Winchester Local Development Framework Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report

CONSULTATION DRAFT

HRA Screening of Core Strategy Preferred Option

May 2009

prepared by

enfusion

HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT
SCREENING REPORT

Winchester City Council Core Strategy - Preferred Option

date:	May 2009	
prepared for:	Winchester City Council	
prepared by:	Alastair Peattie (Enfusion)	
quality assurance:	Ruth Thomas (Enfusion)	

enfusion
environmental planning and management for sustainability

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

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Winchester City Council is currently preparing its Core Strategy for the District. The Core Strategy is one of three key documents to be prepared as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF). When adopted, the Core Strategy will provide the planning framework (vision, objectives, spatial development strategy and core policies for spatial planning) that guides development in the City and surrounding District over the period to 2026. An Issues and Options (I&O) paper was published for public consultation in December 2007 and a series of consultation workshops were held throughout the District in January 2008.

1.2 Winchester City Council commissioned Enfusion to carry out Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment [SEA]) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Council's Development Plan Documents which has been undertaken in parallel. Information obtained in the scoping stages of the SA/SEA supports Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).[1] HRA of Development Plan Documents is also required by law and the background to this process is set out in more detail below. Although HRA is also commonly referred to as Appropriate Assessment (AA), the requirement for AA is first determined by an initial 'screening' stage undertaken as part of the HRA. This report details the process and findings of this first screening stage.

Requirement for Habitats Regulations Assessment

1.3 The European Directive (92/43/EEC) on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Flora and Fauna (the Habitats Directive) protects habitats and species of European nature conservation importance. The Habitats Directive establishes a network of internationally important sites designated for their ecological status. These are referred to as Natura 2000 sites or European Sites, and comprise Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs).

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.[2] In 2007, this requirement was transposed into UK law in Part IVA of the Habitats Regulations (The Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c.)(Amendment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2007). These regulations require the application of AA to all land use plans. Government guidance also requires that

[1] Winchester Local Development Framework Sustainability Appraisal (SA) & Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) SA Scoping Report, June 2007.
[2] 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 and where information is limited the precautionary principle applies.

Ramsar sites (which support internationally important wetland habitats and are listed under the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance [Ramsar Convention]) are included within HRA/AA.

1.5 The purpose of AA 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 integrity[3] of that site. Where significant negative effects are identified, avoidance, mitigation and where necessary alternative options should be examined to avoid any potential damaging effects. The scope of the HRA/AA is dependent on the location, size and significance of the proposed plan or project and the sensitivities and nature of the interest features of the European sites under consideration. If it is not possible to avoid or remove the identified effects assessed as arising from the plan implementation, then [if the plan makers wish to proceed with the policies/ proposals as set] it must be demonstrated that there are Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest (IROPI) to continue with the plan [(Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive).

Guidance for Habitats Regulations Assessment

1.6 Draft guidance for AA 'Planning for the Protection of European Sites: Appropriate Assessment', has been produced by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG, August 2006). A partnership of consultants[4] has also prepared guidance (Appropriate Assessment of Plans, August 2007) to assist planning bodies in complying with the Habitats Directive and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) has also produced guidance on HRA to support the planning community.[5] Most recently Natural England has produced draft guidance 'The Habitats Regulations Assessment of Local Development Documents (D Tyldesley and Associates, Feb 2009) which takes account of recent development in HRA practice.

1.7 The application of HRA to Local Development Documents is an emerging field and the approach applied for the WCC Core Strategy Preferred Options is based on the best current government guidance and emergent practice. The method applied considers HRA in three main stages - outlined in **Table 1.** This report addresses the first screening stage [1] of the HRA.

[3] 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).
[4] Scott Wilson, Levett-Therivel Sustainability Consultants, Treweek Environmental Consultants and Land Use Consultants.
[5] Dodd AM, Cleary BE, Dawkins JS, Byron HJ, Palframan LJ & Williams GM (2007) The Appropriate Assessment of Spatial plans: a guide to why, when and how to do it. RSPB, Sandy.

Table 1 Habitats Regulations Assessment: Key Stages	
Stage 1	
Screening	▪ Identify international sites in and around the plan/ strategy area ▪ Examine conservation objectives (if available) ▪ Analyse the policy/plan and its key components ▪ Identify potential effects on Natura 2000 sites ▪ Examine other plans and programmes that could contribute to 'in combination' effects
	▪ *If no effects likely – report that no significant effect.* ▪ *If effects are judged likely or uncertainty exists – the precautionary principle applies proceed to* ***stage 2***
Stage 2	
Appropriate Assessment	▪ 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 effect on integrity of site could be avoided by changes to plan and the consideration of alternatives ▪ Develop mitigation measures (including timescale and mechanisms)
	▪ *Report outcomes of AA and develop monitoring strategies* ▪ *If effects remain following the consideration of alternatives and development of mitigations proceed to* ***stage 3***
Stage 3	
Assessment where no alternatives and adverse impacts remain	▪ Identify 'imperative reasons of overriding public interest' (IROPI) ▪ Identify/ develop potential compensatory measures
	Difficult test to pass, requirements are onerous and untested to date

Consultation

1.8 The Habitats Regulations require the plan making/ competent authority [Winchester City Council] to consult the appropriate nature conservation statutory body [Natural England (NE)]. Enfusion produced an HRA Screening: Interim Report in February 2008, which detailed the processes involved, and information gathered to inform this HRA screening for WCC Core Strategy Preferred Options. The interim report was sent to NE for comments in March 2009. Overall NE was satisfied with the HRA method and emphasised the need for the emergent analysis to inform the development of the Core Strategy. The importance of first pursuing avoidance measures prior to consideration of mitigation was highlighted. NE reinforced the methodological approach taken in this HRA that distance itself is not a

definitive guide to the likelihood or severity of an impact. These comments have been taken on board throughout the preparation of the HRA.

1.9 NE has been issued a copy of this report, and any comments will be addressed and taken forward in the AA - as it informs the Core Strategy; consultation with NE expected to be ongoing. The Habitats Regulations leave consultation with other bodies and the public to the discretion of the plan making authority. If consultation is undertaken with the public it is recommended that this be undertaken alongside the consultation for the plan. This Screening Report is being published alongside the Core Strategy Preferred Options document.

Purpose and Structure of Report

1.10 This report documents the process and findings of the Screening Stage of HRA for the WCC Core Strategy Preferred Options. Following this introductory section the document is organised into three further sections:

- **Section 2** outlines the method used for the screening process.
- **Section 3** outlines the screening process and summary findings of the screening assessment.
- **Section 4** outlines the key conclusions.

2.0 METHOD

2.1 In accordance with the official guidance and current practice, conducting the screening stage of the HRA for the WCC Core Strategy Preferred Options used the method outlined below. This approach combines both a **plan** and a **site** focus.

- The **plan** focus first screens out those elements of the plan unlikely to have a significant effect and then considers the impacts of the remaining elements on European sites, including the potential for 'in-combination' impacts.
- The **site** focus considers the environmental conditions of the site and the factors required to maintain site integrity, and looks at the potential impacts the plan may have.

2.2 HRA experience to date has indicated that maintaining a site based approach as core to the HRA/AA method more closely reflects the intent of the Habitats Directive. This means that subsequent avoidance and mitigation measures [developed if/ as required during the AA stage 2] seek to focus on the conditions necessary to maintain site integrity (e.g. avoiding specific types of development/ activity at or near sensitive areas).

2.3 Other avoidance or mitigation measures developed during the HRA process may include policy caveats at a strategic level. In some instances where decisions on avoidance and mitigation can only be made when site level detail becomes available, then the HRA process should be undertaken in relation to lower level planning documents (Tyldesley, D. 2009).

2.4 The key tasks employed for the HRA Screening are set out in **Table 2**.

2.5 As part of this screening process consideration was also given to related HRA work and Sustainability Appraisal (SA)/ Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and other HRA work [where available] being undertaken in neighboring councils and in the wider area. For example, this included the Appropriate Assessment of the Draft South East Plan (Scott Wilson, Levett Therivel, 2006).[6]

[6] References provided in the 'Reference and Bibliography section of this Report.

Table 2 **HRA Screening Stage: Key Tasks**	
Task 1 **Identification of Natura 2000 sites & characterisation**	▪ Identification of European sites both within the WCC boundary, within 15 km of the boundary and/or within the potential influence of the plan.[7] ▪ Information was obtained for each European site, based on publicly available information and consultation with Natural England where appropriate.[8] ▪ This included information relating to the sites' qualifying features; conservation objectives (where available) ; vulnerabilities/ sensitivities and geographical boundaries.
Task 2 **Strategy review, policy screening and identification of likely impacts**	▪ Screening of the Core Strategy Preferred Options and the identification of likely impacts (including a review of the strategy to determine likely impacts).
Task 3 **Consideration of other plans and programmes**	▪ Consideration, where appropriate, of other plans and programmes that may have in-combination effects with the Core Strategy Preferred Options.
Task 4 **Screening Assessment**	▪ Summary of screening outcomes and recommendations.

[7] Search area distance based on extant guidance, (Tyldesley, D. 2009).
[8] www.jncc.gov.uk, www.natural-england.org.uk.

3.0 SCREENING

Task 1: Identification of European sites & characterisation

3.1 There are four Natura 2000 sites within the Winchester District boundary. However, plans and programmes have spatial implications that can extend beyond the intended plan area boundaries. In particular; it is also recognised 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. This means that a plan directing development some distance away from a European site could still have effects on the site and, therefore, needs to be considered as part of the screening process.

3.2 Taking into account the potential for transboundary impacts the screening has identified sixteen European sites within a 15km search area of the WCC administrative boundary and therefore potentially within the influence of the plan (**Table 3**). Hydrological connectivity was a major consideration during the identification of European sites, given the number of water dependent sites in the South Hampshire area.

Table 3 **European Sites within Winchester City Council administrative boundaries**	**Designation**
River Itchen	SAC
Solent Maritime	SAC
Solent and Southampton Water	SPA/ Ramsar
European Sites within a 15km search area & downstream	
Butser Hill	SAC
Chichester and Langstone Harbours	SPA/ Ramsar
East Hampshire Hangers	SAC
Emer Bog	SAC
Mottisfont Bats	SAC
New Forest	SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar
Portsmouth Harbour	SPA/ Ramsar
Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons	SAC

Task 2: Strategy Review, Policy Screening and Identification of Likely Impacts

Winchester Core Strategy: Summary Review

3.3 The Core Strategy sets out the Vision, Objectives and strategic direction for spatial planning in the Winchester District area up to 2026. It implements the Council's Community Strategy in terms of spatial and

land use planning. Issues and Options were developed in 2007 and then consulted on in 2008.

3.4 The South East Plan (adopted May 2009)[9], the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East of England sets out the strategy for planning and development in the South East to the year 2026. The Plan identifies South Hampshire as a sub-regional strategy area where economic growth will be promoted along with substantial housing development (80,000 dwellings). The southern part of Winchester District falls within the South Hampshire sub-region, known as the 'PUSH' area (Partnership for Urban South Hampshire). Based on regional policy drivers and national guidance on housing and employment provision, the Winchester Core Strategy makes provision for 12,740 dwellings in the period 2006-2026; including 6,740 dwellings within the PUSH area and 6,000 dwellings within the rest of the District.

3.5 The Spatial Vision for the Core Strategy is set out below.

Box 1: Spatial Planning Vision

"Winchester District will retain its distinctive identity as a predominantly rural area of countryside, villages and market towns. Growth and change will be directed to the most sustainable locations; the County Town of Winchester and the urban areas on the southern fringes of the District which have a greater functional relationship with urban south Hampshire. The varied economy will expand and change to reflect its range of skills and technologies from traditional rural enterprises to knowledge and creative industries. The District's rich heritage, biodiversity and landscape, a significant part of which falls within the proposed South Downs National Park, will be maintained and enhanced to provide an attractive place to live, work and do business. The many communities and individuals within the District will have continued access to a range of local services and facilities including green space to ensure social inclusion and the promotion of healthy lifestyles. Change will be accommodated in a sustainable manner minimising its impact on precious resources and climate change."

Winchester Core Strategy: Screening of Core Strategy Preferred Options

3.6 Screening of the Preferred Policy Approaches involved identifying the policies that may lead to significant effects on European sites both alone and in-combination. The approach taken was in accordance with NE draft guidance for HRA of Local Development Documents (Tyldesley, D. 2009). In order to complete the policy screening each policy was categorised as to its likely effects on each European site identified in **Appendix 1**. There are four categories of potential effects, which are as follows:

[9] For the purposes of the assessment process reference is made to the Draft South East Plan, prior to adoption. This is the version that has informed the Core Strategy Preferred Option which preceded adoption of the South East Plan.

- **Category A**: elements of the plan /options that would have no negative effect on a European site at all;
- **Category B**: elements of the plan /options that could have an effect, but the likelihood is there would be no significant negative effect on a European site either alone or in combination with other elements of the same plan, or other plans or projects;
- **Category C**: elements of the plan /options that could or would be likely to have a significant effect alone and will require the plan to be subject to an appropriate assessment before the plan may be adopted;
- **Category D**: elements of the plan /options that would be likely to have a significant effect in combination with other elements of the same plan, or other plans or projects and will require the plan to be subject to an appropriate assessment before the plan may be adopted.

3.7 Categories A, C and D are subdivided so that the specific reason why a policy has been allocated to a particular category is clear. The detail of the screening assessment which considers each of WCC's policies against the categories is provided in **Appendix 3** and policies which were considered to lead to potential significant effects are listed in **Table 4.**

Table 4	
Core Strategy Preferred Option policies screened in to the assessment process	**Assessment Category**
Policy WT2 Strategic Housing Allocation - Barton Farm	Category C & D
Policy WT3 Strategic Employment Allocation - Bushfield Camp	Category C & D
Policy SH2 Strategic Housing Allocation - West of Waterlooville	Category C & D
Policy SH3 Strategic Housing Allocation - North Whiteley	Category C & D
Policy MTRA2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy	Category D
Policy MTRA 4 Re-use of Rural Buildings	Category C

Identification of Likely Impacts

3.8 The Strategy Review, consultation with Natural England and Screening of Preferred Policy Approaches identified a number of impacts that have the potential to result in significant effects on Natura 2000 sites. These impacts can be broadly characterised against the following 'pathways of impact':

- **Water Resource and Water Quality** - resulting from increased demand for water consumption and discharge requirements arising

from new/ expanded housing and commercial developments and the potential for increased point source pollution, changes to surface water/ run-off which may have implications for water dependant sites.

- **Atmospheric Pollution** - arising from a growth in traffic and transport and general development (emissions from construction/ building stock) which has the potential to affect sites sensitive to changes in air quality
- **Recreational Activity** - resulting from an expanding population within and around Winchester District has the potential to increase disturbance on the designated habitats and species.

3.9 The potential for the impacts identified to have a significant effect on the SACs highlighted is summarised in the main screening assessment findings at **Task 4** below.

Task 3: Consideration of other plans and programmes

3.10 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). Undertaking an assessment of other PPs requires a pragmatic approach (given the extensive range of PPs underway in the region). For this screening consideration of other PPs has focused on those likely to lead to significant infrastructure/ development changes with related impacts and plans which provide information that help to determine environmental condition and pressures of European sites were also considered, these included:

- The Draft South East Plan: A Clear Vision for the South East 2006
- Local Transport Plans
- Local Development Frameworks in neighbouring authorities
- Waste Strategies for the South East and neighbouring authorities
- South East River Basin Management Plan, Consultation Draft, December 2008
- Catchment Abstraction Management Plans - where relevant to the designated sites under consideration
- Water Resource Management Plans

3.11 The potential effects of these plans are reviewed in detail at **Appendix 2** and the findings of this review considered in the light of impacts arising from the screening process are used to inform the screening assessment [**Appendix 3**]. The range of in-combination impacts considered was focused on the key issues outlined below:

- Pressures on **water abstraction** and waste water treatment as a result of development and growth around the plan area and potential impacts on **water quality** (particularly in relation to water dependant European sites).

- Potential for significant increased traffic generation and associated **air pollution issues** as a result of population growth around and between major existing settlements and major road building programmes.
- Direct and Indirect impacts from new/increased/ displaced **recreational pressures** as a result of new developments particularly along the Solent coast and in the New Forest National Park.
- Temporal emissions, **disturbance and pollutant impacts** associated with construction/ development operations - particularly in areas experiencing high level of regeneration inputs.
- Potential for the **loss and fragmentation** of bat-fly ways and feeding areas used by the barbastelle bat population in relation to Mottisfont Bats SAC.

3.12 The PPs considered at this stage are reviewed in **Appendix 2** and this analysis was used to inform the screening assessment (**Appendix 3**).

Task 4: Screening Assessment of the WCC Core Strategy Preferred Options

3.13 In line with the screening requirements of the Habitats Regulations, an assessment was undertaken to determine the potential likely significant effects of the WCC Core Strategy Preferred Options on the integrity of European sites that lie within the potential influence of the plan. This assessment was based on:

- The information gathered on European sites (**Appendix 1**)
- The evaluation of impacts arising from the plan
- The review of other relevant plans and programmes (**Appendix 2**)

Screening Assessment Summary

3.14 The screening assessment detailing the analysis in accordance with NE guidance is set out in the screening matrix (**Appendix 3**) and the results of the assessment are summarised in **Table 5** below.

3.15 The screening assessment identified that the Core Strategy has the potential to have likely significant effects alone on a number of European sites given the proximity and size of a number of Strategic Housing Allocations. There is potential for development proposed in policies WT2, WT3, SH2 and SH3 to increase levels of water abstraction and change drainage (surface and groundwater) patterns in the area, which could potentially have significant effects on the water levels and quality of water dependent sites. New development could also put increased pressure on sewerage system capacity, which has the potential to reduce water quality in the river network. There is also potential for development at these locations to increase recreational activity, therefore increasing levels of disturbance to the protected habitats and species.

