

# **The East Hampshire District Local Plan**

## **Consultation Draft 'Planning Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy' Supplementary Planning Document**

### **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)**

Screening Statement - Determination under Regulation 9 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

### **Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)**

Screening Statement – Determination under Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.

**Final Determination**

**October 2015**

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This statement sets out the Council's determination under Regulation 9 (1) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 on whether or not a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required for the 'Planning Contributions' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 1.2 This statement also sets out the Council's determination as to whether Appropriate Assessment is required under Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010.

### **Strategic Environmental Assessment**

- 1.3 Under the requirements of the European Union Directive 2001/42/EC (Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive)) and Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004) specific types of plans that set out the framework for future development consent of projects must be subject to an environmental assessment.
- 1.4 There are exceptions to this requirement for plans that determine the use of a small area at a local level and for minor modifications if it has been determined that the plan is unlikely to have significant environmental effects.
- 1.5 In accordance with the provisions of the SEA Directive and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004)(Regulation 9(1)), the Council must determine if a plan requires an environmental assessment. Where the Council determines that SEA is not required then under Regulation 9(3) the Council must prepare a statement setting out the reasons for this determination. The need for SEA is considered under Section 3 of this report.

### **Sustainability Appraisal**

- 1.6 Under separate legislation (the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and associated Regulations), the Council is required to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for all Development Plan Documents. This considers the social and economic impacts of a plan as well as the environmental impacts.
- 1.7 In accordance with current Regulations (Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England)(Amendment) Regulations 2012) SA is not required to be carried out for SPD. However, despite this, it is still necessary to determine the need for SEA.

## Habitats Regulations Assessment

1.8 Habitats Regulations Assessment is required to determine whether a plan or project would have significant adverse effects upon the integrity of internationally designated sites of nature conservation importance, or Natura 2000 sites. The need for HRA is set out within the EC Habitats Directive 92/43/EC and transposed into British Law by Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. In accordance with Article 6 of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) and Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 the District Council must determine if a plan requires Appropriate Assessment. Section 4 of this report deals with the need for Habitats Regulation Assessment.

## 2. Scope of the 'Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy' SPD

2.1 The way in which the Council can collect contributions towards the funding of infrastructure is changing with the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Currently, most financial contributions towards infrastructure are collected from developers through Section 106 (S106) planning obligations. However, once CIL is in place, S106 contributions, will, in the majority of cases be replaced by the CIL tariff. The Council anticipates adopting a CIL Charging Schedule in early 2016 and further information can be found on the [Council's CIL Webpage](#).

2.2 The Planning Obligations and CIL SPD will include the following:

- Summarise the CIL charging schedule in the District and provide further information on exemptions
- Identify the circumstances under which S106 contributions will continue to be used. This will include for non infrastructure items, for site specific infrastructure and for affordable housing.
- Identify circumstances where Section 278 agreements could be used to secure transport infrastructure.
- A table clearly setting out the infrastructure that will be funded through CIL and those that will be secured through S106 agreements.

2.3 The SPD will help to implement the following Joint Core Strategy (Part 1) Policies:

- CP4 – Existing Employment Land

- CP5 – Employment and workforce skills
- CP13 – Affordable Housing on Residential Development Sites
- CP14 – Affordable Housing for Rural Communities
- CP16 – Protection and Provision of Social Infrastructure
- CP21 – Biodiversity
- CP22 – Internationally Designated Sites
- CP28 – Green Infrastructure
- CP31 – Transport
- CP32 – Infrastructure

2.4 The SPD will also support, and be supported by other documents including the interim [Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy](#) (December 2014).

### 3. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

#### The SEA Screening Process

- 3.1 The process for determining whether or not an SEA is required is called screening. In order to screen, it is necessary to determine if a plan will have significant environmental effects using the criteria set out in Annex II of the Directive and Schedule I of the Regulations. A determination cannot be made until the three statutory consultation bodies have been consulted: The Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage.
- 3.2 Within 28 days of making its determination the authority must publish a statement such as this one, setting out its decision. If it determines that an SEA is not required, the statement must include the reasons for this.

