

ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON A EUROPEAN SITE

CONSERVATION OF SPECIES AND HABITAT REGULATIONS 2010

| <i>PART A: THE PROPOSAL</i> | |
|---|--|
| Type of plan or project: | Development Plan – Core Strategy Publications Document – |
| Application / plan reference no: | NR |
| National grid reference: | Bath & North East Somerset - District wide |
| Application site: | NR |
| Brief description of proposal: | Review of Schedule of significant changes proposed for the Core Strategy following consultation on the draft Core Strategy and the Inspectors preliminary comments and questions |

Introduction

A number of changes have been proposed for the draft Core Strategy. These changes result from issues raised through the preliminary comments and questions from the Inspector (ID/1) appointed to conduct the Core Strategy Examination and also resulting from the response to issues raised during consultation on the Publication version of the Core Strategy (approved under the delegated arrangement agreed by Council on 2 December 2010).

A Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Publications Document was completed in November 2010. This concluded that the different elements of the Core Strategy as amended to address the issues raised within the HRA, and when considered along side the requirements of the Place Making DPD proposed, are not likely to result in significant effects upon any European site within or adjacent to B&NES.

In addition, when the plan was considered as a whole, predicting the effects of the total change proposed through to 2016, it was also concluded that no significant adverse effects are likely. Moreover the requirements for European site protection within the strategy and the policy for green infrastructure suggest that some benefits could be secured.

The majority of changes now proposed to the Publications Document are minor and relate to changes within the supporting text as opposed to policy changes. These changes were examined and reviewed very simply to determine whether they would result in any change to ground conditions that could then impact upon European sites. This process clarified that the majority of changes were of no real consequence in

Habitat Regulations Assessment

terms of actual physical change on the ground, and so would not result in any new or significant impacts to any European site. There is one exception however, this being the addition of a policy requirement within Policy B1 as detailed below. If implemented this would result in development and change of use of an existing green field site or possibly sites and so could have some potential of impacting upon European sites. This policy change therefore required further review.

Details of policy change:

The additional requirement within policy B1 to provide an upstream flood storage facility (previously referred to in the supporting text and area of search identified on diagram 5: Bath Spatial Strategy). The details are as follows:

10, d: Implementing an upstream flood storage facility to enable development in vulnerable areas of the Central Area and Western Corridor.

Stage 1 : Screening for likely significant effect

A sequential / systematic approach to screening for likely significant effect was applied to these policy changes using the approach adopted at the Options Stage of the Core Strategy and for the Publications Document. This began with a review of all European sites within a 15km radius of the West of England area in terms of their potential to be affected by the policy change.

This approach seeks to identify those European sites with any potential to be affected by this Core Strategy change and those which can be filtered out from further review.

Broad screening

This broad brush review involved consideration of the location of the European sites within and adjacent to the area of search for the upstream flood storage facility. The findings are listed in Appendix 1. The review filtered out all but one of the European sites. The Bath and Bradford on Avon SAC was identified as being potentially at risk from impacts associated with the provision of an upstream flood storage facility.

Sites identified for detailed screening

Bath & Bradford-on-Avon Bats SAC

Detailed screening

Potential Issues

- Land take and land use change from grazing land to water storage facility within 4km bat sustenance zone
- Reduced viability and potential loss of existing agricultural land use within 4km bat sustenance zone

Potential Effects

- reduction of habitat quality and function close to some sites (including function as foraging grounds or access ways)
- habitat loss close to some sites
- habitat fragmentation

Habitat Regulations Assessment

| PART B: THE EUROPEAN SITES AFFECTED: | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Site names: | Bath & Bradford on Avon Bat SAC |
| | |

Conservation objectives and special interest features:

| <i>European Site</i> | <i>Conservation Objectives</i> | <i>Interest Features</i> |
|--|--|--|
| Bath & Bradford on Avon Bat SAC | <p><i>to maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the population of:</i></p> <p>1) Greater Horseshoe Bat (<i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i>) (all component SSSIs)</p> <p>2) Lesser Horseshoe Bat (<i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i>) (all component SSSIs)</p> <p>3) Bechstein's Bat (<i>Myotis bechsteinii</i>) (Box Mine SSSI)</p> | <p>**Greater horseshoe bat (GHB) <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> - This site in southern England includes the hibernation sites associated with 15% of the UK Greater Horseshoe bat population and is selected on the basis of the importance of this exceptionally large over-wintering population. The Combe Down and Bathampton Down SAC component has both a hibernation and maternity roost function for greater horsehoes.</p> <p>*Lesser horseshoe bat <i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i> - The Bath & Bradford on Avon SAC site comprises an extensive network of caves, mines and manmade tunnels which are used by bats for hibernation, mating and as a staging post prior to dispersal. The stone mines have been identified as a hibernation site for Lesser horseshoe bats.</p> <p>**Bechstein's bat <i>Myotis bechsteinii</i> - Small numbers of Bechstein's bats have been recorded hibernating in abandoned mines in this area, though maternity sites remain unknown.</p> |

Is the proposal directly connected with or necessary to the management of the European sites for nature conservation?
 No

PART C: ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY EFFECTS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

Scope of potential effects

a) Effects of proposed Publications Document changes

| Policy | European sites potentially affected | Range of potential impacts | Potential occurrence and mechanism of impact | Likely significant effect | Response |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Provision of an upstream storage facility (east & south east Bath).</p> | <p>Bath & Bradford on Avon SAC</p> | <p>Loss & damage to roost sites Disturbance to bats Loss & damage of foraging habitats Loss & damage of flight-lines</p> | <p>This policy requires the provision of an upstream flood storage facility to the east or south east of Bath. The precise location is not identified, but an area of search adjacent to the river Avon at Batheaston and beyond is identified in diagram 5.</p> <p>At its closest this area of search is just 0.5km from the 4km bat sustenance zone associated with the Bath & Bradford on Avon SAC, and in parts impinges on areas considered to be important for Horseshoe bat foraging and commuting.</p> <p>A poorly located and designed flood storage facility could therefore impact negatively upon foraging grounds and flightlines of importance to the SAC. However, it would be possible to select a site and scheme design which safeguarded bat foraging</p> | <p>Low -and can be prevented by requirements within the Place Making DPD notably:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of the flood storage facility should avoid highly valued bat foraging habitat within 4km of the SAC roosts. • No net loss of significant hedgerows and permanent pastures. • Enhancement and creation of semi-natural habitat. | <p>Secure these site requirements within the Placemaking DPD.</p> |

Habitat Regulations Assessment

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>and flightline conditions.</p> <p>Site specific development, such as the location of the flood storage facility are to be guided by a Place Making DPD which will clarify the measures required to protect European Sites and species. This will be informed by a technical assessment of potential options and public consultation.</p> <p>Therefore, assuming normal detailed planning controls, it is considered unlikely that a significant negative effect upon the European Site will result from this proposed change.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

b) Possible in-combination effects

No in combination effects are considered likely

Habitat Regulations Assessment

Discussion and assessment of Likely Effects and their significance

The majority of changes proposed for the Core Strategy would not impact upon any European site. If the location of the flood storage facility is selected sensitively to avoid highly valued bat habitat, as required by existing planning legislation, and which will be a requirement of the Placemaking DPD, then it is considered that the Core Strategy change proposed would not have any significant effects upon any European site. This will require specific site development requirements for the flood storage facility within the Placemaking DPD (as detailed within part C above).

Is the potential scale or magnitude of any effect likely to be significant:

- a) Alone ? No
- b) In combination with other plans or projects? No

PART D: COUNCIL'S CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion:

Is the proposal likely to have a significant effect on a European site? No

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Name of assessing officer: | Kären Renshaw | Job Title: | Ecologist |
| Signed: | <i>Kären Renshaw</i> | Date: 19.09.11 | |
| Name of Supervising Officer | Mark Minkley | Job Title: | Team Leader – Environment Team |
| Signed | <i>Mark Minkley</i> | Date: 19.09.11 | |

Habitat Regulations Assessment

PART E: CONSULTATION WITH NATURAL ENGLAND

Natural England's comment on conclusion:

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|---|
| Name of Natural England Officer: | Alison Howell | Job Title: | Lead Advisor, Sustainable Land Use Team |
| Signed: | <i>Alison Howell</i> | Date: 20.09.11 | |

***IF THE PROPOSAL IS LIKELY TO HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT AN
APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT WILL BE REQUIRED***

Habitat Regulations Assessment: Appendix 1

Appendix 1: Habitats Regulations - Broad Scoping of policy B1 change.