3.16 The screening assessment also identified that the Core Strategy has the potential to have likely significant in-combination effects with development proposed in surrounding authorities (PUSH area). There is potential for likely significant in-combination effects through increased levels of abstraction, increased pressure on sewerage capacity/ flow and increased recreational activity. Given the sensitivity of the European sites and the pressures currently arising as a result of development proposed in Winchester District and the surrounding areas, it is considered that further AA is required to assess the potential for adverse effects on site integrity both alone and in-combination on the European sites identified as requiring AA in **Table 5**.

3.17 A number of European sites scoped into the screening (Table 3) were not identified by the screening assessment as being significantly affected by development proposed in the Core Strategy and surrounding areas. The analysis and justification for screening these sites out of the HRA is provided in **Appendix 4**.

Table 5 HRA Screening Table Summary

European Sites	Designation	AA required alone? ✗ No ✓ Yes ? Uncertain	AA required in combination? ✗ No ✓ Yes ? Uncertain
Butser Hill	SAC	✗	✗
Chichester and Langstone Harbours	SPA/ Ramsar	?	✓
East Hampshire Hangers	SAC	✗	✗
Emer Bog	SAC	✗	✗
Mottisfont Bats	SAC	?	?
New Forest	SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar	✗	✓
Portsmouth Harbour	SPA/ Ramsar	?	✓
River Itchen	SAC	✓	✓
Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons	SAC	?	✓
Solent Maritime	SAC	✓	✓
Solent and Southampton Water	SPA/ Ramsar	✓	✓

Screening Stage Recommendations

3.18 The findings of the screening process suggested the potential for significant effects at thirteen European Sites within the influence of the plan. Likely significant effect and therefore the requirement for AA has been identified at Mottisfont Bats SAC. However, it is recommended

that if the Core Strategy provides sufficient direction to ensure that site level HRA is applied to specific development proposals, the Mottisfont Bats SAC can be screened out of the HRA process. It is therefore recommended that the Core Strategy should include the following wording:

'In line with the Habitats Regulations, it may be necessary for project level assessments to be undertaken where there is a likelihood of significant effects on Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites, to ensure that these designations will not be adversely affected by any development proposals'.

3.19 The screening assessment also identified that the level of development proposed within the Core Strategy and surrounding areas has the potential put increased pressure on sewerage capacity, which could lead to reductions in water quality. The Core Strategy may wish to address this issue as part of policy development by including the following wording:

'Adequate sewage disposal facilities and surface water drainage capacity must be available and in place before a development can be occupied'.

3.20 These recommendations are subject to consultation and advice from Natural England and the Environment Agency.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS, FUTURE WORK

4.1 This HRA screening process has considered the potential significant effect arising from the policies within the WCC Core Strategy Preferred Options.

4.2 The HRA considered four European sites within WCC's plan boundaries and twelve European sites within a 15km search area around the Authority's boundaries. The findings of the screening process suggested the potential for significant effects at thirteen European Sites within the influence of the plan. These effects are considered to arise both from the plan itself (in relation to specific, identified policies) and potentially as a result of 'in-combination' effects from other plans and programmes being developed and implemented simultaneously in the area.

4.3 Based on the information gathered for the screening process and considering the Habitats Regulations requirements for a precautionary approach, it is determined that further Appropriate Assessment work is required for:

- Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA/ Ramsar
- New Forest SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar
- Mottisfont Bats SAC - subject to screening summary recommendations (paragraph 3.18)
- Portsmouth Harbour SPA/ Ramsar
- River Itchen SAC
- Solent and Southampton SPA/ Ramsar
- Solent Maritime SAC
- Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC

4.4 The AA will require more detailed information gathering to assess, and where possible quantify, the potential impacts identified and determine the most effective mechanism for avoiding or mitigating those effects. This work will need to take place in parallel to the development of the WCC Core Strategy and in consultation with the Statutory Body, NE and other key stakeholders, in particular the EA.

4.5 A full AA report should be presented alongside the WCC Core Strategy Submission DPD as part of the evidence base for examination where it serves to provide a record of how the plan is consistent with UK government/ EU regulations on biodiversity protection. The assessment should be revisited in the light of any significant changes to the plan.

REFERENCES/ BIBLIOGRAPHY

Air Pollution Information System. www.apis.ac.uk

Department for Communities and Local Government (2006) Planning for the Protection of European Sites: Appropriate Assessment under The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) (Amendment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006: Guidance for Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents.

Department of Transport (2005) Interim Advice Note 61/04 Guidance for Undertaking Environmental Assessment of Air Quality for Sensitive Ecosystems in Internationally Designated Nature Conservation Sites and SSSIs (Supplement to DMRB 11.3.1). HMSO, London.

Natural England. http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/

Environment Agency (2008) Water for Life and Livelihoods: A Consultation on the Draft River Basin Management Plan South East River Basin District.

Environment Agency (Accessed 26/03/09) Catchment Abstraction Management Strategies. Available online: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/33372.aspx

Environment Agency (Accessed 08/05/09) What's in Your Backyard? Available online: http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?ep=maptopics&lang=_e

Environment Agency (Accessed 08/05/09) Habitats Directive Review of Consents. Available online: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/regulation/31915.aspx

Joint Nature Conservation Committee. www.jncc.gov.uk

Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (2008) South Hampshire: Integrated Water Management Strategy (Atkins, October 2008).

Portsmouth Water (2008) Draft Water Resources Management Plan. Available online: http://www.portsmouthwater.co.uk/news/default2.aspx?id=424

Scott Wilson, Levett-Therivel Sustainability Consultants, Treweek Environmental Consultants and Land Use Consultants (August, 2006) Appropriate Assessment of Plans.

Sharp, J., Lowen, J. & Liley, D. (2008) Changing patterns of visitor numbers within the New Forest National Park, with particular reference to the New Forest SPA.

Southern Water (2008) Draft Water Resources Management Plan

Available online:
http://www.southernwater.co.uk/Environment/managingResources/publicConsultation.asp

Tyldesley, D. (2009) The Habitats Regulations Assessment of Local Development Documents. Revised Draft Guidance for Natural England, Sheffield.

UK Air Quality Archive www.airquality.co.uk

Winchester City Council. Local Development Framework. Available online:
http://www.winchester.gov.uk/Housing/Planning/LocalDevelopmentFramework/

Appendix 1: European Site Characterisations

SAC

Site Name: Butser Hill Location: SU716197 Size: 238.66ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**SAC**
Qualifying Features	Annex I Habitats primary reason for selection: ▪ Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*) ▪ *Taxus baccata* woods of the British Isles Priority feature
Conservation Objectives	Conservation Objectives 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. **Habitat Types represented (Biodiversity Action Plan categories)** Lowland Calcareous Grassland Broadleaved, Mixed and Yew Woodland **Geological features (Geological Site Types)** STATIC (FOSSIL) GEOMORPHOLOGICAL (IS) (*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.
Component SSSIs	▪ Butser Hill

Site Name: Butser Hill **Location: SU716197** **Size: 238.66ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**					
Designation	**SAC**					
SSSI Condition Status	**% Area meeting PSA[1] target**	**% Area favourable**	**% Area unfavourable recovering**	**% Area unfavourable no change**	**% Area unfavourable declining**	**% Area destroyed / part destroyed**
	100.00%	88.71%	11.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity	▪ Maintain well drained soils. ▪ Maintain soil chemistry. ▪ Minimise soil disturbance - Manage/restrict recreational use. ▪ Maintain levels of grazing.					
Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)	▪ Its immediate location adjacent to the A3 and the surrounding intensively managed arable land means that there is the potential for localised atmospheric pollution. o Nitrogen deposition o Photochemical oxidants (ozone). o Particulate matter. ▪ Recreational pressure. o Trampling of shallow/thin soils.					

[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.

Site Name: East Hampshire Hangers **Location: SU739268** **Size: 569.68ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SAC**
Qualifying Features	Annex I Habitats primary reason for selection: ▪ Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia)* (important orchid sites) * Priority feature ▪ *Asperulo-Fagetum* beech forests ▪ Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines Priority feature Annex I Habitats qualifying feature: ▪ Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*) ▪ *Taxus baccata* woods of the British Isles * Priority feature Annex II Species qualifying feature: ▪ Early gentian *Gentianella anglica*
Conservation Objectives	No conservation objectives available. From the information provided by Natural England on the component SSSIs it is possible that future conservation objectives will try to maintain, in a favourable condition the: ▪ Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*) (important orchid sites)* Priority feature ▪ *Asperulo-Fagetum* beech forests ▪ Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines * Priority feature ▪ *Taxus baccata* woods of the British Isles * Priority feature They could also contain reference to maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the population of: ▪ Early gentian *Gentianella anglica*

Site Name: East Hampshire Hangers **Location: SU739268** **Size: 569.68ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**					
Designation	**SAC**					
Component SSSIs	▪ Upper Greensand Hangers: Empshott to Hawkley ▪ Wick Wood and Worldham Hangers ▪ Upper Greensand Hangers: Wyck to Wheatley ▪ Noar Hill ▪ Selborne Common ▪ Wealden Edge Hangers ▪ Coombe Wood and The Lythe					
SSSI Condition Status	**% Area meeting PSA[2] target**	**% Area favourable**	**% Area unfavourable recovering**	**% Area unfavourable no change**	**% Area unfavourable declining**	**% Area destroyed / part destroyed**
	Upper Greensand Hangers: Empshott to Hawkley					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Wick Wood and Worldham Hangers					
	94.85%	94.85%	0.00%	5.15%	0.00%	0.00%
	Upper Greensand Hangers: Wyck to Wheatley					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Noar Hill					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Selborne Common					
	100.00%	99.53%	0.47%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Wealden Edge Hangers					
	100.00%	94.19%	5.81%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

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

Site Name: East Hampshire Hangers **Location: SU739268** **Size: 569.68ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**					
Designation	**SAC**					
	Coombe Wood and The Lythe					
	93.18%	77.81%	15.37%	2.71%	4.12%	0.00%
Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity	▪ Maintain soil chemistry. ▪ Maintain surface water regime. ▪ Minimise soil disturbance. ▪ Maintain levels of grazing. ▪ Maintain air quality.					
Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)	▪ Recreational pressure (trampling, rock climbers etc), this may not be an issue for the *Tilio-Acerion* forests of slopes, screes and ravines due to inaccessibility. ▪ Eutrophication as a result of run-off from adjacent agricultural land. ▪ Growth of ruderal vegetation. ▪ Beech disease.					

<table>
<tr><td>Site Name: Emer Bog
Location: SU394214
Size: 37.5ha</td><td colspan="6">HRA Data Proforma</td></tr>
<tr><td>Designation</td><td colspan="6">SAC</td></tr>
<tr><td>Qualifying Features</td><td colspan="6">Annex I Habitats primary reason for selection:
Transition mires and quaking bogs</td></tr>
<tr><td>Conservation Objectives</td><td colspan="6">To maintain*, in favourable condition, the:

▪ Transition Mires and Quaking Bogs

*maintenance implies restoration, if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Component SSSIs</td><td colspan="6">▪ Baddesley Common and Emer Bog</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">SSSI Condition Status</td><td>% Area meeting PSA[3] target</td><td>% Area favourable</td><td>% Area unfavourable recovering</td><td>% Area unfavourable no change</td><td>% Area unfavourable declining</td><td>% Area destroyed / part destroyed</td></tr>
<tr><td>100.00%</td><td>3.73%</td><td>96.27%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>0.00%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity</td><td colspan="6">▪ Maintain levels of Nitrogen.
▪ Maintain surface and groundwater hydrological processes.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)</td><td colspan="6">▪ Principal threat to site is adjacent land-use.
Nitrogen deposition
Affect hydrological processes.</td></tr>
</table>

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

<table>
<tr><td>Site Name: Mottisfont Bats
Location: SU322297
Size: 196.88ha</td><td colspan="6">HRA Data Proforma</td></tr>
<tr><td>Designation</td><td colspan="6"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Qualifying Features</td><td colspan="6">Annex II Species primary reason for selection:
Barbastelle Barbastella barbastellus</td></tr>
<tr><td>Conservation Objectives</td><td colspan="6">Subject to natural change, maintain, in favourable condition*, the broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland as a habitat for:
Barbastelle Barbastella barbastellus
* or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Component SSSIs</td><td colspan="6">Mottisfont Bats</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">SSSI Condition Status</td><td>% Area meeting PSA[4] target</td><td>% Area favourable</td><td>% Area unfavourable recovering</td><td>% Area unfavourable no change</td><td>% Area unfavourable declining</td><td>% Area destroyed / part destroyed</td></tr>
<tr><td>100.00%</td><td>100.00%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>0.00%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity</td><td colspan="6">Maintain woodland, which the bats use for breeding, roosting, commuting and feeding.
Appropriate management of vegetation at roost entrances. The presence of trees can cause shading and damage by tree root growth can cause problems to structure.
Bats require connectivity of habitat features for commuting and foraging.
Restrict/reduce recreational disturbance at site.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)</td><td colspan="6">Recreational pressure.
Light pollution.</td></tr>
</table>

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

Site Name: River Itchen **Location: SU467174** **Size: 309.26ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SAC**
Qualifying Features	Annex I Habitats primary reason for selection: ▪ Water courses of plain to montane levels with the *Ranunculion fluitantis* and *Callitricho-Batrachion* vegetation Annex II Species primary reason for selection: ▪ Southern damselfly *Coenagrion mercuriale* ▪ Bullhead *Cottus gobio* Annex II Species qualifying feature: ▪ White-clawed (or Atlantic stream) crayfish *Austropotamobius pallipes* ▪ Brook lamprey *Lampetra planeri* ▪ Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* ▪ Otter *Lutra lutra*
Conservation Objectives	To maintain*, in favourable condition, the river as a habitat for: ▪ floating formations of water crowfoot (*Ranunculus*) of plain and sub-mountainous rivers ▪ populations of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) ▪ populations of bullhead (*Cottus gobio*) ▪ populations of brook lamprey (*Lampetra planeri*) ▪ populations of white-clawed crayfish (*Austropotamobius pallipes*) and the river and adjoining land as habitat for: ▪ populations of southern damselfly (*Coenagrion mercuriale*)

<table>
<tr><td>Site Name: River Itchen
Location: SU467174
Size: 309.26ha</td><td colspan="6">HRA Data Proforma</td></tr>
<tr><td>Designation</td><td colspan="6">SAC</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="6">▪ populations of otter (Lutra lutra)

*maintenance implies restoration, if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Component SSSIs</td><td colspan="6">▪ River Itchen</td></tr>
<tr><td>SSSI Condition Status</td><td>% Area meeting PSA[5] target</td><td>% Area favourable</td><td>% Area unfavourable recovering</td><td>% Area unfavourable no change</td><td>% Area unfavourable declining</td><td>% Area destroyed / part destroyed</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>53.35%</td><td>15.57%</td><td>37.78%</td><td>25.30%</td><td>21.36%</td><td>0.00%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity</td><td colspan="6">Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitricho-Batrachion vegetation
▪ Maintain hydrological process of river – river velocity, transport etc.
○ Manage and monitor abstraction levels[6].

Southern damselfly Coenagrion mercuriale
▪ Maintain shallow, well-vegetated, base-rich runnels and flushes in open areas.
○ Maintenance of grazing.

Bullhead Cottus gobio
▪ Maintain water quality.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)</td><td colspan="6">▪ Decrease in flow velocities and increased siltation.
▪ Increased abstraction in the upper catchment has led to a Reduction in macrophyte cover (especially Ranuculus).
▪ Low flows interact with nutrient inputs from point sources to produce localised increases in filamentous</td></tr>
</table>

[5] PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.
[6] The Test and Itchen Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy, March 2006.

Site Name: River Itchen Location: SU467174 Size: 309.26ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	SAC
	algae and nutrient-tolerant macrophytes at the expense of Ranunculus. ▪ Discharges into the River Itchen SAC from a sewage treatment works at Chickenhall (Eastleigh)[7].

[7] Appropriate Assessment of the Draft South East Plan Final Report, October 2006.

Site Name: Solent & Isle of Wight Lagoons **Location: SZ608977** **Size: 36.24ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SAC**
Qualifying Features	Annex I Habitats primary reason for selection: ▪ Coastal lagoons Priority feature
Conservation Objectives	Subject to natural change, maintain, in favourable condition*, the coastal lagoons as a habitat for: ▪ Lagoonal sand-shrimp (*Gammarus insensibilis*) ▪ Starlet sea anemone (*Nematostella vectensis*) *or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfovourable. Based on information sent from Natural England on the conservation objectives for the Newton Lagoon component SSSI and the Yar Lagoon component SSSI.
Component SSSIs	▪ Hurst Castle and Lymington River Estuary ▪ Langstone Harbour ▪ Brading Marshes to St Helens Ledges ▪ Gilkicker Lagoon

SSSI Condition Status

% Area meeting PSA[8] target	**% Area favourable**	**% Area unfavourable recovering**	**% Area unfavourable no change**	**% Area unfavourable declining**	**% Area destroyed / part destroyed**
Hurst Castle and Lymington River Estuary					
35.98%	31.11%	4.87%	0.37%	63.65%	0.00%
Langstone Harbour					

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

<table>
<tr><td>Site Name: Solent & Isle of Wight Lagoons
Location: SZ608977
Size: 36.24ha</td><td colspan="6">HRA Data Proforma</td></tr>
<tr><td>Designation</td><td colspan="6">SAC</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="6"></td><td>9.41%</td><td>8.96%</td><td>0.45%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>90.60%</td><td>0.00%</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Brading Marshes to St Helens Ledges</td></tr>
<tr><td>90.58%</td><td>38.06%</td><td>52.52%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>9.42%</td><td>0.00%</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Gilkicker Lagoon</td></tr>
<tr><td>100.00%</td><td>100.00%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>0.00%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity</td><td colspan="6">▪ Maintain water quality.
▪ Maintain water salinity.
▪ Maintain suitable distance between SAC and development to allow for managed retreat of intertidal habitats.
▪ Avoid introduction of non-native species, e.g. from shipping activity[9].</td></tr>
<tr><td>Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)</td><td colspan="6">▪ Water quality due to industrial waste disposal/landfill/discharges and diffuse pollution occurring off the site.
▪ Effects of sea-level rise; coastal defence.
▪ Water level management/sluice maintenance.
▪ Water-based and land-based recreational pressures, water quality problems, over-abstraction, coastal squeeze.
▪ Pollution from shipping[10].
▪ Recreational Pressure.</td></tr>
</table>

[9] Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Hampshire Minerals Plan Final Report, October 2007.
[10] Appropriate Assessment of the Draft South East Plan Final Report, October 2006.

