North Somerset Futures
Local Development Framework

Core Strategy

Habitats Regulations Assessment Report

North Somerset Council

February 2014

Contents

Habitats Regulations Assessment Report

North Somerset Council Core Strategy

February 2014

1. Introduction.

1.1 This report documents the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) work which has been carried out on the North Somerset Core Strategy, which forms part of the North Somerset Local Development Framework. The relevant regulations are the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, which relate to Articles 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive.

1.2 Screening work has been undertaken. It considers whether policies in the Core Strategy are likely to have significant effects on the integrity of European Sites having regard to their conservation objectives. Screening determines whether an Appropriate Assessment is necessary, under section 102 of the above regulations.

1.3 “European sites” are Natura 2000 sites. They include Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Ramsar sites, under the EC Birds and Habitats Directives.

1.4 Consistent with the regulations, the screening exercise has taken account of whether significant effects are likely from the Core Strategy alone, and also whether in-combination effects are likely (taking account of other plans and projects in combination with the Core Strategy).

2. North Somerset Core Strategy

2.1 The Core Strategy is part of the emerging North Somerset Local Development Framework and sets out strategic planning policies for the district up to 2026. It is a strategic, not a detailed document. The HRA has been at an appropriate level of detail for this high level document. More detailed Development Plan Documents (DPDs) are being produced and are likely to need to be subject to separate HRA.

2.2 A Consultation Draft version of the Core Strategy was subject to public consultation in November 2009. A Publication version was produced for public consultation (regarding issues of soundness only) in February 2011. Screening was carried out at both stages. Modifications to the plan were proposed in January 2012, and an assessment was made as to whether they would have likely significant effects (LSEs) on European sites. No LSEs were predicted, subject to appropriate mitigation, at any of these stages. The Core Strategy was adopted in April 2012. However, following a legal challenge to the Core Strategy and the remitting of policies to the Planning Inspectorate for re-examination, the Council recommended increasing the district housing requirement in Policy CS13. This was advertised for consultation in November 2013 for seven weeks. The Council has updated the HRA by

considering whether those changes would be likely to have LSEs, and has concluded that, subject to appropriate mitigation, they would not. More details on this are provided in the paragraphs below.

2.3 The Consultation Draft, Publication and adopted versions of the Core Strategy can be seen at the following links: Consultation Draft Plan Publication version Adopted Core Strategy.

2.4 The November 2013 recommended changes to the Core Strategy can be seen as part of the November 2013 Council statement for consultation

2.5 The first column of the HRA matrices in Appendix C below (blue text) summarise the implications of the November 2013 recommended changes (if any) for Core Strategy policies.

3. How has the HRA been carried out?

3.1 The HRA work has been carried out by the Council, (including Planning Policy Officers and the Council's Ecologist), with the help of consultants (Halcrow) who were commissioned to provide expertise on technical matters, notably air quality.

3.2 Natural England officers have been involved throughout, and have attended progress meetings. These meetings agreed the scope of the exercise and the format of the screening matrices to be used. It was agreed that all four European Sites within North Somerset district, (the Severn Estuary SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar, Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC, North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC and Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC) should be considered in the assessment. Details on these European sites are shown in Appendix A, including their qualifying interests and conservation objectives.

3.3 The screening exercise was undertaken using Screening Assessment Matrices covering potential sources of effects, and Air Quality Assessment Matrices covering possible effects on air quality.

3.4 In completing the Screening Assessment matrices, officers initially categorised each Core Strategy policy on whether (without considering any avoidance/mitigation measures) the policy seemed potentially likely to have a significant effect on the relevant European site, alone or in combination etc. (See third column of Screening Assessment matrices in Appendix C). In doing so they used the categories recommended in the Natural England draft guidance on carrying out HRA. Eg. B: No significant effect, C: Likely significant effect alone, etc. That guidance is Revised Draft Guidance:The Habitats Regulations Assessment of Local Development Documents, (David Tyldesley and Associates for Natural England, January 2009.)

3.5 Potential possible impacts were considered, and following consideration of these, and potential avoidance/mitigation measures, the policies were then reassessed and re categorised where appropriate, assuming that avoidance/mitigation measures would be carried out. (See penultimate column of Screening Assessment matrices in Appendix C). Consideration was also given (in the final column of the matrices) to whether further HRA might be required, notably at the project level (planning application stage).

3.6 A list of policies which might have potential effects regarding air quality was identified, for closer investigation. Halcrow produced detailed Air Quality Assessment matrices in respect of all those policies. (See Appendix D. The methodology is set out at the end of that appendix). The Air Quality assessment matrices were then used to help complete the impacts section of the Screening Assessment matrices, cross referring where appropriate.

3.7 Also, since it was considered that there might be potential for in-combination effects relating to air quality (from emissions from road traffic and point sources such as energy from waste plants), Halcrow carried out further work on this. They considered whether there would be such in-combination effects, looking at the Core Strategy alongside other projects and plans. That assessment is in table 15 on page 66 of Appendix D.

3.8 This high level assessment of the Consultation Draft Core Strategy found that, with avoidance/mitigation measures, no significant effects were predicted on European sites either alone or in combination. The level of housing development proposed in the Consultation Draft Core Strategy was approximately 17,750 dwellings, 2006-2026.

3.9 This assessment was sent to Natural England, for comment, in September 2010. Natural England replied in a letter of 27 October 2010, stating that they were “in general agreement” with the assessment’s findings. However they noted that the HRA related to the Consultation Draft version and advised that the HRA should be updated in due course so that it relates to the Publication version of the document.

3.10 Accordingly, following production of the Publication version of the Core Strategy, the Council updated the HRA. A table was produced identifying the main changes to policies made between the Consultation Draft and Publication stages, and their implications; (See Appendix B). The main changes were a reduction in the levels of development to be accommodated in the district (notably a new housing requirement of a minimum of 13,400 dwellings for 2006-2026 relating to a locally derived housing requirement rather than the South West Regional Spatial Strategy). The Publication version policies were assessed using the Screening Assessment matrices. Rows (in red type) were inserted in those matrices as part of that process, relating to the Publication version. (For each policy, they sit beneath the black text rows relating to the Consultation Draft document, in Appendix C.)

3.11 Screening assessment of the Publication version found that no likely significant effects (LSEs) would result from the changes it introduced.

3.12 In updating the HRA to take account of the Publication version, the Council responded to points made by Natural England. We amended the Screening Assessment matrices to indicate what mechanisms may underpin delivery of certain avoidance/mitigation measures. We also added specific reference to such measures in the Core Strategy itself, stressing the importance of their delivery, in paragraph 1.10.

3.13 Our subsequent assessment of the January 2012 proposed modifications to the Core Strategy similarly found no LSEs on European sites. That part of the HRA can be seen at HRA of Jan 2012 proposed mods to Core Strategy

The main modification to the plan regarding housing numbers was a slight increase in housing requirement from a minimum of 13,400 to 14,000 to correct an error in the calculation of the housing requirement. (The latter figure was in the subsequently adopted Core Strategy.)

3.14 The most recent updating of the HRA has assessed the November 2013 recommended changes to the Core Strategy, relating to a proposed increase in the housing figure to a minimum of 17,130 dwellings for 2006-2026, reflecting an updated assessment of the housing requirement following the legal challenge. (Note however that this figure is less than the 17,750 dwellings that was in the Consultation Draft plan.) Again this assessment predicted no LSEs on European sites assuming there is appropriate mitigation. This assessment is again documented in the Appendix C matrices by the insertion of rows in blue text, with the implications of the proposed changes for each policy (if any) made clear in the 1st column. (Note that for completeness the added blue text may also provide further information, to help explain how the policies evolved at earlier stages of the plan.)

3.15 This latest updating of the HRA involved further discussions with the Council's Ecologist and with Natural England. It was recognised that time had elapsed between the identification of mitigation measures at earlier stages of HRA, particularly the HRA of the Consultation Draft plan, completed in September 2010, so in response to a request by Natural England, we considered whether those mitigation measures were still relevant, in consultation with the Council's Ecologist. In most cases the measures were considered to still be relevant, (as indicated in blue in the matrix) although in some cases it was felt that, on reflection, some measures mentioned may not be necessary, and a note was added to the matrix to explain why. For example, this was done for policy CS20 (on supporting a successful economy) concerning the Severn Estuary site, regarding the mitigation measure of promotion of non-car modes of transport; (the air quality assessment had predicted no significant air quality–related impacts on Severn Estuary habitats.)

3.16 Discussions with the Ecologist suggest that in some cases factors outside the Core Strategy may be potential causes of impacts on European Sites, factors over which the Core Strategy has little influence. An example is the potential for over-grazing of land in the Mendip Grasslands SAC, affecting the ability of rare plants to thrive. For such impacts appropriate mitigation might include promotion of education of farmers and landowners so that less intensive grazing occurs, and perhaps encouraging them to take up agri-environment schemes.

4. Conclusions from the HRA work

4.1 Screening has found that, at all stages of HRA, with the avoidance/mitigation measures identified in the Appendix C matrices, no likely significant effects (LSEs) on European sites were predicted from the Core Strategy. Similarly, assuming appropriate avoidance/mitigation measures, no LSEs are predicted from the recommended November 2013 changes, which propose a lower number of dwellings than were considered at the Consultation Draft stage.

4.2 As indicated in Appendix C, without avoidance/mitigation measures, the same potential impacts apply as were identified before, such as potential impact of lighting from development on bats regarding the North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC. However with appropriate avoidance/mitigation

measures, no LSEs should result. (Note that the lighting impact on bats issue has been fully considered in the case of the Weston Villages proposal through the Weston Villages SPD which has been subject to its own HRA.)

4.3 Therefore the screening suggests that there is not a need for Appropriate Assessment of the Core Strategy, with regard to the November 2013 recommended changes.

4.4 However this is a high level assessment and there might be instances where project level HRA is required. The Screening Assessment matrices suggest that such detailed HRA may need to be carried out in respect of some individual planning applications. The Council's Ecologist would be involved in determining which applications need HRA. Natural England would be consulted where appropriate.

4.5 This HRA report is a supporting document to the Core Strategy. The HRA process has been undertaken in close liaison with Natural England.

4.6 The importance of protecting European Sites, and of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity in general, is reflected in the Core Strategy itself. Policy CS4 on nature conservation is particularly relevant here, referring to protection and enhancement of important habitats, particularly designated sites. Its supporting text refers to all the European sites in North Somerset and the HRA process.

APPENDIX A

<u>The European Sites considered</u>

<u>Severn Estuary SAC, SPA, Ramsar</u>

Severn Estuary SAC (73715.4 ha) is located between Wales and England in south-west Britain. It is a large estuary with extensive intertidal mud-flats and sand-flats, rocky platforms and islands. Saltmarsh fringes the coast backed by grazing marsh with freshwater ditches and occasional brackish ditches. The seabed is rock and gravel with sub-tidal sandbanks. The estuary's classic funnel shape, unique in the UK, is a factor causing the Severn to have the second highest tidal range in the world (after the Bay of Fundy in Canada).

<u>Qualifying Interests:</u>
Annex I habitats that are a Primary reason for the selection of the site:

1. ***Estuaries*** – Estuaries are defined as the downstream part of a river valley, subject to the tide and extending from the limit of brackish water. There is a gradient of salinity from freshwater in the river to increasingly marine conditions towards open sea.

2. ***Mudflats and Sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide*** – Mudflats form in the most sheltered areas of the coast, usually where large quantities of silt derived from rivers are deposited in estuaries. The sediment is stable and communities are typically dominated by polychaete worms and bivalve molluscs and may support very high densities of the mud-snail *Hydrobia ulvae*. The high biomass of invertebrates in such sediments often provides an important food source for waders and wildfowl, such as common shelduck *Tadorna tadorna*, knot *Calidris canuta* and dunlin *Calidris alpine*.

3. ***Atlantic salt meadows*** develop when halophytic vegetation colonises soft intertidal sediments of mud and sand in areas protected from strong wave action. This vegetation forms the middle and upper reaches of saltmarshes, where tidal inundation still occurs but with decreasing frequency and duration. A wide range of community types is represented and the saltmarshes can cover large areas, especially where there has been little or no enclosure on the landward side. The vegetation varies with climate and the frequency and duration of tidal inundation. Grazing by domestic livestock is particularly significant in determining the structure and species composition of the habitat type and in determining its relative value for plants, for invertebrates and for wintering or breeding waterfowl.

4. ***Reefs*** are rocky marine habitats or biological concretions that rise from the seabed. They are generally subtidal but may extend as an unbroken transition into the intertidal zone, where they are exposed to the air at low tide. Intertidal areas are only included within this *Annex I* type where they are connected to subtidal reefs. Reefs are very variable in form and in the communities that they support. Two main types of reef can be recognised: those where animal and plant communities develop on rock or stable boulders and cobbles, and those where structure is created by the animals themselves (biogenic reefs).

5. ***Sandbanks slightly covered by sea water all the time*** consist of sandy sediments that are permanently covered by shallow sea water. Shallow sandy sediments are typically colonised by a burrowing fauna of worms, crustaceans,

bivalve molluscs and echinoderms. Mobile epifauna occur at the surface of the sandbank.

Annex II species present on the site:
Sea Lamprey (*Petromyzon marinus*), River Lamprey (*Lampetra fluviatilis*) and Twaite Shad (*Alosa fallax)* are *Annex II* species present as a qualifying feature here, but not a primary reason for site selection. However, they still need to be considered when assessing the qualifying interests and conservation objectives of the site.

Conservation Objectives:
The conservation objectives of the Severn Estuary are to keep the above interest features in a favourable condition

Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Special Area of Conservation (SAC) comprises three scattered component SSSIs which are located to the west of the Mendip Hills and extend to the Severn Estuary. Mendip Limestone Grasslands (417.47ha) is primarily designated for the presence of the Annex I habitat, semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*). This site comprises coastal headland and inland hill sections of the Carboniferous Limestone outcrops of the Mendips, and supports the largest area of CG1 *Festuca ovina – Carlina vulgaris* grassland in England, including two sub-types (CG1a *Carex humilis* and CG1c *Trinia glauca* sub-communities) which are known at no other site in the UK.

Qualifying Interests:
Mendip Limestone Grasslands Special Area of Conservation SAC was primarily selected as an SAC for:

1. Its ***semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia)*** for which this is considered to be one of the best areas in the UK. *Festuco-Brometalia* grasslands are found on thin, well-drained, lime-rich soils associated with chalk and limestone. Often maintained by grazing, a large number of rare plants are associated with this habitat, including the *Annex II* species *Gentianella anglica* (early gentian). The invertebrate fauna is also noteworthy and includes rarities such as the Adonis blue *Lysandra bellargus* and silver-spotted skipper *Hesperia comma*.

2. ***European dry heaths*** typically occur on freely-draining, acidic to circumneutral soils with generally low nutrient content. The vegetation is dominated by ericaceous dwarf-shrubs, commonly *Calluna vulgaris* (heather), which often occurs in combination with *Ulex* spp. (gorse), *Vaccinium* spp. (bilberry) or *Erica cinerea* (bell heather). Other dwarf-shrubs are important locally. Nearly all dry heath is semi-natural (derived from woodland through a long history of grazing and burning) and most heathlands are managed for livestock grazing or, in upland areas, grouse moors.

3. ***Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines*** for which this is considered to be one of the best areas in the UK. *Tilio-Acerion* forests are woods of ash *Fraxinus excelsior*, wych elm *Ulmus glabra* and lime (mainly small-leaved lime *Tilia cordata* but more rarely large-leaved lime *T.platyphyllos*). Introduced sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* is often present and is a common part of the community in mainland Europe, where it is native.

4. ***Natural caves that are not routinely exploited for tourism,*** and which host specialist or endemic cave-dwelling species (cavernicoles) or support important populations of *Annex II* species. Cavernicoles in the UK include bacteria, algae, fungi and various groups of invertebrates (e.g. insects, spiders and crustaceans). Some caves are important hibernation sites for bat species, including all four *Annex II* species found in the UK.

Annex II Species present on the site:
Greater Horseshoe Bat (*Rhinolophus ferrumequinum)* are *Annex II* species present as a qualifying feature here, but not a primary reason for site selection. However they still need to be considered when assessing the qualifying interests and conservation objectives of the site.

Conservation Objectives:
The Conservation Objectives for the Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC are focussed on the component SSSIs. Those in/adjoining North Somerset are:

- Brean Down
- Crook Peak to Shute Shelve Hill
- Uphill Cliff

The conservation objectives are to maintain in favourable condition the semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*).

Additional Information:
These sites are all open-access and are heavily used for informal recreation. The balance of habitats is heavily dependant upon adequate grazing, which is not always available. The communing system on which the management of the Crook Peak part of the site depends is breaking down and may cause serious problems in the future.

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC

North Somerset and Mendip Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC) comprises seven component SSSIs located approximately 5km to the north west of the Mendip Hills and immediately south of the Mendip Hills. This SAC (561.19ha) comprises a number of component areas. The Cheddar complex and Wookey Hole areas support a wide range of semi-natural habitats including *Tilio-Acerion* forest and semi-natural dry grasslands, which support a large number of rare plants. Kings and Urchin's Wood has a large block of *Tilio-Acerion* forest which has developed over limestone which out crops in parts of the site and forms a steep scarp to the south-east.

The limestone caves of the Mendips in this area provide a range of hibernation sites for horseshoe bat species. The SAC represents 3% of the UK greater horseshoe bat population, comprising an exceptional range of sites used by the population, including two maternity sites in lowland North Somerset and a variety of cave and mine hibernation sites in the Mendip Hills.

Qualifying Interests:
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC was primarily selected as a SAC for:

1. Its ***semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia)*** for which this is considered to be one of the best

areas in the UK. *Festuco-Brometalia* grasslands are found on thin, well-drained, lime-rich soils associated with chalk and limestone. Often maintained by grazing, a large number of rare plants are associated with this habitat, including the *Annex II* species *Gentianella anglica* (early gentian). The invertebrate fauna is also noteworthy and includes rarities such as the Adonis blue *Lysandra bellargus* and silver-spotted skipper *Hesperia comma*.

2. ***Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines*** for which this is considered to be one of the best areas in the UK. *Tilio-Acerion* forests are woods of ash *Fraxinus excelsior*, wych elm *Ulmus glabra* and lime (mainly small-leaved lime *Tilia cordata* but more rarely large-leaved lime *T.platyphyllos*). Introduced sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* is often present and is a common part of the community in mainland Europe, where it is native.

3. ***Natural caves that are not routinely exploited for tourism***, and which host specialist or endemic cave-dwelling species (cavernicoles) or support important populations of *Annex II* species. Cavernicoles in the UK include bacteria, algae, fungi and various groups of invertebrates (e.g. insects, spiders and crustaceans). Some caves are important hibernation sites for bat species, including all four *Annex II* species found in the UK.

<u>*Annex II* species present on the site:</u>
Lesser Horseshoe Bat (*Rhinolophus hipposideros)* and Greater Horseshoe Bat (*Rhinolophus ferrumequinum)* are *Annex II* species present as a qualifying feature here, but not a primary reason for site selection. They still need to be considered however, when assessing the qualifying interests and conservation objectives of the site.

<u>Conservation Objectives:</u>
The Conservation Objectives for the North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC are focussed on the component SSSIs, which within North Somerset are :

- Banwell Caves
- Banwell Ochre Caves
- Brockley Hall Stables
- Kings Wood and Urchin Wood

The conservation objectives are to maintain in favourable condition the *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum* (Greater Horseshoe Bat), for which this is considered one of the best areas in the UK, and the *Rhinolophus hipposideros* (Lesser Horseshoe Bat).