| NATURA 2000 SITE NAME | QUALIFYING FEATURES | CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES SUMMARY | Vulnerabilities | Scope for effects to occur | Reasons/Comments |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC | <p>Annex I Habitats that are a primary reason for selection: <i>Tilio-Acerion</i> forests of slopes, screes and ravines</p> <p>Annex I Habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <p>Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>)</p> | CO's are by SSSI. COs relevant to the SAC: To maintain, in favourable condition, the <i>Tilio-Acerion</i> forests of slopes, screes and ravines; Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates. | Air quality - this site suffers from traffic generated road pollution. APIS report suggest site already exceeds the critical load for woodlands. Any increase in traffic generation could have an effect on this site. Habitat damage & disturbance from increased recreational pressures. | Not likely | Possible air pollution issue if Core Strategy generates traffic movements along the Portway. Development of an upstream flood storage capacity east and south east of Bath will not impact upon this SAC. |
| Bath & Bradford-on-Avon Bats SAC | <p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of the site: <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> (Greater horseshoe bat)</p> <p><i>Myotis bechsteinii</i> (Bechstein's bat)</p> <p>Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <p><i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i> (Lesser horseshoe bat)</p> | CO's are by SSSI. COs relevant to the SAC: To maintain, in favourable condition, habitats for the population of <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> (Greater horseshoe bat), <i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i> (Lesser horseshoe bat) and <i>Myotis bechsteinii</i> (Bechstein's bat). | Potential for loss of foraging areas due to development; increased habitat disturbance & deterioration from urban impacts -noise, light pollution, domestic pets, increased recreational pressures. Horseshoe bats need suitable feeding areas close to their roosts (GHB typically forage 3-5km from roost & generally <1km in Spring & autumn; LHB forage v. close to roosts, in summer 2-3km) but ,will forage 9km+ from roosts at times. Their foraging requires permanent pasture grazed by stock, and a network of hedges and other linear features. Expansion of urban fringe areas could reduce livestock farming and adversely affect foraging habitat. | possible effects from flood storage capacity | Development of an upstream flood storage capacity east and south east of Bath could impact upon key foraging areas, and requires greater scrutiny. |

Habitat Regulations Assessment: Appendix 1

| NATURA 2000 SITE NAME | QUALIFYING FEATURES | CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES SUMMARY | Vulnerabilities | Scope for effects to occur | Reasons/Comments |
|-----------------------|---|--|---|----------------------------|---|
| Chew Valley SPA | Internationally important bird assemblage. This site qualifies under Article 4.2 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) by supporting populations of European importance of the following migratory species: Over winter: <i>Anas clypeata</i> (Shoveler) | No significant decrease in relation to water reference level. No significant displacement of birds attributable to human disturbance. No significant reduction in presence and abundance of food species including aquatic plants and aquatic invertebrates. | The lake is the main source of drinking water for the District with the exception of Bath, and is also a key recreational site (trout fishing, sailing and walking). The site is owned and managed by Bristol Water Plc, who implement a nature conservation strategy for the site, including a zoning scheme for the lake to safeguard wildlife. Potential for increase in visitors to the site and increased pressure on the quiet refuge area, and increases in water consumption. Shoveler numbers, and those of the other ducks, tend to be higher in years when there is significant late summer drawdown of water at Chew Valley Lake. The Draft Bristol Water Plan takes account of forecast growth to plan water supply for the next 25 years. | Not likely | Development of an upstream flood storage capacity east of Bath will not impact upon water levels or other issues at Chew Valley Lake. If designed to promote wildlife and facilitate public access through well planned Green Infrastructure development this could offset some visitor pressure on Chew Valley Lake. |
| Mells Valley SAC | <p>Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <p>Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>) Caves not open to the public</p> <p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of the site: <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> (Greater horseshoe bat)</p> | CO's are by SSSI. COs relevant to the SAC: To maintain, in favourable condition, the Caves not open to the public and Semi-natural dry grasslands. And, to maintain, in favourable condition, habitats for the population of <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> (Greater horseshoe bat). | Potential for loss of foraging areas due to development; increased habitat disturbance & deterioration from urban impacts -noise, light pollution, domestic pets, increased recreational pressures. Greater Horseshoe bats need suitable feeding areas close to their roosts (GHB typically forage 3-5km from roost & generally <1km in Spring & autumn) but will forage 9km+ from roosts at times. Their foraging requires permanent pasture grazed by stock, and a network of hedges and other linear features. Expansion of urban fringe areas could reduce livestock farming and adversely affect foraging habitat. Grassland & cave habitat vulnerable to increased recreational pressures and grassland vulnerable to increased. Vulnerable to air pollution from increased nitrogen deposition and acidic dust deposition. | Not likely | The compensatory flood storage area of search is at least 20km from this SAC, so loss of green field land and associated habitat features not significant. No effects are considered likely. |

