetland species. The whole site complex, with its examples of semi-natural habitats is essential to the genetic and ecological diversity of southern England. 					
Conservation Objectives	See the Conservation Objectives for the New Forest SAC.					
Condition Assessment	No condition assessment is currently available for the New Forest RAMSAR, therefore, the condition status of the component SSSIs are provided below.					
	% Area meeting PSA³² target	% Area favourable	% Area unfavourable recovering	% Area unfavourable no change	% Area unfavourable declining	% Area destroyed / part destroyed

³² PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.

The New Forest RAMSAR						
	New Forest SSSI condition summary ³³ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	98.68%	33.18%	65.50%	0.34%	0.97%	0.01%
	Roydon Woods SSSI condition summary ³⁴ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Whiteparish Common SSSI condition summary ³⁵ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	93.11%	1.27%	91.84%	6.90%	0.00%	0.00%
	Loosehanger Copse and Meadows SSSI condition summary ³⁶ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Langley Wood and Homan's Copse SSSI condition summary ³⁷ (compiled 01 November 2010).					
	98.87%	0.00%	98.87%	1.13%	0.00%	0.00%
Landford Bog SSSI condition summary ³⁸ (compiled 01 November 2010).						
100.00%	27.76%	72.24%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
Vulnerabilities	<p>Disturbance - The site is subject to recreational pressure. Recreational pressures and disturbance has been shown to adversely affect biodiversity. Steps are being taken to deal with recreational pressures. A recent decline in waders; redshank, lapwing, curlew and snipe may in part be due to the effects of walkers and particularly those with dogs. The Forestry Commission is carrying out an exercise to educate the dog- walking public during the nesting season. Commercial-scale forest exploitation is also an issue.</p>					

³³ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1003036>

³⁴ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1003197>

³⁵ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1003134>

³⁶ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1005817>

³⁷ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1003920>

³⁸ Natural England SSSI condition summary. Available [online]:

<http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?report=sdr18&category=S&reference=1003189>

The New Forest RAMSAR	
	<p>Drainage - Most of the valley mires in the Forest have been damaged in the past by drainage which has caused drying out of the peat layers. Prevention of further erosion has already been tackled on some sites but a more extensive programme of infilling drainage ditches is currently being discussed with the landowners and commoners. The work to restore valley mires systems is expected to influence bird populations and wetlands in time.</p>

Appendix 2: Consultation Commentary**HRA Screening Report April 2011**

Ref	Consultee Comments	Response (record of amendment to HRA)
Natural England (NE) (26th July 2011) Charles Routh, Planning and Local Government lead (Wiltshire and Swindon)		
General Comments	For a number of sites, it is asserted that because a site is located within an existing light industrial unit, that the operation of processes at the site is unlikely to result in impacts outwith the site boundary. We are concerned that it is not demonstrated that all these sites have suitable surface water drainage systems, and that there is a potential risk of pollutants entering the River Avon SAC. We therefore advise that for the relevant sites, it is flagged up that that surface water drainage systems are explicitly considered as part of the planning application process. This matter is picked up in the site level assessment of likely significant effects completed by Wiltshire Council (http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/waste_site_allocations_dpd_ecological_site_briefings__february_2011_.pdf) e.g. page 22, row 1, but not carried into the Habitats Regulations Assessment document.	The HRA Screening Report (Dec 2011) recommends (Section 4, para 4.42) that any proposals for the sites are accompanied by a surface water management strategy that specifically considers the integration of surface water drainage systems.

Appendix 2: Consultation Commentary**HRA Screening Report April 2011**

Ref	Consultee Comments	Response (record of amendment to HRA)
Natural England (NE) (26th July 2011) Charles Routh, Planning and Local Government lead (Wiltshire and Swindon)		
General Comments	For a number of sites, it is asserted that because a site is located within an existing light industrial unit, that the operation of processes at the site is unlikely to result in impacts outwith the site boundary. We are concerned that it is not demonstrated that all these sites have suitable surface water drainage systems, and that there is a potential risk of pollutants entering the River Avon SAC. We therefore advise that for the relevant sites, it is flagged up that that surface water drainage systems are explicitly considered as part of the planning application process. This matter is picked up in the site level assessment of likely significant effects completed by Wiltshire Council (http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/waste_site_allocations_dpd_ecological_site_briefings_february_2011_.pdf) e.g. page 22, row 1, but not carried into the Habitats Regulations Assessment document.	The HRA Screening Report (Dec 2011) recommends (Section 4, para 4.42) that any proposals for the sites are accompanied by a surface water management strategy that specifically considers the integration of surface water drainage systems.