<u>Additional Information:</u>
There are significant management problems associated with both the grassland and woodland elements of the SAC. Low levels of grazing have led to scrub invasion and the development of secondary woodland. The woodland has been badly managed in the past and requires a considerable amount of restoration.

<u>Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC</u>

Avon Gorge Woodlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is situated to the west of the A4, on the edge of Bristol city. Avon Gorge Woodlands (152.35ha) occurs on the limestone cliffs and screes of a large river gorge. It is important because of the high concentration of small-leaved lime *Tilia cordata*, compared with other sites in the

region, the presence of rare whitebeams *Sorbus* spp., including two unique to the Avon Gorge (S. *bristoliensis* and S. *wilmottiana*), and other uncommon plants, such as green hellebore *Helleborus viridis*. Species-rich transitions to scrub and grasslands are associated with the woodland.

Qualifying Interests:
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC was primarily selected as a SAC for:

1. **Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines.** *Tilio-Acerion* ravine forests are woods of ash *Fraxinus excelsior*, wych elm *Ulmus glabra* and lime (mainly small-leaved lime *Tilia cordata* but more rarely large-leaved lime *T.platyphyllos*). Introduced *sycamore Acer pseudoplatanus* is often present and is a common part of the community in mainland Europe, where it is native.

2. Its **semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia).** Festuco-Brometalia grasslands are found on thin, well-drained, lime-rich soils associated with chalk and limestone. Often maintained by grazing, a large number of rare plants are associated with this habitat, including the Annex II species *Gentianella anglica* (early gentian). The invertebrate fauna is also noteworthy and includes rarities such as the Adonis blue *Lysandra bellargus* and silver-spotted skipper *Hesperia comma*.

Conservation Objectives:
The Conservation Objectives for the Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC are focussed on the component Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), in/adjoining North Somerset:

- Avon Gorge

The conservation objectives are to maintain in favourable condition the *Tilio-Acerion* forests of slopes, screes and ravines and the semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*).

Map of European Sites within North Somerset

APPENDIX B

Table summarising changes made to Core Strategy policies between the Consultation Draft and Publication stages, and their implications

Core Strategy Policy	Main changes to policy made by Publication version of Core Strategy (from 2009 Consultation Draft version)	Implications: Do Likely Significant Effects (LSEs) for European Sites result from the changes?
CS1 Addressing climate change and carbon reduction	Very minor changes to wording, none detrimental, and some positive; eg. addition that green infrastructure would "include not only green spaces but also creation and enhancement of woodland areas". Policy is still positive environmentally (eg. commitment to reducing carbon emissions, etc.)	No LSEs
CS2 Delivering sustainable design and construction	Minor changes not affecting generally positive nature of policy, eg. slight variations in requirements regarding Code for Sustainable Homes requirements. Some improvements environmentally: eg addition of requirement for Sustainable Drainage Systems.	No LSEs
CS3 Environmental impacts and flood risk assessment	None.	No LSEs
CS4 Nature Conservation	Minor changes not affecting positive nature of policy for nature conservation.	No LSEs
CS5 Landscape and Historic Environment	None.	No LSEs
CS6 North Somerset's Green Belt	No significant change: proposal to not change the Green Belt boundaries retained and effectively strengthened.	No LSEs
CS7 Planning for Waste	None.	No LSEs
CS8 Minerals Planning	Minor positive change for environment: reference to local testing of North Somerset's apportionment share for provision of aggregates, including environmental acceptability.	No LSEs
CS9 Green Infrastructure	Minor changes not affecting generally positive nature of policy, and some enhancing it: eg. reference to value of trees and tree planting to	No LSEs

	biodiversity, and of Sustainable Drainage Systems for Green Infrastructure.	
CS10 Transportation and Movement	Minor change, positive: addition of text stating that transport schemes should contribute towards carbon reduction.	No LSEs
CS11 Parking	No significant change, just added reference to promoting town centre attractiveness and vitality	No LSEs
CS12 Achieving high quality design and place-making	No significant change, just added reference to maintaining and enhancing historic built environment, coastal areas, historic rural settlements.	No LSEs
CS13 Scale of new housing	Significant reduction in number of dwellings in North Somerset for which land will be identified 2006-2026, from 17,750 to minimum of 13,400	No LSEs
CS14 Distribution of new housing	No significant change, Weston still to be focus for new residential development, with some in the other towns, and small scale development in Service Villages. Positive elements retained (priority to previously developed land and no conflict with nature conservation).	No LSEs
CS15 Mixed and balanced communities	Very minor change, just reference to supporting greater community cohesion.	No LSEs
CS16 Affordable housing	Very minor change to thresholds for size of developments for which affordable housing will be sought.	No LSEs
CS17 Rural exception sites	Minor change making policy stricter in not allowing exception schemes in locations other than within or adjoining Service Villages and Infill Villages.	No LSEs
CS18 Gypsies, travellers and travelling show people	No significant change, some of detail moved to supporting text.	No LSEs
CS19 Strategic gaps	No change	No LSEs
CS20 Supporting a successful economy	Significant reduction in number of jobs to be provided in North Somerset, from 29,500 to 10,100 2006-2026, reflecting introduction of reduced (locally derived) housing requirement. Supporting text shows indicative employment land allocations (B1,B2 and B8 allocations) to be as in adopted Replacement Local Plan, except for about 38ha at the Weston Villages (a reduction from the 61 ha that was proposed in that broad location in the Consultation Draft Core Strategy, for the Weston Urban Extension).	No LSEs
CS21 Delivering a prosperous economy	Minor change requiring all proposals for town centre uses outside existing centres to meet sequential test etc, rather than those above a size threshold.	No LSEs
CS22 Tourism	No significant change. Addition to statement on	No LSEs.

Strategy	improving the range and quality of tourist accommodation, including hotels, giving priority to locations within Weston's seafront area. However Screening Assessment matrices already include mitigation measures regarding potential impacts of increased recreational pressures, for Severn Estuary site	
CS23 Bristol airport	No change	No LSEs
CS24 Royal Portbury Dock	No change	No LSEs
CS25 Children, young people and higher education	No change	No LSEs
CS26 Supporting healthy living and the provision of health care facilities	No significant change. New references to making provision for needs of an ageing population, and to resisting new developments likely to have an adverse impact on the wider community.	No LSEs
CS27 Sport, recreation and community facilities	No change	No LSEs
CS28 Weston super Mare	Reduction in housing provision for Weston, (from about 12,000 dwellings 2006-2026 to 5,850 2010-2026), reflecting introduction of reduced (locally derived) housing requirement.	No LSEs
CS29 Weston super Mare town centre	No significant changes. Major retail development still proposed at retail core, with tourism and entertainment uses at seafront and commercial office development at the Gateway area.	No LSEs
CS30 Weston Villages	Significant reduction in housing provision for this area (formerly referred to as the Weston Urban Extension area) from about 9,000 new dwellings 2006-2026 to 5,500, reflecting introduction of reduced (locally derived) housing requirement.	No LSEs
CS31 Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead	No significant changes. Principles still to support development within settlement boundaries of these towns where they increase self containment, improve availability of jobs and services, and improve town's role as a service centre.	No LSEs
CS32 Service Villages	Some changes but overall potential impact on European sites unlikely to increase. Consultation Draft policy permitted employment development of "appropriate" scale within or adjacent to settlement boundaries of these villages. Publication version tends to restrict residential or employment development to within those boundaries, but where this is not	No LSEs

	possible allows scope for small scale mixed use schemes outside the limits to come forward as allocations.	
CS33 Infill villages, smaller settlements and countryside	Some changes with introduction of Infill Villages, but they are restricted to small scale developments. Overall potential impact on European sites unlikely to increase. Reference to strict control of development outside Service Villages retained.	No LSEs
CS34 Infrastructure Delivery and Development Contributions	Policy condenses the Consultation Draft policies CS34 and CS35 into one. (CS35 is deleted from the Publication version). The resultant policy makes no significant changes to the principles of those policies (that there should be mechanisms and funding for delivery of infrastructure requirements, such as development contributions.)	No LSEs
CS35 Implementation	Policy is deleted in the Publication version.	No LSEs

Appendix C

Screening Assessment Matrices

(Note: For each policy the upper row (black) text relates to the Consultation Draft North Somerset Core Strategy, November 2009, the lower row (red) to the Publication version, February 2011), and the lowest (blue) row to the recommended (November 2013) changes to the Core Strategy.)

Screening Assessment Matrix for Severn Estuary SAC, SPA, Ramsar

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
Living within Environmental Limits										
Policy CS1: Addressing Climate Change and Carbon Reduction	Renewable energy in development ;e.g. Energy from Waste Plant at Weston urban extension, green infrastructure networks, sustainable transport, enhancing and /protecting biodiversity, re-use of previously developed land etc.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Mostly neutral. Some projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process. Air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see HRA Air	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Use of appropriate technology/design (through conditions on planning consents or Environmental Permits from Environment Agency) .	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning applications. Energy from Waste Plants may require an HRA.

[1] Based on the Natural England Habitats Regulations Assessment of Local Development Documents by David Tyldesley, Jan 2009

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
			Quality Appendix D). Only specific reference to energy from waste plant is for Weston urban extension.							There is likely to be scope and flexibility for proposals to include detailed mitigation measures, as necessary.
Policy CS1 of Publication version of Core Strategy	As above	**As above**	As above. Note: Weston Villages now replace Weston Urban Extension	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS1 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The additions that were made at Modifications stage are likely to have environmental benefits : (need for development to demonstrate water efficiency measures,	As above, although on reflection the C classification is arguably pessimistic, given that the only reference to a particular type of renewable energy is waste to energy facilities at Weston Villages. They are unlikely to impact	As above. Note: Weston Villages now replace Weston Urban Extension	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above. The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage would be still relevant to address adverse effects, but as indicated, they are in fact unlikely.	**As above**	As above

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	and promotion of public transport). Policy refers to creation of waste to energy facilities at Weston Villages.	on the Severn Estuary site since the Weston Villages area is 2km away from it, and the Air Quality Assessment suggests that air pollution impacts on this European site are unlikely.								
Policy CS2: Delivering Sustainable Design and Construction.	Sustainable design and construction. Policy sets targets e.g. for on site renewable energy, Code for Sustainable Homes BREEAM ratings, etc	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS2 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS2 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Modifications	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	stage added requirement to apply best practice in sustainable urban drainage systems. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.									
Policy CS3: Environmental Risk Management.	Sets out the Sequential Test for development with regard to flood zones.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS3 Publication Environmental Impacts and Flood Risk Assessment	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS3 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Reference to NPPF rather than PPS25. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS4: Nature Conservation.	Maintain and enhance biodiversity within the district.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS4 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS4 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Documents such as Green Infrastructure Strategy and Biodiversity and Trees SPD are referred to in supporting text . No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.									
Policy CS5: Landscape and the Historic Environment.	Protect and enhance the character, distinctiveness, diversity and quality of North Somerset's landscape and townscape.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS5 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS5 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Reference to heritage assets rather than just assets. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS6: North Somerset's Green Belt	Protect the existing Green Belt.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
CS6 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS6 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. A difference is that it no longer refers to possibility of taking land out of the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances, by local review. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS7: Planning for Waste in North Somerset	Support for sustainable management of waste, recovery of energy from waste in line with Joint Waste Core Strategy policies	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Mostly neutral. Some projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process. Air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see HRA Air Quality Appendix).	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Use of appropriate technology/design (through conditions on planning consents or Environmental Permits from Environment Agency) .	**No significant effect**	Potentially on individual planning applications. Energy from Waste Plants may require an HRA. There is likely to be scope and flexibility for

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
										proposals to include detailed mitigation measures, as necessary.
CS7 Publication Planning for Waste	As above	**As above.**	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS7 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Refers to Sites and Policies DPD rather than "a Development Management DPD".	As above, although on reflection the C classification is arguably pessimistic, given that the supporting text refers to WoE Joint Waste Core Strategy and the fact it identifies land at Warne Road Weston and land on SE side of Weston as potential locations for residual waste treatment facilities. They are unlikely to impact on the Severn Estuary site since the **locations are**	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above. The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage would be still relevant to address adverse effects, but as indicated, they are in fact unlikely.	**As above**	As above

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
		both over 1.6km away from it, and the Air Quality Assessment suggests that air pollution impacts on this European site are unlikely.								
Policy CS8: Minerals Planning in North Somerset	Provision will be made for North Somerset to contribute towards approximately 40% of the West of England's aggregates requirement. The council will seek to maintain a land bank for crushed rock of at least 10 years.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Mostly neutral. Some projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process. Air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see HRA Air Quality Appendix (D))	N/A	Potential impacts of quarrying activity	N/A	N/A	Use of appropriate technology. Strict locational control of quarrying, leaving adequate minimum distance between quarry and European site	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially required on individual planning applications. There is likely to be adequate scope and flexibility for proposals to include detailed mitigation measures, as necessary.
CS8 Publication Minerals Planning	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
Policy CS8 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The addition that was made at Modifications stage to quantify the crushed rock apportionment for North Somerset in tonnes , did not alter the earlier HRA conclusions.	**As above**	As above	N/A	In theory quarrying close to the Severn Estuary site could potentially cause disturbance to birds due to quarrying activity, such as noise from blasting. However this is not likelyto occur , even without mitigation, since most quarrying in North Somerset is for carboniferous limestone, and that currently occurs east of Backwell. The limited limestone areas near the Severn Estuary are largely constrained by factors like wildlife designations (eg LNRs), and settlements.	N/A	N/A	As above . The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant.	**As above**	As above
Policy CS9: Green Infrastructure	Safeguard, improve and enhance the existing network of green infrastructure.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	N/A	N/A	Potential for increased recreational use of beaches and potential disturbance of	N/A	N/A	Consider use of interpretation if necessary.	**B (No significant effect)**	**No**

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
					waders and wildfowl					
CS9 Publication	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS9 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Includes reference to tree planting. Reference to Green Infrastructure SPD in supporting text.	**As above**	As above	N/A	More relevant to say: Potential for increased recreational use of green space overlooking Severn Estuary and possibly of nearby beaches and potential disturbance of waders and wildfowl	N/A	N/A	As above The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant.	**As above**	As above
Policy CS10: Transport and Movement	Encouragement for travel management policies and development proposals that encourage an improved and integrated transport network and allow for wide choice of transport modes. Lists proposed transport schemes over the plan period.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process, However air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see HRA Air Quality Appendix)	N/A	**N/A**	N/A	N/A	Implementation of measures to promote non-car travel modes as promoted in policies such as CS10 and in LTP3.	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially required on individual planning applications.
CS10 PublicationcTransport	As above	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
ation and Movement										
Policy CS10 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Includes addition of requirement for transport schemes to contribute towards carbon reduction, and support movement of freight by rail, which should have beneficial environmental effects. List of transport schemes is the same except for addition of Airfield Bridge Link (ABL) between Weston Airfield and Winterstoke Rd, and Weston Southern Rail Chord (WSRC). ABL is a more direct road link so should help reduce distance travelled and hence emissions. WSRC should help promote train rather than car transport which should have environmental benefits.	As above	As above	N/A	**N/A**	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS11: Parking	Provision of adequate car parking to meet the	**B**	Projects will need to be	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Implementation of measures to	**B (No**	Potentially

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	needs of anticipated users.	**(No significant effect)**	individually assessed as part of the planning process. However, air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see HRA Air Quality Appendix).					promote non-car travel modes as promoted in policies such as CS10 and in LTP3.	**significant effect)**	required on individual planning applications.
CS11 Publication	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	As above
Policy CS11 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Only difference is that policy refers to Sites and Policies DPD rather than Development Management DPD.	As above	As above	N/A	The policy is seeking adequate provision of parking and does not influence its locations, so no LSEs ar e predicted. However it is worth noting that location of car parks may influence the degree to which parts of the Severn Estuary site are affected by disturbance, particularly disturbance to	N/A	N/A	N/A. The suggested mitigation (black text) at Consultation Draft stage may overstating things, as Halcrow's work suggests air pollution impacts are unlikely to b significant for Severn Estuary habitats. While not addressing an identified LSE of	**As above**	As above

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[1]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to wildlife	Land take from European site	Other			
					birds from dogs, if dog walkers allow them to run unrestrained on intertidal sand and mud flats important to the European site.			this policy, it may be beneficial to promote management of location of car parks, especially free car parks, to try to minimise potential for disturbance. Eg. Where car parks have to be located near areas of intertidal mud and sand flats important to the European site, promote use of interpretation boards requesting dogs on leads, and explaining why that is appropriate .		
Delivering Strong and Inclusive Communities										
Policy CS12: Achieving High Quality Design and	High quality architecture and urban design will be expected from all developments.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
Place Making										
CS12 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS12 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. While some paragraphs differ, the thrust of the policy is on promoting well designed building and places, and there is still reference to environmental sustainability. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS13: Scale of New Housing.	Provision of 17,750 dwellings across the district over the plan period. 3000 dwellings in Weston-super-Mare urban area and 9,000 dwellings as an urban extension to Weston-super-Mare. The remainder of 5,750 dwellings will be met by land from existing identified sources and no additional allocation	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process. Air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see HRA Air Quality	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which concluded that despite the amount of	Disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl in the Severn Estuary, due to increased noise and light and increased recreational pressures for new development in Weston-super-Mare.	N/A	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Require best practice construction techniques at	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[1]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA requir ed?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to wildlife	Land take from European site	Other			
	will be required in the plan period.		Appendix)	development proposed in North Somerset it won't result in a likely significant effect on water abstraction. Further Specialist advice was provided by the Environment Agency which confirmed this.				sites close to the Estuary to ensure minimal disruption. Ensure (through planning conditions etc) that key construction activities which cause significant vibration and noise, such as piling, is undertaken between April and August to avoid disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl, if site is within 300 m (guideline only) of wading bird foraging zones. Consider use of interpretation if necessary. A site-wide lighting strategy,		

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
								may be required		
CS13 Publication	Provision of minimum of 13,400 dwellings across the district over the plan period. 3,300 net additional dwellings in Weston-super-Mare urban area and 5,500 dwellings at Weston villages. Outside Weston most additional development to occur in towns on existing site allocations, or new development in their settlement boundaries, or Nailsea through site allocations outside Green Belt	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS13 as at November 2013.	Proposed change in housing number from the minimum of 14,000 in adopted plan (the figure introduced at Modifications stage) to minimum of 17,130 dwellings within North Somerset 2006 -2026 . (Note: while this is an increase, the 17,130 is less than the 17,750 dwellings at the Consultation Draft stage. The main issue regarding the Severn Estuary site is the same	As above	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on water issues after this table.)	As above	As above	As above	As above. The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant.	**As above**	As above