Site Name: Solent Maritime **Location: SU756003** **Size: 11325.09ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SAC**
Qualifying Features	Annex I Habitats primary reason for selection: ▪ Estuaries ▪ Spartina swards (*Spartinion maritimae*) ▪ Atlantic salt meadows (*Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae*) Annex I Habitats qualifying feature: ▪ Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time ▪ Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide ▪ Coastal lagoons * Priority feature ▪ Annual vegetation of drift lines ▪ Perennial vegetation of stony banks ▪ Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand ▪ Shifting dunes along the shoreline with *Ammophila arenaria* (`white dunes`) Annex II Species qualifying feature: ▪ Desmoulin`s whorl snail (*Vertigo moulinsiana*)
Conservation Objectives	1. Subject to natural change, maintain* the Estuaries in favourable condition, in particular: ▪ Shingle communities. ▪ Reedbed communities. ▪ Saltmarsh communities. ▪ Intertidal mudflat & sandflat communities. ▪ Intertidal mixed sediment communities. ▪ Subtidal sediment communities.

Site Name: Solent Maritime Location: SU756003 Size: 11325.09ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**SAC**
	2. The conservation objective for annual vegetation of drift lines Subject to natural change, maintain* the Annual vegetation of drift lines in favourable condition. 3. The conservation objective for Atlantic salt meadows (*Glauco-Puccinellietalia*) Subject to natural change, maintain* the Atlantic salt meadows (*Glauco-Puccinellietalia*) in favourable condition, in particular: ▪ Low marsh communities. ▪ Mid-marsh communities. ▪ Upper marsh communities. ▪ Transitional high marsh communities. 4. The conservation objective for Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand Subject to natural change, maintain* the Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand in favourable condition, in particular: ▪ Annual Salicornia saltmarsh communities (SM8). ▪ *Suaeda maritima* saltmarsh communities (SM9). 5. The conservation objective for cordgrass swards (Spartinion) Subject to natural change, maintain* the cordgrass swards (Spartinion) in favourable condition, in particular: ▪ Small cordgrass (*Spartina maritima*) communities.

Site Name: Solent Maritime Location: SU756003 Size: 11325.09ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**SAC**
	▪ Smooth cordgrass (*Spartina alterniflora*) communities. ▪ Townsend's cordgrass (*Spartina x townsendii*) communities. 6. The conservation objective for mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide Subject to natural change, maintain* the mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide in favourable condition, in particular: ▪ Intertidal mud communities. ▪ Intertidal muddy sand communities. ▪ Intertidal sand communities. ▪ Intertidal mixed sediment communities. 7. The conservation objective for sandbanks slightly covered by seawater all the time Subject to natural change, maintain* the sandbanks slightly covered by seawater all the time in favourable condition, in particular: ▪ Subtidal gravel and sands. ▪ Subtidal muddy sand. ▪ Subtidal eelgrass Zostera marina beds. 8. The conservation objective for lagoons Subject to natural change, maintain* the lagoons in favourable condition. 9. The conservation objective for perennial vegetation of stony banks

Site Name: Solent Maritime **Location: SU756003** **Size: 11325.09ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SAC**
	Subject to natural change, maintain* the Perennial vegetation of stony banks in favourable condition. 10. The conservation objective for shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophilia arenaria (white dunes) Subject to natural change, maintain* the Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophilia arenaria (white dunes) in favourable condition. 11. The conservation objective for *Vertigo moulinsiana* (Desmoulin's Whorl Snail) Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for *Vertigo moulinsiana* (Desmoulin's Whorl Snail) *maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.
Component SSSIs	▪ Yar Estuary ▪ North Solent ▪ Newtown Harbour ▪ Langstone Harbour ▪ Lee-on-the-Solent to Itchen Estuary ▪ Hurst Castle and Lymington River Estuary ▪ King's Quay Shore ▪ Eling and Bury Marshes ▪ Lower Test Valley ▪ Bouldnor and Hamstead Cliffs ▪ Medina Estuary ▪ Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes

Site Name: Solent Maritime Location: SU756003 Size: 11325.09ha	HRA Data Proforma					
Designation	**SAC**					
	▪ Upper Hamble Estuary and Woods ▪ Thorness Bay ▪ Hythe to Calshot Marshes ▪ Chichester Harbour					
SSSI Condition Status	**% Area meeting PSA[11] target**	**% Area favourable**	**% Area unfavourable recovering**	**% Area unfavourable no change**	**% Area unfavourable declining**	**% Area destroyed / part destroyed**
	Yar Estuary					
	90.61%	56.67%	33.94%	0.00%	9.38%	0.00%
	North Solent					
	81.98%	67.14%	14.84%	1.59%	16.44%	0.00%
	Newtown Harbour					
	98.86%	79.43%	19.43%	1.14%	0.00%	0.00%
	Langstone Harbour					
	9.41%	8.96%	0.45%	0.00%	90.60%	0.00%
	Lee-on-the-Solent to Itchen Estuary					
	82.49%	82.49%	0.00%	17.51%	0.00%	0.00%
	Hurst Castle and Lymington River Estuary					
	35.98%	31.11%	4.87%	0.37%	63.65%	0.00%
	King's Quay Shore					
	98.10%	76.62%	21.48%	0.00%	1.90%	0.00%
	Eling and Bury Marshes					
	11.46%	11.46%	0.00%	88.54%	0.00%	0.00%
	Lower Test Valley					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

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

Site Name: Solent Maritime Location: SU756003 Size: 11325.09ha	HRA Data Proforma					
Designation	**SAC**					
	Bouldnor and Hamstead Cliffs					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Medina Estuary					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes					
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Upper Hamble Estuary and Woods					
	85.94%	85.94%	0.00%	11.31%	2.75%	0.00%
	Thorness Bay					
	96.21%	96.21%	0.00%	0.00%	3.79%	0.00%
	Hythe to Calshot Marshes					
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
	Chichester Harbour					
	58.00%	57.77%	0.23%	40.23%	1.76%	0.00%
Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity	▪ Maintain water quality. ▪ Maintain coastal hydrological processes. ▪ Maintain suitable distance between intertidal habitats and development to reduce coastal squeeze. ▪ Restriction of dredging or land-claim of coastal habitats.					
Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)	▪ Developments pressures including ports, marinas, jetties etc. ▪ Existing and proposed flood defence and coast protection works. ▪ Coastal squeeze of intertidal habitats due to coastal erosion/ sea level rise and sea-walls/ development in					

Site Name: Solent Maritime Location: SU756003 Size: 11325.09ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**SAC**
	the hinterland. ▪ Potential accidental pollution from shipping, oil/chemical spills, heavy industrial activities, former waste disposal sites and waste-water discharge. Chickenhall (Eastleigh) sewage treatment works discharges into the River Itchen SAC, which drains into the Solent Maritime SAC[12]. ▪ Introduction of non-native species e.g. from shipping activity. ▪ Atmospheric pollution. ○ Nitrogen deposition ○ Photochemical oxidants (ozone). ○ Particulate matter.

[12] Appropriate Assessment of the Draft South East Plan Final Report, October 2006.

Site Name: The New Forest **Location: SU225075** **Size: 29262.36**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SAC**
Qualifying Features	Annex I Habitats primary reason for selection: ▪ Oligotrophic water containing very few minerals of sandy plains (*Littorelletalia uniflorae)* ▪ Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the *Littorelletalia uniflorae* and/or *Isoeto-Nanojuncetea* ▪ Northern Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix* ▪ European dry heaths ▪ *Molinia* meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (*Molinion caeruleae)* ▪ Depressions on peat substrates of the *Rhynchosporion* ▪ Atlantic acidophilios beech forests with *Ilex* and sometimes also *Taxus* in the shrublayer (*Quercion robori-patraeae* or *Ilici-Fragenion)* ▪ *Asperulo-Fagetum* beech forests ▪ Old acidophilous oak woods with *Quercus robur* on sandy plains ▪ Bog woodland *Priority Feature ▪ Alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae* *Priority Feature Annex I Habitats qualifying feature: ▪ Transition mires and quaking bogs ▪ Alkaline fens Annex II Species primary reason for selection: ▪ Southern Damselfly *Coenagrion mercuriale* ▪ Stag beetle *Lucanus cervus* Annex II Species qualifying feature:

Site Name: The New Forest **Location: SU225075** **Size: 29262.36**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SAC**
	▪ Great crested newt *Titurus cristatus*
Conservation Objectives	The conservation objectives for the European interest on the SSSI are To maintain*, in favourable condition, the: ▪ Alkaline fens ▪ Alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior* (*Alno-Padion, Alnion incanaem Salicion albae*) ▪ *Asperulo-Fagetum* beech forests ▪ Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with Ilex and sometimes also Taxus in the shrublayer (*Quercion robori-petraeae or Ilici-Fagenion*) ▪ Bog woodland ▪ Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhyncosporion ▪ European dry heath ▪ Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (*Molinion caeruleae*) ▪ North Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix* ▪ Old acidophilous oak woods with *Quercus robur* on sandy plains ▪ Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the *Littorelletea uniflorae* and or of the *Isoeto-Naonjuncetea* ▪ Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains: *Littorelletalia uniflora* ▪ Transition mires and quaking bogs To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the population of: ▪ Great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*)

Site Name: The New Forest Location: SU225075 Size: 29262.36	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**SAC**
	▪ Southern damselfly (*Coenagrion mercuriale*) ▪ Stag beetle (*Lucanus cervus*) * maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition
Component SSSIs	▪ The New Forest ▪ Langley Wood and Homan's Copse ▪ Roydon Woods ▪ Whiteparish Common ▪ Loosehanger Copse and Meadows ▪ Landford Bog

SSSI Condition Status

% Area meeting PSA[13] target	% Area favourable	% Area unfavourable recovering	% Area unfavourable no change	% Area unfavourable declining	% Area destroyed / part destroyed
The New Forest					
97.14%	32.15%	64.99%	0.97%	1.88%	0.01%
Langley Wood and Homan's Copse					
98.87%	0.00%	98.87%	1.13%	0.00%	0.00%
Roydon Woods					
100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Whiteparish Common					
91.54%	1.27%	90.27%	8.46%	0.00%	0.00%
Loosehanger Copse and Meadows					
100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

[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.

<table>
<tr><td>Site Name: The New Forest
Location: SU225075
Size: 29262.36</td><td colspan="6">HRA Data Proforma</td></tr>
<tr><td>Designation</td><td colspan="6">SAC</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="6">Landford Bog</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>72.24%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>72.24%</td><td>27.76%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>0.00%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity</td><td colspan="6">▪ Maintain natural hydrological regime.
○ Water levels.
○ Flushing rates of the system.
▪ Maintain sedimentary regime within acceptable limits.
▪ Maintain water quality.
▪ Management of heathland.
○ Control of inappropriate and invasive species.
○ Grazing.
▪ Maintain sward composition and structure (height, litter and bare ground).
▪ Management of vegetation structure.
▪ Management of surrounding tress and scrubs.
▪ Management of woodland required to maintain natural processes, a diverse woodland structure, tree regeneration potential, a diverse age structure, control invasive species, and support characteristic species and habitat types.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)</td><td colspan="6">▪ The New Forest is a popular tourist destination and is subject to recreational pressures potentially affecting habitats.
▪ Drainage of wetland habitats for improved grazing and farming has affected the condition of habitats.
▪ Areas of the New Forest have undergone afforestation of heathland habitats, with conifers and other non-native species, modifying the original biodiversity of the area.
▪ Risks also exist due to fluctuating farming trends (relating to the level of livestock) and the extent of grazing.</td></tr>
</table>

SPA

Site Name: Chichester & Langstone Harbours **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 48 23 N** **00 55 12 W** **Size: 5810.03ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SPA**
Qualifying Features	Article 4.1 Qualification During the breeding season the area regularly supports: ▪ *Sterna albifrons* 4.2% of the GB breeding population ▪ *Sterna Hirundo* 0.3% of the GB breeding population ▪ *Sterna sandvicensis* 0.2% of the GB breeding population Over winter the area regularly supports: ▪ *Limosa Lapponica* 3.2% of the GB breeding population Article 4.2 Qualification Over winter the area regularly supports: ▪ *Anas acuta* 1.2% of the population in Great Britain ▪ *Anas clypeata* 1% of the population in Great Britain ▪ *Anas crecca* 0.5% of the population ▪ *Anas Penelope* 0.7% of the population in Great Britain ▪ *Arenaria interpres* 0.7% of the population in Great Britain ▪ *Branta bernicla bernicla* 5.7% of the population ▪ *Calidris alba* 0.2% of the population ▪ *Calidris alpina* alpina 3.2% of the population

Site Name: Chichester & Langstone Harbours **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 48 23 N** **00 55 12 W** **Size: 5810.03ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SPA**
	▪ *Charadrius hiaticula* 3% of the population in Great Britain ▪ *Mergus serrator* 3% of the population in Great Britain ▪ *Numenius arquata* 1.6% of the population in Great Britain ▪ *Pluvialis squatarola* 2.3% of the population ▪ *Tadorna tadorna* 3.3% of the population in Great Britain ▪ *Tringa tetanus* 1% of the population Article 4.2 Qualification: Internationally Important Assemblage of Birds ▪ 93,230 Waterfowl
Conservation Objectives	1. The conservation objective for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring Annex 1 species Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring Annex 1 species, in particular: ▪ Sand and shingle ▪ Shallow coastal waters 2. The conservation objective for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species, in particular: ▪ Reedbeds

Site Name: Chichester & Langstone Harbours Location (Lat & Long): 50 48 23 N 00 55 12 W Size: 5810.03ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**SPA**
	▪ Standing water ▪ Coastal and inundation grassland ▪ Sand and shingle ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats ▪ Mixed sediment shores ▪ Shallow coastal waters 3. The conservation objective for the internationally important assemblage of waterfowl Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important assemblage of waterfowl, in particular: ▪ Reedbeds ▪ Standing water ▪ Coastal and inundation grassland ▪ Sand and shingle ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats ▪ Mixed sediment shores ▪ Shallow coastal waters *maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

<table>
<tr><td>Site Name: Chichester & Langstone Harbours
Location (Lat & Long):
50 48 23 N
00 55 12 W
Size: 5810.03ha</td><td colspan="6">HRA Data Proforma</td></tr>
<tr><td>Designation</td><td colspan="6">SPA</td></tr>
<tr><td>Component SSSIs</td><td colspan="6">▪ Chichester Harbour
▪ Langstone Harbour</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">SSSI Condition Status</td><td>% Area meeting PSA[14] target</td><td>% Area favourable</td><td>% Area unfavourable recovering</td><td>% Area unfavourable no change</td><td>% Area unfavourable declining</td><td>% Area destroyed / part destroyed</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Chichester Harbour</td></tr>
<tr><td>58.00%</td><td>57.77%</td><td>0.23%</td><td>40.23%</td><td>1.76%</td><td>0.00%</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Langstone Harbour</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>9.41%</td><td>8.96%</td><td>0.45%</td><td>0.00%</td><td>90.60%</td><td>0.00%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity</td><td colspan="6">▪ Maintain water quality.
▪ Maintain hydrological regime, e.g. freshwater flows at heads of channels for birds.
▪ Maintain suitable distance between SPA and development to allow for managed retreat of intertidal habitats and avoid coastal squeeze.
▪ Maintain short grasslands surrounding SPA as it is a key foraging resource for Brent Goose[15].
▪ Avoid introduction of non-native species, e.g. from shipping activity[16].</td></tr>
<tr><td>Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)</td><td colspan="6">▪ Significant recreational pressure during summer months.
▪ Effluent discharges and agricultural run-off can lead to localised eutrophication. This more likely to occur at Chichester Harbour as it surrounded mainly by high grade farmland.
▪ Sea-level rise and 'coastal squeeze' are significant threats to the long-term maintenance of habitat diversity</td></tr>
</table>

[14] PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.
[15] Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Hampshire Minerals Plan Final Report, October 2007.
[16] Opcite.

Site Name: Chichester & Langstone Harbours Location (Lat & Long): 50 48 23 N 00 55 12 W Size: 5810.03ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**SPA**
	and structural integrity. ▪ Incremental loss of fringing habitats and transitional communities is a threat as hard coastal defences are maintained by riparian land-owners. ▪ SPA lies close to the A259 so there is potential for atmospheric pollution, especially in the case of Langstone Harbour, which is fringed by urban and industrial development.