#### SEA Determination and Reasons for Determination

- 3.3 Before making a determination under Regulation 9 the three consultation bodies were consulted. The responses received are as set out in Table 1 below:

**Table 1 – Comments received by Consultation bodies**

Consultation Body	Comments
Environment Agency	Please find below our opinion on whether the Planning Contributions and CIL Supplementary Planning Document is likely to have significant environmental effects. We will not be commenting on the HRA requirement as this is for Natural England to provide comment on.

Consultation Body	Comments
	<p>The proposed SPD is not intended to develop policies itself but will provide information and guidance to support developers and the council during the preparation and determination of planning applications through the implementation of policies in the adopted East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy. The policies of the Joint Core Strategy have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal incorporating the requirements of the SEA Directive.</p> <p>We are therefore of the opinion that the SPD itself is unlikely to result in significant environmental effects.</p>
Historic England	<p>Having carefully considered these determinations, Historic England agrees that the 'Planning Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy' SPD is unlikely to have any significant environmental effects and therefore does not require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. We leave an opinion on the need for a Habitat Regulations Assessment to Natural England.</p>
Natural England	<p>Natural England concurs with your conclusion that this SPD can be screened out of further assessment under Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, and under Regulation 9 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.</p>

**Table 2 - SEA Screening for the Planning Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy SPD**

Criteria (from Annex II) of SEA Directive and Schedule I of the Regulations)	EHDC Comments
<b>Characteristics of the plan or programme</b>	
<p>a) The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regards to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources.</p>	<p>The framework is set by strategic policies in the Joint Core Strategy (Policies CP4, CP5, CP13, CP14, CP16, CP21, CP22, CP23, CP31 and CP32).</p> <p>The Planning Obligations and CIL SPD will not set the framework for other activities either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources. The allocation of financial resources is not covered by the SEA Directive.</p>
<p>b) The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy.</p>	<p>The SPD is an implementation tool for delivering already adopted development plan policies at a higher tier which have already been subject to SA/SEA and for prioritising infrastructure funding to support delivery of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy.</p> <p>The SPD will not identify the specific projects that are to be funded but the mechanism by which they are to be prioritised.</p>
<p>c) The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations, in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development.</p>	<p>The SPD supports the integration of environmental considerations by supporting the relevant Joint Core Strategy Policies and the implementation of the Interim Solent Recreational Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>It will help to ensure sustainable development is delivered by helping to prioritise infrastructure funding and deliver affordable housing.</p>
<p>d) Environmental problems relevant to the plan or</p>	<p>The SPD is an implementation tool for delivering already adopted development plan policies at a</p>

Criteria (from Annex II) of SEA Directive and Schedule I of the Regulations)	EHDC Comments
programme.	<p>higher tier which have already been subject to SA/SEA.</p> <p>The SPD will have a positive impact on environmental issues relating to the Solent SPA by ensuring that in line with the Core Strategy and Interim Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy appropriate mitigation is provided.</p>
e) The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community (EU) legislation on the environment (for example plans and programmes linked to waste management or water protection).	<p>The SPD will aid in the implementation of the Habitats Directive by ensuring that qualifying development contributes towards avoiding adverse impacts to European sites. However, the SPD does not set development targets or allocate development which would affect European sites.</p> <p>The SPD will also support measures to help meet objective 7 of the Water Framework Directive.</p>
<b>Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected</b>	
a) The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects.	<p>The SPD will not in itself set out or bring forward development plans or projects. It will solely set out guidance for how the council will seek planning obligations from developers.</p> <p>The SPD will however ensure that sufficient funding is available to deliver Solent SPA mitigation and will therefore have a positive effect on the local environment.</p>
b) The cumulative nature of the effects	<p>The SPD will identify the appropriate mechanism for infrastructure funding in the District but does not in itself give consent for such projects. As such no cumulative effects arise from the SPD itself, although there may be a beneficial effect on European Sites.</p>