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	(possible disturbance of birds) and the same mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage (in black text above) is still relevant.									
Policy CS14: Distribution of New Housing	New housing development will be concentrated in Weston-super-Mare. At Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea residential development will be acceptable within their existing settlement boundaries on brownfield land. Within the Service Villages small scale infill development may be appropriate where it will support the retention of existing services. Elsewhere housing development will not be permitted unless it is for essential workers in rural enterprises, replacement dwellings or affordable housing need.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process. Air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see HRA Air Quality Appendix)	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which concluded that despite the amount of development proposed in North Somerset it won't result in a likely significant effect on water abstraction. Further Specialist advice was provided by the Environment Agency which confirmed this.	Disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl in the Severn Estuary, due to increased noise and light and increased recreational pressures for new development in Weston-super-Mare.	N/A	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Require best practice construction techniques at sites close to the Estuary to ensure minimal disruption. Ensure (through planning conditions etc) that key construction activities which cause significant vibration and noise, such as piling, is	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
								undertaken between April and August to avoid disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl, if site is within 300 m (guideline only) of wading bird foraging zones. Consider use of interpretation if necessary).		
CS14 Publication	Weston will be focus of new housing development. Outside Weston most additional development to occur at Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea, on existing allocations, within their existing settlement boundaries, or in Nailsea at allocations outside Green Belt. Priority to previously developed land. Within the Service Villages small scale infill development or site allocations can occur. All new housing to not conflict with nature	**As above**	As above	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	conservation policies									
Policy CS14 as at November 2013.	Proposed policy wording is unchanged from the adopted plan except for the housing figures in the table. Weston will be focus of new housing development. Outside Weston most additional development to occur at Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea, on existing allocations, within their existing settlement boundaries, or in Nailsea at allocations outside Green Belt. Priority to previously developed land. At Service Villages small scale infill development or site allocations can occur. All new housing to not conflict with nature conservation policies. While the proposed distribution of the housing has changed slightly from the Consultation Draft stage, mainly due to a reduction in the amount of housing proposed at Weston Villages, the main issue regarding the	**As above**	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on water issues after this table.)	As above	N/A	N/A	As above. The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant.	**As above**	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	Severn Estuary site is the same (possible disturbance of birds) and the mitigation is still relevant.									
Policy CS15: Mixed and Balanced Communities	The Council will seek to ensure a genuine mix of housing types within existing and future communities.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS15 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS15 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS16: Affordable Housing	On-site affordable housing will be sought to meet local needs on all residential developments of 15 dwellings or more (or site of 0.5ha or above). On other sites the Council will seek to negotiate a financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS16 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
Policy CS16 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The addition made at Modifications stage to widen the definition of affordable housing to include affordable rented did not have significant implications for HRA. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS17: Residential Sites Providing Affordable Housing Only	Housing schemes for 100% affordable housing to meet local need within small rural communities will be supported provided it meets certain criteria. Specific sites may also be allocated in W-s-M, Portishead, Nailsea and Clevedon and the service villages for 100% affordable housing to meet an identified local need.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS17 Publication Rural Exceptions Schemes	Housing schemes for 100% affordable housing to meet local need within small rural	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	communities will be supported provided it meets certain criteria.									
Policy CS17 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS18: Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show People	Provision will be made for an additional 36 residential and 10 transit pitches for Gypsies and travellers for the period 2006 – 2011.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS18 Publication	Sets out considerations for determination of locations for sites for Gypsies, travellers and travelling show people	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS18 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version in so far as the criteria are broadly similar. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
Policy CS19: Green Wedges/Strategic Gaps.	The Council will seek to protect green wedges/strategic gaps to help retain the separate identity, character or landscape setting of settlements.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS19 Publication Strategic gaps	As above, but reference to strategic gaps, not green wedges	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS19 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Delivering a Prosperous Economy										
Policy CS20: Supporting a Successful Economy	Employment-led strategy to both deliver significant employment development and to ensure that new residential development is provided in association with employment opportunities. The Core Strategy provides for around 29,500 jobs.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see HRA Air Quality Appendix)	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which concluded that	Disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl in the Severn Estuary, due to increased noise and light and increased population due to amount of new development in Weston-super-Mare.	N/A	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Require best practice	**B (No significant effect)**	Projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process.

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	Supporting text suggests indicative employment requirement for B1-B8 uses would include 61 ha at Weston Urban Extension			despite the amount of development proposed in North Somerset it won't result in a likely significant effect on water abstraction. Further specialist advice was provided by the Environment Agency which confirmed this.				construction techniques at sites close to the Estuary to ensure minimal disruption. Ensure (through planning conditions etc) that key construction activities which cause significant vibration and noise, such as piling, is undertaken between April and August to avoid disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl, if site is within 300 m (guideline only) of wading bird foraging zones.		
CS20 Publication	The Core Strategy seeks to provide for at least 10,100 additional jobs. Supporting text suggests indicative	**As above**	As above	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	As above	As above

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	employment land allocations (B1-B8 uses) to be as in adopted Replacement Local Plan, plus about 38ha at Weston Villages.									
Policy CS20 as at November 2013.	The policy is not proposed to change from the adopted plan version. It states that the Core Strategy seeks to provide for at least 10,100 additional jobs, which is less than at Consultation Draft stage, with consequentially lower employment land implications. The main issue regarding the Severn Estuary site is the same (possible disturbance of birds) and the mitigation is still relevant.	**As above**	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on water issues after this table.)	As above	N/A	N/A	As above. The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant, with the possible exception of the references to promoting sustainable transport modes, since air pollution impacts are unlikely to be significant for the site.	As above	As above
Policy CS21: Retail Hierarchy and Provision.	Identifies retail hierarchy across the district.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS21 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS21 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	N/A	N/A	It is considered that as the policy refers to regeneration of town centre sites,	N/A	N/A	The reference to mitigation under policy CS20 (in blue) is appropriate.	**As above**	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	different to Consultation Draft version.	**(see column 6)**			some of which are on the seafront, this policy too could be judged to have potential impacts, regarding disturbance to birds from noise and light, without mitigation. This point was not recognised in earlier HRA work.					
Policy CS22: Tourism Strategy	Supports visitor facilities and accommodation across the district provided they meet certain criteria.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Projects may need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process.	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which concluded that despite the amount of development proposed in North Somerset it won't result in a likely significant effect on water abstraction. Further	Disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl in the Severn Estuary, due to increased noise and light and increased recreational pressures.	Some leisure developments within the seafront area in Weston-super-Mare may have potential impacts (including land take in some cases) on the Severn Estuary SAC.	The sites that include land take from the Severn Estuary have had Appropriate Assessments undertaken as part of the planning application process.	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Require best practice construction techniques to ensure minimal disruption. Ensure key construction activities which cause significant vibration and	**B (No significant effect)**	Projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process.

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
				specialist advice was provided by the Environment Agency which confirmed this.				noise, such as piling, is undertaken between April and August to avoid disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl, if site is within 300 m (guideline only) of wading bird foraging zones. Consider use of interpretation if necessary.		
CS22 Publication	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	**As above**	**As above**	**As above**	**As above**
Policy CS22 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version The main issue regarding the Severn Estuary site is the same (possible disturbance of birds) and the mitigation is still relevant.	As above	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on water issues after this table.)	As above	As above	**As above**	As above. The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant.	**As above**	**As above**
Policy CS23: Bristol International Airport	Proposals will be required to demonstrate the satisfactory resolution of	**B (No significant effect)**	Air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**B (No significant**	Projects may need to be

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	environmental issues, including the impact of growth on surrounding communities and surface access infrastructure.		HRA Air Quality Appendix)						**effect)**	individually assessed as part of the planning process.
CS23 Publication Bristol Airport	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	As above
Policy CS23 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA. The airport is over 11km from the Severn Estuary (crow fly).	**As above**	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on water issues after this table.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	As above
Policy CS24: Royal Portbury Dock	Identified land will continue to be safeguarded for port uses, subject to demonstrable need for those uses that cannot be accommodated elsewhere within the existing port estate. Further expansion of the port within North Somerset is not supported.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Dock located near to SAC but dock uses not likely to be enough source of NOx air pollution to have a significant effect (see HRA Air Quality Appendix)	N/A	Potential disturbance of wading birds and wildfowl in the Severn Estuary, due to increased noise and light.	N/A	N/A	Require best practice construction techniques to ensure minimal disruption. Ensure (through planning conditions etc) that key construction activities which	**B (No significant effect)**	Projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process. Project-level HRA/EIA

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
								cause significant vibration and noise, such as piling, is undertaken between April and August to avoid disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl, if site is within 300 m (guideline only) of wading bird foraging zones. Use of appropriate technology/design (through conditions on planning consents or Environmental Permits from Environment Agency) .		may be needed for any developments at Royal Portbury Dock.
CS24 Publication	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS24 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally	**As above**	As above	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above. The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is	**As above**	As above

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	different to Consultation Draft version; (only a difference in the name of the site allocations document referred to.) The main issue regarding the Severn Estuary site is the same (possible disturbance of birds) and the mitigation is still relevant.							still relevant.		
Ensuring Safe and Healthy Communities										
Policy CS25: Children, Young People and Higher Education	Provision of educational facilities.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS25 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS25 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS26: Supporting Healthy Living and the	Requires HIA on all large scale developments, Joint working with health	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**B (No significant**	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[1]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to wildlife	Land take from European site	Other			
Provision of Health Care Facilities.	providers to deliver a district wide network of health facilities, reduce health inequalities in the district, encourage development that promotes active lifestyles.								effect)	
CS26 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A
Policy CS26 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A
Policy CS27: Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities.	Provision of sport, recreation and community facilities	B (No significant effect)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	B (No significant effect)	N/A
CS27 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A
Policy CS27 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A
Area Policies										

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
Policy CS28: Weston-super-Mare	W-s-M will be the primary focus for development within North Somerset. The town will accommodate 12,000 new dwellings and 10,000 new jobs between 2006-2026 as part of an employment-led strategy to deliver improved self-containment and reduced out-commuting over the plan period.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see HRA Air Quality Appendix)	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which concluded that despite the amount of development proposed in Weston-super-Mare it won't result in a likely significant effect on water abstraction. Further specialist advice was provided by the Environment Agency which confirmed this.	Disturbance of wading birds and wildfowl in the Severn Estuary, due to increased noise and light and increased recreational pressures.	N/A	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Require best practice construction techniques to ensure minimal disruption. Ensure (through planning conditions etc) that key construction activities which cause significant vibration and noise, such as piling, is undertaken between April and August to avoid disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl, if	**B (No significant effect)**	Projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process.

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[1]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to wildlife	Land take from European site	Other			
								site is within 300m of (guideline only) wading bird foraging zones. Consider use of interpretation if necessary.		
CS28 Publication	W-s-M will be the primary focus for development within North Somerset. The town will accommodate around 5,850 additional new dwellings with approx 10,500 employment opportunities between 2010-2026 as part of an employment-led strategy to deliver improved self-containment and reduced out-commuting over the plan period.	**As above**	As above	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS28 as at November 2013.	The only change being proposed to the adopted plan policy is a change in the number of dwellings to be built in Weston from around 6,913 to 5,136, and a change in the period for that to occur from 2011-	**As above**	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on water issues after this table.)	As above	N/A	N/A	The reference to mitigation under policy CS20 (in blue) is appropriate.	**As above**	As above

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	2026 to 2013-2026. The Consultation Draft plan had referred to a figure of 12,000 dwellings for 2006-2026, but this was reduced in the Publication version due to determination of a locally derived housing requirement. The main issue regarding the Severn Estuary is the same: potential disturbance , without mitigation, for birds; (see 6th column).									
Policy CS29: Weston-super-Mare Town Centre	Town centre regeneration: major retail-led development in retail core; entertainment and leisure uses, tourist facilities and accommodation at seafront; creation of an office quarter within the gateway area	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see HRA Air Quality Appendix)	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which concluded that despite the amount of development proposed in Weston-super-Mare it won't result in a likely significant	Disturbance of wading birds and wildfowl in the Severn Estuary, due to increased noise and light and increased recreational pressures.	N/A	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Require best practice construction techniques to ensure minimal disruption. Ensure (through planning conditions etc)	**B (No significant effect)**	Projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process.

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[1]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to wildlife	Land take from European site	Other			
				effect on water abstraction. Further specialist advice was provided by the Environment Agency which confirmed this.				that key construction activities which cause significant vibration and noise, such as piling, is undertaken between April and August to avoid disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl, if site is within 300m of (guideline only) wading bird foraging zones. Consider use of interpretation if necessary.		
CS29 Publication	As above	**As above**	As above	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS29 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The main issue regarding the Severn Estuary is the	**As above**	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on water issues after this table.)	As above	N/A	N/A	The reference to mitigation under policy CS20 (in blue) is appropriate.	**As above**	As above

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	same: potential disturbance , without mitigation, for birds; (see 6th column).									
Policy CS30: Weston Urban Extension	A major mixed use, employment-led urban extension will be developed south-east of Weston-super-Mare. This will include 9,000 homes, 42ha of employment land along with other necessary community, social and transport infrastructure to support the development.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Air pollution impacts unlikely to be significant (see HRA Air Quality Appendix)	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which concluded that despite the amount of development proposed in Weston-super-Mare it won't result in a likely significant effect on water abstraction. Further specialist advice was provided by the Environment Agency which confirmed this.	Disturbance of wading birds and wildfowl in the Severn Estuary, due to increased noise and light and increased recreational pressures.	N/A	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Require best practice construction techniques to ensure minimal disruption. Ensure (through planning conditions etc) that key construction activities which cause significant vibration and noise, such as piling, is undertaken generally between April	**B (No significant effect)**	Projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process.

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
								and August to avoid disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl, if site is within 300 m (guideline only) of wading bird foraging zones. Consider use of interpretation if necessary.		
CS30 Publication Weston Villages	Employment–led development in two villages on mainly previously developed land at Weston airfield and Locking Parklands (the "Weston Villages"). To include total of 5,500 new homes and at least 37.7ha of B use employment land.	**As above**	As above	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS30 as at November 2013.	The only change being proposed to the adopted plan policy is a slight change in the number of dwellings to be built at Weston Villages from about 5,500 to about 5,800. The Consultation Draft plan had referred	**As above**	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on water issues after this table.)	Some potential for increased recreational pressure and hence disturbance to birds.	N/A	N/A	The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage , regarding possible use of interpretation . is still relevant.	**As above**	As above

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	to a figure of 9,000 dwellings for that area , but this was reduced in the Publication version . Arguably the HRA assessments at both Consultation Draft and Publication stages were unduly pessimistic in predicting disturbance impacts from development without mitigation, since the Weston Villages area is 2km from the Severn Estuary. However there is potential for increased recreational pressure, but also scope for mitigation for that; (see columns 6 and 9).									
Policy CS31: Market and Coastal Towns	Proposals for development at Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead will be supported if they increase self-containment, ensure the availability of jobs and services for the town and surrounding catchments, and improve the town's role as a service centre.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS31 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead										
Policy CS31 as at November 2013.	The only changes being proposed to the adopted plan policy are the following changes in the number of dwellings to be built from 2006-2026 as follows: Clevedon: change from 454 to 493; Nailsea: change from 210 to 647; Portishead: change from 3,051 to 3,040. The policy at Consultation Draft stage did not specify housing numbers, although they were given in the supporting text . The adopted policy permits development within settlement limits at all three towns, and mixed use schemes adjacent to the settlement boundary at Nailsea outside the Green Belt, subject to criteria. It is considered that, without mitigation there may be potential for impacts which were not	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	N/A	N/A	Theoretically, given that the settlement limits of Clevedon and Portishead extend to the seafronts, there could be scope for seafront development with associated potential for disturbance of birds from construction. However much of the development proposed in these towns has already been built or has consent, particularly at Portishead on key sites like the harbourside. However there could be some increased recreation pressure, from development at all three towns and associated potential for	N/A	N/A	Require best practice construction techniques to ensure minimal disruption. Ensure (through planning conditions etc) that key construction activities which cause significant vibration and noise, such as piling, is undertaken generally between April and August to avoid disturbance to wading birds and wildfowl, if site is within 300 m (guideline only) of wading bird foraging zones. Consider use of	**B (No significant effect**	Projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process.

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	identified in the earlier HRA work, but which can be mitigated. (See columns 6 and 9.)				disturbance. .			interpretation if necessary.		
Policy CS32: Service Villages	Proposals for development which support or enhance their roles as local hubs for community facilities and services, employment and affordable housing, including public transport will be supported.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS32 Publication	Support for small scale development within settlement boundaries which supports and enhances village's role as local hub.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS32 as at November 2013.	No changes are proposed to adopted policy. Latter differs from Consultation Draft version in allowing small scale residential or mixed use developments outside settlement boundaries subject to criteria. However reference to small scale and fact that only one of the proposed Service Villages (Easton in Gordano/Pill) is adjacent to the Severn	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	Estuary site suggests that LSEs are unlikely. The Sites and Policies Plan which would make any allocations in Service Villages is likely to be subject to its own HRA.									
Policy CS33: Smaller Settlements and Countryside.	Proposals for development within the rural areas outside of Service Villages will be strictly controlled in order to protect their character and prevent unsustainable development.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS33 Publication Infill Villages, smaller settlements and countryside	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS33 as at November 2013.	No changes are proposed to adopted policy. Latter differs from Consultation Draft version in allowing some market housing within infill villages but restricted to one or two infill dwellings or small scale residential development within the settlement limits, subject to criteria. Reference to small scale and fact that	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[1]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to wildlife**	**Land take from European site**	**Other**			
	only one of the proposed infill villages (Kewstoke) is adjacent to the Severn Estuary site suggests that LSEs are unlikely.									
Delivery Policies										
Policy CS34: Developer Contributions to Infrastructure.	Financial contributions will be sought in the form of a standardised tariff scheme applied across the district to ensure the effective and timely delivery of the key infrastructure requirements to support new development.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS34 Publication Infrastructure delivery and development contributions	Concerns mechanisms for funding and delivery of infrastructural elements, with regard to the Weston villages, Weston urban area and rest of district	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS34 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS35: Implementation	Implementation will take place as part of a co-ordinated strategy, provided in step with the	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Severn Estuary Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[1]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to wildlife	Land take from European site	Other			
	necessary infrastructure, utilities and service provision needed to support and enable the development.									
CS35 is deleted in the Publication version	N/A	**N/A**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS35 is deleted in the adopted plan, and no change is being proposed to that situation	N/A	**N/A**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Screening Assessment Matrix for Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
Living within Environmental Limits										
Policy CS1: Addressing Climate Change and Carbon Reduction	Renewable energy in development ;e.g. Energy from Waste Plant at Weston urban extension, green infrastructure networks, sustainable transport, enhancing/protecting biodiversity, re-use of previously developed land etc.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Mostly neutral. Some projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process. Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site. Only specific reference to energy from waste plant is for Weston urban extension, within that distance of Uphill Cliff.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Use of appropriate technology/design (through conditions on planning consents or Environmental Permits from Environment Agency) .	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning applications. Energy from waste plants may require an HRA. There is likely to be scope and flexibility for proposals to include detailed mitigatio

[2] Based on the Natural England Habitats Regulations Assessment of Local Development Documents by David Tyldesley, Jan 2009

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
										n measures, as necessary.
Policy CS1 of Publication version of Core Strategy	As above	**As above**	As above. Note: Weston Villages now replace Weston Urban Extension	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS1 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Has addition of need for development to demonstrate water efficiency measures. Policy refers to creation of waste to energy facilities at Weston Villages.	**As above**	As above. Note: Weston Villages now replace Weston Urban Extension	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above. The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant,	**As above**	As above
Policy CS2: Delivering Sustainable Design and Construction.	Sustainable design and construction. Policy sets targets e.g. for on site renewable energy, Code for Sustainable homes, BREEAM ratings etc	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
CS2 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS2 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Addition of requirement to apply best practice in sustainable urban drainage systems. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS3: Environmental Risk Management.	Sets out the Sequential Test for development with regard to flood zones.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS3 Publication Environmental Impacts and Flood Risk Assessment	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS3 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Reference	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	to NPPF rather than PPS25. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.									
Policy CS4: Nature Conservation.	Maintain and enhance biodiversity within the district.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Part 5 of policy refers to tree planting. Inappropriate planting could lead to loss of grasslands.	Planting needs to take into account the loss of interest features of European Sites.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS4 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	As above	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS4 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Documents such as Green Infrastructure Strategy and Biodiversity and Trees SPD are referred to in supporting text . No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A . A difference between the Consultation Draft and later versions of the policy is the reference in the latter to "well targeted woodland creation" which should help ensure that inappropriate loss of grasslands to woodland	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
							planting is avoided.			
Policy CS5: Landscape and the Historic Environment.	Protect and enhance the character, distinctiveness, diversity and quality of North Somerset's landscape and townscape.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS5 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS5 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Reference to heritage assets rather than just assets. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS6: North Somerset's Green Belt	Protect the existing Green Belt.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS6 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS6 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	Consultation Draft version. A difference is that it no longer refers to possibility of taking land out of the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances, by local review. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.									
Policy CS7: Planning for Waste in North Somerset	Support for sustainable management of waste, recovery of energy from waste in line with Joint Waste Core Strategy policies	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Mostly neutral. Some projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process. Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site. (See HRA air quality appendix)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Use of appropriate technology/design (through conditions on planning consents or Environmental Permits from Environment Agency) .	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning applications. Energy from Waste Plants may require an HRA. There is likely to be scope and flexibility for proposals to include detailed mitigatio