Site Name: New Forest **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 49 32 N** **01 39 22 W** **Size: 28002.81**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SPA**
Qualifying Features	Article 4.1 Qualification During the breeding season the area regularly supports: ▪ *Caprimulgus europaeus* 8.8% of the GB breeding population ▪ *Lullula arborea* 29.5% of the GB breeding population ▪ *Pernis apivorus* 12.5% of the GB breeding population ▪ *Sylvia undata* 33.6% of the GB breeding population Over winter the area regularly supports: ▪ *Circus cyaneus 2% of the GB population]* Article 4.2 Qualification During the breeding season the area regularly supports: ▪ *Falco subbuteo 5%* of the GB population ▪ *Phylloscopus sibilatrix 2%* of the GB population
Conservation Objectives	The conservation objectives for the European interest on the SSSI are To maintain*, in favourable condition, the: ▪ Alkaline fens ▪ Alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior* (*Alno-Padion, Alnion incanaem Salicion albae*) ▪ *Asperulo-Fagetum* beech forests

Site Name: New Forest **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 49 32 N** **01 39 22 W** **Size: 28002.81**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SPA**
	▪ Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with Ilex and sometimes also Taxus in the shrublayer (*Quercion robori-petraeae or Ilici-Fagenion*) ▪ Bog woodland ▪ Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhyncosporion ▪ European dry heath ▪ Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (*Molinion caeruleae*) ▪ North Atlantic wet heaths with Erica tetralix ▪ Old acidophilous oak woods with *Quercus robur* on sandy plains ▪ Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the *Littorelletea uniflorae* and or of the *Isoeto-Naonjuncetea* ▪ Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains: *Littorelletalia uniflora* ▪ Transition mires and quaking bogs To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of Annex 1 bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to: ▪ dry heathland ▪ dry grassland ▪ inclosure and pasture woodlands + Honey Buzzard, Nightjar, Woodlark, Dartford Warbler, Hen Harrier * maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition

<table>
<tr><td>Site Name: New Forest
Location (Lat & Long):
50 49 32 N
01 39 22 W
Size: 28002.81</td><td colspan="6">HRA Data Proforma</td></tr>
<tr><td>Designation</td><td colspan="6">SPA</td></tr>
<tr><td>Component SSSIs</td><td colspan="6">▪ The New Forest</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">SSSI Condition Status</td><td>% Area meeting PSA[17] target</td><td>% Area favourable</td><td>% Area unfavourable recovering</td><td>% Area unfavourable no change</td><td>% Area unfavourable declining</td><td>% Area destroyed / part destroyed</td></tr>
<tr><td>97.14%</td><td>32.15%</td><td>64.99%</td><td>0.97%</td><td>1.88%</td><td>0.01%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity</td><td colspan="6">▪ Manage/maintain habitats (see Key Environmental Conditions for The New Forest SAC)
▪ Reduce disturbance.
○ Manage recreational activities.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)</td><td colspan="6">▪ Recreational pressure.
○ Walkers.
○ Predation by dogs.
▪ Low water levels.
▪ Many mires have been damaged in the past by drainage to improve grazing and forestry, which in turns dries out the peat layers.
▪ Afforestation of heathland habitats, with conifers and other non-native species, modifying the original biodiversity of the area.
▪ Grazing trends.</td></tr>
</table>

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

Site Name: Portsmouth Harbour **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 49 41 N** **01 07 32 W** **Size: 1248.77ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SPA**
Qualifying Features	Article 4.2 Qualification Over winter the area regularly supports: ▪ *Branta bernicla bernicla* 0.9% of the population ▪ *Calidris alpina alpine* 1% of the population in Great Britain ▪ *Limosa limosa islandica* 0.4% of the population in Great Britain ▪ *Mergus serrator* 0.9% of the population in Great Britain
Conservation Objectives	The conservation objective for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species, in particular: ▪ Coastal and inundation grassland ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats ▪ Shallow coastal waters *maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.
Component SSSIs	▪ Portsmouth Harbor

Site Name: Portsmouth Harbour **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 49 41 N** **01 07 32 W** **Size: 1248.77ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**					
Designation	**SPA**					
SSSI Condition Status	**% Area meeting PSA[18] target**	**% Area favourable**	**% Area unfavourable recovering**	**% Area unfavourable no change**	**% Area unfavourable declining**	**% Area destroyed / part destroyed**
	30.16%	29.36%	0.80%	21.41%	48.08%	0.35%
Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity	▪ Maintain water quality. ▪ Maintenance of freshwater inputs for certain bird species. ▪ Restriction of dredging or land-claim of coastal habitats. ▪ Maintain suitable distance between SPA and development to allow for managed retreat of intertidal habitats and avoid coastal squeeze. ▪ Restrict public access over-wintering periods. ▪ Avoid introduction of non-native species, e.g. from shipping activity[19].					
Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)	▪ Modification of physical processes through large-scale land-claim, capital and maintenance dredging, sea defences and the knock on effects on the extent and distribution of intertidal habitats. ▪ Sea Level Rise and issues related to Coastal Squeeze. ▪ Maintenance and development of both commercial and military ports. ▪ Accidental pollution from shipping and heavy industrial activities, former military and waste disposal sites, re-distribution of contaminated sediments. ▪ High levels of recreational pressure both on shore and offshore which can have disturbance effects during sensitive (over-wintering) periods.					

[18] PSA target - The Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010.
[19] Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Hampshire Minerals Plan Final Report, October 2007.

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 44 25 N** **01 31 33 W** **Size: 5505.86**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SPA**
Qualifying Features	Article 4.1 Qualification During the breeding season the area regularly supports: ▪ *Larus melancephalus* 15.4% of the GB breeding population ▪ *Sterna albifrons* 2% of the GB breeding population ▪ *Sterna dougallii* 3.1% of the GB breeding population ▪ *Sterna hirundo* 2.2% of the GB breeding population ▪ *Sterna sandvicensis* 1.7% of the GB breeding population Article 4.2 Qualification Over winter the area regularly supports: ▪ *Ana crecca* 1.1% of the population ▪ *Branta bernicula* 2.5% of the population ▪ *Charadrius hiaticula* 1.2% of the population ▪ *Limosa islandica* 1.7% of the population Article 4.2 Qualification: Internationally Important Assemblage of Birds ▪ 51,361 Waterfowl
Conservation Objectives	1. The conservation objective for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring Annex 1 species

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 44 25 N** **01 31 33 W** **Size: 5505.86**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SPA**
	Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring Annex 1 species, in particular: ▪ Standing water ▪ Sand and shingle ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats ▪ Shallow coastal waters ▪ Lagoons 2. The conservation objective for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species, in particular: ▪ Grazing marsh ▪ Reedbeds ▪ Standing water ▪ Coastal and inundation grassland ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats ▪ Boulder and cobble shores

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 44 25 N** **01 31 33 W** **Size: 5505.86**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**SPA**
	▪ Mixed sediment shores ▪ Lagoons 3. The conservation objective for the internationally important assemblage of waterfowl Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important assemblage of waterfowl, in particular: ▪ Grazing marsh ▪ Reedbeds ▪ Standing water ▪ Coastal and inundation grassland ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats ▪ Boulder and cobble shores ▪ Mixed sediment shores ▪ Lagoons *maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.
Component SSSIs	▪ Thorness Bay ▪ Sowley Pond ▪ Medina Estuary ▪ Hurst Castle and Lymington River Estuary

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water Location (Lat & Long): 50 44 25 N 01 31 33 W Size: 5505.86	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**SPA**
	▪ Brading Marshes to St. Helen's Ledges ▪ Lymington River Reedbeds ▪ Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes ▪ Lower Test Valley ▪ Ryde Sands and Wootton Creek ▪ Lee-on-The-Solent to Itchen Estuary ▪ Titchfield Haven ▪ Newtown Harbour ▪ Yar Estuary ▪ King's Quay Shore ▪ Eling and Bury Marshes ▪ Upper Hamble Estuary and Woods ▪ Hythe to Calshot Marshes ▪ Whitecliff Bay and Bembridge Ledges ▪ North Solent

SSSI Condition Status	% Area meeting PSA[20] target	% Area favourable	% Area unfavourable recovering	% Area unfavourable no change	% Area unfavourable declining	% Area destroyed / part destroyed
	Thorness Bay					
	96.21%	96.21%	0.00%	0.00%	3.79%	0.00%

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

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water Location (Lat & Long): 50 44 25 N 01 31 33 W Size: 5505.86	HRA Data Proforma					
Designation	**SPA**					
	Sowley Pond					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Medina Estuary					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Hurst Castle and Lymington River Estuary					
	35.98%	31.11%	4.87%	0.37%	63.65%	0.00%
	Brading Marshes to St. Helen's Ledges					
	90.58%	38.06%	52.52%	0.00%	9.42%	0.00%
	Lymington River Reedbeds					
	49.61%	35.50%	14.11%	50.40%	0.00%	0.00%
	Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes					
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Lower Test Valley					
	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Ryde Sands and Wootton Creek					
	91.22%	71.92%	19.30%	2.21%	5.84%	0.74%
	Lee-on-The-Solent to Itchen Estuary					
	82.49%	82.49%	0.00%	17.51%	0.00%	0.00%
	Titchfield Haven					
	96.48%	96.48%	0.00%	0.00%	3.52%	0.00%
	Newtown Harbour					
	98.86%	79.43%	19.43%	1.14%	0.00%	0.00%
	Yar Estuary					
	90.61%	56.67%	33.94%	0.00%	9.38%	0.00%
	King's Quay Shore					

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water Location (Lat & Long): 50 44 25 N 01 31 33 W Size: 5505.86	HRA Data Proforma					
Designation	**SPA**					
	98.10%	76.62%	21.48%	0.00%	1.90%	0.00%
	Eling and Bury Marshes					
	11.46%	11.46%	0.00%	88.54%	0.00%	0.00%
	Upper Hamble Estuary and Woods					
	85.94%	85.94%	0.00%	11.31%	2.75%	0.00%
	Hythe to Calshot Marshes					
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
	Whitecliff Bay and Bembridge Ledges					
	99.07%	99.07%	0.00%	0.93%	0.00%	0.00%
	North Solent					
	81.98%	67.14%	14.84%	1.59%	16.44%	0.00%
Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity	▪ Retain the current extent and condition of the habitat whilst allowing natural coastal processes to operate along the length of the rocky coast. ▪ Maintenance of a broad and integrated approach to coastal management as inappropriate coastal defences or development which may alter erosion/deposition rates may have indirect, off-site impacts on an interconnected part of the coast ▪ Maintenance of the natural processes and dynamics of dune development and succession in order to maintain the range of habitats and associated species reflecting the different stages of succession. Mobility of the substrate is essential to maintain vegetation diversity. ▪ Management of access to minimise trampling and disturbance. ▪ Maintenance of good water quality and sediment quality is vital, and maintenance of the sediment budget within the estuarine or coastal system to ensure it is not restricted by anthropogenic influences. ▪ Create space to enable landward roll-back to take place in response to sea-level rise and allow the system to be dynamic and retain the flexibility to respond to associated changes such as migrating subtidal sandbanks.					

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water Location (Lat & Long): 50 44 25 N 01 31 33 W Size: 5505.86	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**SPA**
	▪ Where saltmarshes have a history of management through grazing, continue this to provide habitat variety, particularly for wintering birds, and maintain botanical diversity - avoid overgrazing as this may reduce species diversity and impact the sediments supporting the saltmarsh. ▪ Where there is no history of grazing, the saltmarsh will be able to maintain itself and grazing-sensitive species are likely to be present so grazing should not be introduced. ▪ Maintain grazing. ▪ Agricultural operations should be avoided before mid-June to minimise disturbance to breeding birds or the destruction of nests. ▪ An element of managed scrub, both within and fringing a field can be of importance to birds and invertebrates, as can a surrounding hedge. ▪ A mosaic of flooded grassland and permanently un-flooded grassland is desirable, with both temporary and permanent pools present to provide roosting and feeding habitat for birds – area of flooding should be adjusted to meet seasonal bird needs. ▪ Minimise any harmful disturbance, especially at times when bird populations are under stress, such as severely cold conditions. ▪ Predators, especially crows and related species, should be controlled and this may be best achieved by limiting their nesting sites. ▪ Careful maintenance of existing ditches and drains is usually acceptable practice, but abandonment or deepening of ditches can be harmful. ▪ Maintaining salinity and water depths.
Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)	▪ Sea level rise and coastal squeeze ▪ Due to the scale of Southampton port and increasing concentration of shipping transportation the potential for accidental pollution from shipping, heavy industrial activities and former waste disposal sites is a serious

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water Location (Lat & Long): 50 44 25 N 01 31 33 W Size: 5505.86	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**SPA**
	threat to the environment. ▪ The area is also vulnerable to ongoing impacts from waste water discharge. ▪ The area is highly developed with ongoing pressures both on shore and at sea from recreational and commercial interests. ▪ Modified physical processes and sediment transfer patterns caused by previous flood and coastal defence works, which may have a knock on effect on the extent and distribution of intertidal habitats. ▪ Flood and coastal defence works - sedimentation, see level rise. Physical damage from dredging. ▪ Accidental pollution from former waste disposal sites, toxic contamination.

Ramsar

Site Name: Chichester & Langstone Harbour Location (Lat & Long): 50 48 23 N 00 55 12 W Size: 5810.03ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**Ramsar**
Qualifying Features	Ramsar criterion1 ▪ Two large estuarine basins linked by the channel which divides Hayling Island from the main Hampshire coastline. The site includes intertidal mudflats, saltmarsh, sand and shingle spits and sand dunes. Ramsar criterion 5 ▪ Species with peak counts in winter (76480 waterfowl) Ramsar criterion 6 Species with peak counts in spring/autumn: ▪ Ringed plover, *Charadrius hiaticula* ▪ Black-tailed godwit, *Limosa limosa islandica* ▪ Common redshank, *Tringa totanus tetanus* ▪ Species with peak counts in winter: ▪ Dark-bellied brent goose, *Branta bernicla bernicla* ▪ Common shelduck, *Tadorna tadorna* ▪ Grey plover, *Pluvialis squatarola* ▪ Dunlin, *Calidris alpina alpina*
Conservation Objectives	1. The conservation objective for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring Annex 1 species

Site Name: Chichester & Langstone Harbour Location (Lat & Long): 50 48 23 N 00 55 12 W Size: 5810.03ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**Ramsar**
	Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring Annex 1 species, in particular: ▪ Sand and shingle ▪ Shallow coastal waters 2. The conservation objective for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species, in particular: ▪ Reedbeds ▪ Standing water ▪ Coastal and inundation grassland ▪ Sand and shingle ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats ▪ Mixed sediment shores ▪ Shallow coastal waters 3. The conservation objective for the internationally important assemblage of waterfowl

Site Name: Chichester & Langstone Harbour **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 48 23 N** **00 55 12 W** **Size: 5810.03ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**Ramsar**
	Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important assemblage of waterfowl, in particular: ▪ Reedbeds ▪ Standing water ▪ Coastal and inundation grassland ▪ Sand and shingle ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats ▪ Mixed sediment shores ▪ Shallow coastal waters *maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.
Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity	▪ Maintain water quality. ▪ Maintain hydrological regime, e.g. freshwater flows at heads of channels for birds. ▪ Maintain suitable distance between SPA and development to allow for managed retreat of intertidal habitats and avoid coastal squeeze. ▪ Maintain short grasslands surrounding SPA as it is a key foraging resource for Brent Goose[21]. ▪ Avoid introduction of non-native species, e.g. from shipping activity[22].

[21] Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Hampshire Minerals Plan Final Report, October 2007.
[22] Opcite.

Site Name: Chichester & Langstone Harbour Location (Lat & Long): 50 48 23 N 00 55 12 W Size: 5810.03ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**Ramsar**
Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)	▪ Significant recreational pressure during summer months. ▪ Effluent discharges and agricultural run-off can lead to localised eutrophication. This more likely to occur at Chichester Harbour as it surrounded mainly by high grade farmland. ▪ Sea-level rise and 'coastal squeeze' are significant threats to the long-term maintenance of habitat diversity and structural integrity. ▪ Incremental loss of fringing habitats and transitional communities is a threat as hard coastal defences are maintained by riparian land-owners. ▪ SPA lies close to the A259 so there is potential for atmospheric pollution, especially in the case of Langstone Harbour, which is fringed by urban and industrial development.

Site Name: New Forest **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 49 32 N** **01 39 22 W** **Size: 28002.81ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**Ramsar**
Qualifying Features	Ramsar criterion: ▪ Valley mires and wet heaths found throughout the site – largest concentration of intact valley mires of their type in Britain. ▪ Diverse assemblage of wetland plants and animals including several nationally rare species. ▪ Mire habitats are of high ecological quality and diversity – concentration of rare and scarce wetland species.
Conservation Objectives	The conservation objectives for the European interest on the SSSI are To maintain*, in favourable condition, the: ▪ Alkaline fens ▪ Alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior* (*Alno-Padion, Alnion incanaem Salicion albae)* ▪ *Asperulo-Fagetum* beech forests ▪ Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with Ilex and sometimes also Taxus in the shrublayer (*Quercion robori-petraeae or Ilici-Fagenion*) ▪ Bog woodland ▪ Depressions on peat substrates of the *Rhyncosporion* ▪ European dry heath ▪ Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (*Molinion caeruleae*) ▪ North Atlantic wet heaths with Erica tetralix ▪ Old acidophilous oak woods with Quercus robur on sandy plains ▪ Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the *Littorelletea uniflorae* and or of

Site Name: New Forest Location (Lat & Long): 50 49 32 N 01 39 22 W Size: 28002.81ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**Ramsar**
	the Isoeto-Naonjuncetea ▪ Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains: *Littorelletalia uniflora* ▪ Transition mires and quaking bogs To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the population of: ▪ Great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*) ▪ Southern damselfly (*Coenagrion mercuriale)* ▪ Stag beetle *(Lucanus cervus)* To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of Annex 1 bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to: ▪ dry heathland ▪ dry grassland ▪ inclosure and pasture woodlands + Honey Buzzard, Nightjar, Woodlark, Dartford Warbler, Hen Harrier * maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition
Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity	▪ Maintain natural hydrological regime. ○ Water levels. ○ Flushing rates of the system. ▪ Maintain water quality.

Site Name: New Forest Location (Lat & Long): 50 49 32 N 01 39 22 W Size: 28002.81ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**Ramsar**
	▪ Management of vegetation structure. ▪ Management of surrounding tress and scrubs.
Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)	▪ The New Forest is a popular tourist destination and is subject to recreational pressures potentially affecting habitats. ▪ Drainage of wetland habitats for improved grazing and farming has affected the condition of habitats. ▪ Areas of the New Forest have undergone afforestation of heathland habitats, with conifers and other non-native species, modifying the original biodiversity of the area. ▪ Risks also exist due to fluctuating farming trends (relating to the level of livestock) and the extent of grazing.