Criteria (from Annex II) of SEA Directive and Schedule I of the Regulations)	EHDC Comments
c) The transboundary nature of the effects	Funding for the mitigation of the impacts of development on the Solent SPA will support protected habitats outside the District. It is possible that other infrastructure projects that are delivered through the Community Infrastructure Levy may also be transboundary, for example transport improvements.
d) The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents)	The SPD presents no risks to human health or the environment.
e) The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected)	The SPD will cover the area of East Hampshire District outside of the South Downs National Park Authority.
f) The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to: i) Special natural characteristics or cultural heritage; ii) Exceeding environmental quality standards or limit values; ii) Intensive land-use	The SPD will establish the mechanisms that will be used to provide financial support to projects that protect and improve the natural characteristics and environmental quality.
g) The effects on areas or landscapes which have recognised national, community or international protection status.	The SPD will provide financial support to in line with approved policies in the adopted Core Strategy and the Interim Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy. As such no significant adverse effects are considered to arise on adoption of the SPD.



## Other Considerations

3.4 In reviewing these criteria and coming to a conclusion, the Council has also had regard to the following:

- The SPD does not present new policies or development proposals but seeks to support and elaborate on existing development plan policies and the emerging CIL Charging Schedule. Much of the process around CIL is taken from CIL legislation and is not new Council policy.
- One purpose of the SPD is to support the Council in delivering its obligations under the Habitats Regulations.
- The SPD will have a positive impact on sustainable development through both ensuring a financial mechanism for the provision of the Solent SPA mitigation and setting out an approach by which financial allocations can be made towards infrastructure needed to support development in the District

## SEA Conclusion

3.5 Having regard to the considerations above, the Council considers that the 'Planning Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy' SPD is unlikely to have any significant environmental effects and therefore does not require a Strategic Environmental Assessment.

3.6 This determination was made on **7<sup>th</sup> October 2015**.

## 4 Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Statement

- 4.1 This part of the report seeks to determine whether the Council's policies and proposals set out in the 'Planning Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy' SPD will have any significant impacts on nearby Natura 2000 sites.
- 4.2 This SPD will support policies in the adopted East Hampshire District Joint Core Strategy. This was subject to a Habitats Regulation Assessment which was prepared in consultation with Natural England. The purpose of HRA is to assess the impacts of plans and/or projects against the conservation objectives of a European site. The assessment must determine whether the plan and / or project would adversely affect the integrity of the site in terms of its conservation objectives. Where adverse effects are identified these effects should be avoided or mitigated.
- 4.3 The Appropriate Assessment stage of HRA is only required should the preliminary screening assessment not be able to rule out likely significant effect.
- 4.4 The Directive states that any plan or project not connected to or necessary for a sites management, but likely to have significant effect thereon shall be subject to appropriate assessment. There are 4 distinct stages in HRA namely:

**Step 1: Screening** – Identification of likely impacts on a European site either alone or in combination with other plans/projects and consideration of whether these are significant. This can include the consideration of avoidance measures.

**Step 2: Appropriate Assessment** – consideration of the impact on the integrity of the European Site whether alone or in combination with other plans or projects with respect to the sites structure, function and conservation objectives. Where there are significant effects, step 2 should consider potential mitigation measures.

**Step 3: Assessment of Alternative Solutions** – Assessing alternative ways of achieving the objectives of the plan/project which avoid impacts; and

**Step 4: Assessment of Compensatory Measures** – Identification of compensatory measures should impact not be avoided and no alternative solutions exist and an assessment of imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI) deems that a project should proceed.

- 4.5 Should screening (step 1) reveal that significant effects are likely or effect cannot be discounted because of uncertainty, then it is necessary to move onto step 2: Appropriate Assessment. If step 2 cannot rule out significant effect even with mitigation, then the process moves onto step 3 and finally step 4 if no alternative solutions arise.