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
										n measures, as necessary.
CS7 Publication Planning for Waste	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS7 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Refers to Sites and Policies DPD rather than "a Development Management DPD".	**As above.**	As above. The supporting text refers to WoE Joint Waste Core Strategy and the fact it identifies land at Warne Road Weston and land on SE side of Weston as potential locations for residual waste treatment facilities. They are within 10km of the SAC component sites, such as Uphill Cliff.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above. The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant.	**As above**	As above
Policy CS8: Minerals Planning in North Somerset	Provision will be made for North Somerset to contribute towards approximately 40%	**C (likely significant effect alone)**	Mostly neutral. Some projects will need to be individually assessed as	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Use of appropriate technology. Strict locational	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning applicatio

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	of the West of England's aggregates requirement. The council will seek to maintain a land bank for crushed rock of at least 10 years.		part of the planning process. Unlikely to be significant air pollution impacts (see HRA air quality appendix)					control of quarrying, leaving adequate minimum distance between quarry and European site		ns. There is likely to be scope and flexibility for proposals to include detailed mitigation measures, as necessary.
CS8 Publication Minerals Planning	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS8 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The addition that was made at Modifications stage to quantify the crushed rock apportionment for North Somerset in	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	It is considered that this entry should be altered from N/A to "very unlikely". The likelihood of adverse impact from quarrying on this SAC is very limited. (It would only be probable if	N/A	As above . The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant.	**As above**	As above

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	tonnes , did not alter the earlier HRA conclusions.					habitat , such as semi natural dry grasslands, was lost due to direct land take from the SAC itself from quarrying , and being a European site that is extremely unlikely to occur.)				
Policy CS9: Green Infrastructure	Safeguard, improve and enhance the existing network of green infrastructure.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	N/A	N/A	Promoting an accessible green infrastructure network could lead to extra pressure from increased visitor numbers – eg. recreational impacts including trampling (physical damage), erosion, collection/digging, disturbance, fires and litter on Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC.	N/A	N/A	The NSC Green Infrastructure Strategy will identify opportunities for green infrastructure elsewhere such as public open space provision, which is likely to provide alternative locations for recreation . Seek to maintain seasonal wardening presence	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning applications.

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
CS9 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS9 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Includes reference to tree planting. Reference to Green Infrastructure SPD in supporting text.	**As above**	As above	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	It is considered that the following is more flexible and hence more appropriate: Promotion of opportunities for informal recreation elsewhere on less sensitive sites through policies and proposals for provision of green infrastructure and public open space provision; eg. In DPDS, and SPDs.(For example, the Weston Villages SPD proposes provision of extensive green infrastructure at Weston Villages, including a network of green corridors with multifunctional recreational benefits including a strategic	**As above**	As above

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
								cycleway/footpath network, and community parks.) Encourage provision of interpretation boards encouraging restriction of walking to established public footpaths		
Policy CS10: Transport and Movement	Encouragement for travel management policies and development proposals that encourage an improved and integrated transport network and allow for wide choice of transport modes. Lists proposed transport schemes over the plan period.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Transport schemes which would significantly increase traffic on sections of A38 and A371 alongside component sites are potentially significant with respect to airborne nitrogen deposition (see HRA air quality appendix)	N/A	Potentially increased number of visitors.	N/A	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. The NSC Green Infrastructure Strategy will identify opportunities for green infrastructure elsewhere such as public open space provision, which is likely to provide alternative	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning applications.

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
								locations for recreation . Seek to maintain seasonal wardening presence		
CS10 Publication Transportation and Movement	As above	**AS above**	As above	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS10 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Includes addition of requirement for transport schemes to contribute towards carbon reduction, and support movement of freight by rail, which should have beneficial environmental effects. List of transport schemes is the same except for addition of Airfield Bridge Link (ABL) between Weston	As above	As above	N/A	**As above**	N/A	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Regarding potential for increased visitor numbers the mitigation re policy CS9 is appropriate.	**As above**	As above

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	Airfield and Winterstoke Rd, and Weston Southern Rail Chord (WSRC). ABL is a more direct road link so should help reduce distance travelled and hence emissions. WSRC should help promote train rather than car transport which should have environmental benefits.									
Policy CS11: Parking	Provision of adequate car parking to meet the needs of anticipated users.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Any parking measures which could increase traffic on section of A38 and A371 alongside component site are potentially significant with regard to airborne nitrogen deposition (see HRA air quality appendix)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling.	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning applications.
CS11 Publication	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A.	N/A	AS above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS11 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes	As above	As above	N/A	Potentially increased number	N/A	N/A	Encourage and facilitate	**As above**	As above

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Only difference is that policy refers to Sites and Policies DPD rather than Development Management DPD.				of visitors.			sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Regarding potential for increased visitor numbers the mitigation re policy CS9 is appropriate.		
Delivering Strong and Inclusive Communities										
Policy CS12: Achieving High Quality Design and Place Making	High quality architecture and urban design will be expected from all developments.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS12 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS12 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. While some paragraphs differ the thrust of the policy is	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	on promoting well designed buildings and places, and there is still reference to environmental sustainability. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.									
Policy CS13: Scale of New Housing.	Provision of 17,750 dwellings across the district over the plan period. 3000 dwellings in Weston-super-Mare urban area and 9,000 dwellings as an urban extension to Weston-super-Mare. The remainder of 5,750 dwellings will be met by land from existing identified sources and no additional allocation will be required in the plan period.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Weston urban extension located generally over 2km from nearest component site (Uphill Cliff). Traffic emissions unlikely to be significant (see HRA air quality appendix)	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which concluded that despite the amount of development proposed in North Somerset it won't result in a likely significant effect on water abstraction. Further specialist advice was provided by the	Increased population could lead to extra pressure from increased visitor numbers; eg. recreational impacts including trampling (physical damage), erosion, collection/digging, disturbance, fires and litter on Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC.	N/A	N/A	The NSC Green Infrastructure Strategy will identify opportunities for green infrastructure elsewhere such as public open space provision, which is likely to provide alternative locations for recreation. Seek to maintain seasonal wardening presence. Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning applications.

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
				Environment Agency which confirmed this.				public transport, walking and cycling.		
CS13 Publication	Weston will be focus of new housing development . Outside Weston most additional development to occur at Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea, on existing allocations, within their existing settlement boundaries, or in Nailsea at allocations outside Green Belt. Priority to previously developed land. Within the Service villages small scale infill development or site allocations can occur. All new housing to not conflict with nature conservation policies	**As above**	As above, but urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages	As above	As above	As above	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS13 as at November 2013.	Proposed change in housing number from the minimum of 14,000 in adopted plan to minimum of 17,130 dwellings	As above	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on water issues after this table.)	As above	As above	As above	It is considered that the following is more flexible and therefore more appropriate: Promotion of	**As above**	As above

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
	within North Somerset 2006 - 2026 . (Note: while this is an increase, the 17,130 is less than the 17,750 dwellings at the Consultation Draft stage, referred to in black above. The main issue regarding the Mendip Limestone Grasslands site is the same (possible recreational impact on habitats) .							opportunities for informal recreation elsewhere on less sensitive sites through policies and proposals for provision of green infrastructure and public open space provision; eg. In DPDS, and SPDs.(For example, the Weston Villages SPD proposes provision of extensive green infrastructure at Weston Villages, including a network of green corridors with multifunctional recreational benefits including a strategic cycleway/footpath network, and community parks.) Encourage provision of interpretation boards encouraging		

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
								restriction of walking to established public footpaths..		
Policy CS14: Distribution of New Housing	New housing development will be concentrated in Weston-super-Mare. At Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea residential development will be acceptable within their existing settlement boundaries on brownfield land. Within the Service Villages small scale infill development may be appropriate where it will support the retention of existing services. Elsewhere housing development will not be permitted unless it is for essential workers in rural enterprises, replacement dwellings or affordable housing need.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Weston urban extension located generally over 2km from nearest component site (Uphill Cliff). Traffic emissions unlikely to be significant (see HRA air quality appendix)	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which concluded that despite the amount of development proposed in North Somerset it won't result in a likely significant effect on water abstraction. Further specialist advice was provided by the Environment Agency which confirmed this.	Increased population could lead to increased visitor numbers resulting in erosion.	N/A	N/A	The NSC Green Infrastructure Strategy will identify opportunities for green infrastructure elsewhere such as public open space provision, which is likely to provide alternative locations for recreation. Seek to maintain seasonal wardening presence Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling.	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning applications.
CS14 Publication	Weston will be focus of new housing	**As above**	As above but urban	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
	development . Outside Weston most additional development to occur at Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea, on existing allocations, within their existing settlement boundaries, or in Nailsea at allocations outside Green Belt. Priority to previously developed land. Within the Service Villages small scale infill development or site allocations can occur. All new housing to not conflict with nature conservation policies		extension now replaced by Weston Villages							
Policy CS14 as at November 2013.	Proposed policy wording is unchanged from the adopted plan except for the housing figures in the table. Weston will be focus of new housing development. Outside Weston most additional development to	**As above**	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on water issues after this table.)	As above	N/A	N/A	As in blue text for policy CS13 .	**As above**	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
	occur at Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea, on existing allocations, within their existing settlement boundaries, or in Nailsea at allocations outside Green Belt. Priority to previously developed land. At Service Villages small scale infill development or site allocations can occur. All new housing to not conflict with nature conservation policies. While the proposed distribution of the housing has changed slightly from the Consultation Draft stage, mainly due to a reduction in the amount of housing proposed at Weston Villages, the main issue regarding the Mendip Limestone Grasslands site is the same (possible									

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	recreational impact on habitats) .									
Policy CS15: Mixed and Balanced Communities	The Council will seek to ensure a genuine mix of housing types within existing and future communities.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS15 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS15 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS16: Affordable Housing	On-site affordable housing will be sought to meet local needs on all residential developments of 15 dwellings or more (or site of 0.5ha or above). On other sites the Council will seek to negotiate a financial contribution towards the	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	provision of affordable housing.									
CS16 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS16 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The addition made at modifications stage to widen the definition of affordable housing to include affordable rented did not have significant implications for HRA. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS17: Residential Sites Providing Affordable Housing Only	Housing schemes for 100% affordable housing to meet local need within small rural communities will be supported provided it meets certain criteria. Specific	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
	sites may also be allocated in W-s-M, Portishead, Nailsea and Clevedon and the service villages for 100% affordable housing to meet an identified local need.									
CS17 Publication Rural Exceptions Schemes	Housing schemes for 100% affordable housing to meet local need within small rural communities will be supported provided it meets certain criteria.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS17 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS18: Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show People	Provision will be made for an additional 36 residential and 10 transit pitches for Gypsies and travellers for the	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
	period 2006 – 2011.									
CS18 Publication	Sets out considerations for determination of locations for sites for Gypsies, travellers and travelling show people	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS18 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS19: Green Wedges/Strategic Gaps.	The Council will seek to protect green wedges/strategic gaps to help retain the separate identity, character or landscape setting of settlements.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS19 Publication Strategic gaps	As above, but reference to strategic gaps, not green wedges	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS19 as at November	Effectively as above. No changes	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
2013.	are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.									
Delivering a Prosperous Economy										
Policy CS20: Supporting a Successful Economy	Employment-led strategy to both deliver significant employment development and to ensure that new residential development is provided in association with employment opportunities. The Core Strategy provides for around 29,500 jobs Supporting text suggests indicative employment requirement for B1-B8 uses would include 61 ha at Weston Urban	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Weston urban extension located generally over 2km from nearest component site (Uphill Cliff). Traffic emissions unlikely to be significant (see HRA air quality appendix)	N/A	Increased population could lead to increased visitor numbers resulting in erosion.	N/A	N/A	The NSC Green Infrastructure Strategy will identify opportunities for green infrastructure elsewhere such as public open space provision, which is likely to provide alternative locations for recreation . Seek to maintain seasonal wardening presence	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
	Extension.									
CS20 Publication	The Core Strategy seeks to provide for at least 10,100 additional jobs. Supporting text suggests indicative employment land allocations (B1-B8 uses) to be as in adopted Replacement Local Plan, plus about 38ha at Weston Villages.	**As above**	As above but urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS20 as at November 2013.	The policy is not proposed to change from the adopted plan version. It states that the Core Strategy seeks to provide for at least 10,100 additional jobs, which is less than at Consultation Draft stage, with consequentially lower employment land implications. As with the Consultation Draft stage, a consequence of employment development could be to attract more people into the	**As above**	As above	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As in blue text for policy CS13	As above	As above

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	district, and the main issue regarding the Mendip Limestone Grasslands site is the same ; (possible recreational impact on habitats) .									
Policy CS21: Retail Hierarchy and Provision.	Identifies retail hierarchy across the district.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS21 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS21 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS22: Tourism Strategy	Supports visitor facilities and accommodation across the district provided they meet certain criteria.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	N/A	N/A	Increased population could lead to increased visitor numbers resulting in erosion.	N/A	N/A	The NSC Green Infrastructure Strategy will identify opportunities for green infrastructure elsewhere such	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning applications.

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
								as public open space provision, which is likely to provide alternative locations for recreation . Seek to maintain seasonal wardening presence		
CS22 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS22 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version The main issue regarding the Mendip Limestone Grasslands site is the same ; (possible recreational impact on habitats) .	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	**As above**	It is considered that the following is more flexible and therefore more appropriate: Promotion of opportunities for informal recreation elsewhere on less sensitive sites through policies and proposals for provision of green infrastructure and public open space provision; eg. In DPDS, and SPDs. Encourage provision of interpretation	**As above**	**As above**

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
								boards encouraging restriction of walking to established public footpaths		
Policy CS23: Bristol International Airport	Proposals will be required to demonstrate the satisfactory resolution of environmental issues, including the impact of growth on surrounding communities and surface access infrastructure.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS23 Publication Bristol Airport	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS23 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	As above
Policy CS24: Royal Portbury	Identified land will continue to be safeguarded for port	**B (No significant**	Royal Portbury Dock located > 10 km from	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
Dock	uses, subject to demonstrable need for those uses that cannot be accommodated elsewhere within the existing port estate. Further expansion of the port within North Somerset is not supported.	**effect)**	site, unlikely to have significant effect							
CS24 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS24 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version; (only a difference in the name of the site allocations document referred to.) No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	As above	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	As above
Ensuring Safe and Healthy Communities										
Policy CS25: Children, Young People and	Provision of educational facilities.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
Higher Education										
CS25 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS25 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS26: Supporting Healthy Living and the Provision of Health Care Facilities.	Requires Health Impact Assessment (HIA) on all large scale developments, Joint working with health providers to deliver a district wide network of health facilities, reduce health inequalities in the district, encourage development that promotes active lifestyles.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS26 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS26 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.									
Policy CS27: Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities.	Provision of sport, recreation and community facilities	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS27 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A
CS27 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Area Policies										
Policy CS28: Weston-super-Mare	W-s-M will be the primary focus for development within North Somerset. The town will accommodate 12,000 new dwellings and 10,000 new jobs between 2006-2026	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Impact from traffic unlikely to be significant. (see HRA air quality Appendix D)	N/A	Extra pressure from increased visitor numbers; eg. recreational impacts including trampling (physical damage), erosion, collection/digging, disturbance, fires	No – Although potential disturbance to natural habitats due to increased recreational related activities.	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. The NSC Green	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	as part of an employment-led strategy to deliver improved self-containment and reduced out-commuting over the plan period.				and litter on Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC.			Infrastructure Strategy will identify opportunities for green infrastructure elsewhere such as public open space provision, which is likely to provide alternative locations for recreation . Seek to maintain seasonal wardening presence		
CS28 Publication	W-s-M will be the primary focus for development within North Somerset. The town will accommodate around 5,850 additional new dwellings with approx 10,500 employment opportunities between 2010-2026 as part of an employment-led	**As above**	As above. Note: Weston urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages	N/A	As above	As above	N/A	As above	**As above**	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	strategy to deliver improved self-containment and reduced out-commuting over the plan period.									
Policy CS28 as at November 2013.	The only change being proposed to the adopted plan's policy is a change in the number of dwellings to be built in Weston from around 6,913 to 5,136, and a change in the period for that to occur from 2011-2026 to 2013-2026. The Consultation Draft plan had referred to a figure of 12,000 dwellings for 2006-2026, but this was reduced in the Publication version due to determination of a locally derived housing requirement. The main issue regarding the Mendip Limestone Grasslands site is the same ; (possible recreational impact	**As above**	As above	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As in blue text for policy CS13 .	**As above**	As above

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	on habitats) .									
Policy CS29: Weston-super-Mare Town Centre	Town centre regeneration: major retail-led development in retail core; entertainment and leisure uses, tourist facilities and accommodation at seafront; creation of an office quarter within the gateway area	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Impact from traffic unlikely to be significant. (see HRA air quality Appendix D)	N/A	Extra pressure from increased visitor numbers; eg.recreational impacts including trampling (physical damage), erosion, collection/digging, disturbance, fires and litter on Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC.	No – although potential disturbance to natural habitats due to increased recreation related activities.	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. The NSC Green Infrastructure Strategy will identify opportunities for green infrastructure elsewhere which are likely to provide alternative locations for recreation. Seek to maintain seasonal wardening presence	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS29 Publication	As above	**AS above**	**AS above**	**AS above**	**AS above**	**AS above**	N/A	**AS above**	**AS above**	N/A
Policy CS29 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which	Arguably the C classification is pessimistic, since the town centre	As above	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As in blue text for policy CS13 .	**As above**	As above

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. .	areas are divorced from this SAC's component sites. The only link to possible increased recreational pressure on the SAC is the reference to housing which could house walkers.								
Policy CS30: Weston Urban Extension	A major mixed use, employment-led urban extension will be developed south-east of Weston-super-Mare. This will include 9,000 homes, 42ha of employment land along with other necessary community, social and transport infrastructure to support the development.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Impact from traffic unlikely to be significant. (see HRA air quality Appendix D) Point source air pollution impacts could be significant from on site energy generation (see HRA air quality appendix)	N/A	Recreational impacts on the site have been considered as a result of increased site usage resulting from population growth. Experience to date suggests that recreational impacts can currently be accommodated without a likely significant effect on the qualifying features of the European Site.	No – Although potential disturbance to natural habitats due to increased recreational related activities.	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. The NSC Green Infrastructure Strategy will identify opportunities for green infrastructure elsewhere which are likely to provide alternative locations for recreation.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
								Seek to maintain seasonal wardening presence HRA/EIA may be needed for any renewable energy projects associated with urban extension Ensure renewable energy plants are designed to minimise emissions.		
CS30 Publication Weston Villages	Employment–led development in two villages on mainly previously developed land at Weston airfield and Locking Parklands (the "Weston Villages"). To include total of 5,500 new homes and at least 37.7ha of B use employment land.	**As above**	As above but urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages	**As above**	**As above**	**As above**	N/A	**As above**	**As above**	**As above**
Policy CS30	The only change being proposed to	**As above**	As above	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	The mitigation as at Consultation	**As above**	As above