Habitat Regulations Assessment: Appendix 1

| NATURA 2000 SITE NAME | QUALIFYING FEATURES | | Scope for effects to occur | Reasons/Comments | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|------------------|---|
| | CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES SUMMARY | Vulnerabilities | | | |
| Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC | <p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for the selection of the site: Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrub facies on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>)</p> <p>Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site: European dry heaths <i>Tilio-Acerion</i> forests of slopes, screes and ravines</p> <p>Caves not open to the public</p> <p>Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site: <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> (Greater horseshoe bat)</p> | <p>CO's are by SASSY. COs relevant to the SAC: To maintain, in favourable condition, the <i>Tilio-Acerion</i> forests of slopes, screes and ravines; Caves not open to the public; European dry heaths and Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco brometalia</i>). And, to maintain, in favourable condition, habitats for the population of <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> (Greater horseshoe bat). <i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i> (Lesser horseshoe bat) are also included in the COs.</p> | <p>Habitat disturbance and degradation from increased recreational pressure and dog walking, and would be vulnerable to a reduction in live stock farming that sustains the habitat. Vulnerable to air pollution from increased nitrogen deposition and acidic dust deposition.</p> | Not likely | The compensatory flood storage area of search is at least 20km from this SAC. No effects are considered likely. |
| Mendip Woodlands SAC | <p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for the selection of the site: <i>Tilio-Acerion</i> forests of slopes, screes and ravines</p> | <p>CO's are by SASSY. COs relevant to the SAC: To maintain, in favourable condition, the <i>Tilio-Acerion</i> forests of slopes, screes and ravines.</p> | | Not likely | The compensatory flood storage area of search is at least 15km from this SAC. No effects are considered likely. |
| North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC | <p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for the selection of the site: Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrub facies on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>) <i>Tilio-Acerion</i> forests of slopes, screes and ravines</p> <p>Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site: Caves not open to the public</p> <p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of the site: <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> (Greater horseshoe bat)</p> | <p>CO's are by SASSY. COs relevant to the SAC relate to Annex II species: To maintain, in favourable condition, habitats for the population of <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> (Greater horseshoe bat) and <i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i> (Lesser horseshoe bat).</p> | <p>Potential for loss of foraging areas due to development; increased habitat disturbance & deterioration from urban impacts -noise, light pollution, domestic pets, increased recreational pressures. Horseshoe bats need suitable feeding areas close to their roosts (GHB typically forage 3-5km from roost & generally <1km in Spring & autumn; LHB forage v. close to roosts, in summer 2-3km) but ,will forage 9km+ from roosts at times. Their foraging requires permanent pasture grazed by stock, and a network of hedges and other linear features. Expansion of urban fringe areas could reduce livestock farming and adversely affect foraging habitat. Grassland & cave habitat vulnerable to increased recreational pressures and grassland vulnerable to increased. Vulnerable to air pollution from increased nitrogen deposition and acidic dust deposition.</p> | | The compensatory flood storage area of |