### **Step 1 - Screening**

- 4.6 There are four stages to consider in a screening exercise:

**Stage 1:** Determining whether the plan/project is directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site;

**Stage 2:** Describing the plan/project and description of other plan/projects that have the potential for in-combination impacts;

**Stage 3:** Identifying potential effects on the European site(s); and

**Stage 4:** Assessing the significance of any effects

#### **Stage 1**

- 4.7 It can be determined that the 'Planning Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy' SPD is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site.

#### **Stages 2 to 4**

- 4.8 Information about the scope of the SPD can be found in Section 2 of this document. Table 3 overleaf identifies the European sites assessed through the East Hampshire District Joint Core Strategy HRA process as having the potential to have some likely significant effect and identifies the significance of possible effects from the 'Planning Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy' SPD. The SPD policies will supplement and support Core Strategy policies (already subject to a full HRA) and will not identify any new policies, levels of development or development distribution.

**Table 3: Significant Effects Matrix for the Planning Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy SPD**

Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
<p><b>East Hampshire Hangers SAC</b></p> <p>Contains the Habitats Directive Annex I habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dry grasslands and scrublands on chalk or limestone, including important orchid sites</li> <li>• Beech forests on neutral to rich soils: the site is extremely rich in terms of vascular plants;</li> <li>• Mixed woodland on base-rich soils associated with rocky slopes</li> <li>• Dry grasslands or scrublands on chalk or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low nutrient runoff from surrounding land</li> <li>• Maintenance of grazing</li> <li>• Controlled off-track recreational activity (i.e. trampling)</li> <li>• Minimal air pollution (nitrogen deposition may cause reduction in diversity, sulphur deposition can cause acidification)</li> <li>• Absence of direct fertilisation</li> <li>• Well-drained soils</li> </ul>	<p>None</p>	<p>Potential effects from the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) development on urbanisation, recreational disturbance and air pollution were assessed and the JCS HRA concludes that it has been possible to determine that significant urbanisation, recreation and air quality effects on the East Hampshire Hangers SAC as a result of Joint Core Strategy development are unlikely.</p>	<p>Not specifically arising from the SPD.</p> <p>In combination effects have been subject to appropriate assessment as part of the HRA for the adopted East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy</p>

Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
<p>limestone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yew-dominated woodland</li> </ul> <p>The site contains the Habitats Directive Annex II species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early gentian <i>Gentianella anglica</i>,</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Shortheath Common SAC</b></p> <p>The site contains the Habitats Directive Annex I habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very wet mires often identified by an unstable 'quaking' surface: this habitat forms the focal point of the SAC.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Careful management of water levels;</li> <li>• Good air quality;</li> <li>• Careful management of recreational activity.</li> </ul>	None	Potential effects from the Joint Core Strategy development on urbanisation, recreational disturbance, air pollution and water quality were assessed and the JCS HRA concludes that significant effects on Shortheath Common SAC as a result of Joint Core Strategy development are inherently unlikely, other	<p>Not specifically arising from the SPD.</p> <p>In combination effects have been subject to appropriate assessment as part of the HRA for the adopted East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy</p>

Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dry heaths</li> <li>• Bog woodland</li> </ul>			<p>than recreational and air quality effects arising from Whitehill &amp; Bordon and these will be rendered unlikely through the implementation of the recommendations generated by the Whitehill &amp; Bordon HRA.</p>	
<p><b>Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA and Woolmer Forest SAC</b></p> <p>Wealden Heaths Phase 2 qualifies as a SPA for its breeding bird species. The site contains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.3% of the British breeding population of nightjar</li> <li>• 2.5% of the British breeding population of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate management</li> <li>• Management of disturbance during breeding season</li> <li>• Minimal air pollution</li> <li>• Absence or control of urbanisation effects, such as fires and introduction of invasive non-native Species</li> </ul>	None	<p>Potential effects from the Joint Core Strategy development on urbanisation, recreational disturbance, air pollution and water quality were assessed and appropriate mitigation provided in the JCS.</p>	<p>Not specifically arising from the SPD.</p> <p>In combination effects have been subject to appropriate assessment as part of the HRA for the adopted East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy</p>

Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
<p>woodlark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1% of the British breeding population of Dartford warbler</li> </ul> <p>The SAC interest features of Woolmer Forest are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acid peat-stained lakes and ponds</li> <li>• Dry heaths</li> <li>• Depressions on peat substrates</li> <li>• Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath</li> <li>• Very wet mires often identified by an unstable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance of appropriate water levels</li> <li>• Maintenance of water quality</li> </ul>			

Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
'quaking' surface				
<p><b>Butser Hill SAC</b></p> <p>The site contains the Habitats Directive Annex I habitats of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dry grasslands and scrublands on chalk or limestone: the richest terricolous lichen flora of any chalk grassland site in England.</li> <li>• Yew-dominated woodland</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance of grazing</li> <li>• Minimal air pollution – nitrogen deposition may cause reduction in diversity, sulphur deposition can cause acidification</li> <li>• Absence of direct fertilisation</li> <li>• Well-drained soils Controlled recreational pressure</li> <li>• No spray-drift (i.e. eutrophication) from surrounding intensive arable land.</li> </ul>	None	Potential effects from the Joint Core Strategy development on recreational pressure and air quality were assessed and appropriate mitigation provided in the JCS.	<p>Not specifically arising from the SPD.</p> <p>In combination effects have been subject to appropriate assessment as part of the HRA for the adopted East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy</p>
<b>Thursley, Hankley &amp; Frensham Commons</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance of grazing and other traditional</li> </ul>	None	Potential effects from the Joint Core Strategy	Not specifically arising from the SPD.



Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
<p><b>(Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA, Thursley, Ash, Pirbright &amp; Chobham SAC and Thursley &amp; Ockley Bogs Ramsar site</b></p> <p>Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons SPA is designated for its breeding bird populations, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0.6% of the British breeding population of nightjar <i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i></li> <li>• 1.8% of the British breeding population of woodlark <i>Lullula arborea</i></li> <li>• 1.3% of the British breeding population of Dartford warbler <i>Sylvia</i></li> </ul>	<p>management practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Un-fragmented habitat</li> <li>• Minimal recreational pressure and a low incidence of wildfires;</li> <li>• Maintenance of water levels.</li> </ul>		<p>development on urbanisation, recreational disturbance, recreational pressure, water resources and air quality were assessed and appropriate mitigation provided in the JCS.</p>	<p>In combination effects have been subject to appropriate assessment as part of the HRA for the adopted East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy</p>

Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
<p><i>undata</i></p> <p>Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham qualifies as a SAC for its habitats. The site contains the Habitats Directive Annex I habitats of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath</li> <li>• Dry heaths: This site contains a series of large fragments of once-continuous heathland</li> <li>• Depressions on peat substrates</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Solent European Sites</b></p> <p>Solent Maritime qualifies as</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient space between the site and development to allow for managed</li> </ul>	None	Potential effects from the Joint Core Strategy on water quality, water resource and	Not specifically arising from the SPD.

Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
<p>a SAC for both habitats and species. Firstly, the site contains the following Habitats Directive Annex I habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estuaries</li> <li>• Cord-grass swards</li> <li>• Atlantic salt meadows</li> <li>• Subtidal sandbanks</li> <li>• Intertidal mudflats and sandflats</li> <li>• Lagoons (coastal lagoons)</li> <li>• Annual vegetation of drift lines</li> </ul>	<p>retreat of intertidal habitats and avoid coastal squeeze.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No dredging or land-claim of coastal habitats.</li> <li>• Unpolluted water.</li> <li>• Absence of nutrient enrichment.</li> <li>• Absence of non-native species.</li> <li>• Maintenance of freshwater inputs.</li> <li>• Balance of saline and non-saline conditions.</li> <li>• Maintenance of grazing.</li> </ul>		<p>air quality effects are unlikely to occur and that the Council's ongoing commitment to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy will enable adequate strategic mitigation to be delivered for recreational pressure.</p>	<p>In combination effects have been subject to appropriate assessment as part of the HRA for the adopted East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy</p>

Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coastal shingle vegetation outside the reach of waves</li> <li>• Glasswort and other annuals colonising mud and sand</li> <li>• Shifting dunes with marram</li> </ul> <p>Secondly, the site contains the following Habitats Directive Annex II species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desmoulin's Whorl Snail <i>Vertigo moulinsiana</i></li> <li>• Portsmouth Harbour qualifies as a SPA for its passage bird species. The site contains:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient space between the site and development to allow for managed retreat of intertidal habitats and avoid coastal squeeze.</li> <li>• Short grasslands surrounding the site are essential to maintaining interest features as they are now the key foraging resource for Brent goose.</li> </ul>			

Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Dark-bellied Brent Goose</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC</b></p> <p>The Solent and Isle of Wight lagoons qualifies as a SAC for the following Habitats Directive Annex I habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lagoons: for which this is considered to be one of the best areas in the United Kingdom.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salinity is the key water quality parameter for these lagoons. Therefore the relative balance of saltwater to freshwater inputs is critical. At the moment, most of these lagoons are considered to have a salt concentration that is below the desirable level (15 – 40%).</li> <li>• Sufficient space between the site and development to allow for managed retreat of intertidal habitats and avoid coastal squeeze.</li> <li>• No dredging or land-claim of coastal habitats.</li> </ul>	None	Potential effects from the Joint Core Strategy development on water quality and water resources are unlikely to occur.	<p>Not specifically arising from the SPD.</p> <p>In combination effects have been subject to appropriate assessment as part of the HRA for the adopted East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy</p>

Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unpolluted water.</li> <li>• Absence of nutrient enrichment.</li> <li>• Absence of non-native species.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>River Itchen SAC</b></p> <p>The River Itchen qualifies as a SAC for both habitats and species. Firstly, the site contains the Habitats Directive Annex I habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rivers with floating vegetation often dominated by water crowfoot: The Itchen is a classic example of a sub-type 1 chalk river.</li> </ul> <p>Secondly, the SAC also contains the following</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance of flow velocities - low flows interact with nutrient inputs from point sources to produce localised increases in filamentous algae and nutrient-tolerant macrophytes at the expense of <i>Ranunculus</i>.</li> <li>• Low levels of siltation,</li> <li>• Unpolluted water and low nutrient inputs.</li> </ul>	None	Potential effects from the Joint Core Strategy development on water resources are unlikely to occur.	<p>Not specifically arising from the SPD.</p> <p>In combination effects have been subject to appropriate assessment as part of the HRA for the adopted East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy</p>

Site description/Qualifying Features	Key Environmental Conditions to support site integrity	Possible impacts arising from the SPD	Possible impacts from other plans, trends etc.	Is there a significant risk of 'in combination' effects arising from the SPD
<p>Annex II species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Southern damselfly</li> <li>• Bullhead</li> <li>• White-clawed crayfish</li> <li>• Otter</li> <li>• Atlantic salmon</li> <li>• Brook lamprey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance of grazing pressure is essential for Southern damselfly habitat.</li> </ul>			

## **HRA Screening Conclusion**

4.9 On the basis of the above and having regard to the scope of the '*Planning Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy*' SPD and the considerations set out in paragraph 3.5 of this report, the Council considers that this SPD will not have a significant adverse effect on any Natura 2000 sites and that a full appropriate assessment is therefore not required. The SPD will support the delivery of Joint Core Strategy policies which have been subject to a full Habitats Regulations Assessment, including of any in-combination effects with other plans and/or projects. The SPD will provide an effective mechanism for delivering appropriate mitigation, in accordance with the adopted Joint Core Strategy.

## **Date of Determination**

4.10 This determination has been made on **7<sup>th</sup> October 2015**