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
as at November 2013.	the adopted plan policy is a slight change in the number of dwellings to be built at Weston Villages from about 5,500 to about 5,800. The Consultation Draft plan had referred to a figure of 9,000 dwellings for that area , but this was reduced in the Publication version . The policy still refers to possible provision of a waste to energy plant.							Draft stage is still relevant., but it is considered that more flexible wording regarding mitigating recreational pressures is appropriate. Hence: Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Promotion of opportunities for informal recreation elsewhere on less sensitive sites through policies and proposals for provision of green infrastructure and public open space provision; eg. In DPDS, and SPDs.(For example, the Weston Villages		

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[2]	Impacts					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Recreational Disturbance	Land take from European Site	Other			
								SPD proposes provision of extensive green infrastructure at Weston Villages, including a network of green corridors with multifunctional recreational benefits including a strategic cycleway/footpath network, and community parks.) Encourage provision of interpretation boards encouraging restriction of walking to established public footpaths.. HRA/EIA may be needed for any renewable energy projects associated with urban extension Ensure renewable		

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
								energy plants are designed to minimise emissions.		
Policy CS31: Market and Coastal Towns	Proposals for development at Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead will be supported if they increase self-containment, ensure the availability of jobs and services for the town and surrounding catchments, and improve the town's role as a service centre.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**N/A**
CS31 Publication Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**N/A**
Policy CS31 as at November 2013.	The only changes being proposed to the adopted plan policy are the following changes in the number of dwellings to be built from 2006-2026 as follows:	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	N/A	N/A	Theoretically, there could be some increased recreation pressure, from development at all three towns. However much of the development	N/A	N/A	Promotion of opportunities for informal recreation elsewhere on less sensitive sites through policies and proposals for provision of green	**B (No significant effect**	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	Clevedon: change from 454 to 493; Nailsea: change from 210 to 647; Portishead: change from 3,051 to 3,040. The policy at Consultation Draft stage did not specify housing numbers, although they were given in the supporting text . The adopted policy permits development within settlement limits at all three towns, and mixed use schemes adjacent to the settlement boundary at Nailsea outside the Green Belt, subject to criteria. It is considered that, without mitigation there may be potential for impacts which were not identified in the earlier HRA work, but which can be mitigated. (See columns 6 and 9.)				proposed in these towns has already been built or has consent, particularly at Portishead on key sites like the harbourside. Also the towns are relatively distant from the component sites for this SAC, which are in the south of the district.			infrastructure and public open space provision; eg. In DPDS, and SPDs. Encourage provision of interpretation boards encouraging restriction of walking to established public footpaths		
Policy CS32:	Proposals for development which	**B**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**N/A**

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
Service Villages	support or enhance their roles as local hubs for community facilities and services, employment and affordable housing, including public transport will be supported.	**(No significant effect)**								
CS32 Publication	Support for small scale development within settlement boundaries which supports and enhances village's role as local hub.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**N/A**
Policy CS32 as at November 2013.	No changes are proposed to adopted policy. Latter differs from Consultation Draft version in allowing small scale residential or mixed use developments outside settlement boundaries subject to criteria. However reference to small scale and fact that none of the proposed Service Villages are adjacent to a component site for this SAC suggests that LSEs	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	are unlikely.									
Policy CS33: Smaller Settlements and Countryside.	Proposals for development within the rural areas outside of Service Villages will be strictly controlled in order to protect their character and prevent unsustainable development.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**N/A**
CS33 Publication Infill Villages, smaller settlements and countryside	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**N/A**
Policy CS33 as at November 2013.	No changes are proposed to adopted policy. Latter differs from Consultation Draft version in allowing some market housing within infill villages but restricted to one or two infill dwellings or small scale residential development within the settlement limits, subject to criteria. Reference to small	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
	scale and fact that only one of the proposed infill villages (Uphill) is adjacent to a component site for the SAC suggests that LSEs are unlikely.									
Delivery Policies										
Policy CS34: Developer Contributions to Infrastructure.	Financial contributions will be sought in the form of a standardised tariff scheme applied across the district to ensure the effective and timely delivery of the key infrastructure requirements to support new development.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**N/A**
CS34 Publication Infrastructure delivery and development contributions	Concerns mechanisms for funding and delivery of infrastructural elements, with regard to the Weston villages, Weston urban area and rest of district	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**N/A**
Policy CS34	Effectively as above No changes are	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mendip Limestone Grasslands Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[2]**	**Impacts**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Recreational Disturbance**	**Land take from European Site**	**Other**			
as at November 2013.	proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.									
Policy CS35: Implementation	Implementation will take place as part of a co-ordinated strategy, provided in step with the necessary infrastructure, utilities and service provision needed to support and enable the development.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS35 is deleted in the Publication version	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**N/A**	**N/A**
CS35 is deleted in the adopted plan, and no change is being proposed to that situation	N/A	**N/A**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Screening Assessment Matrix for North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
Living within Environmental Limits										
Policy CS1: Addressing Climate Change and Carbon Reduction	Renewable energy in development;e.g. Energy from Waste Plant at Weston urban extension, green infrastructure networks, sustainable transport, enhancing/protecting biodiversity, re-use of previously developed land etc..	**C (Likely significant effects alone)**	Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located <10km from site	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Use of appropriate technology/design (through conditions on planning consents or Environmental Permits from Environment Agency) .	**B (No significant effect)**	.N/A
Policy CS1 of Publication version of Core Strategy	As above but urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS1 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally	**As above**	As above. Note: Weston Villages now replace Weston Urban	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above. The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant,	**As above**	As above

[3] Based on the Natural England Habitats Regulations Assessment of Local Development Documents by David Tyldesley, Jan 2009

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	different to Consultation Draft version. Has addition of need for development to demonstrate water efficiency measures. Policy refers to creation of waste to energy facilities at Weston Villages.		Extension . The NE part of the Weston Villages site is just within 10km of the Kings Wood and Urchin Wood component sites for the SAC.							
Policy CS2: Delivering Sustainable Design and Construction.	Sustainable design and construction. Policy sets targets e.g. for on site renewable energy, Code for Sustainable homes, BREEAM ratings etc	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Potential damage to bat and bird species through killing or injuring by wind turbines.	Location of wind turbines following best practice guidance monitoring of impacts.	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning application s for wind turbines.
CS2 Publication	AS above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	As above	As above	As above
Policy CS2 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Addition of requirement to apply best practice in sustainable urban	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	As above	As above	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
	drainage systems. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.									
Policy CS3: Environmental Risk Management.	Sets out the Sequential Test for development with regard to flood zones.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS3 Publication Environmental Impacts and Flood Risk Assessment	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS3 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Reference to NPPF rather than PPS25. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS4: Nature Conservation.	Maintain and enhance biodiversity within the district.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
CS4 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS4 as at	Effectively as above.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
November 2013.	No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Documents such as Green Infrastructure Strategy and Biodiversity and Trees SPD are referred to in supporting text . No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.									
Policy CS5: Landscape and the Historic Environment.	Protect and enhance the character, distinctiveness, diversity and quality of North Somerset's landscape and townscape.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
CS5 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS5 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Reference to heritage assets rather than just	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	assets. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.									
Policy CS6: North Somerset's Green Belt	Protect the existing Green Belt.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**N/A**	**N/A**
CS6 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS6 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. A difference is that it no longer refers to possibility of taking land out of the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances, by local review. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
Policy CS7: Planning for Waste in North Somerset	Support for sustainable management of waste, recovery of energy from waste in line with Joint Waste Core Strategy policies	**C (Likely significant effects alone)**	Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located <10km from site	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Use of appropriate technology/design (through conditions on planning consents or Environmental Permits from Environment Agency) .	**B (No significant effect)**	.N/A
CS7 Publication Planning for Waste	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS7 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Refers to proposals for location of waste management facilities being subject to policies in Joint Waste Core Strategy (JWCS). Refers to Sites and Policies DPD rather than "a Development Management DPD".	**As above.**	As above. Supporting text refers to JWCS and the fact it identifies land on SE side of Weston as a broad strategic area within which proposals for residual waste treatment facilities may come forward. The NE part of that area is just within	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above. The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant.	**As above**	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
			10km of the Kings Wood and Urchin Wood component sites for the SAC.							
Policy CS8: Minerals Planning in North Somerset	Provision will be made for North Somerset to contribute towards approximately 40% of the West of England's aggregates requirement. The council will seek to maintain a land bank for crushed rock of at least 10 years.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Unlikely to be significant air pollution impacts (see HRA air quality appendix)	N/A	N/A	Potential impact of quarrying on key horseshoe bat foraging area	Effects from quarrying	Strict locational control of quarrying, leaving adequate minimum distance between quarry and European site	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning application s.
CS8 Publication Minerals Planning	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above
Policy CS8 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The addition that was made at	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	Potential for quarrying to impact on bats' foraging area.	N/A	The mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant. Note that it will be the distance between the quarry and the component sites of the SAC which will be for	**As above**	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	Modifications stage to quantify the crushed rock apportionment for North Somerset in tonnes , did not alter the earlier HRA conclusions.							consideration..		
Policy CS9: Green Infrastructure	Safeguard, improve and enhance the existing network of green infrastructure.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	N/A	N/A	Recreational impacts from increased lighting on footpaths/ cycle ways.	Recreational impacts from increased lighting on footpaths/ cycle ways.	N/A	Best practice design of facilities to include minimising light pollution.	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning application s.
CS9 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	As above		As above	As above	As above
Policy CS9 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Includes reference to tree planting. Includes reference to network of green spaces, paths, cycleways and bridleways. Reference to Green Infrastructure SPD in supporting text.	**As above**	As above	N/A	More accurate to just refer to potential for possible impact of artificial lighting of footpaths/cycle ways on bats if inappropriately designed.	More accurate to just refer to potential for possible impact of artificial lighting of footpaths/cycle ways on bats if inappropriately designed.	N/A	The above mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant,	**As above**	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
Policy CS10: Transport and Movement	Encouragement for travel management policies and development proposals that encourage an improved and integrated transport network and allow for wide choice of transport modes. Lists proposed transport schemes over the plan period.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Transport schemes which could affect traffic on section of A370 and A368 alongside component sites are potentially significant	N/A	Potential noise and light disturbance to bats from vehicles.		Potential bat collision risk with vehicles	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling.	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning application s.
CS10 Publication Transportation and Movement	As above	As above	As above	N/A	As above		As above	As above	As above	As above
Policy CS10 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Includes addition of requirement for	As above	As above	N/A	**As above**	N/A	N/A	The above mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant,	**As above**	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	transport schemes to contribute towards carbon reduction, and support movement of freight by rail, which should have beneficial environmental effects. List of transport schemes is the same except for addition of Airfield Bridge Link (ABL) between Weston Airfield and Winterstoke Rd, and Weston Southern Rail Chord (WSRC). ABL is a more direct road link so should help reduce distance travelled and hence emissions. WSRC should help promote train rather than car transport which should have environmental benefits.									
Policy CS11: Parking	Provision of adequate car parking to meet the needs of anticipated	**C (Likely significant**	Parking provision which could affect traffic on	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	users.	**effect alone)**	section of A370 and A368 alongside component sites is potentially significant					transport such as public transport, walking and cycling.		
CS11 Publication	As above	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	As above
Policy CS11 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Only difference is that policy refers to Sites and Policies DPD rather than Development Management DPD.	As above	As above	N/A		N/A	N/A	The above mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant,	**As above**	As above
Delivering Strong and Inclusive Communities										
Policy CS12: Achieving High Quality Design and Place Making	High quality architecture and urban design will be expected from all developments.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
CS12 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS12 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. While some paragraphs differ the thrust of the policy is on promoting well designed buildings and places, and there is still reference to environmental sustainability. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS13: Scale of New Housing.	Provision of 17,750 dwellings across the district over the plan period. 3000 dwellings in Weston-super-Mare urban area and 9,000 dwellings as an urban extension to Weston-super-Mare. The remainder of 5,750 dwellings will	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Impacts from air pollution not likely to be significant; (see HRA air quality appendix).	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which	Potential disturbance from increased noise/light. Potential recreational impacts. Recreational impacts on the qualifying features which	Potential loss of foraging area particularly hedgerows and pasture.		Retention of dark vegetated corridors within green infrastructure to form part of any large-scale development. A site-wide lighting strategy, incorporating a	**B (No significant effect)**	

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	be met by land from existing identified sources and no additional allocation will be required in the plan period.			concluded that despite the amount of development proposed in North Somerset it won't result in a likely significant effect on water abstraction. Further specialist advice was provided by the Environment Agency which confirmed this.	may result have been considered. These include erosion and the impacts of dogs. Natural England advise that they consider that these impacts are De minimis.			lighting contour plan with details of light intensity and hours of lighting operation, will be required on large-scale developments. Consideration should be given to providing green (living) roofs on suitable large buildings. This should be covered with local substrates or grass rather than *sedum* species to maximise its value for wildlife conservation and foraging bats. Off site areas to be grazed to benefit horseshoe bats may be required.		
CS13 Publication	Provision of	As above	As above.	**As above**	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
	minimum of 13,400 dwellings across the district over the plan period. 3,300 net additional dwellings in Weston-super-Mare urban area and 5,500 dwellings at Weston villages. Outside Weston most additional development to occur in towns on existing site allocations, or new development within their settlement boundaries, or at Nailsea through site allocations outside Green Belt		Note Weston urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages							
Policy CS13 as at November 2013.	Proposed change in housing number from the minimum of 14,000 in adopted plan to minimum of 17,130 dwellings within North Somerset 2006 - 2026 . (Note: while this is an increase, the 17,130 is less than the 17,750 dwellings at the	As above	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on water issues after this table.) Also bats are unlikely to be affected by water issues.	It is considered that the main potential for adverse impact relates to artificial lighting associated with new development if inappropriately designed.	As above	As above	The above mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant. Some such mitigation (such as proposed dark corridors) is included in the Weston Villages SPD, which was produced in consultation with	**As above**	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	Consultation Draft stage, referred to in black above. The main issue regarding the SAC is the same (possible impact of lighting from development on bats) .							Natural England.		
Policy CS14: Distribution of New Housing	New housing development will be concentrated in Weston-super-Mare. At Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea residential development will be acceptable within their existing settlement boundaries on brownfield land. Within the Service Villages small scale infill development may be appropriate where it will support the retention of existing services. Elsewhere housing development will not be permitted unless it is for essential workers in rural	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Impacts from air pollution not likely to be significant; (see HRA air quality appendix)	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which concluded that despite the amount of development proposed in North Somerset it won't result in a likely significant effect on water abstraction.	Potential disturbance from increased noise/light. Potential recreational impacts. Recreational impacts on the qualifying features which may result have been considered. These include erosion and the impacts of dogs. Natural England advise that they consider that these impacts are De minimis.	Potential loss of foraging area particularly hedgerows.		Retention of dark vegetated corridors within green infrastructure to form part of any large-scale development. A site wide lighting strategy, incorporating a lighting contour plan with details of light intensity and hours of lighting operation, will be required on large-scale developments. Consideration should be given to providing green (living) roofs on	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	enterprises, replacement dwellings or affordable housing need.			Further specialist advice was provided by the Environment Agency which confirmed this.				suitable large buildings. This should be covered with local substrates or grass rather than *sedum* species to maximise its value for wildlife conservation and foraging bats. Off site areas to be grazed to benefit horseshoe bats may be required		
CS14 Publication	Weston will be the focus of new housing development . Outside Weston most additional development to occur at Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea, on existing allocations, within their existing settlement boundaries, or in Nailsea at	As above	As above Note Weston urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages	**As above**	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
	allocations outside Green Belt. Priority to previously developed land. Within the Service villages small scale infill development or site allocations can occur. All new housing to not conflict with nature conservation policies									
Policy CS14 as at November 2013.	Proposed policy wording is unchanged from the adopted plan except for the housing figures in the table. Weston will be focus of new housing development. Outside Weston most additional development to occur at Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea, on existing allocations, within their existing settlement boundaries, or in Nailsea at allocations outside Green Belt. Priority	**As above**	As above	LSEs unlikely (see under CS13.)	It is considered that the main potential for adverse impact relates to artificial lighting associated with new development if inappropriately designed.	N/A	N/A	Same comments for mitigation as for policy CS13 above.	**As above**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
	to previously developed land. At Service Villages small scale infill development or site allocations can occur. All new housing to not conflict with nature conservation policies. While the proposed distribution of the housing has changed slightly from the Consultation Draft stage, mainly due to a reduction in the amount of housing proposed at Weston Villages, The main issue regarding the SAC is the same (possible impact of lighting from development on bats) ..									
Policy CS15: Mixed and Balanced Communities	The Council will seek to ensure a genuine mix of housing types within existing and future communities.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
CS15 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS15 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS16: Affordable Housing	On-site affordable housing will be sought to meet local needs on all residential developments of 15 dwellings or more (or site of 0.5ha or above). On other sites the Council will seek to negotiate a financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS16 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS16 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The addition made at modifications stage to widen the definition of affordable housing to include affordable rented did not have significant implications for HRA. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.									
Policy CS17: Residential Sites Providing Affordable Housing Only	Housing schemes for 100% affordable housing to meet local need within small rural communities will be supported provided it meets certain criteria. Specific sites may also be allocated in W-s-M, Portishead, Nailsea and Clevedon and the service villages	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
	for 100% affordable housing to meet an identified local need.									
CS17 Publication Rural Exceptions Schemes	Housing schemes for 100% affordable housing to meet local need within small rural communities will be supported provided it meets certain criteria.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS17 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS18: Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show People	Provision will be made for an additional 36 residential and 10 transit pitches for Gypsies and travellers for the period 2006 – 2011.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS18 Publication	Sets out considerations for	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
	determination of locations for sites for Gypsies, travellers and travelling show people									
Policy CS18 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS19: Green Wedges/Strategic Gaps.	The Council will seek to protect green wedges/strategic gaps to help retain the separate identity, character or landscape setting of settlements.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS19 Publication Strategic gaps	As above, but reference to strategic gaps, not green wedges	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS19 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.									
Delivering a Prosperous Economy										
Policy CS20: Supporting a Successful Economy	Employment-led strategy to both deliver significant employment development and to ensure that new residential development is provided in association with employment opportunities. The Core Strategy provides for around 29,500 jobs. Supporting text suggests indicative employment requirement for B1-B8 uses would include 61 ha at Weston Urban	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Impacts from air pollution not likely to be significant; (see HRA air quality appendix)	N/A	Potential disturbance from increased noise/light. Potential recreational impacts. Recreational impacts on the qualifying features which may result have been considered. These include erosion and the impacts of dogs. Natural England advise that they consider that these impacts	N/A	N/A	Retention of dark vegetated corridors within green infrastructure to form part of any large-scale development. A site wide lighting strategy, incorporating a lighting contour plan with details of light intensity and hours of lighting operation, will be required on large-scale developments. Consideration	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	Extension.				are De minimis.			should be given to providing green (living) roofs on suitable large buildings. This should be covered with local substrates or grass rather than *sedum* species to maximise its value for wildlife conservation and foraging bats. Off site areas to be grazed to benefit horseshoe bats may be required		
CS20 Publication	The Core Strategy seeks to provide for at least 10,100 additional jobs. Supporting text suggests indicative employment land allocations (B1-B8 uses) to be as in adopted Replacement Local Plan, plus about 38ha at Weston Villages...	**As above**	As above. Note Weston urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
Policy CS20 as at November 2013.	The policy is not proposed to change from the adopted plan version. It states that the Core Strategy seeks to provide for at least 10,100 additional jobs, which is less than at Consultation Draft stage, with consequentially lower employment land implications. However, as with the Consultation Draft stage, the main issue regarding the SAC is the possible impact of lighting from development on bats.	**As above**	As above	As above	It is considered that the main potential for adverse impact relates to artificial lighting associated with new development if inappropriately designed.	N/A	N/A	The same mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage (above) is still relevant. Some such mitigation (such as proposed dark corridors) is included in the Weston Villages SPD, which was produced in consultation with Natural England	As above	As above
Policy CS21: Retail Hierarchy and Provision.	Identifies retail hierarchy across the district.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	Potential light pollution	N/A	N/A	Sensitive lighting in new developments to minimise effect of light pollution.	N/A	Impact will be assessed on each individual planning application.
CS21 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	As above
Policy CS21 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to	As above. In theory lighting from town centre uses might	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
	adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The policy seek to maintain the vitality and viability of the existing and proposed centres, and supports town centre uses within them of an appropriate scale. Town centre uses outside the centres will be controlled by the sequential approach.	possibly affect horseshoe bats, but the urban location makes this unlikely. Also , in seeking to confine such uses to town centres, the policy would be likely to lessen the potential for impact, Also only a few of the many existing and proposed centres are within the 5km consultation zone for bats (Nailsea, Queensway, Worle, and a small part of the Marchfields Way centre), and they are in built up areas. This accounts for the B classification, but it would still be beneficial for sensitive lighting to be used								