Habitat Regulations Assessment: Appendix 1

| | <i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i> (Lesser horseshoe bat) | | | Not likely | search is at least 15 km away from this SAC.No effects are considered likely. |
|---------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|
| NATURA 2000 SITE NAME | QUALIFYING FEATURES | CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES SUMMARY | Vulnerabilities | Scope for effects to occur | Reasons/Comments |
| River Usk / Afon Wysg SAC | <p>Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <p>Water courses of plain to montane levels with the <i>Ranunculion fluitantis</i> and <i>Callitriche-Batrachion</i> vegetation</p> <p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of the site:</p> <p><i>Petromyzon marinus</i> (Sea lamprey) <i>Lampetra planeri</i> (Brook lamprey) <i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i> (River lamprey) <i>Alosa fallax</i> (Twait shad) <i>Salmo salar</i> (Atlantic salmon) <i>Cottus gobio</i> (Bullhead) <i>Lutra lutra</i> (Otter)</p> <p>Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <p><i>Alosa alosa</i> (Allis shad) <i>Lampetra planeri</i> (Brook lamprey) <i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i> (River lamprey) <i>Alosa fallax</i> (Twait shad) <i>Salmo salar</i> (Atlantic salmon) <i>Cottus gobio</i> (Bullhead) <i>Lutra lutra</i> (Otter)</p> <p>Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> | | Vulnerable to riparian habitat degradation from increased recreational pressures, reduced farming viability, and vulnerable to increased water abstraction. | no | Significant distance from B&NES - no direct or indirect effects anticipated |

Habitat Regulations Assessment: Appendix 1

| NATURA 2000 SITE NAME | QUALIFYING FEATURES | | Scope for effects to occur | Reasons/Comments | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|------------------|--|
| | CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES SUMMARY | Vulnerabilities | | | |
| River Wye / Afon Gwy SAC | <p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for the selection of the site: Water courses of plain to montane levels with the <i>Ranunculus fluitantis</i> and <i>Callitriche-Batrachion</i> vegetation</p> <p>Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site: Transition mires and quaking bogs</p> <p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of the site: <i>Austropotamobius pallipes</i> (White-clawed crayfish (or Atlantic stream) crayfish) <i>Petromyzon marinus</i> (Sea lamprey) <i>Lampetra planeri</i> (Brook lamprey) <i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i> (River lamprey) <i>Alosa fallax</i> (Twaite shad) <i>Salmo salar</i> (Atlantic salmon) <i>Cottus gobio</i> (Bullhead) <i>Lutra lutra</i> (Otter)</p> <p>Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site: <i>Alosa alosa</i> (Allis shad)</p> | <p>CO's are by SASSY. These are dated 2001 and should be used with caution. COs relevant to the SAC: To maintain, in favourable condition, floating formations of water crowfoot (<i>Ranunculus</i>) of plain and sub-mountainous rivers. Also populations of atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>), allis shad (<i>Alosa alosa</i>), twaite shad (<i>Alosa fallax</i>), bullhead (<i>Cottus gobio</i>), brook lamprey (<i>Lampetra planeri</i>), river lamprey (<i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i>), sea lamprey (<i>Petromyzon marinus</i>), white-clawed crayfish (<i>Austropotamobius pallipes</i>). Also the river adjoining land as habitat for populations of otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>). Also contact CCW.</p> | <p>Vulnerable to increased water abstraction and recreational pressures.</p> | no | <p>Significant distance from B&NES - no indirect effects anticipated</p> |

Habitat Regulations Assessment: Appendix 1

| NATURA 2000 SITE NAME | QUALIFYING FEATURES | CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES SUMMARY | Vulnerabilities | Scope for effects to occur | Reasons/Comments |
|--|--|--|--|----------------------------|------------------|
| <p>Severn Estuary cSAC, SPA and Ramsar</p> | <p>cSAC Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for the selection of the site: Estuaries Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide Atlantic salt meadows Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site: Sandbanks slightly covered by sea water all the time Reefs Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of the site: <i>Petromyzon marinus</i> (Sea lamprey) <i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i> (River lamprey) <i>Alosa fallax</i> (Twaite shad) SPA This site qualifies under Article 4.1 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) by supporting populations of European importance of the following species listed on Annex I of the Directive: Over winter: <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i> (Bewick's swan) Internationally important bird assemblage. This site qualifies under Article 4.2 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) by supporting populations of European importance of the following migratory species: On passage: <i>Charadrius hiaticula</i> (Ringed plover) Over winter: <i>Numenius arquata</i> (Curlew) <i>Calidris alpina alpina</i> (Dunlin) <i>Anas acuta</i> (Pintail) <i>Tringa totanus</i> (Redshank) <i>Tadorna tadorna</i> (Shelduck) Ramsar Assemblage qualification: A wetland of international importance.</p> | <p>cSAC & Ramsar: Note CO tables are to be completed in 2009. To maintain, in favourable condition estuaries subtidal sandbanks; intertidal mudflats and sandflats; Atlantic salt meadows; reefs. Also, to maintain in favourable condition, River lamprey (<i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i>), sea lamprey (<i>Petromyzon marinus</i>) and Twaite shad (<i>Alosa fallax</i>).</p> <hr/> <p>SPA & Ramsar: To maintain, in favourable condition, habitats for and the population of Berwick's swan and populations of regularly occurring migratory species including shelduck, dunlin, redshank, European white-fronted goose. And to maintain, in favourable condition habitat for and the assemblage of wintering waterfowl.</p> <hr/> <p>See above (there are no individual COs for the Ramsar designation).</p> | <p>Habitats vulnerable to increased recreational pressures; habitat degradation from domestic & industrial pollution, & development; Habitat loss from Port expansion & other development.</p> | | |