Site Name: Portsmouth Harbour **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 49 41 N** **01 07 32 W** **Size: 1248.77ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**Ramsar**
Qualifying Features	Ramsar criterion 3 ▪ The intertidal mudflat areas possess extensive beds of eelgrass *Zostera angustifolia* and *Zostera noltei* which support the grazing dark-bellied brent geese populations. ▪ The mud-snail *Hydrobia ulvae* is found at extremely high densities, which helps to support the wading bird interest of the site. ▪ Common cord-grass *Spartina anglica* dominates large areas of the saltmarsh and there are also extensive areas of green algae *Enteromorpha spp*. and sea lettuce *Ulva lactuca*. ▪ More locally the saltmarsh is dominated by sea purslane *Halimione portulacoides* which gradates to more varied communities at the higher shore levels. ▪ The site also includes a number of saline lagoons hosting nationally important species. Ramsar criterion 6 Species with peak counts in winter: ▪ Dark-bellied brent goose, *Branta bernicla bernicla* - 2105 individuals, representing an average of 2.1% of the GB population
Conservation Objectives	The conservation objective for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species, in particular: ▪ Coastal and inundation grassland ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats

Site Name: Portsmouth Harbour **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 49 41 N** **01 07 32 W** **Size: 1248.77ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**Ramsar**
	▪ Shallow coastal waters *maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.
Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity	▪ Maintain water quality. ▪ Maintenance of freshwater inputs for certain bird species. ▪ Restriction of dredging or land-claim of coastal habitats. ▪ Maintain suitable distance between SPA and development to allow for managed retreat of intertidal habitats and avoid coastal squeeze. ▪ Restrict public access over-wintering periods. ▪ Avoid introduction of non-native species, e.g. from shipping activity[23].
Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)	▪ Modification of physical processes through large-scale land-claim, capital and maintenance dredging, sea defences and the knock on effects on the extent and distribution of intertidal habitats. ▪ Sea Level Rise and issues related to Coastal Squeeze. ▪ Maintenance and development of both commercial and military ports. ▪ Accidental pollution from shipping and heavy industrial activities, former military and waste disposal sites, re-distribution of contaminated sediments. ▪ High levels of recreational pressure both on shore and offshore which can have disturbance effects during sensitive (over-wintering) periods.

[23] Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Hampshire Minerals Plan Final Report, October 2007.

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 44 25 N** **01 31 32 W** **Size: 5346.44ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**Ramsar**
Qualifying Features	Ramsar criterion 1 ▪ The site is one of the few major sheltered channels between a substantial island and mainland in European waters, exhibiting an unusual strong double tidal flow and has long periods of slack water at high and low tide. It includes many wetland habitats characteristic of the biogeographic region: saline lagoons, saltmarshes, estuaries, intertidal flats, shallow coastal waters, grazing marshes, reedbeds, coastal woodland and rocky boulder reefs. Ramsar criterion 2 ▪ The site supports an important assemblage of rare plants and invertebrates. At least 33 British Red Data Book invertebrates and at least eight British Red Data Book plants are represented on site. Ramsar criterion 5 Assemblages of international importance: Species with peak counts in winter: ▪ 51343 waterfowl Ramsar criterion 6 Species/populations occurring at levels of international importance. Qualifying Species/populations (as identified at designation): Species with peak counts in spring/autumn: ▪ Ringed plover, *Charadrius hiaticula*, 397 individuals, representing an average of 1.2% of the GB population Species with peak counts in winter:

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 44 25 N** **01 31 32 W** **Size: 5346.44ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**Ramsar**
	▪ Dark-bellied brent goose, *Branta bernicla bernicla*, 6456 individuals, representing an average of 3% of the population ▪ Eurasian teal, *Anas crecca*, 5514 individuals, representing an average of 1.3% of the population ▪ Black-tailed godwit, *Limosa limosa islandica*, 1240 individuals, representing an average of 3.5% of the population
Conservation Objectives	1. The conservation objective for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring Annex 1 species Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring Annex 1 species, in particular: ▪ Standing water ▪ Sand and shingle ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats ▪ Shallow coastal waters ▪ Lagoons 2. The conservation objective for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species, in particular:

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water Location (Lat & Long): 50 44 25 N 01 31 32 W Size: 5346.44ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**Ramsar**
	▪ Grazing marsh ▪ Reedbeds ▪ Standing water ▪ Coastal and inundation grassland ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats ▪ Boulder and cobble shores ▪ Mixed sediment shores ▪ Lagoons 3. The conservation objective for the internationally important assemblage of waterfowl Subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important assemblage of waterfowl, in particular: ▪ Grazing marsh ▪ Reedbeds ▪ Standing water ▪ Coastal and inundation grassland ▪ Saltmarsh ▪ Intertidal mudflats and sandflats ▪ Boulder and cobble shores

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 44 25 N** **01 31 32 W** **Size: 5346.44ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**Ramsar**
	▪ Mixed sediment shores ▪ Lagoons *maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.
Key Environmental Conditions (factors that maintain site integrity	▪ Retain the current extent and condition of the habitat whilst allowing natural coastal processes to operate along the length of the rocky coast. ▪ Maintenance of a broad and integrated approach to coastal management as inappropriate coastal defences or development which may alter erosion/deposition rates may have indirect, off-site impacts on an interconnected part of the coast ▪ Maintenance of the natural processes and dynamics of dune development and succession in order to maintain the range of habitats and associated species reflecting the different stages of succession. Mobility of the substrate is essential to maintain vegetation diversity. ▪ Management of access to minimise trampling and disturbance. ▪ Maintenance of good water quality and sediment quality is vital, and maintenance of the sediment budget within the estuarine or coastal system to ensure it is not restricted by anthropogenic influences. ▪ Create space to enable landward roll-back to take place in response to sea-level rise and allow the system to be dynamic and retain the flexibility to respond to associated changes such as migrating subtidal sandbanks. ▪ Where saltmarshes have a history of management through grazing, continue this to provide habitat variety, particularly for wintering birds, and maintain botanical diversity - avoid overgrazing as this may reduce species diversity and impact the sediments supporting the saltmarsh. ▪ Where there is no history of grazing, the saltmarsh will be able to maintain itself and grazing-sensitive species are likely to be present so grazing should not be introduced.

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water **Location (Lat & Long):** **50 44 25 N** **01 31 32 W** **Size: 5346.44ha**	**HRA Data Proforma**
Designation	**Ramsar**
	▪ Maintain grazing. ▪ Agricultural operations should be avoided before mid-June to minimise disturbance to breeding birds or the destruction of nests. ▪ An element of managed scrub, both within and fringing a field can be of importance to birds and invertebrates, as can a surrounding hedge. ▪ A mosaic of flooded grassland and permanently un-flooded grassland is desirable, with both temporary and permanent pools present to provide roosting and feeding habitat for birds – area of flooding should be adjusted to meet seasonal bird needs. ▪ Minimise any harmful disturbance, especially at times when bird populations are under stress, such as severely cold conditions. ▪ Predators, especially crows and related species, should be controlled and this may be best achieved by limiting their nesting sites. ▪ Careful maintenance of existing ditches and drains is usually acceptable practice, but abandonment or deepening of ditches can be harmful. ▪ Maintaining salinity and water depths.
Vulnerabilities (includes existing pressures and trends)	▪ Sea level rise and coastal squeeze ▪ Due to the scale of Southampton port and increasing concentration of shipping transportation the potential for accidental pollution from shipping, heavy industrial activities and former waste disposal sites is a serious threat to the environment. ▪ The area is also vulnerable to ongoing impacts from waste water discharge. ▪ The area is highly developed with ongoing pressures both on shore and at sea from recreational and commercial interests. ▪ Modified physical processes and sediment transfer patterns caused by previous flood and coastal defence

Site Name: Solent & Southampton Water Location (Lat & Long): 50 44 25 N 01 31 32 W Size: 5346.44ha	HRA Data Proforma
Designation	**Ramsar**
	works, which may have a knock on effect on the extent and distribution of intertidal habitats. ▪ Flood and coastal defence works – sedimentation, see level rise. Physical damage from dredging. ▪ Accidental pollution from former waste disposal sites, toxic contamination

Appendix 2: Plans & Programmes Review

Regional

Regional	
Draft South East Plan: A Clear Vision for the South East 2006	
Plan Type	**Regional Spatial Strategy**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**South East England Regional Assembly**
Currency	**2006 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**South East England**
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**Appropriate Assessment of the Draft South East Plan Final Report, October 2006**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The plan outlines how the region will go about responding to challenges facing the area including housing, economy, transport and the conservation of the environment. The aim to sustain the quality of life whilst remaining economically successful and promoting the area as an attractive place to live corresponds to the sustainable approach the region will take in implementing the plan. **Housing** ▪ Providing at least 60% of new housing on brownfield sites. ▪ Increase housing density to an average 40 dwellings per hectare. ▪ 12,740 (as per proposed changes) new dwellings in Winchester from 2006 to 2026. **Transport and Communications**	▪ Direct loss of habitat through development - South Hampshire is identified as a Sub-regional Strategy Area. ▪ Housing and employment growth may lead to increased transport movements - the potential for in-combination effect is greater where housing sites are in close proximity to European sites. ▪ New communities require increased infrastructure - potential for land take, pollution increase, disturbance/ severance of habitats and species. ▪ Growth in the requirement for waste management/ transport disposal from new communities and businesses has the potential to increase pollution, and introduce land take issues. ▪ Increased levels of water abstraction could result in reduced water levels. ▪ Recreation pressures may result from housing developments near/

Regional	
Draft South East Plan: A Clear Vision for the South East 2006	
▪ Managing transport systems to exploit existing capacity combined with an increased investment in public transport, cycling and pedestrian areas. ▪ Improving access to international and regional gateways. ▪ Accept major future role for road freight but encourage railways to increase share. **Natural Resource Management** ▪ Improve management of water resources and quality including greater water efficiency and development of new reservoirs. ▪ Decrease the risk of flooding including the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems. ▪ Protect ancient woodlands and ensure better management and expansion of key wildlife habitats. **Improve air quality and noise reduction.** ▪ Expand the use of renewable energy – setting a target for developers that at least 10% of new developments energy needs are met by renewables. ▪ Promote higher energy efficiency. **Waste and Minerals** ▪ Minimise reliance on landfill through recycling and composting. ▪ Provide increased facilities for recycling and recovery. ▪ Promote use of sustainable construction techniques and recycled aggregates.	adjacent to Natura 2000 sites. ▪ Atmospheric pollution generated as a result of housing, employment and transport growth.

Regional	
South East River Basin Management Plan, Consultation Draft, December 2008.	
Plan Type	**River Basin Management Plan**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Environment Agency**
Currency	**6 years**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**South East River Basin District**
Sector	**Water**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**SEA of the Draft River Basin Management Plan for the South East river basin district, December 2008**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The draft River Basin Management Plan describes the main issues for the South East river basin district and highlights some key actions proposed for dealing with them set out in brief the actions the EA propose should be taken. The document sets out detailed proposals for the next six years and beyond. Across the river basin district, the proposed actions will: ▪ Improve rivers to 23 percent at good status or good potential by 2015, from 14 per cent now. This means more than doubling the length of river in good status or potential: from 182 km or eight per cent now, to 394 km or 18 per cent in 2015. Within this, there will be improvements to water quality and ecology across the river basin district. ▪ Ensure the long term improvement of lakes to good ecological status or potential by 2027. We will develop our knowledge and understanding of the status of lakes during the first planning cycle. ▪ Improve all coastal waters to ensure they reach good ecological status or good potential by 2027, from one (six	River Basin Management Plans fall within the scope of the Habitats Directive, this means that each one will require an assessment of its likely effects on any Natura 2000 sites within, or hydrologically linked to, the river basin district. According to the EA it is unlikely that any parts of the plan will have a significant effect on European sites. An initial assessment by the EA will determine if the objectives and actions contained within the River Basin Management Plans pass a number of tests. These tests will look at whether the SE River Basin Management Plan contains actions to support the achievement of objectives for Natura 2000 sites in the time required; that the objectives within the River Basin Management Plan are not less stringent than those already used to determine consents and licences as part of previous Habitats Directive assessments; and that the plans contain no exemptions, derogations or less stringent objectives for Natura 2000 sites other than those that are compatible with the Habitats and Birds Directives. If the River Basin Management Plan does not pass these tests and does not appear to be meeting its obligation for Natura 2000 sites, then a fuller assessment may be required.

Regional	
South East River Basin Management Plan, Consultation Draft, December 2008.	
per cent) now. 59 per cent of coastal waters will be at good chemical status by 2015. ▪ Ensure the long term improvement of our estuaries to good ecological status or potential by 2027, with seven (35 per cent) at good chemical status by 2015. ▪ Ensure no deterioration in groundwater, such that 33 per cent is at good overall status in 2015, and prevent or limit pollution. 19 groundwater bodies will be at good chemical status, 11 at good quantitative status. It can take a long time for improvements to be shown in groundwater quality. However, the target is to improve all groundwater to good status by 2027	

Regional	
South Hampshire: Integrated Water Management Strategy October 2008.	
Plan Type	**Integrated Water Management Strategy**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH)**
Currency	**2008**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) boundary**
Sector	**Water**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**N/A**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The aim of the strategy is to reduce the risk of proposed growth by coastal and fluvial processes, water management and the water environment and vice versa. The objectives of the Integrated Water Management Strategy (IWMS) are to:	**Water Supply** The Strategy assess that there is a high degree of confidence that sufficient water can be made available to meet the demands of new housing, this will require the development of a number of major new resources. There is uncertainty of how much new resource will be required, when it will be

Regional	
South Hampshire: Integrated Water Management Strategy October 2008.	
Guide and inform the level and location of development to be accommodated in South Hampshire in accordance with the Draft South East Plan; Identify a preferred high level strategy for water management for the period to 2026, including the general location and timing of infrastructure requirements, the agencies responsible and the means of funding the necessary work; and Identify further work necessary to implement the preferred strategy and to monitor its effectiveness over the plan period.	required and which schemes will be developed by the two water companies to provide it. The IWMS recommendations include: ▪ No additional growth should be planned beyond that already proposed ▪ Continue to drive the Sustainable Housing Agenda **Wastewater Management** The findings suggest that EA concerns are warranted - by 2020, 7 out of 13 (over 50%) of wastewater treatment works in the area are forecast to exceed their flow consents. Despite the above the IWMS study concludes that the situation may not be as problematic as the standard method of wastewater forecasting suggests. The main reason for this is that a combination of environmental impacts, climate change and recent droughts are driving a number of significant changes on the water supply side. The IWMS also suggests that it is very unlikely that major new wastewater treatment infrastructure will be required during the next 20 years other than that already required to achieve consents set by the EA under the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive and those proposed to fulfil the requirements of the Habitats and Birds Directives. The PUSH Authorities and Southern Water do however, need to ensure that where existing works need to be upgraded to fulfil EA's proposed consents, appropriate provision for land allocation and planning requirements have been made. **Planning and Water Management** The IWMS recommendations include:

Regional	
South Hampshire: Integrated Water Management Strategy October 2008.	
	▪ Developing sub-regional policies and guidance ▪ LDF preparation by individual authorities ▪ Determination of planning applications ▪ Funding infrastructure provision ▪ Targeted research

Regional	
The Test and Itchen Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy, March 2006.	
Plan Type	**Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Environment Agency**
Currency	
Region/Geographic Coverage	**The Test and Itchen Catchment**
Sector	**Water**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**HRA of Review of Consents (Completed in 2010)**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
Requested a copy of the document from the EA.	

Regional	
The East Hampshire Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy, May 2003.	
Plan Type	**Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Environment Agency**
Currency	**2003 - 2009**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**The East Hampshire Rivers Catchment**
Sector	**Water**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**HRA of Review of Consents (Completed in 2010)**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The document sets out how the Environment Agency Wales will manage water abstraction from the East Hampshire rivers catchment until 2009. The strategy provides the framework for any decision on an abstraction license application. The three principal rivers within the CAMS area are the River Hamble, River Meon and River Wallington. Groundwater abstraction accounts for 98% of all licensed abstraction by volume. Surface water abstractions are used for fish farming and spray irrigation. There are 10 water company abstractions in the CAMS area accounting for 89% of all licensed abstraction. Most water abstracted for public water supply is consumed within the East Hampshire CAMS area. However, 84% of all discharge consents in the CAMS area discharge out to the Solent and the largest consents are for sewage treatment works along the south coast. The catchment has been split into 7 Water Resource Management Units (WRMU). The CAMS assesses: ▪ WRMU 1 as 'water available' ▪ WRMU 2 as 'over-abstracted' ▪ WRMU 3 as 'no water available' ▪ WRMU 4 as 'over-abstracted'	The rivers within the East Hampshire Catchment ultimately flow into the English Channel. Therefore any impact to the coastal and marine European sites caused by changes to the water resource management of the catchment needs is considered as part of the CAMS process. Under the Habitats Regulations the Environment Agency has a duty to assess the effects of existing abstraction licences and any new applications to make sure they are not impacting on internationally important nature conservation sites. Water efficiency is also tested by the EA before a new license is granted. If the assessment of a new application shows that it could have an impact on a SAC/SPA the EA will have to follow strict rules in setting a time limit for that license.

Regional	
The East Hampshire Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy, May 2003.	
▪ WRMU 5 as 'over-abstracted' ▪ WRMU 6 as 'over-abstracted' ▪ WRMU 7 as 'over-licensed'	

Regional	
The Arun and Western Streams Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy, April 2003.	
Plan Type	**Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Environment Agency**
Currency	**2003 - 2009**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Arun and Western Streams Catchment**
Sector	**Water**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**HRA of Review of Consents (Completed in 2010)**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The document sets out how the Environment Agency Wales will manage water abstraction from the Arun and Western Streams catchment until 2009. The strategy provides the framework for any decision on an abstraction license application. The CAMS area incorporates the catchments of the River Arun, including its main tributary the River Rother, and the West Sussex coastal streams including the rivers Ems and Lavant. There are two major aquifers within the catchment, which represent the area's most important water resource and provide the numerous springs and streams which support surface water flows. The catchment has been split into 7 Water Resource	The aquifers within the catchment support freshwater inputs to Chichester and Langstone Harbour SPA and Ramsar site and Solent Maritime SAC. Under the Habitats Regulations the Environment Agency has a duty to assess the effects of existing abstraction licences and any new applications to make sure they are not impacting on internationally important nature conservation sites. Water efficiency is also tested by the EA before a new license is granted. If the assessment of a new application shows that it could have an impact on a SAC/SPA the EA will have to follow strict rules in setting a time limit for that license.