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
		(column 9) as a positive measure.								
Policy CS22: Tourism Strategy	Supports visitor facilities and accommodation across the district provided they meet certain criteria.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	Potential disturbance from increased noise/light. Potential recreational impacts. Recreational impacts on the qualifying features which may result have been considered. These include erosion and the impacts of dogs. Natural England advise that they consider that these impacts are de minimis.	N/A	N/A	Generally small scale development likely in rural area near to SAC component habitats. Sensitive lighting in new developments to minimise effect of light pollution.	N/A	N/A
CS22 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS22 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft	As above. While lighting from tourism development could have an impact on bats, the policy makes	As above	As above	Possible impact of artificial lighting associated with new development if inappropriately	As above	**As above**	The same mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage (above) is still relevant.	**As above**	**As above**

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	version. The policy supports new and replacement visitor and tourist facilities across the district subject to criteria, including supporting conservation and economic development objectives.	reference to appropriate scale and also states that conservation objectives should be supported. Nevertheless it would be beneficial for development to have sensitive lighting, as indicated in column 9.			designed.					
Policy CS23: Bristol International Airport	Proposals for the development of Bristol Airport will be required to demonstrate the satisfactory resolution of environmental issues, including the impact of growth on surrounding communities and surface access infrastructure.	**B (No significant effect)**	Impacts from air pollution not likely to be significant; (see HRA air quality appendix)	N/A	Potential light pollution	Potential loss of foraging area.	N/A	Dedicated land managed for nature conservation. Retain a dark buffer around the edge of the development for commuting and foraging horseshoe bats.	**B (No significant effect)**	May be required on an individual application basis.
CS23 Publication Bristol Airport	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	As above	As above	N/A	As above	As above	As above
Policy CS23	Effectively as	As above. B	As above	N/A	As above	As above.	N/A	The same	**As above**	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
as at November 2013.	above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	classification reflects fact that policy requires resolution of environmental issues. However it would still be beneficial for development to include appropriate mitigation as in column 9.				Airport is within the 5km consultation zone for the SAC.		mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage (above) would be beneficial.		
Policy CS24: Royal Portbury Dock	Identified land at Court House Farm will continue to be safeguarded for port uses, subject to demonstrable need for those uses that cannot be accommodated elsewhere within the existing port estate. Further expansion of the port within North Somerset is not supported.	**B (No significant effect)**	Dock located approximately 9 km from site. Furthermore dock uses unlikely to be significant sources of point source air emissions. Significant effects from air pollution unlikely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS24 Publication	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As above	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS24 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally	**As above.** The dock and Court House Farm are well beyond (over 5km from	As above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	different to Consultation Draft version; (only a difference in the name of the site allocations document referred to.) No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	the boundary of) the 5km consultation zone for the SAC.								
Ensuring Safe and Healthy Communities										
Policy CS25: Children, Young People and Higher Education	Provision of educational facilities to be sought where local provision will be inadequate to meet the needs of new residential developments. .	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	Potential light pollution	Potential loss of foraging areas.	N/A	Sensitive lighting in new developments to minimise effect of light pollution. Green/living roofs on school and larger buildings to provide potential foraging habitats	N/A	Impact will be assessed on each individual planning application.
CS25 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	As above	N/A	As above	N/A	As above
Policy CS25 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)** It is now considered that a "C" classification,	N/A	N/A	As above	As above	N/A	The same mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage (above) is still relevant.	**As above**	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
		without mitigation, is appropriate, as lighting of school buildings, if poorly designed. could affect bats, and the policy does not confine them to particular areas.								
Policy CS26: Supporting Healthy Living and the Provision of Health Care Facilities.	Requires Health Impact Assessment on all large scale developments. Joint working with health providers to deliver a district wide network of health facilities, reduce health inequalities in the district, encourage development that promotes active lifestyles.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	Potential light pollution	Potential loss of foraging areas.	N/A	Sensitive lighting in new developments to minimise effect of light pollution. Green/living roofs on school and larger buildings to provide potential foraging habitats	N/A	Impact will be assessed on each individual planning application.
CS26 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	As above	N/A	As above	N/A	As above
Policy CS26 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	As above. While poorly designed lighting of health facilities could have an impact on bats, much of the policy is	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The same mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage (above) would be beneficial..	**As above**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
		about promoting provision of open space , allotments etc, which could benefit bats, Development is encouraged to incorporate usable green space and contribute to enhancing the green infrastructure network. This accounts for the B classification, but it would still be beneficial to have sensitive lighting, so this is still referred to in column 9 .								
Policy CS27: Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities.	Provision of sport, recreation and community facilities	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	Potential light pollution	N/A	N/A	Sensitive lighting in new developments to minimise effect of light pollution.	N/A	Impact will be assessed on each individual planning application.
CS27 Publication	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	As above
Policy CS27	Effectively as above. No changes	**C (Likely**	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	The same mitigation as at	**As above**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
as at November 2013.	are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	**significant effect alone)** It is now considered that a "C" classification, without mitigation, is appropriate, as lighting of sports buildings and facilities could affect bats, and the policy does not confine them to particular areas.						Consultation Draft stage (above) is still relevant.		
Area Policies										
Policy CS28: Weston-super-Mare	W-s-M will be the primary focus for development within North Somerset. The town will accommodate 12,000 new dwellings and 10,000 new jobs between 2006-2026 as part of an employment-led strategy to deliver improved self-	**B (No significant effect)**	Impacts from air pollution not likely to be significant; (see HRA air quality appendix)	N/A	N/A	Impacts of development.	N/A	Retention of dark vegetated corridors within green infrastructure to form part of any large-scale development. A site wide lighting strategy, incorporating a lighting contour plan with details of	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	containment and reduced out-commuting over the plan period.							light intensity and hours of lighting operation, will be required on large-scale developments. Consideration should be given to providing green (living) roofs on suitable large buildings. This should be covered with local substrates or grass rather than *sedum* species to maximise its value for wildlife conservation and foraging bats. Off site areas to be grazed to benefit horseshoe bats may be required		
CS28 Publication	W-s-M will be the primary focus for development within North Somerset. The town will	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A	As above	As above	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	accommodate around 5,850 additional new dwellings with approx 10,500 employment opportunities between 2010-2026 as part of an employment-led strategy to deliver improved self-containment and reduced out-commuting over the plan period.									
Policy CS28 as at November 2013.	The only change being proposed to the adopted plan policy is a change in the number of dwellings to be built in Weston from around 6,913 to 5,136, and a change in the period for that to occur from 2011-2026 to 2013-2026. The Consultation Draft plan had referred to a figure of 12,000 dwellings for 2006-2026, but this was reduced in	**C (Likely significant effect alone)** It is now considered that a "C" classification, without mitigation, is appropriate, as lighting of development could affect bats, and the Weston Villages area, and the southern part of	As above	N/A	Possible impact of artificial lighting associated with new development if inappropriately designed.	N/A	N/A	The above mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant. Some such mitigation (such as proposed dark corridors) is included in the Weston Villages SPD, which was produced in consultation with Natural England.	**As above**	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	the Publication version due to determination of a locally derived housing requirement. The policy still focuses new development on two key locations in Weston: Weston Villages and the town centre and gateway.	the east area of Weston are within the 5km consultation zone for the SAC.								
Policy CS29: Weston-super-Mare Town Centre	Town centre regeneration: major retail-led development in retail core; entertainment and leisure uses, tourist facilities and accommodation at seafront; creation of an office quarter within the gateway area	**B (No significant effect)**	Impacts from air pollution not likely to be significant; (see HRA air quality appendix)	N/A	N/A	Negligible impact (de minimis) – Already urbanised and lacking connectivity to surrounding habitats.	N/A	N/A	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS29 Publication	As above	**As above**	As above	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A
Policy CS29 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	**As above**	As above	N/A	A/A	As above	N/A	N/A	**As above**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
Policy CS30: Weston Urban Extension	A major mixed use, employment-led urban extension will be developed south-east of Weston-super-Mare. This will include 9,000 homes, 42ha of employment land along with other necessary community, social and transport infrastructure to support the development.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Impacts from air pollution not likely to be significant; (see HRA air quality appendix)	Water abstraction has been assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment which concluded that despite the amount of development proposed in Weston-super-Mare it won't result in a likely significant effect on water abstraction. Further specialist advice was provided by the Environment Agency which confirmed this.	Potential loss of or disturbance to foraging area particularly hedgerows. Potential recreational impacts.	Weston urban extension is within the 5km North Somerset and Mendip Bat Consultation Zone. Comprehensive Supplementary Planning Document is to be produced for the whole site which will include mitigation measures.	Potential impact of lighting on foraging area	Retention of dark vegetated corridors within green infrastructure to form part of any large-scale development. A site wide lighting strategy, incorporating a lighting contour plan with details of light intensity and hours of lighting operation, will be required on large-scale developments. Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Consideration should be given to providing green	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning application s within the Urban Extension. There is likely to be scope and flexibility for proposals to include detailed mitigation measures, as necessary.

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
								(living) roofs on suitable large buildings. This should be covered with local substrates or grass rather than *sedum* species to maximise its value for wildlife conservation and foraging bats. Off site areas to be grazed to benefit horseshoe bats may be required		
CS30 Publication Weston Villages	Employment–led development in two villages on mainly previously developed land at Weston airfield and Locking Parklands (the "Weston Villages"). To include total of 5,500 new homes and at least 37.7ha of B use employment land.	**As above**	As above Note Weston urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages	As above	As above	As above	N/A	As above	**As above**	As above
Policy CS30	The only change being proposed to	**As above**	As above	LSEs unlikely (see note on	As above	As above	N/A	The above mitigation as at	**As above**	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
as at November 2013.	the adopted plan policy is a slight change in the number of dwellings to be built at Weston Villages from about 5,500 to about 5,800. The Consultation Draft plan had referred to a figure of 9,000 dwellings for that area , but this was reduced in the Publication version . The main issue regarding the SAC is still the same: possible impact of lighting from development on bats.			water issues after this table.) Also bats are unlikely to be affected by water issues				Consultation Draft stage is still relevant. Some such mitigation (such as proposed dark corridors) is included in the Weston Villages SPD, which was produced in consultation with Natural England.		
Policy CS31: Market and Coastal Towns	Proposals for development at Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead will be supported if they increase self-containment, ensure the availability of jobs and services for the town and surrounding catchments, and	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	improve the towns role as a service centre.									
CS31 Publication Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS31 as at November 2013.	The only changes being proposed to the adopted plan policy are the following changes in the number of dwellings to be built from 2006-2026 as follows: Clevedon: change from 454 to 493; Nailsea: change from 210 to 647; Portishead: change from 3,051 to 3,040. The policy at Consultation Draft stage did not specify housing numbers, although they were given in the supporting text . The adopted policy permits development within settlement limits at all three	**C (Likely significant effect alone)** It is now considered that this classification is appropriate regarding possible disturbance to habitat; (see column 6).	N/A	N/A	The main potential for possible impact concerns the potential for a significant greenfield development on the edge of Nailsea, and the possible impact of lighting on bats, if inappropriately designed/located. (Nailsea falls within the 5km consultation zone for the SAC, whereas. Clevedon and Portishead do not.) Also much of the development proposed in	N/A	N/A	Retention of dark vegetated corridors within green infrastructure to form part of any large-scale development. However ensure that where planting is to occur to reinforce /create dark corridors, where possible ensure that they do not cause overshadowing of important rhynes to avoid depriving light to water insects. A site wide lighting strategy, incorporating a	**B (No significant effect**	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
	towns, and mixed use schemes adjacent to the settlement boundary at Nailsea outside the Green Belt, subject to criteria. It is considered that, without mitigation there may be potential for impacts which were not identified in the earlier HRA work, but which can be mitigated. (See columns 6 and 9.)				Clevedon and Portishead has already been built or has consent, particularly at Portishead on key sites like the harbourside.			lighting contour plan with details of light intensity and hours of lighting operation, will be required on large-scale developments. Promote sensitive orientation of buildings to avoid light spill, particularly on the periphery of significant sites Within green infrastructure, where possible retain tall hedgerows and tree lines which bats tend to follow, and wetlands . Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and		

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
								cycling. Consideration should be given to providing green (living) roofs on suitable large buildings. This should be covered with local substrates or grass rather than *sedum* species to maximise its value for wildlife conservation and foraging bats. Off site areas to be grazed to benefit horseshoe bats may be required		
Policy CS32: Service Villages	Proposals for development which support or enhance their roles as local hubs for community facilities and services, employment and affordable housing, including public	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	Potential light pollution	N/A	N/A	Generally small scale development. Sensitive lighting in new developments to minimise effect of light pollution.	**B (No significant effect)**	Impact will be assessed on each individual planning application.

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	transport will be supported.									
CS32 Publication	Support for small scale development within settlement boundaries which supports and enhances village's role as local hub.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	As above	As above
Policy CS32 as at November 2013.	No changes are proposed to adopted policy. Latter differs from Consultation Draft version in allowing small scale residential or mixed use developments outside settlement boundaries subject to criteria	**As above**. The reference to small scale and fact that none of the proposed Service Villages actually adjoins a component site for this SAC suggests that LSEs are unlikely.The NE limits of Congresbury are close to the component site at Urchins Wood, but the intervening land, and the wood, are in the Green Belt, where significant development is unlikely. The	N/A	N/A	Possible impact of artificial lighting associated with new development if inappropriately designed.	N/A	N/A	The above mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant.	As above	As above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
		limits of Banwell are fairly close to the Banwell Caves sites, but the distances are greater than at Congresbury. Nevertheless sensitive lighting would be beneficial. (See column 9).								
Policy CS33: Smaller Settlements and Countryside.	Proposals for development within the rural areas outside of Service Villages will be strictly controlled in order to protect their character and prevent unsustainable development.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	Potential light pollution	N/A	N/A	Generally small scale development. Sensitive lighting in new developments to minimise effect of light pollution.	**B (No significant effect)**	Impact will be assessed on each individual planning application.
CS33 Publication Infill Villages, smaller settlements and countryside	As above	**As above**	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	A above
Policy CS33 as at November 2013.	No changes are proposed to adopted policy. Latter differs from Consultation Draft version in	**As above** Reference to small scale and fact that none of	N/A	N/A	Possible impact of artificial lighting associated with new	N/A	N/A	The above mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant.	N/A	A above

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[3]**	**Potential Impacts on SAC**					**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Decreased Water Quality**	**Disturbance to habitat**	**Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area**	**Other**			
	allowing some market housing within infill villages but restricted to one or two infill dwellings or small scale residential development within the settlement limits, subject to criteria.	the proposed Service Villages actually adjoins a component site for this SAC suggests that LSEs are unlikely . Cleeve is close to the Kings Wood but the village , wood and the intervening land are in the Green Belt, where significant development is unlikely. Nevetheless sensitive lighting would be beneficial. (See column 9).			development if inappropriately designed.					
Delivery Policies										
Policy CS34: Developer Contributions to Infrastructure.	Financial contributions will be sought in the form of a standardised tariff scheme applied across the district to ensure the effective and timely delivery	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
	of the key infrastructure requirements to support new development.									
CS34 Publication Infrastructure delivery and development contributions	Concerns mechanisms for funding and delivery of infrastructural elements, with regard to the Weston villages, Weston urban area and rest of district	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS34 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	**As above**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS35: Implementation	Implementation will take place as part of a co-ordinated strategy, provided in step with the necessary infrastructure, utilities and service provision needed to support and enable the development.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CS35 is deleted	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Assessment Matrix										
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[3]	Potential Impacts on SAC					Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required?
			Decreased Air Quality	Decreased Water Quality	Disturbance to habitat	Land-take from horseshoe bat foraging area	Other			
in the Publication version										
CS35 is deleted in the adopted plan, and no change is being proposed to that situation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Screening Assessment Matrix for Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
Living within Environmental Limits									
Policy CS1: Addressing Climate Change and Carbon Reduction	Renewable energy in development;e.g. energy from waste plant at Weston urban extension, green infrastructure networks, sustainable transport, enhancing/protecting biodiversity, re-use of previouslydeveloped land etc.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Mostly neutral. Some projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process. Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site (see HRA air quality appendix).	N/A			Use of appropriate technology/design (through conditions on planning consents or Environmental Permits from Environment Agency) .	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning applications. Energy from waste plants may require an HRA. There is likely to be scope and flexibility for proposals to include detailed mitigation measures, as necessary
Policy CS1 of Publication version of Core Strategy	As above	As above	As above	N/A			As above	As above	As above

[4] Based on the Natural England Habitats Regulations Assessment of Local Development Documents by David Tyldesley, Jan 2009