Habitat Regulations Assessment: Appendix 1

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|----|---|
| | <p>The area qualifies under Article 4.2 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) by regularly supporting at least 20,000 waterfowl</p> <p><i>Criterion 1:</i> Presence of <i>Annex I</i> features listed above for cSAC.</p> <p><i>Criterion 3:</i> Unusual estuarine communities.</p> <p><i>Criterion 4:</i> Run of migratory fish between sea and river via estuary.</p> <p><i>Criterion 5/6:</i> Bird assemblages and species of international importance.</p> <p><i>Criterion 8:</i> Diverse fish populations, important feeding, nursery ground and migration route.</p> | | | | no | Significant distance from B&NES - no indirect effects anticipated |
| Wye Valley & Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC | <p>Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of the site:</p> <p><i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> (Greater horseshoe bat)</p> <p><i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i> (Lesser horseshoe bat)</p> | <p>CO's are by SASSY. COs relevant to the SAC: To maintain, in favourable condition, habitats for the population of <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> (Greater horseshoe bat), and <i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i> (Lesser horseshoe bat). Also contact CCW.</p> | <p>Vulnerable to loss of foraging areas and roost disturbance due to increased development pressures; Expansion of urban fringe areas could reduce livestock farming and adversely affect foraging habitat.</p> | | no | Significant distance from B&NES - no indirect effects anticipated |
| Wye Valley Woodlands SAC | <p>Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for the selection of the site:</p> <p><i>Aspergo-fagetum</i> beech forests</p> <p><i>Tilio-acerion</i> forests of slopes, screes and ravines</p> <p><i>Taxus baccata</i> woods</p> <p>Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site:</p> <p><i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i> (Lesser horseshoe bat)</p> | <p>CO's are by SASSY. COs relevant to the SAC: to maintain <i>Tilio-acerion</i> forests of slopes, screes and ravines; <i>Asperulo-Fagetum</i> beech forests and <i>Taxus baccata</i> woods in a favourable condition. And, to maintain in favourable condition habitats for the population of Lesser Horseshoe Bat (<i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i>). Also contact CCW.</p> | <p>main vulnerability lack of and inappropriate management; potential increase in recreational pressures and habitat disturbance</p> | | no | Significant distance from B&NES - no indirect effects anticipated |

Habitat Regulations Assessment: Appendix 1

| NATURA 2000 SITE NAME | QUALIFYING FEATURES | CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES SUMMARY | Vulnerabilities | Scope for effects to occur | Reasons/Comments |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------------|---|
| Somerset Levels & Moors SPA and Ramsar | <p>This site qualifies under Article 4.1 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) by supporting populations of European importance of the following species listed on Annex I of the Directive:</p> <p>Over winter:</p> <p><i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i> (Bewick's swan)</p> <p><i>Pluvialis apricaria</i> (Golden plover)</p> <p>This site also qualifies under Article 4.2 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) by supporting populations of European importance of the following migratory species:</p> <p>Over winter:</p> <p><i>Anas clypeata</i> (Shoveler)</p> <p><i>Anas crecca</i> (Teal)</p> <p><i>Anas penelope</i> (Wigeon)</p> <p>Ramsar</p> <p>Assemblage qualification: A wetland of international importance.</p> <p>The area qualifies under Article 4.2 of the Directive (79/409/EEC) by regularly supporting at least 20,000 waterfowl</p> | CO's have not been requested as part of the West of England Joint Waste Core Strategy HARD. | habitat loss and degradation from increased development, increased recreational pressures and any reduction in sympathetic farming activities; water abstraction; sea level change. | no | Significant distance from B&NES - no indirect effects anticipated |