Regional	
The Arun and Western Streams Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy, April 2003.	
Management Units (WRMU). The CAMS assesses: ▪ WRMU 1 as 'water available' ▪ WRMU 2 as 'over-abstracted' ▪ WRMU 3 as 'over-licensed' ▪ WRMU 4 as 'over-abstracted' ▪ WRMU 5 as 'no water available' ▪ WRMU 6 as 'no water available' ▪ WRMU 7 as 'over-licensed'	

Regional	
Portsmouth Water - Water Resource Management Plan, Draft for Consultation, April 2008.	
Plan Type	**Southern Water**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Environment Agency**
Currency	**2010 - 2035**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Southern Water supply area**
Sector	**Water**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**SEA of the Water Resource Management Plan, January 2009.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Water Resources Management Plan sets out how Portsmouth Water proposes to ensure that there is sufficient security of water supplies to meet the anticipated demands of its customers over the 25-year planning period from 2010 to 2035. To ensure that Portsmouth Water continues to maintain the availability of adequate and sufficient supplies to its customers,	The EA produced separate Site Action Plans for each of the following European sites as a result of the Habitats Directive Stage 4 Review of Consents: ▪ Chichester Harbour SPA ▪ Langstone Harbour SPA ▪ Portsmouth Harbour SPA ▪ Solent Maritime SAC

Regional	
Portsmouth Water - Water Resource Management Plan, Draft for Consultation, April 2008.	
it proposes the following: ▪ The development of a Farlington Washwater Recovery Plant in the AMP5 period by 2011/12. ▪ Initiating a Leakage Savings Programme which will reduce leakage levels from the current target of 29.7 Ml/d to a new target of 26.7 Ml/d by 2014/15. ▪ Instigating a promotional Water Efficiency Programme which will include sending cistern devices to all customers starting in 2010/11. The programme will be repeated on a five-yearly basis as the devices only have a short life expectancy. ▪ Beginning a 25 year programme of Compulsory Metering for all domestic households, where practicable, beginning in 2010/11. ▪ Developing Additional Boreholes at Lavant and Brickkiln Water Treatment Works within the currently licensed abstraction limits by 2014/15. ▪ Promoting a programme of Retrofit Fitting of Dual Flush Devices in toilets from 2015/16. ▪ Continuing the development of Havant Thicket Winter Storage Reservoir for completion by 2021. Southern Waters area of supply is divided into 3 Water Resource Zones (WRZ), of which WRZ 1 (Gosport and Waterlooville) and 2 (Portsmouth and Havant) are relevant to this assessment.	▪ Solent and Southampton Water SPA ▪ River Itchen SAC The Environment Agency has recently provided indicative conclusions for the Company's sources, the key outcomes being: ▪ a significant reduction in deployable output at the Company's Gaters Mill abstraction on the River Itchen. ▪ a marginal reduction in deployable output for the Havant & Bedhampton Springs licence. ▪ the imposition of time-limited licences for the remaining Hampshire sources which result in uncertainty for the future. ▪ the imposition of a new group licence for the majority of the Sussex sources which will reduce annual licensed capacity but not the deployable output.

Regional	
Southern Water - Water Resource Management Plan, Draft for Consultation, April 2008.	
Plan Type	**Southern Water**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Environment Agency**
Currency	**2010 - 2035**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Southern Water supply area**
Sector	**Water**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**SEA of the Water Resource Management Plan, Draft for Consultation, April 2008.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Water Resources Management Plan sets out how Southern Water proposes to ensure that there is sufficient security of water supplies to meet the anticipated demands of its customers over the 25-year planning period from 2010 to 2035. The Plan proposes 'demand management' measures such as: ▪ Reducing leakage from the supply network by 10% ▪ Implementing a planned programme of compulsory metering to all households by 2035 ▪ Implementing an active Water Efficiency Programme incorporating a number of measures for customers Southern Waters area of supply is divided into 10 Water Resource Zones (WRZ), some of these zones are connected by treated or raw water transfers. For the purposes of this strategic plan some of these WRZ have been grouped together to form sub-regional areas. The sub-regional area of relevance to this assessment if the Western Area WRZ, which covers part of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.	The EA produced separate Site Action Plans for each of the following European sites as a result of the Habitats Directive Stage 4 Review of Consents: ▪ Chichester Harbour SPA ▪ Langstone Harbour SPA ▪ Portsmouth Harbour SPA ▪ Solent Maritime SAC ▪ Solent and Southampton Water SPA ▪ River Itchen SAC There is potentially a fundamental change to abstraction licences in the Lower Itchen as a result of the recommendations of the Habitats Directive Stage 4 Review of Consents. The EA has advised Southern Water that it considers a need for significant changes to the Southern Water Lower Itchen abstraction licences and that these changes are made by 2015. These changes would result in a significant reduction in the abstraction levels at the sources affected. Southern water has stated that they will not make these changes voluntarily and request a local inquiry to be held in order to determine the effects of the proposals on the water supply system.

County

County	
Hampshire County Council Local Transport Plan 2006 - 2011	
Plan Type	**Local Transport Plan**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Hampshire County Council**
Currency	**2006 - 2011**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Hampshire County Council administrative boundary**
Sector	**Transport**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**SEA of the Hampshire County Council Local Transport Plan, March 2006.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The LTP sets out the County Council's transport strategy for the next five years. It explains how the strategy has been designed to achieve wider policy objectives, such as improving quality of life, protecting the environment and securing economic prosperity. The overall vision for this LTP is of a transport strategy that: "Enhances quality of life and economic prosperity by connecting people, communities, employment, goods, services and amenities." The main objectives of this LTP are: 1. To increase accessibility 2. To promote safety 3. To reduce the impact and effect of congestion 4. To widen travel choice 5. To improve air quality 6. To support wider quality of life objectives 7. To encourage value for money and efficient asset management	▪ The LTP does not propose any major developments that are likely to have significant effects on European sites; however it is possible that the plan could lead to an increase in diffuse air pollution. ▪ Measures proposed in the plan to meet the overarching objectives will help to mitigate or offset any increase in diffuse air pollution as a result of this Plan. Objectives include reducing the impact and effect of congestion and improving air quality.

County	
Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton and New Forest National Park Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, September 2008.	
Plan Type	**Minerals and Waste Core Strategy**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Hampshire County Council**
Currency	**2006 - 2011**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Hampshire County Council, Southampton and Portsmouth City Councils and the New Forest National Park Authority administrative boundaries.**
Sector	**Minerals and Waste**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**Integrated SA of the Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton and New Forest National Park Minerals and Waste Minerals and Waste Development Framework, March 206.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Strategy sets out a Spatial Vision for future minerals and waste planning in Hampshire and explains its role within the planning process. It also sets out the various environmental and social and economic objectives relevant to minerals and waste developments in Hampshire and respective general policies. The Strategy also includes a number of 'development control' policies for evaluating planning applications for minerals and waste developments. **S16 - Location of Waste Management** All areas of major new development, including those on greenfield and brownfield land, and especially those containing new or redeveloping employment land, should accommodate an appropriate proportion of the waste management capacity for recycling, composting or recovery	South Hampshire is identified as a potential area of search for locating strategic waste and minerals facilities. Specific potential in-combination impacts cannot be explored in absence of specific waste and mineral locations. **DC2 - Sites with International and National Designations** Minerals and waste development, which is likely to prejudice the purpose of the following designated sites and their settings, will not be permitted unless the reasons for development outweigh the likely adverse impact, taking into account the requirements of relevant legislation and guidance. Internationally Designated Sites: European Sites (Special Protection Areas, proposed Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, proposed Special Areas of Conservation) and Ramsar sites (Wetlands of International Importance);

County	
Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton and New Forest National Park Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, September 2008.	
and treatment set out in Policy S5. Strategic facilities, shall be located within the North East Hampshire or South Hampshire areas shown on the Key Diagram.	Nationally Designated Sites: The New Forest National Park, the proposed South Downs National Park and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; National Nature Reserves, Sites of Special Scientific Interest; Scheduled Ancient Monuments; Listed Buildings, and sites on the National Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest; Registered Battlefields. In all cases, applications will be subject to the most rigorous examination.

Local

Local	
Basingstoke and Dean Borough Council Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation, January 2008.	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Basingstoke and Dean Borough Council**
Currency	**2008 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Basingstoke and Dean Borough Council administrative boundaries**
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**SA of the Core Strategy Issues and Options**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Basingstoke and Dean Core Strategy will be the key Development Plan Document within the Basingstoke and Dean Local Development Framework (LDF). The Core Strategy sets the LDF's long-term spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives for development planning and it considers the options available through the planning system to the Council and communities in the Basingstoke and Dean Borough area. The scale of employment land requirement has not yet been agreed, and will depend on the outcome of further work to forecast future economic growth in the Borough, The Core Strategy proposes 740 new dwellings per annum during the life of the plan. The focus for housing provision in terms of the number of new homes lies within the Western Corridor/ Blackwater Valley sub-regional area, as defined in the South East Plan.	Core Strategy impacts will be dependant on the Preferred Strategy options. Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts ▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading ▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations

Local	
East Hampshire District Council Core Strategy Issues and Options, Spring 2008.	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**East Hampshire District Council**
Currency	**2008 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**East Hampshire District Council administrative boundaries**
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**SA of Broad Development Options, Spring 2008.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Basingstoke and Dean Core Strategy will be the key Development Plan Document within the Basingstoke and Dean Local Development Framework (LDF). The Core Strategy sets the LDF's long-term spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives for development planning and it considers the options available through the planning system to the Council and communities in the Basingstoke and Dean Borough area. The South East Plan proposes 5,200 new dwellings in East Hampshire between 2006 and 2026 (Panel Report recommends an extra 2,500). Of these 4,000 homes are to be provided in the part of the district that lies within Central Hampshire. 1,200 homes are to be provided within the part of the district that lies within South Hampshire.	Core Strategy impacts will be dependant on the Preferred Strategy options. Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts ▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading ▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations

Local	
Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review, Adopted May 2006. LDS submitted to GOSE in January 2009.	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Eastleigh Borough Council**
Currency	**2006 - 2011**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Eastleigh Borough Council administrative boundaries**

Local	
Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review, Adopted May 2006. LDS submitted to GOSE in January 2009.	
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**N/A**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The function of the Local Plan which covers the whole Borough, include the following: 1. to guide development within the Borough up to the year 2011; 2. to reflect government policies on development in ways which suit local circumstances; 3. to put into effect the policies of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and relate them to precise areas of land; 4. to provide detailed planning policies for the purposes of development control; 5. to provide a detailed basis for co-ordinating the development and other use of land in the Borough; and 6. to bring local planning issues before the public. The Local Plan makes the following provisions for new housing in the period September 2001 to March 2011, as follows: Baseline: 5608 dwellings; Reserve: 395 dwellings. Policy 21 NC: Development which is likely to adversely affect the integrity of a European nature conservation site will not be permitted.	Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts ▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading ▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations There is potential for likely significant in-combination effects on coastal and marine European sites - including the River Itchen SAC - through reduced water levels and quality and increased levels of disturbance.

Local

Fareham Borough Council Core Strategy Preferred Options, January 2009.	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Fareham Borough Council**
Currency	**2009 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Fareham Borough Council administrative boundaries**
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**SA Scoping Report March 2008**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Fareham Core Strategy will be the key Development Plan Document within the Fareham Local Development Framework (LDF). The Core Strategy sets the LDF's long-term spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives for development planning and it considers the options available through the planning system to the Council and communities in the Fareham Borough area. The preferred spatial option is to concentrate development on a mixture of previously developed land within the urban areas and previously developed land outside existing urban areas and to include the Coldeast and Daedalus as strategic development sites. Quantity and Type of Development in Fareham: ▪ 1,082 dwellings (2007) ▪ 11,500sqm B1 floorspace ▪ Improvements to M27, junctions to serve the needs of the SDA Quantity and Type of Development in the western ward settlements: ▪ 1,576 dwellings plus 315 dwellings at Whiteley (2007) ▪ 900sqm B1 floorspace plus ▪ 10,000sqm at Whiteley	Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts ▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading ▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations Proposed strategic site and improvements to the M27 could have the potential for likely significant in-combination effects on Portsmouth Harbour SPA & Ramsar site. There is also potential for likely significant in-combination effects on Solent and Southampton SPA/ Ramsar, Solent Maritime SAC and the Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC through reduced water levels and quality and increased levels of disturbance.

Local	
Fareham Borough Council Core Strategy Preferred Options, January 2009.	
▪ 5,100sqm B2 floorspace plus ▪ 6,000sqm at Whiteley ▪ 2,600sqm B8 floorspace ▪ Open space, sports pitches and fitness suite at Coldeast ▪ Expanded community facilities including a swimming pool at Locks Heath	

Local	
Gosport Borough Council Core Strategy Issues and Options, December 2006.	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Gosport Borough Council**
Currency	**2006 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Gosport Borough Council administrative boundaries**
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**SA Report for the Gosport Core Strategy : Issues And Options December 2006**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Core Strategy sets out the spatial vision for the future of Gosport Borough over the next 20 years and will set out objectives and policies which seek to achieve this vision. Locational Principles: ▪ Appropriate development should take place on sites within the existing urban area ▪ A Strategic Gap should be maintained between Stubbington/Lee-on-the-Solent and Fareham/Gosport	Core Strategy impacts will be dependant on the Preferred Strategy options. Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts ▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading

Local	
Gosport Borough Council Core Strategy Issues and Options, December 2006.	
▪ Brownfield sites should be prioritised for development ▪ Higher density development should be located in the areas best served by public transport with good access to a range of shops and services ▪ There should be an appropriate mix of uses in Gosport to provide a sustainable community ▪ Existing open spaces and nature conservation areas should be protected and enhanced ▪ Development should not take place within the Floodzone Areas unless it can be demonstrated through a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment that the proposal will not be at risk of flooding or put other areas at risk At April 2006 there was outstanding planning permission for 1,571 new homes and additional sites allocated in the Local Plan Review could provide a further 252 homes. Therefore in order to meet the requirement set out in the draft SE Plan of 2,500 new dwellings there is a need to provide land for an additional 677 new dwellings.	▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations

Local	
Havant Borough Council Core Strategy Preferred Options, March 2008.	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Havant Borough Council**
Currency	**2006 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Havant Borough Council administrative boundaries**
Sector	**Planning**

Local	
Havant Borough Council Core Strategy Preferred Options, March 2008.	
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**SA of the Core Strategy Preferred Options, March 2008.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Havant Borough Core Strategy will be the key Development Plan Document within the Local Development Framework (LDF). The Core Strategy sets the LDF's long-term spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives for development planning and it considers the options available through the planning system to the Council and communities in the Havant Borough area. Housing: ▪ 6,301 new homes during the period 2006-2026. Employment: ▪ B1 Offices - 74,400 sq m ▪ B2 Manufacturing - 49,400 sq m ▪ B8 Warehousing - 32,400 sq m Policy CS1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Environment - ensures that development will only be allowed if it protects and enhances the borough's international designated sites of importance for biodiversity. It also states that development proposals that would cause significant harm, themselves or cumulatively, to sites of international interests will be avoided.	Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts ▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading ▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations There is potential for likely significant in-combination effects on Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC, Solent Maritime SAC and Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA/ Ramsar through reduced water levels and quality and increased levels of disturbance.

Local	
New Forest District Council Core Strategy Submission, November 2008.	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**New Forest District Council**
Currency	**2006 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**New Forest District Council administrative boundaries**
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**Screening Statement and Appropriate Assessment for New Forest DC Core Strategy Submission, September 2008.** **SA of the Core Strategy DPD Submission, November 2008.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Core Strategy sets out New Forest District Council's strategy for the future planning of the area outside the National Park for the period up to 2026. It is the key DPD within the Local Development Framework, which will comprise a series of documents to guide the spatial planning of the area. Policy CS 11 New housing land allocations Provision will be made for new housing development in the latter part of the plan period, by the allocation of land previously reserved for residential development at: (a) Crow Lane, Ringwood, for 150 dwellings, (See Fig. 20, Section 9) and (b) Durley Farm, Hounsdown, Totton for 100 dwellings, (See Fig. 17, Section 9). Policy CS9 Settlement hierarchy The settlement hierarchy is as follows: ▪ Level 1 - Larger towns and service centres - Totton & Eling, Hythe & Dibden, Lymington and Pennington, New Milton and Barton on Sea, and Ringwood.	Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts ▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading ▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations There is potential for likely significant in-combination effects on the New Forest SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar through increased levels of recreation.

Local	
New Forest District Council Core Strategy Submission, November 2008.	
▪ Level 2 - Small towns and employment centres - Fordingbridge and Marchwood ▪ Level 3 - Defined villages - Ashford, Blackfield & Langley, Bransgore, Everton, Fawley, Hardley and Holbury, Hordle, Milford and Sandleheath ▪ Level 4 - Breamore, Damerham, Ellingham, Harbridge, Ibsley, Martin, Rockbourne, Sopley and Whitsbury Policy CS10 The spatial strategy The spatial strategy is to provide for sustainable development to help meet the needs of local communities and the local economy by: (a) locating new residential development, (in accordance with the settlement hierarchy (d) ensuring through development management and the provision of appropriate mitigation measures that the local impacts arising from developments are acceptable, whether on the local services and infrastructure or on sensitive areas of nature conservation value (as further developed in Policy CS25); (e) providing for a minimum of 3,920 new dwellings within the Plan Area between 2006 and 2026 through: Policy CS3 Protecting and enhancing our special environment (Heritage and Nature Conservation) Development proposals must protect and, where possible, enhance sites of recognised importance for nature and heritage conservation.	