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
Policy CS1 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Has addition of need for development to demonstrate water efficiency measures. Policy refers to creation of waste to energy facilities at Weston Villages.	The C classification is arguably pessimistic, given that the only reference to a particular type of renewable energy is waste to energy facilities at Weston Villages. They would be unlikely to impact on the SAC since the Air Quality Assessment suggests that air pollution impacts are unlikely unless such facilities are under 10km away. The Weston Villages area is over 20km from the SAC.	As above. Note: Weston Villages now replace Weston Urban Extension.	N/A			The above measures would be beneficial.	As above	As above
Policy CS2: Delivering Sustainable Design and Construction.	Sustainable design and construction. Policy sets targets e.g.for on site renewable energy, Code for Sustainable Homes BREEAM ratings,	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	etc								
CS2 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS2 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Addition of requirement to apply best practice in sustainable urban drainage systems. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS3: Environmental Risk Management.	Sets out the Sequential Test for development with regard to flood zones.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS3 Publication Environmental Impacts and Flood Risk Assessment	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS3 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Reference	**As above**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	to NPPF rather than PPS25. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.								
Policy CS4:ensure that Nature Conservation.	Maintain and enhance biodiversity within the district.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	Part 5 of policy refers to tree planting. Inappropriate planting could lead to loss of grasslands.			Planting needs to take into account the potential loss of interest features of European Sites.	N/A	N/A
CS4 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS4 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version, although it specifies "native" tree planting, which was introduced at Publication stage. Documents such as Green Infrastructure Strategy and Biodiversity and Trees SPD are referred to in supporting text . Policy is very positive for biodiversity.	**As above**	N/A	N/A. A difference between the Consultation Draft and later versions of the policy is the reference in the latter to "well targeted woodland creation" which should help ensure that inappropriate loss of grasslands to woodland planting is avoided.			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS5: Landscape and the Historic	Protect and enhance the character, distinctiveness,	**B (No significant**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
Environment.	diversity and quality of North Somerset's landscape and townscape.	**effect)**							
CS5 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS5 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Reference to heritage assets rather than just assets. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS6: North Somerset's Green Belt	Protect the existing Green Belt.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS6 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS6 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. A difference is that it no longer refers to possibility of taking land out of the Green Belt in	**As above**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	exceptional circumstances, by local review. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.								
Policy CS7: Planning for Waste in North Somerset	Support for sustainable management of waste, recovery of energy from waste in line with Joint Waste Core Strategy policies	**B (No significant effect)**	Mostly neutral. Some projects will need to be individually assessed as part of the planning process. Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site (see HRA air quality appendix D).	N/A			Use of appropriate technology/design (through conditions on planning consents or Environmental Permits from Environment Agency) .	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially on individual planning application s. Energy from waste plants may require an HRA. There is likely to be scope and flexibility for proposals to include detailed mitigation measures, as necessary
CS7 Publication Planning for Waste	**As above**	**As above**	**As above**	N/A			**As above**	**As above**	**As above**
Policy CS7 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft	**As above.**	As above. Supporting text refers to Joint Waste Core Strategy and the fact it identifies land	N/A			As above.	As above.	**As above**

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	version. Refers to Sites and Policies DPD rather than "a Development Management DPD". Refers to proposals for location of waste management facilities being subject to policies in Joint Waste Core Strategy (JWCS).		at Warne Road, Weston for location of residual waste treatment facilities, and land on the SE side of Weston as a broad strategic area within which proposals for residual waste treatment facilities may come forward. However both these areas are well over 10km from the SAC. It would however be beneficial to design facilities to a high standard (see column 9).						
Policy CS8: Minerals Planning in North Somerset	Provision will be made for North Somerset to contribute towards approximately 40% of the West of	**B (No significant effect)**	Mostly neutral. Some projects will need to be individually assessed as	N/A			Use of appropriate technology/design (through conditions on planning consents).	**B (No significant effect)**	Potentially required on individual planning application

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	England's aggregates requirement. The council will seek to maintain a land bank for crushed rock of at least 10 years.		part of the planning process. Unlikely to be significant effects on SAC (see HRA air quality appendix)						s.
CS8 Publication Minerals Planning	**As above**	**As above**	**As above**	N/A			**As above**	**As above**	**As above**
Policy CS8 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The addition that was made at Modifications stage to quantify the crushed rock apportionment for North Somerset in tonnes , did not alter the earlier HRA conclusions.	**As above**	As above	N/A. While the BGS Mineral Resources Map suggests that high quality limestone exists near and within part of the SAC ,it is most unlikely that land take from the SAC to quarrying would be permitted, it being a European site. It would however s still be beneficial for			The measures below are considered more appropriate: Use of appropriate technology. Strict locational control of quarrying, leaving adequate minimum distance between quarry and European site .	**As above**	**As above**

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
				the proximity of the site to be taken into account in assessing any proposals for quarrying in the vicinity. Hence the measures in column 9 are appropriate.					
Policy CS9: Green Infrastructure	Safeguard, improve and enhance the existing network of green infrastructure.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	Recreational impacts on the SAC were considered in HRA of Bristol Core Strategy. This concluded that the site is not particularly vulnerable to trampling, and largely inaccessible due to steepness.			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS9 Publication	**As above**	**As above**	N/A	As above			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS9 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Includes	**As above**	As above	As above. The Bristol Core Strategy HRA found that recreational pressure was not considered a significant or unmanageable			N/A	N/A	**As above**

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	reference to tree planting. Reference to Green Infrastructure SPD in supporting text.			risk to the SAC.					
Policy CS10: Transport and Movement	Encouragement for travel management policies and development proposals that encourage an improved and integrated transport network and allow for wide choice of transport modes. Lists proposed transport schemes over the plan period.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Transport Schemes which could affect traffic on section of A4, A369, A4176 and B3129 alongside site are potentially significant	Potential to increase recreational use, from improved transport .			Encourage and facilitate sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling, (eg. through CS10 and LTP3) Transport Schemes which could affect traffic on section of A4, A369, A4176 and B3129 alongside site have been considered in terms of in combination effects and are unlikely to have a Likely Significant Effect, assuming avoidance/mitigation; (see Table 15 of Appendix D) (See also HRA of Bristol Core Strategy,2010 , which suggests that even at worst case scenario, significant traffic growth would result in only marginal, non significant increases in critical pollutants regarding this SAC)	**B (No significant effect)**	May be needed on individual planning application s.

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
							Recreational impacts on the SAC were considered in HRA of Bristol Core Strategy. This concluded that the site is not particularly to trampling, and largely inaccessible due to steepness.		
CS10 Publication Transportation and Movement	As above	As above	As above	As above			As above	As above	As above
Policy CS10 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Includes addition of requirement for transport schemes to contribute towards carbon reduction, and support movement of freight by rail, which should have beneficial environmental effects. List of transport schemes is the same except for	As above	As above	As above, but note that recreational impacts on the SAC were considered in HRA of Bristol Core Strategy. This concluded that the site is not particularly to trampling, and largely inaccessible due to steepness.			The above mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant.	As above	**As above**

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	addition of Airfield Bridge Link (ABL) between Weston Airfield and Winterstoke Rd, and Weston Southern Rail Chord (WSRC). ABL is a more direct road link so should help reduce distance travelled and hence emissions. WSRC should help promote train rather than car transport which should have environmental benefits.								
Policy CS11: Parking	Provision of adequate car parking to meet the needs of anticipated users.	**C (Likely significant effect alone)**	Parking provision which could affect traffic on A4, A369, A4176 and B3129 alongside site is potentially significant	N/A			As for CS10 above	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
CS11 Publication	As above	As above	As above	N/A			As above	N/A	N/A
Policy CS11 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. Only difference is that the policy refers to Sites and Policies DPD rather than Development Management DPD.	As above	As above	N/A			The above mitigation as at Consultation Draft stage is still relevant,	As above	**As above**
Delivering Strong and Inclusive									

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
Communities									
Policy CS12: Achieving High Quality Design and Place Making	High quality architecture and urban design will be expected from all developments.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS12 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS12 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. While some paragraphs differ the thrust of the policy is on promoting well designed buildings and places, and there is still reference to environmental sustainability. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS13: Scale of New Housing.	Provision of 17,750 dwellings across the district over the plan period. 3000 dwellings in Weston-super-Mare urban area and 9,000	**B (No significant effect)**	Weston urban extension, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site.	Potential to increase recreational use,			Recreational impacts on the SAC were considered in HRA of Bristol Core Strategy. This concluded that the site is not particularly vulnerable to trampling,	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	dwellings as an urban extension to Weston-super-Mare. The remainder of 5,750 dwellings will be met by land from existing identified sources and no additional allocation will be required in the plan period.		Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts (see HRA air quality appendix)				and largely inaccessible due to steepness.		
CS13 Publication	Provision of minimum of 13,400 dwellings across the district over the plan period. 3, 300 net additional dwellings in Weston-super-Mare urban area and 5,500 dwellings at Weston villages. Outside Weston most additional development to occur in towns on existing site allocations, or new development in their settlement boundaries, or Nailsea through site allocations outside Green Belt	As above	As above Note: Weston urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages	As above			As above	As above	N/A
Policy CS13 as at November 2013.	Proposed change in housing number from the minimum of 14,000 in adopted plan to minimum of	As above	As above	As above			The above points as at Consultation Draft stage are still relevant.	As above	**N/A**

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	17,130 dwellings within North Somerset 2006 - 2026 . (Note: while this is an increase, the 17,130 is less than the 17,750 dwellings at the Consultation Draft stage, referred to in black above.)								
Policy CS14: Distribution of New Housing	New housing development will be concentrated in Weston-super-Mare. At Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea residential development will be acceptable within their existing settlement boundaries on brownfield land. Within the Service Villages small scale infill development may be appropriate where it will support the retention of existing services. Elsewhere housing development will not be permitted unless it is for essential workers in rural enterprises, replacement	**B (No significant effect)**	Weston urban extension, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts (see HRA air quality appendix)				Recreational impacts on the SAC were considered in HRA of Bristol Core Strategy. This concluded that the site is not particularly vulnerable to trampling, and largely inaccessible due to steepness.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	dwellings or affordable housing need.								
CS14 Publication	Weston will be focus of new housing development. Outside Weston most additional development to occur at Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea, on existing allocations, within their existing settlement boundaries, or in Nailsea at allocations outside Green Belt. Priority to previously developed land. Within the Service Villages small scale infill development or site allocations can occur. All new housing to not conflict with nature conservation policies	As above	As above	As above			As above	As above	N/A
Policy CS14 as at November 2013.	Proposed policy wording is unchanged from the adopted plan except for the housing figures in the table. Weston will be focus of new housing	**As above**	As above	As above			The above points as at Consultation Draft stage are still relevant.	As above	**N/A**

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	Description	Assessment Category[4]	Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge				Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures	Assessment Category post mitigation	HRA required ?
			Decreased Air Quality	Other					
	development. Outside Weston most additional development to occur at Clevedon, Portishead and Nailsea, on existing allocations, within their existing settlement boundaries, or in Nailsea at allocations outside Green Belt. Priority to previously developed land. At Service Villages small scale infill development or site allocations can occur. All new housing to not conflict with nature conservation policies. While the proposed distribution of the housing has changed slightly from the Consultation Draft stage, mainly due to a reduction in the amount of housing proposed at Weston Villages, it is not considered that significant effects								

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	are likely.								
Policy CS15: Mixed and Balanced Communities	The Council will seek to ensure a genuine mix of housing types within existing and future communities.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS15 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS15 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS16: Affordable Housing	On-site affordable housing will be sought to meet local needs on all residential developments of 15 dwellings or more (or site of 0.5ha or above). On other sites the Council will seek to negotiate a financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
CS16 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS16 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The addition made at modifications stage to widen the definition of affordable housing to include affordable rented did not have significant implications for HRA. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS17: Residential Sites Providing Affordable Housing Only	Housing schemes for 100% affordable housing to meet local need within small rural communities will be supported provided it meets certain criteria. Specific sites may also be allocated in W-s-M, Portishead, Nailsea and Clevedon and the service villages	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	for 100% affordable housing to meet an identified local need.								
CS17 Publication Rural Exceptions Schemes	Housing schemes for 100% affordable housing to meet local need within small rural communities will be supported provided it meets certain criteria.	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS17 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS18: Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show People	Provision will be made for an additional 36 residential and 10 transit pitches for Gypsies and travellers for the period 2006 – 2011.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS18 Publication	Sets out considerations for determination of locations for sites for Gypsies, travellers	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	and travelling show people								
Policy CS18 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS19: Green Wedges/Strategic Gaps.	The Council will seek to protect green wedges/strategic gaps to help retain the separate identity, character or landscape setting of settlements.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS19 Publication Strategic gaps	As above, but reference to strategic gaps, not green wedges	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS19 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. No LSEs were predicted at	**As above**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	any stage of HRA.								
Delivering a Prosperous Economy									
Policy CS20: Supporting a Successful Economy	Employment-led strategy to both deliver significant employment development and to ensure that new residential development is provided in association with employment opportunities. The Core Strategy provides for around 29,500 jobs. Supporting text suggests indicative employment requirement for B1-B8 uses would include 61 ha at Weston Urban Extension	**B (No significant effect)**	Weston urban extension, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts (see HRA air quality appendix)	Potential for increased recreational use.			Recreational impacts on the SAC were considered in HRA of Bristol Core Strategy. This concluded that the site is not particularly to trampling, and largely inaccessible due to steepness.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS20 Publication	The Core Strategy seeks to provide for at least 10,100 additional jobs. Supporting text suggests indicative employment land allocations (B1-B8	As above	As above Note: Weston urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	uses) to be as in adopted Replacement Local Plan, plus about 38ha at Weston Villages.								
Policy CS20 as at November 2013.	The policy is not proposed to change from the adopted plan version. It states that the Core Strategy seeks to provide for at least 10,100 additional jobs, which is less than at Consultation Draft stage, with consequentially lower employment land implications.	**As above**	As above	N/A			The above points as at Consultation Draft stage are still relevant.	N/A	N/A
Policy CS21: Retail Hierarchy and Provision.	Identifies retail hierarchy across the district.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS21 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS21 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The policy seek to maintain the vitality and viability	As above. There are no existing or proposed centres adjacent to the SAC. The nearest is at Easton in Gordano/Pill, over 2km away.	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	of the existing and proposed centres, and supports town centre uses within them of an appropriate scale. Town centre uses outside the centres will be controlled by the sequential approach.								
Policy CS22: Tourism Strategy	Supports visitor facilities and accommodation across the district provided they meet certain criteria.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	Potential for increased recreational use.			Recreational impacts on the SAC were considered in HRA of Bristol Core Strategy. This concluded that the site is not particularly vulnerable to trampling, and largely inaccessible due to steepness	N/A	N/A
CS22 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			As above	N/A	N/A
Policy CS22 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version. The policy supports new and replacement visitor and tourist facilities across the district subject to criteria, including supporting	As above. This classification, without mitigation, is considered appropriate since, while the policy could promote recreational activity, it makes reference to appropriate scale and also states that conservation	As above	As above			The above points as at Consultation Draft stage are still relevant.	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	conservation and economic development objectives.	objectives should be supported. Also note the comments about recreation in the mitigation column.							
Policy CS23: Bristol International Airport	Proposals will be required to demonstrate the satisfactory resolution of environmental issues, including the impact of growth on surrounding communities and surface access infrastructure.	**B (No significant effect)**	Unlikely to be significant air quality impacts (see HRA air quality appendix)	N/A			N/A	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS23 Publication Bristol Airport	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS23 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	**As above**	As above.	N/A.			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS24: Royal Portbury Dock	Identified land will continue to be safeguarded for port uses, subject to demonstrable need for those uses that cannot be	**B (No significant effect)**	HRA Air Quality Appendix D states dock located approx. 3km from SAC;	N/A			Use of appropriate technology/design (through conditions on planning consents or Environmental Permits from Environment Agency) .	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	accommodated elsewhere within the existing port estate. Further expansion of the port within North Somerset is not supported.		dock uses not likely to be significant source of point source air emissions.						
CS24 Publication	As above	As above	As above				N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS24 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version; (only a difference in the name of the site allocations document referred to.) No LSEs were predicted at any stage of HRA.	**As above.**	As above	N/A			Significant effects are not likely, but use of appropriate technology/design would be prudent good practice	N/A	N/A.
Ensuring Safe and Healthy Communities									
Policy CS25: Children, Young People and Higher Education	Provision of educational facilities.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS25 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS25 as at November	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
2013.	policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.								
Policy CS26: Supporting Healthy Living and the Provision of Health Care Facilities.	Requires HIA on all large scale developments, Joint working with health providers to deliver a district wide network of health facilities, reduce health inequalities in the district, encourage development that promotes active lifestyles.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS26 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS26 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS27: Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities.	Provision of sport, recreation and community facilities	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
CS27 Publication	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS27 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Area Policies									
Policy CS28: Weston-super-Mare	W-s-M will be the primary focus for development within North Somerset. The town will accommodate 12,000 new dwellings and 10,000 new jobs between 2006-2026 as part of an employment-led strategy to deliver improved self-containment and reduced out-commuting over the plan period.	**B (No significant effect)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic/energy centre impacts (see HRA air quality appendix)	Potential for increased recreational use.			Recreational impacts on the SAC were considered in HRA of Bristol Core Strategy. This concluded that the site is not particularly vulnerable to trampling, and largely inaccessible due to steepness	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS28 Publication	W-s-M will be the primary focus for development within North Somerset. The town will accommodate	As above	As above	As above			As above	As above	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	around 5,850 additional new dwellings with approx 10,500 employment opportunities between 2010-2026 as part of an employment-led strategy to deliver improved self-containment and reduced out-commuting over the plan period.								
Policy CS28 as at November 2013.	The only change being proposed to the adopted plan policy is a change in the number of dwellings to be built in Weston from around 6,913 to 5,136, and a change in the period for that to occur from 2011-2026 to 2013-2026. The Consultation Draft plan had referred to a figure of 12,000 dwellings for 2006-2026, but this was reduced in the Publication version due to determination of a locally derived housing	As above	As above	As above. While there is potential for increased recreational use, the significant distance of Weston from the SAC, (over 20km crow fly) and the points in the mitigation column suggest no LSEs.			The above points as at Consultation Draft stage are still relevant.	**As above**	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	requirement. The policy still focuses new development on two key locations in Weston: Weston Villages and the town centre and gateway.								
Policy CS29: Weston-super-Mare Town Centre	Town centre regeneration: major retail-led development in retail core; entertainment and leisure uses, tourist facilities and accommodation at seafront; creation of an office quarter within the gateway area	**B (No significant effect)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic/energy centre impacts (see HRA air quality appendix)	Potential increased recreational use.			Recreational impacts on the SAC were considered in HRA of Bristol Core Strategy. This concluded that the site is not particularly vulnerable to trampling, and largely inaccessible due to steepness	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
CS29 Publication	As above	As above	As above	As above			As above	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A
Policy CS29 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above. No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to Consultation Draft version.	**As above**	As above	The comment in blue for Policy CS28 is also relevant here.			The above points as at Consultation Draft stage are still relevant.	**As above**	N/A
Policy CS30: Weston Urban Extension	A major mixed use, employment-led urban extension will be developed south-east of Weston-super-Mare. This will	**B (No significant effect)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic/energy centre	Potential for increased recreational use.			Recreational impacts on the SAC were considered in HRA of Bristol Core Strategy. This concluded that the site is not particularly	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	include 9,000 homes, 42ha of employment land along with other necessary community, social and transport infrastructure to support the development.		impacts (see HRA air quality appendix)				vulnerable to trampling, and largely inaccessible due to steepness		
CS30 Publication Weston Villages	Employment–led development in two villages on mainly previously developed land at Weston airfield and Locking Parklands (the "Weston Villages". To include total of 5,500 new homes and at least 37.7ha of B use employment land.	As above	As above. Note: Weston urban extension now replaced by Weston Villages	As above			As above	As above	N/A
Policy CS30 as at November 2013.	The only change being proposed to the adopted plan policy is a slight change in the number of dwellings to be built at Weston Villages from about 5,500 to about 5,800. The Consultation Draft plan had referred to a figure of 9,000 dwellings for that area , but this was	As above	As above	Potential for increased recreational use is limited since the policy is for employment development, and Weston villages are over 20km (crow fly) from the SAC. Also the points in the mitigation			The above points as at Consultation Draft stage are still relevant.	As above	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	reduced in the Publication version .			column apply.					
Policy CS31: Market and Coastal Towns	Proposals for development at Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead will be supported if they increase self-containment, ensure the availability of jobs and services for the town and surrounding catchments, and improve the towns role as a service centre.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS31 Publication Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS31 as at November 2013.	The only changes being proposed to the adopted plan policy are the following changes in the number of dwellings to be built from 2006-2026: Clevedon: change from 454 to 493; Nailsea: change from 210 to 647; Portishead: change from 3,051 to 3,040. The policy at Consultation Draft	As above	N/A	As above. While there is potential for increased recreational use, none of these towns is particularly close to the SAC, the nearest being Portishead at over 6km. Also recreational impacts on the SAC were			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	stage did not specify housing numbers, although they were given in the supporting text . The adopted policy permits development within settlement limits at all three towns, and mixed use schemes adjacent to the settlement boundary at Nailsea outside the Green Belt, subject to criteria.			considered in the HRA of Bristol Core Strategy. This concluded that the site is not particularly vulnerable to trampling, and largely inaccessible due to steepness. This points to the "B" classification.					
Policy CS32: Service Villages	Proposals for development which support or enhance their roles as local hubs for community facilities and services, employment and affordable housing, including public transport will be supported.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS32 Publication	Support for small scale development within settlement boundaries which supports and enhances village's role as local hub.	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS32	No changes are proposed to adopted	**As above**. The reference to	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
as at November 2013.	policy. Latter differs from Consultation Draft version in allowing small scale residential or mixed use developments outside settlement boundaries subject to criteria	small scale and fact that none of the proposed Service Villages are adjacent to this SAC, which is in the Green Belt, suggests that LSEs are unlikely. The nearest, Flax Bourton, is over 5km away.							
Policy CS33: Smaller Settlements and Countryside.	Proposals for development within the rural areas outside of Service Villages will be strictly controlled in order to protect their character and prevent unsustainable development.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS33 Publication Infill Villages, smaller settlements and countryside	As above	As above	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS33 as at November 2013.	No changes are proposed to adopted policy. Latter differs from Consultation Draft version in allowing some market housing within infill villages	**As above** Reference to small scale and fact that none of the proposed Infill Villages are adjacent to this	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	but restricted to one or two infill dwellings or small scale residential development within the settlement limits, subject to criteria.	SAC, which is within the Green Belt, suggests that LSEs are unlikely. Dundry, the nearest, is over 5km away.							
Delivery Policies									
Policy CS34: Developer Contributions to Infrastructure.	Financial contributions will be sought in the form of a standardised tariff scheme applied across the district to ensure the effective and timely delivery of the key infrastructure requirements to support new development.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS34 Publication Infrastructure delivery and development contributions	Concerns mechanisms for funding and delivery of infrastructural elements, with regard to the Weston villages, Weston urban area and rest of district	**As above**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CS34 as at November 2013.	Effectively as above No changes are proposed to adopted policy which is not fundamentally different to	**As above**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Assessment Matrix									
Policy/Proposal	**Description**	**Assessment Category[4]**	**Potential Impacts on Avon Gorge**				**Avoidance/ Mitigation Measures**	**Assessment Category post mitigation**	**HRA required ?**
			Decreased Air Quality	**Other**					
	Consultation Draft version.								
Policy CS35: Implementation	Implementation will take place as part of a co-ordinated strategy, provided in step with the necessary infrastructure, utilities and service provision needed to support and enable the development.	**B (No significant effect)**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS35 is deleted in the Publication version	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
CS35 is deleted in the adopted plan, and no change is being proposed to that situation	N/A	**N/A**	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A