Local	
New Forest National Park Authority National Park Management Plan	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**New Forest National Park Authority**
Currency	**2006 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**New Forest National Park boundaries**
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**HRA Screening Statement of the New Forest National Park Plan Consultation Draft, August 2008.** **SA of the New Forest National Park Plan Consultation Draft, August 2008.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The draft National Park Plan sets out the long-term Vision and objectives for the National Park, together with the policies and actions for the next 5 years and beyond. The Plan combines two statutory documents into a single integrated plan; these are the National Park Management Plan and the Local Development Framework Core Strategy including Development Control policies. The strategic policy approach is to consider activity generating development and outdoor recreation in the context of three broad geographical zones covering the National Park, which are based on the sensitivity and level of risk to the natural environment. Zone 1 is the most sensitive and is characterised by the New Forest SSSI, SAC, SPA and Ramsar. Central to this Plan, and reflected by the approach above, is the conservation and enhancement of the Special Qualities of the National Park. The approach taken will be to: ▪ Minimise the impact of external development pressures on	Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts ▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading ▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations The National Park Plan contains strong policies in regard to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and habitats and also proposes a limited amount of development. The Winchester Core Strategy is more likely act in combination with surrounding Plans and Programmes in the South Hampshire area by increasing the levels of recreational activity in the New Forest National Park.

Local	
New Forest National Park Authority National Park Management Plan	
the National Park, especially recreational pressure from the proposed future development in the adjoining growth areas of the South Hampshire sub-region and the Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole conurbation. There is no specific National Park requirement and nearly all new residential development will be in settlements outside the National Park. Based on past building rates it is estimated that on average 10 dwellings per year might be built within the National Park. There is also no strategic employment development requirement. The National Park Plan will seek to retain existing employment sites whilst encouraging some limited new employment development in the defined Service Villages, and very limited development in other rural settlements. More detailed policies and actions for recreation will be published separately in the Recreation Management Strategy for the National Park.	

Local	
Portsmouth City Council Core Strategy Preferred Options, August 2008.	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Portsmouth City Council**

Local	
Portsmouth City Council Core Strategy Preferred Options, August 2008.	
Currency	**2006 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Portsmouth City Council administrative boundaries**
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**HRA of the Portsmouth City Council Core Strategy, Screening Statement, August 2008.** **SA Report Core Strategy (Regulation 25), August 2008.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Portsmouth City Core Strategy will be the key Development Plan Document within the Local Development Framework (LDF). The Core Strategy sets the LDF's long-term spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives for development planning and it considers the options available through the planning system to the Council and communities in the Portsmouth City area. In line with the sub-regional strategy Portsmouth will provide for 14,700 additional homes (735 homes per year), 225,000m2 of new employment floor space, 68,360m2 net of retail floor space and the necessary associated facilities and services between 2006 and 2026. This will be realised in Portsmouth through focusing development at: ▪ Key development sites - Tipner, Port Solent & North Harbour, Somerstown and Fratton Park. ▪ The city centre, including Gunwharf Quays and the Hard ▪ Other town centres - particularly Southsea, North End and Cosham ▪ Key employment areas - city centre, North Harbour, VT Halmatic, Dockyard, Commercial Port, Portsdown Hill and industrial estates.	Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts ▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading ▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations There is potential for likely significant in-combination effects on Portsmouth Harbour SPA/ Ramsar, Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA/ Ramsar and Solent and Maritime SAC through reduced water levels and quality and increased levels of disturbance.

Local	
Portsmouth City Council Core Strategy Preferred Options, August 2008.	
There are a range of different developments (not including employment and housing) proposed at key developments sites, these include: Tipner: ▪ A Park & Ride facility with 1,800 spaces ▪ A 150 bed hotel ▪ A new junction and associated slip roads from the M275 motorway, with a bus lane southbound into the city centre from the site ▪ Infrastructure to enable the integration of the bridge link to Port Solent ▪ Improvements to flood defences to ensure the site is defended to against a 1 in 1000 year flood event Port Solent & North Harbour: ▪ A new football stadium with a capacity up to 45,000 seats and associated facilities ▪ Improvements to flood defences to ensure the site is defended against a 1 in 1000 year flood event.	

Local	
Southampton City Council Core Strategy Submission, December 2008.	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Southampton City Council**
Currency	**2006 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Southampton City Council administrative boundaries**

Local	
Southampton City Council Core Strategy Submission, December 2008.	
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**AA Screening of the Southampton City Council Core Strategy Submission, December 2008.** **SA/SEA Screening of the Southampton City Council Core Strategy Submission, December 2008.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Southampton City Core Strategy will be the key Development Plan Document within the Local Development Framework (LDF). The Core Strategy sets the LDF's long-term spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives for development planning and it considers the options available through the planning system to the Council and communities in the Southampton City area. An additional 16,300 homes will be provided within the City of Southampton between 2006 and 2026. 2,150 homes have been completed between 2006/7 and 2007/8. Southampton city centre will be the focus for major development, which will include: ▪ A major development quarter in the west of the city centre and a wide range of other development sites; ▪ Approximately 130,000 - 200,000 square metres (gross) of comparison retail floorspace; ▪ Approximately 322,000 square metres (gross) of office floorspace; ▪ Further leisure/ cultural/ hotel development, for example: restaurants, bars, cinema, events arena, cultural quarter and events to attract visitors; and ▪ Approximately 5,450 dwellings.	Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts ▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading ▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations There is potential for likely significant in-combination effects on the River Itchen SAC and Solent and Southampton SPA/ Ramsar through reduced water levels and quality and increased levels of disturbance.

Local	
Southampton City Council Core Strategy Submission, December 2008.	
The city council plans to promote and facilitate the growth of the Port of Southampton provided there are no unacceptable impacts on the environment, including on International Sites in line with the Habitat Regulations and it is balanced with the development growth needs of the city centre. Within the city port growth will take place within the existing port boundaries. Within the city, the council will facilitate growth by: 1. Refusing planning permission for non port related development within the port; except for uses which form an integral part of a cruise line terminal within the city centre, which help create a visitor destination and do not significantly increase the footprint of the terminal area. 2. Supporting an increase in transhipments (ship to ship), rail freight to/ from the port and appropriate road improvements leading to the port. Policy CS22 - Promoting Biodiversity and Protecting Habitats Within Southampton the city council will promote biodiversity through: ▪ Safeguarding international, national and local designated sites from inappropriate development; ▪ Giving appropriate consideration to internationally and nationally protected and important habitats and species;	

Local	
Test Valley Borough Council Core Strategy Preferred Options, March 2008.	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Test Valley Borough Council**
Currency	**2006 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Test Valley Borough Council administrative boundaries**
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**HRA of the Test Valley Core Strategy Submission, March 2009.** **SA of the Test Valley Core Strategy Pre-submission Document, October 2008.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Test Valley Core Strategy will be the key Development Plan Document within the Test Valley Local Development Framework (LDF). The Core Strategy sets the LDF's long-term spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives for development planning and it considers the options available through the planning system to the Council and communities in the Test Valley area. CSP10 Provide New Housing Opportunities The strategic housing requirement of 8,920 to 2026 will be met through the provision of allocated sites, commitments and completions. CSP5 Retaining and Enhancing the Borough's Biodiversity The Council will seek to maintain, enhance and restore biodiversity and geological interests in the Borough and in particular the biodiversity and geological interests of: ▪ internationally, nationally or locally important nature conservation sites; Development likely to result in significant harm to these	Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts ▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading ▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations There is potential for likely significant in-combination effects on Mottisfont Bats SAC through habitat loss and fragmentation and the New Forest SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar through increased levels of disturbance.

Local	
Test Valley Borough Council Core Strategy Preferred Options, March 2008.	
interests, will only be permitted if: a) the need for, and benefits of, development in the proposed location outweighs the loss of or harm to the relevant biodiversity or geological interests; b) it can be demonstrated that it could not reasonably be located on an alternative site that would result in less or no harm to biodiversity or geological conservation interests; and c) measures can be provided to prevent, mitigate against or compensate for the significant harm likely to result from development	

Local	
Isle of Wight Council Core Strategy Submission, December 2008.	
Plan Type	**Local Development Framework**
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	**Isle of Wight Council**
Currency	**2006 - 2026**
Region/Geographic Coverage	**Isle of Wight Council administrative boundaries**
Sector	**Planning**
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	**HRA of the Island Plan Core Strategy and Site Allocations Plan, September 2007.** **SA of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy DPD Submission, December 2008.**
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**
The Isle of Wight Core Strategy will be the key Development Plan Document within the Isle of Wight Local Development Framework (LDF). The Core Strategy sets the LDF's long-term spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives for development planning and it considers the options available through the planning system to the Council and communities on the Isle of	Generic effects related to development/ growth scenarios include: ▪ Potential for land take/ habitat fragmentation ▪ Increased demand for water resources/ abstraction/ hydrological impacts

Local	
Isle of Wight Council Core Strategy Submission, December 2008.	
Wight. The overall strategic development strategy is for economic led regeneration which focuses the majority of development within and around the key regeneration areas and smaller regeneration areas. Development will be concentrated in the Key Regeneration Areas of the Medina Valley, Ryde and The Bay, with a smaller proportion of development in the smaller regeneration areas of West Wight (Freshwater and Totland) and Ventnor. Provision will be made for at least 10,400 dwellings over the period 2006-2026. Key Regeneration Areas (approximately 80%): ▪ Medina Valley At least 5,400 units ▪ Ryde At least 2,000 units ▪ The Bay At least 1,300 units Rest of the Island (approximately 20%): ▪ At least 1,700 units In addition to the currently available employment allocations, at least 10ha of additional land will be allocated and brought forward in the period up to 2011, with an additional 15ha allocated and brought forward 2011-2026. Policy CP6 Sustainable Development seeks to ensure that development must: ▪ Enhance or improve, where appropriate, biodiversity and	▪ Increased traffic movements, contributions to atmospheric pollution loading ▪ Growth in requirements for waste management facilities, increased demand for minerals ▪ Increased recreational pressure from existing/ new populations There is potential for in-combination effects on Solent and Southampton Water SPA/ Ramsar and Solent Maritime SAC through reduced water levels and quality and increased disturbance. The Isle of Wight contains strong policies in regard to the protection of biodiversity and water resources.

Local	
Isle of Wight Council Core Strategy Submission, December 2008.	
natural resources, including water, air and soil and protect and conserve quality or quantity of groundwater resources. ▪ Include appropriate on-site sustainable drainage systems (SUDS). ▪ Demonstrate that there are, or will be, adequate water supply and wastewater treatment facilities in place to serve the whole development. Improvements in these facilities, the timing of their provision and funding sources will be key to the growth proposed on the Island. Policy CP 7 Landscape, Biodiversity and Geodiversity gives priority to: ▪ Protection of the European and Ramsar sites. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be adopted to avoid an adverse effect on the integrity of sites, including the provision of green infrastructure. ▪ Conserving and enhancing protected landscape, biodiversity and geodiversity sites and features in line with PPS9 and maintaining and enhancing the links between designated sites. ▪ Preventing the over-abstraction and/or pollution of water from priority habitats such as wetlands. Policy CP 12 (Water Resources) actively promote the management of demand and local abstraction, by ensuring that new development is compatible with Catchment Abstraction Management Plans and that residential developments should incorporate water consumption reduction and water efficiency measures required as a result of the standards set out in policy CP6.	

Local	
Isle of Wight Council Core Strategy Submission, December 2008.	
The Council will work with Southern Water to implement its Water Resource Management Plan for the Island and to identify and make provision for the necessary waste water infrastructure requirements required as a result of planned development. All developments should include appropriate on-site sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) for the disposal of surface water in order to ensure there is no net loss of flood storage capacity or impact on water quality. All developments will be expected to: 1. Maintain and improve (wherever possible) river and groundwater quality. 2. Reduce the loss of non-renewable environmental resources. 3. Minimise the use of non-renewable resources through recycling and use of renewable resources where possible. 4. Mitigate and compensate for the loss of non-renewable natural resources.	

Plan Type	
Plan Owner/ Competent Authority	

Currency	
Region/Geographic Coverage	
Sector	
Related work SA/SEA HRA/AA	
Document Details	**Potential impacts that could cause 'in-combination' effects**

Appendix 3: Screening Matrix

Policy Screening: Categorising the Potential Effects of the Plan (Tyldesley, 2009)	
Criteria Category	**Rationale**
Category A: No negative effect	
A1	Options/ policies that will not themselves lead to development e.g. because they relate to design or other qualitative criteria for development, or they are not a land use planning policy.
A2	Options/ policies intended to protect the natural environment, including biodiversity.
A3	Options/ policies intended to conserve or enhance the natural, built or historic environment, where enhancement measures will not be likely to have any negative effect on a European site.
A4	Options/ policies that positively steer development away from European sites and associated sensitive areas.
A5	Options/ policies that would have no effect because no development could occur through the policy itself, the development being implemented through later policies in the same plan, which are more specific and therefore more appropriate to access for their effects on European Sites and associated sensitive areas.
Category B: No significant effect	
B	Options/ policies that could have an effect but would not be likely to have a significant (negative) effect on a European site (alone or in-combination with other plans or projects) because the effects are trivial or 'de minimis' even if combined with other effects.
Category C: Likely significant effect alone	
C1	The option, policy could **directly affect** a European site because it provides for, or steers, a quantity or type of development onto a European site, or adjacent to it.
C2	The option, policy could **indirectly affect** a European site e.g. because it provides for, or steers, a quantity or type of development that may be very close to it, or ecologically, hydrologically or physically connected to it or it may increase disturbance as a result of increased recreational pressure.
C3	Proposals for a **magnitude of development** that, no matter where it is located, the development would be likely to have a significant effect on a European site.
C4	An option, or policy that makes provision for a quantity/ type of development (and may indicate one or more broad

Policy Screening: Categorising the Potential Effects of the Plan (Tyldesley, 2009)	
Criteria Category	**Rationale**
	locations e.g. a particular part of the plan area), but the effects are uncertain because the detailed location of the development is to be selected following **consideration of options in a later, more specific plan**. The consideration of options in the later plan will assess potential effects on European Sites, but because the development could possibly affect a European site a significant effect cannot be ruled out on the basis of objective information
C5	Options, policies or proposals for developments or infrastructure projects that **could block options or alternatives** for the provision of other development or projects in the future, which will be required in the public interest, that may lead to adverse effects on European sites, which would otherwise be avoided.
C6	Options, policies or proposals which **depend on how the policies etc are implemented** in due course, for example, through the development management process. There is a theoretical possibility that if implemented in one or more particular ways, the proposal could possibly have a significant effect on a European site
C7	Any other options, policies or proposals that would be **vulnerable to failure** under the Habitats Regulations at project assessment stage; to include them in the plan would be regarded by the EC as 'faulty planning'.
C8	Any other proposal that may have an adverse effect on a European site, which might try to pass the tests of the Habitats Regulations at project assessment stage by arguing that the **plan provides the imperative reasons** of overriding public interest to justify its consent despite a negative assessment.
Category D: Likely significant effects in combination	
D1	The option, policy or proposal alone would not be likely to have significant effects but if its effects are combined with the effects of other policies or proposals **provided for or coordinated** by the Local Development Document (internally) the **cumulative** effects would be likely to be significant.
D2	Options, policies or proposals that alone would not be likely to have significant effects but if their effects are **combined with the effects of other plans and projects** and possibly the effects of other developments provided for in the Local Development Document as well, the combined effects are likely to be significant.
D3	Options or proposals that are, or could be, part of a **programme or sequence of development** delivered over a period, where the implementation of the early stages would not have a significant effect on European sites, but which would dictate the nature, scale, duration, location, timing of the whole project, the later stages of which could have adverse effects on such sites.

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
Spatial Planning Vision	A1	*N/A*	*N/A* Sets overarching/ Strategic Framework for development - issues addressed as part of preferred policy screening assessment below.	N/A	No
Spatial Planning Objectives	A1	*N/A*	*N/A* Sets overarching/ Strategic Framework for development -issues addressed as part of preferred policy screening assessment below.	N/A	No
Policy SS1 Sustainable Development Principles	A5	*N/A*	N/A The policy identifies areas for growth but will not lead to development itself.	N/A	No Development would not occur through the policy itself.
Policy SS2 Requirements for major large scale developments	A5	*N/A*	N/A The policy sets out requirements for major large scale developments but will not lead to development itself as this will be implemented in later policies.	N/A	No Development would not occur through the policy itself.
Policy WT1 Strategy for Winchester Town	A5	*N/A*	N/A The policy sets out the vision for Winchester Town and how this will be achieved. It proposes the provision of 2,000 within the built-up area of Winchester, 2,000	N/A	No Development would not occur through the policy

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
			dwellings at Barton Farm and a knowledge park at Bushfield Camp. The developments proposed are implemented through other policies in the plan.		itself.
Policy WT2 Strategic Housing Allocation - Barton Farm	C2	▪ River Itchen SAC	▪ Reduced water levels and quality Site is less then 1km away from the River Itchen SAC. The current condition status for the SAC is unfavourable due to inappropriate water levels, siltation and reduced water quality. The current ecological condition of the river is Poor but this is predicted to improve to Good status by 2015. The current chemical condition of the river is High, this however, is predicted to decrease to Good status by 2015[1]. There is potential for new development at this location to increase levels of water abstraction and change drainage (surface and groundwater) patterns in the area, which could potentially have significant effects on water levels and quality. New development would also put increased pressure on sewerage system capacity, which has the potential to reduce water quality in the river.	No The policy already seeks to avoid harmful impacts on water quality due to the proximity of the River Itchen SAC. There is uncertainty as to how harmful impacts will be avoided.	Yes Further detailed assessment is required to assess the potential for likely significant effects.

[1] Environment Agency (2008) A Consultation on the Draft River Basin Management Plan South East River Basin District. Annex A: Current state of waters. Available online: http://wfdconsultation.environment-agency.gov.uk/wfdcms/en/southeast/Intro.aspx

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
	D2	▪ Chichester &Langstone Harbours SPA/ Ramsar ▪ New Forest SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar ▪ Portsmouth Harbour SPA/ Ramsar ▪ River Itchen SAC ▪ Solent and Southampton SPA/ Ramsar ▪ Solent Maritime SAC ▪ Solent & Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC	▪ Reduced water levels and quality ▪ Increased disturbance There is also the potential for the development proposed to have in-combination effects with surrounding LDFs through increased levels of abstraction, increased pressure on sewerage capacity/ flow and increased recreational activity. The AA of the South East Plan identified that existing water abstractions had the potential to adversely affect European sites because of uncertainty regarding efficiency savings and the timing and location of future water resources. This is supported by the EA Review of Consents (RoC), which has concluded that existing abstraction licences pose a risk to the integrity of six European sites included within this HRA. The South Hampshire Integrated Water Management Strategy (IWMS) assessed that sufficient water can be made available to meet the demands of new housing in the South Hampshire area. This is reliant however, on the development of a number of major new resources, of which there is uncertainty of how much is required, when it will be required and who will deliver it. It is evident that there is a great deal of uncertainty surrounding the potential increase in abstraction levels and the measures that could be used to mitigate	No Combined effect with other plans and programmes.	Yes Further detailed assessment is required to assess the potential for likely significant in-combination effects.

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
			potential adverse impacts.		
Policy WT3 Strategic Employment Allocation - Bushfield Camp	C2	▪ River Itchen SAC	▪ Reduced water levels and quality Site is less then 500m away from the River Itchen SAC. See above (Policy WT2) for current condition status of the SAC and environmental trends. See above (Policy WT2) for potential impacts of development on the River Itchen SAC.	No	Yes Further detailed assessment is required to assess the potential for likely significant effects.
	D2	▪ Chichester &Langstone Harbours SPA/ Ramsar ▪ New Forest SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar ▪ Portsmouth Harbour SPA/ Ramsar ▪ River Itchen SAC ▪ Solent and Southampton SPA/ Ramsar ▪ Solent	▪ Reduced water levels and quality ▪ Increased disturbance See above (Policy WT2) for potential in-combination effects.	No Combined effect with other plans and programmes.	Yes Further detailed assessment is required to assess the potential for likely significant in-combination effects.

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
		Maritime SAC ▪ Solent & Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC			
Policy SH1 Strategy for South Hampshire Urban Areas	A5	N/A	N/A The policy sets out the vision for the PUSH area and how this will be achieved. It proposes the provision of 3,000 dwellings to the West of Waterlooville and 3,000 dwellings to the North of Whiteley. The developments proposed are implemented through other policies in the plan.	N/A	No Development would not occur through the policy itself.
Policy SH2 Strategic Housing Allocation - West of Waterlooville	C2	▪ Portsmouth Harbour SPA/ Ramsar ▪ Chichester &Langstone Harbours SPA/ Ramsar	▪ Reduced water levels and quality ▪ Increased Disturbance Site is less then 5km from Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA/ Ramsar and approximately 5km from Portsmouth Harbour SPA/ Ramsar. The site is within 200m of the Potwell Trib waterbody, a tributary of the River Wallington, which ultimately flows into Portsmouth Harbour. The current ecological condition of the Potwell Trib waterbody is Moderate and the chemical status is assessed as High. The River Wallington has not yet been assessed. Portsmouth	No Suitable open space/recreation areas would need to be provided within the Strategic Site to try and mitigate the potential increase in recreational activity.	Yes Further detailed assessment is required to assess the potential for likely significant effects.

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
			Harbour is assessed as having Good ecological status and High chemical status[2]. There is potential for new development at this location to increase levels of water abstraction and change drainage (surface and groundwater) patterns in the area, which could potentially have significant effects on water quality in the Potwell Trib waterbody, which could have implications for water quality in Portsmouth Harbour. New development would also put increased pressure on sewerage system capacity, which has the potential to reduce water quality in the streams. There is also potential for development at this site to increase recreational activity on the European site identified, therefore increasing levels of disturbance to the protected habitats and species. The Natura 2000 standard data form for Portsmouth Harbour SPA[3] identifies that there are high levels of recreational pressure both on shore and offshore, which can have disturbance effects during sensitive (over-wintering) periods. There is also potential for significant effects on the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA/ Ramsar through increased recreational activity.	Development that would obstruct or reduce the flow of water in the Potwell Trib waterbody should be avoided.	

[2] Environment Agency (2008) A Consultation on the Draft River Basin Management Plan South East River Basin District. Annex A: Current state of waters. Available online: http://wfdconsultation.environment-agency.gov.uk/wfdcms/en/southeast/Intro.aspx
[3] JNCC. Natura 2000 Standard Data Form for Portsmouth Harbour SPA. Available online: http://www.jncc.gov.uk/pdf/SPA/UK9011051.pdf

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
	D2	▪ New Forest SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar ▪ River Itchen SAC ▪ Solent and Southampton SPA/ Ramsar ▪ Solent Maritime SAC ▪ Solent & Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC	▪ Reduced water levels and quality ▪ Increased Disturbance See above (Policy WT2) for potential in-combination effects.	No Combined effect with other plans and programmes.	Yes Further detailed assessment is required to assess the potential for likely significant in-combination effects.
Policy SH3 Strategic Housing Allocation - North Whiteley	C2	▪ Solent and Southampton SPA/ Ramsar ▪ Solent Maritime SAC	▪ Reduced water quality ▪ Increased disturbance The strategic site boundary is less than 100m from the Solent and Southampton SPA/ Ramsar. The current condition status for the SPA is unfavourable due to inappropriate habitat loss (inappropriate coastal management), inappropriate water levels and reduced water quality. The current condition status of the Ramsar is not known. The Strategic Site intersects the Shedfield and Curbridge Streams, which flow into the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/ Ramsar. The	No Suitable open space/recreation areas would need to be provided within the Strategic Site to try and mitigate the potential increase in recreational activity.	Yes Further detailed assessment is required to assess the potential for likely significant effects.

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
			current ecological conditions of the streams are Poor (Shedfield) and Moderate (Curbridge). The ecological and chemical status of the Southampton water estuary is moderate and this is not predicted to improve by 2015[4]. There is potential for new development at this location to increase levels of water abstraction and change drainage (surface and groundwater) patterns in the area, which could potentially have significant effects on water levels and quality in the Shedfield and Curbridge Streams, which flow into the SPA/ Ramsar site. New development would also put increased pressure on sewerage system capacity, which has the potential to reduce water quality in the streams. There is also the potential for development at this site to increase recreational activity on the SPA/ Ramsar, therefore increasing levels of disturbance to the protected habitats and species. Development on this site would also have the potential to act in-combination with proposed development at Hedge End Strategic Site.	Development that would obstruct or reduce the flow of water in either Shedfield or Curbridge Streams should be avoided.	
	D2	▪ Chichester &Langstone Harbours SPA/	▪ Reduced water levels and quality ▪ Increased Disturbance	No Combined effect	Yes Further detailed

[4] Environment Agency (2008) A Consultation on the Draft River Basin Management Plan South East River Basin District. Annex A: Current state of waters. Available online: http://wfdconsultation.environment-agency.gov.uk/wfdcms/en/southeast/Intro.aspx

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
		Ramsar ▪ New Forest SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar ▪ Portsmouth Harbour SPA/ Ramsar ▪ River Itchen SAC ▪ Solent & Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC	See above (Policy WT2) for potential in-combination effects.	with other plans and programmes.	assessment is required to assess the potential for likely significant in-combination effects.
Policy SH4 North/North-East Hedge End SDA	A1	N/A	N/A The policy outlines requirements to undertake studies into the feasibility of a Strategic Development Area of up to 6,000 dwellings to the north/ north-east of Hedge End.	N/A	No
Policy SH5 North Fareham SDA	A1	N/A	N/A The policy does not propose development but rather identifies land within Winchester District that will form part of the open areas for a SDA of up to 10,000 dwellings.	N/A	No
Policy MTRA 1 Strategy for	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
the Market Towns and Rural Area					
Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy	D2	▪ Chichester &Langstone Harbours SPA/ Ramsar ▪ New Forest SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar ▪ Portsmouth Harbour SPA/ Ramsar ▪ River Itchen SAC ▪ Solent and Southampton SPA/ Ramsar ▪ Solent Maritime SAC ▪ Solent & Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC	▪ Reduced water quality ▪ Increased disturbance See above (Policy WT2) for potential in-combination effects.	No	Yes Further detailed assessment is required to assess the potential for likely significant in-combination effects.
		▪ Mottisfont Bats SAC	▪ Habitat loss and fragmentation ▪ Increased disturbance	Yes If the Core Strategy provides sufficient	Yes AA will not be required if the Core

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
			Mottisfont Bats SAC lies 6km to the east of WCC boundary and is designated for a nationally important population of barbastelle bats. Barbastelle bats will use a range of woodland features including woodland rides for commuting and foraging and broadleaved trees for roosting. Barbastelles are known to travel up to 20km to reach feeding habitat and this colony is known to use all of the woodlands within the SSSI, with individuals travelling up to 4km. The policy has the potential have in-combination effects with development proposed in Eastleigh, Southampton, Test Valley and Wiltshire through the loss and fragmentation of bat fly-ways and foraging areas.	direction to ensure that site level HRA is applied to specific development proposals.	Strategy provides sufficient direction to ensure that site level HRA is applied to specific development proposals. Adverse effect on integrity will be avoided by lower tier appraisal.
Policy MTRA 3 The Wider Countryside	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy MTRA 4 Re-use of Rural Buildings	C2	▪ Mottisfont Bats SAC	▪ Increased Disturbance See above (Policy MTRA 4) for information relating to Mottisfont Bats SAC. Building conversion can be a significant issue where old/ disused buildings are valuable for bat habitats, however, no locations are specified in the policy so this issue would be dealt with at project level.	Yes If the Core Strategy provides sufficient direction to ensure that site level HRA is applied to specific development proposals.	Yes AA will not be required if the Core Strategy provides sufficient direction to ensure that site level HRA is applied to specific development proposals. Adverse effect on integrity

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
					will be avoided by lower tier appraisal.
Policy CP1 Open Space, Sport and Recreation	B	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP2 Transport	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP3 Economic Growth and Diversification	A5	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP4 Major Commercial and Educational Establishments in the Countryside	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP5 Green Infrastructure	A3	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP6 Biodiversity	A2	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP7 Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
Environment					
Policy CP8 Cultural Heritage and Landscape Character	A3	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP9 South Downs National Park/Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	A2	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP10 Settlement Gaps	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP 11 Ensuring high quality sustainable design	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP12 Ensuring the effective use of land	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP13 Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
Policy CP14 Renewable and Decentralised Energy	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP15 Housing Provision	A5	N/A	N/A The policy makes provision for the development of at least 12,470 dwellings within the District. The development proposed is implemented through other policies in the plan.	N/A	No
Policy CP16 Housing Priorities	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP17 Housing Mix	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP18 Affordable Housing	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP19 Affordable Housing - Quota Sites	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP20 Affordable Housing - 'Local Connection Homes'	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No

Core Strategy Preferred Options and Policies	Assessment Category	European Site[s]	Potential Effect	Can the element be changed at screening stage to avoid likely significant effect (LSE)	Is an Appropriate Assessment Required?
Policy CP21 Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP22 Retention of local services and facilities	A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Policy CP23 Infrastructure and Community Benefit	A5	N/A	N/A The policy requires development proposals to provide or contribute towards the infrastructure and services needed to support them. The proposed developments that will require the infrastructure are implemented through other policies in the plan.	N/A	No

Appendix 4: Additional Screening Information

Butser Hill SAC

Buster Hill SAC is situated to the south of Petersfield, adjacent to the A3 and approximately 3.5km away from WCC administrative boundary. The site is designated for its lowland calcareous grassland and broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland and is vulnerable to atmospheric pollution and recreational pressure. The Core Strategy proposes the development of 3,000 dwellings to the west of Waterlooville, which has the potential to increase traffic along the A3 and increase recreational activity in-combination with development proposed in East Hampshire and Havant.

Previous levels of recreational activity on site and traffic along the A3 do not currently appear to be having a negative effect on site integrity as the component SSSI condition status (Appendix 1) is currently assessed as being favourable. According to the UK Air Pollution Information System[1] (APIS) current levels of acid deposition, nitrogen deposition and sulphur dioxides do not exceed critical loads at the site. Given the level of development proposed in the area it is inevitable that traffic levels will increase along the A3, however, the significance of this increase could be mitigated through measures proposed in the Hampshire Local Transport Plan and WCC Core Strategy Preferred Options, which include locating and designing development to reduce the need to travel and encouraging the use of non-car modes.

It is possible that the level of proposed development in the surrounding areas could lead to increased levels of recreational activity, which can lead to trampling of shallow/ thin soils. As previously mentioned the current level of recreation is not considered to be adversely affecting site integrity given the favourable condition status of the component SSSI. Winchester is a rural district, which contains a wide range of alternative areas for recreation. This including the provision of open space and recreational facilities for developments proposed in the WCC Core Strategy Preferred Options will provide some form of mitigation against potential increases in recreational activity.

Given the favourable condition status of the SAC, the availability of alternative areas for recreation and current air quality data, **it is assessed that the WCC Core Strategy will not have likely significant effects on Butser Hill SAC either alone or in-combination through increased atmospheric pollution and recreational pressure.**

East Hampshire Hangers SAC

East Hampshire Hangers SAC is situated over 6km from WCC administrative boundary and covers an area of 569.68ha. The site is primarily designated for

[1] http://www.apis.ac.uk/

its *Asperulo-Fagetum* beech forests, *Tilio-Acerion* forests and semi-natural dry grasslands. Development proposed in the Core Strategy Preferred Options has the potential to act in-combination with surrounding LDFs to increase traffic along the A3 and increase the level of recreational activity at the site.

Previous levels of recreational activity on site and traffic along the A3 do not currently appear to be having a negative effect on site integrity as the component SSSI condition status (Appendix 1) is currently assessed as being favourable. It is clear from the information available on the component SSSIs[2] that appropriate site level management is the most important factor in maintaining site integrity. Given this along with the range of alternative areas for recreation and the provision of open space and recreational facilities for developments proposed by the Core Strategy, it is not likely that the WCC Core Strategy will have likely significant effects either alone or in-combination on the East Hampshire Hangers SAC through increased recreational activity.

Based on Natural England advice[3] to Local Authorities and the HRA of the SE Plan[4] it is assessed that air pollution only needs to be considered at a site if a road carrying a significant proportion of new traffic related to the plan runs within 200 meters of a European site. The East Hampshire Hangers SAC is over 1km from any major roads, however, the Air Pollution Information System (APIS) identifies that nitrogen deposition currently exceeds critical loads at this site.[5] The main sources of nitrogen deposition on site are from livestock and imported emissions; only 17 per cent of the total nitrogen deposition originates from road transport. As previously mentioned this contribution from road transport could be mitigated through measures proposed in the Hampshire Local Transport Plan and WCC Core Strategy Preferred Options. Run-off from surrounding agricultural land is another source of nitrogen on the site. Given the distance of the site from major roads, the favourable condition of the site and that appropriate site level management is the most important factor in maintaining site integrity, **it is assessed that the WCC Core Strategy will not have likely significant effects on the East Hampshire Hangers SAC either alone or in-combination through increased atmospheric pollution.**

Emer Bog SAC

Emer Bog SAC is situated between Romsey and Eastleigh and is approximately 2.5km from WCC administrative boundaries. The site is designated for transition mires and quaking bogs and is vulnerable to changes in the hydrological regime and to nutrient enrichment.

The JNCC identifies that at present the principal threat to the site is adjacent land use, which can alter the hydrological processes and can lead to nutrient loading (agricultural activities). Given the distance of the site from the WCC

[2] Natural England. SSSI Information. Views about management. Available online: http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/search.cfm
[3] English Nature (16 May 2006) letter to Runneymede Borough Council, 'Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994, Runneymede Borough Council Local Development Framework'.
[4] Levett-Therivel (2006) Appropriate Assessment of the Draft South East Plan. Final Report.
[5] APIS (3 year average 2003-2005) The critical load is based on the dominant soil type in the 1km square in which the European site occurs

boundary and that the principal threat to site integrity is adjacent land use and the favourable condition status of the component SSSI **it is assessed that the WCC Core Strategy Preferred Options will not have likely significant effects on the Emer Bog SAC either alone or in-combination.**

Mottisfont Bats SAC

Mottisfont Bats SAC lies 6km to the east of WCC boundary and is designated for a nationally important population of barbastelle bast. Mottisfont contains a mix of woodland types including hazel coppice with standards, broadleaved plantation and coniferous plantation which the bats use for breeding, roosting, commuting and feeding. Barbastelle bats will use a range of woodland features including woodland rides for commuting and foraging and broadleaved trees for roosting. Barbastelles are known to travel up to 20km to reach feeding habitat and this colony is known to use all of the woodlands within the SSSI, with individuals travelling up to 4km.

The Core Strategy Preferred Options identifies two strategic development locations within 20km Mottisfont Bats SAC. This along with development proposed in Eastleigh, Southampton, Test Valley and Wiltshire have the potential to act in-combination on the Mottisfont Bats SAC through the loss and fragmentation of bat fly-ways and foraging areas. Given the strategic nature of this assessment and the lack of information available on the areas used by the Mottisfont bat population for foraging and migrating, it would be more appropriate to assess the potential for likely significant effects at a lower tier of planning. Project level HRA would provide a detailed site level analysis of the importance of a particular site to the bats, and provide suitable mitigation measures to reduce the adverse effects of the proposed allocation on the Barbastelle bat population. Key considerations are likely to involve avoiding or minimising loss/breaching of linear features (e.g. hedgerows, woodland belts) and appropriate design of site lighting to maintain 'dark corridors' as far as practicable. Where loss or interruption of linear features is unavoidable, either mitigation should be provided and/or any gaps kept to a width of 10m or less.

Given the favourable condition status (Appendix 1) of the lesser horseshoe bat and the potential for mitigating adverse effects at the site level, **it is assessed that the WCC Core Strategy will not have likely significant effects on the Mottisfont Bats SAC either alone or in-combination through the loss and fragmentation of bat fly-ways and foraging areas.** The Core Strategy should provide sufficient direction to ensure that site level HRA is applied to specific development proposals.