Note regarding water issues

The Draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) proposed significantly higher levels of development than is being proposed for the Core Strategy;(about 26,000 dwellings for North Somerset as opposed to 17,130), in addition to development in other districts. The HRA of the draft RSS considered the issues of water abstraction and water quality. For water abstraction the HRA categorised the Severn Estuary site as one where it was not possible to conclude that no adverse effects on integrity will occur on the basis of the draft RSS but where it is considered that sufficient safeguards are available at lower levels of plan making and through other regulator mechanisms to ensure that no adverse effects will occur. The HRA referred to water companies' Water Resource Plans, the Environment Agency's Review of Consents procedures and Environment Agency (EA) catchment abstraction management strategies (CAMS) as examples of such regulatory mechanisms. The Review of Consents Procedure requires the EA to review their existing consents for water resources (abstraction) water quality (discharges), and groundwater authorisations that may affect SAC or SPA sites, and where a site might be significantly affected (alone or in combination with nearby permissions) an appropriate assessment is undertaken. Also the EA is required to do an appropriate assessment of the implications for NK2 sites when granting new consents for water abstraction.

The HRA of the Draft RSS concluded that the EA's CAMs, their consenting scheme for new water abstraction and associated HRA should avoid any adverse effects on a number of European sites including the Severn Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar.

It is considered that in view of this, and the strong safeguards provided by the regulatory mechanisms, the Core Strategy is unlikely to have significant effects on European sites regarding water abstraction.

Regarding water quality the HRA of the RSS found that there was a greater likelihood of adverse effects on the Severn Estuary site on the basis of the Draft RSS, because the EA Review of Consents process was not complete. However, regarding avoidance and mitigation it noted that there are strong regulatory controls over discharge licences, and Water Resource Plans, which also need to be subject to HRA. It stated that the consent regime operated by the EA, which will be further strengthened by the requirements of the Water Framework Directive , should ensure that water quality is maintained. In view of this, the significantly lower quantity of development proposed in the Core Strategy than was in the Draft RSS, and the fact that Core Strategy policy CS3 strongly opposes development that on its own or cumulatively would result in water pollution, it is considered unlikely that the Core Strategy would have significant effects on European sites regarding water quality.

APPENDIX D

Air Quality Assessment matrices, including consideration of in-combination effects

CS1 – Addressing Climate Change and Carbon Reduction

Table 1: Impact of CS1 (Addressing Climate Change and Carbon Reduction) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[5]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]		Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 (130%)	Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on	15	16.1 **(107%)**	Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

	calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)			from site							
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd

Ramsar				well below CL)			well below CL)		well below objective)		well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	Only of possible significance if energy facilities were to be located < 10km from site	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance for point source emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worstcase in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. Impacts of a point or area source may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the objective or critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold).

[3] Impacts are likely to be significant if the source contribution is greater than 1% of the relevant objective or critical load and where the total (background + source) deposition or concentration is greater than 70% of the relevant objective or critical load. Where no information exists to calculate the impact, impacts of a point source could potentially be significant when located within 10 km of international designated sites (or 15 km for coal or oil fired power stations). Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

CS7 – Planning for Waste

Table 2: Impact of CS7 (Planning for Waste) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[1]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]		Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	Unlikely to be significant. Sites identified in North Somerset in the Joint Waste Core Strategy are >10km from SAC.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Unlikely to be significant. Sites identified in North Somerset in the Joint Waste Core Strategy are >10km from SAC.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	Unlikely to be significant. Sites identified in North Somerset in the Joint Waste Core Strategy are >10km from SAC.	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Unlikely to be significant. Sites identified in North Somerset in the Joint Waste Core Strategy are >10km from SAC.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	**Potentially significant where energy from waste facilities < 10km from site**	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats	Semi-natural dry grasslands	15	16.1 **(107%)**	**Potentially significant where energy**	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below

SAC	and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)			**from waste facilities < 10km from site**					objective)		objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

	low tide										
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	**Potentially significant where energy from waste facilities < 10km from site**	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	**Potentially significant where energy from waste facilities < 10km from site**	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	**Potentially significant where energy from waste facilities < 10km from site**	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance for point source emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. Impacts of a point or area source may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the objective or critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold).

[3] Impacts are likely to be significant if the source contribution is greater than 1% of the relevant objective or critical load and where the total (background + source) deposition or concentration is greater than 70% of the relevant objective or critical load. Where no information exists to calculate the impact, impacts of a point source could potentially be significant when located within 10 km of international designated sites (or 15 km for coal or oil fired power stations). Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

CS8 – Minerals Planning in North Somerset

Table 3: Impact of CS8 (Minerals Planning in North Somerset) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[1]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]		Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	Unlikely to be significant source of NO_x	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Unlikely to be significant source of NO_x	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	Unlikely to be significant source of NO_x	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Unlikely to be significant source of NO_x	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	Unlikely to be significant source of NO_x	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	16.1 **(107%)**	Unlikely to be significant source of NO_x	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary	Sandbanks which are	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd

Ramsar	slightly covered by seawater all the time			well below CL)			well below CL)		well below objective)		well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	Unlikely to be significant source of NO_x	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	Unlikely to be significant source of NO_x	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	Unlikely to be significant source of NO_x	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance for point source emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. Impacts of a point or area source may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the objective or critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold).

[3] Impacts are likely to be significant if the source contribution is greater than 1% of the relevant objective or critical load and where the total (background + source) deposition or concentration is greater than 70% of the relevant objective or critical load. Where no information exists to calculate the impact, impacts of a point source could potentially be significant when located within 10 km of international designated sites (or 15 km for coal or oil fired power stations). Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

CS10 – Transportation and Movement

Table 4: Impact of CS10 (Transportation and Movement) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[1]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]		Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234 %)**	**Transport schemes which could affect traffic on section of A4, A369, A4176 and B3129 alongside site are potentially significant**	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130 %)**	**Transport schemes which could affect traffic on section of A4, A369, A4176 and B3129 alongside site are potentially significant**	7.1 (36%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2.
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103 %)**	**Transport schemes which could affect traffic on section of A4, A369, A4176 and B3129 alongside site are potentially significant**	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130 %)**	**Transport schemes which could affect traffic on section of A4, A369, A4176 and B3129 alongside site are potentially significant**	7.1 (36%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276 %)**	**Transport schemes which could affect traffic on section of A370 and A368 alongside component**	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2

				sites are potentially significant							
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	16.1 **(107 %)**	**Transport schemes which could affect traffic on section of A370 and A368 alongside component sites are potentially significant**	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2

									objective)		
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225 %)**	**Transport schemes which could affect traffic on section of A38 and A371 alongside component sites are potentially significant**	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	**Transport schemes which could affect traffic on section of A38 and A371 alongside component sites are potentially significant**	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2

Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132 %)**	**Transport schemes which could affect traffic on section of A38 and A371 alongside component sites are potentially significant**	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality guidance for road traffic emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. Deposition impacts may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold). Following Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 207/07), Air Quality, impacts on NO_x may be significant if the NO_x concentration is close to or in excess of the air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).

[3] Road traffic impacts on deposition are likely to be significant if the increase is greater than 1% of the critical load, and where the total (background + source) deposition is greater than 70% of the critical load. Road traffic impacts on NO_x are likely to be significant where the increase is greater than 2 µg m^{-3}, and where total concentrations are close to or in excess of the annual mean air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3). Where no information exists to calculate road-traffic pollutants, impacts could potentially be significant within 200 m of affected roads. Affected roads are defined according to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality, as roads with a change in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow of 1000 or more, or a change in HGV (AADT) flow of 200 or more or a change in annual average speed of 10 km/hr or more as a result of a proposal. Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

CS11 – Parking

Table 5: Impact of CS11 (Parking) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[1]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]		Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	**Parking provision which could affect traffic on section of A4, A369, A4176 and B3129 alongside site is potentially significant**	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	**Parking provision which could affect traffic on section of A4, A369, A4176 and B3129 alongside site is potentially significant**	7.1 (36%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2.
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	**Parking provision which could affect traffic on section of A4, A369, A4176 and B3129 alongside site is potentially significant**	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	**Parking provision which could affect traffic on section of A4, A369, A4176 and B3129 alongside site is potentially significant**	7.1 (36%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	**Parking provision which could affect traffic on section of A370 and A368 alongside component**	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2

				sites is potentially significant							
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	16.1 **(107%)**	**Parking provision which could affect traffic on section of A370 and A368 alongside component sites is potentially significant**	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2

									objective)		
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	**Parking provision which could affect traffic on section of A38 and A371 alongside component sites is potentially significant**	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	**Parking provision which could affect traffic on section of A38 and A371 alongside component sites is potentially significant**	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	**Parking provision which could**	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2

	affect traffic on section of A38 and A371 alongside component sites is potentially significant		objective)

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality guidance for road traffic emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. Deposition impacts may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold). Following Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 207/07), Air Quality, impacts on NO_x may be significant if the NO_x concentration is close to or in excess of the air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).

[3] Road traffic impacts on deposition are likely to be significant if the increase is greater than 1% of the critical load, and where the total (background + source) deposition is greater than 70% of the critical load. Road traffic impacts on NO_x are likely to be significant where the increase is greater than 2 µg m^{-3}, and where total concentrations are close to or in excess of the annual mean air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3). Where no information exists to calculate road-traffic pollutants, impacts could potentially be significant within 200 m of affected roads. Affected roads are defined according to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality, as roads with a change in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow of 1000 or more, or a change in HGV (AADT) flow of 200 or more or a change in annual average speed of 10 km/hr or more as a result of a proposal. Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

CS13 – Scale of New Housing

Table 6: Impact of CS13 (Scale of New Housing) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[1]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]		Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	Weston urban extension, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Weston urban extension, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	Weston urban extension, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Weston urban extension, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	Weston urban extension located within 2 km of the nearest of the component sites (Banwell Caves).	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

				However they are not known to contain these features, so impacts unlikely to be significant.							
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	16.1 **(107%)**	Weston urban extension located within 2 km of the nearest of the component sites (Banwell Caves). However they are not known to contain these features, so impacts unlikely to be significant.	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic.	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

				Therefore impact unlikely to be significant.							
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

						suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance for point source emissions and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality guidance for road traffic emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. For point source emissions, impacts may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the objective or critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold). Following Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 207/07), Air Quality, road traffic impacts on NO_x may be significant if the NO_x concentration is close to or in excess of the air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).

[3] Impacts on deposition and SO_2 and NO_x for point sources are likely to be significant if the increase is greater than 1% of the critical load or objective, and where the total (background + source) deposition is greater than 70% of the critical load or objective. Road traffic impacts on NO_x are likely to be significant where the increase is greater than 2 µg m^{-3}, and where total concentrations are close to or in excess of the annual mean air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3). Where no information exists to calculate point source emissions, impacts of a point source could potentially be significant within 10 km of international designated sites (or 15 km for coal or oil fired power stations). Where no information exists to calculate road-traffic pollutants, impacts could potentially be significant within 200 m of affected roads. Affected roads are defined according to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality, as roads with a change in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow of 1000 or more, or a change in HGV (AADT) flow of 200 or more or a change in annual average speed of 10 km/hr or more as a result of a proposal. Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

CS14 – Distribution of New Housing

Table 7: Impact of CS14 (Distribution of New Housing) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[1]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Lower	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	Weston urban extension, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Weston urban extension, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	Weston urban extension, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts..	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Weston urban extension, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	Weston urban extension located within 2 km of the nearest of the component sites (Banwell Caves).	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

				However they are not known to contain these features, so impacts unlikely to be significant**.**							
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	16.1 **(107%)**	Weston urban extension located within 2 km of the nearest of the component sites (Banwell Caves). However they are not known to contain these features, so impacts unlikely to be significant.	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic.	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

				Therefore impact unlikely to be significant							
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

							suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance for point source emissions and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality guidance for road traffic emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. For point source emissions, impacts may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the objective or critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold). Following Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 207/07), Air Quality, road traffic impacts on NO_x may be significant if the NO_x concentration is close to or in excess of the air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).

[3] Impacts on deposition and SO_2 and NO_x for point sources are likely to be significant if the increase is greater than 1% of the critical load or objective, and where the total (background + source) deposition is greater than 70% of the critical load or objective. Road traffic impacts on NO_x are likely to be significant where the increase is greater than 2 µg m^{-3}, and where total concentrations are close to or in excess of the annual mean air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).). Where no information exists to calculate point source emissions, impacts of a point source could potentially be significant within 10 km of international designated sites (or 15 km for coal or oil fired power stations). Where no information exists to calculate road-traffic pollutants, impacts could potentially be significant within 200 m of affected roads. Affected roads are defined according to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality, as roads with a change in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow of 1000 or more, or a change in HGV (AADT) flow of 200 or more or a change in annual average speed of 10 km/hr or more as a result of a proposal. Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

CS20 – Supporting a Successful Economy

Table 8: Impact of CS20 (Supporting a Successful Economy) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]		Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	Weston urban extension/town centre, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Weston urban extension/town centre, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	7.1 (36%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2.
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	Weston urban extension/town centre, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Weston urban extension/town centre, Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead located > 6 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts	7.1 (36%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	Weston urban extension located within 2 km of the nearest of the component sites (Banwell Caves).	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2

				However they are not known to contain these features, so impacts unlikely to be significant.							
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	16.1 **(107%)**	Weston urban extension located within 2 km from the nearest of the component sites (Banwell Caves). However they are not known to contain these features, so impacts unlikely to be significant.	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2

Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic.	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2

				Therefore impact unlikely to be significant							
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Road traffic not a significant source of SO_2

												suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality guidance for road traffic emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. Deposition impacts may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold). Following Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 207/07), Air Quality, impacts on NO_x may be significant if the NO_x concentration is close to or in excess of the air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).

[3] Road traffic impacts on deposition are likely to be significant if the increase is greater than 1% of the critical load, and where the total (background + source) deposition is greater than 70% of the critical load. Road traffic impacts on NO_x are likely to be significant where the increase is greater than 2 µg m^{-3}, and where total concentrations are close to or in excess of the annual mean air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3). Where no information exists to calculate road-traffic pollutants, impacts could potentially be significant within 200 m of affected roads. Affected roads are defined according to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality, as roads with a change in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow of 1000 or more, or a change in HGV (AADT) flow of 200 or more or a change in annual average speed of 10 km/hr or more as a result of a proposal. Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

CS23 – Bristol International Airport

Table 9: Impact of CS23 (Bristol International Airport) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[1]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)		Likely significant effect from air pollution?
			Bd[2]	Wd[3]		Bd[2]	Wd[3]	Bd[2]	Wd[3]	Bd[2]	Wd[3]	
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	PC < 1% Benchmark		5.8	PC < 1% Benchmark		PC < 1% Benchmark		PC < 1% Benchmark		No
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	PC < 1% Benchmark		4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark		PC < 1% Benchmark		PC < 1% Benchmark		No
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	36.5 (365%)	36.6 (1%)	5.8	PC < 1% Benchmark		PC < 1% Benchmark		No		No
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	PC < 1% Benchmark		4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark		PC < 1% Benchmark		PC < 1% Benchmark		No
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	PC < 1% Benchmark		4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark		PC < 1% Benchmark		PC < 1% Benchmark		No
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at	30	PC < 1% Benchmark		4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark		PC < 1% Benchmark		PC < 1% Benchmark		No

	low tide							
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	PC < 1% Benchmark	4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	No
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	PC < 1% Benchmark	4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	No
Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	PC < 1% Benchmark	4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	No
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	PC < 1% Benchmark	4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	No
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	PC < 1% Benchmark	4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	No
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	PC < 1% Benchmark	4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	No
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	PC < 1% Benchmark	4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	No
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	PC < 1% Benchmark	5.7	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	No
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	PC < 1% Benchmark	4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	No

Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	PC < 1% Benchmark	4.0	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	PC < 1% Benchmark	No

Bd = Background, Wd = With Development, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance reported in the table is based on the air quality assessment submitted with an Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed expansion of Bristol airport from 7.3 million passengers per annum (mppa) to 10 mppa (Entec UK Ltd (2009) Development and Enhancement of Bristol International Airport, Environmental Statement, Air Quality).

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.
[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. Following Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions, impacts of a point or area source may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the objective or critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold).
[3] Process contribution (PC, contribution from source) expressed as percentage of relevant objective or critical load in parenthesis. Impacts are likely to be significant if this value is greater than 1%, and where the total (background + source) deposition or concentration is greater than 70% of the relevant objective or critical load. Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.
[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

CS24 – Royal Portbury Dock

Table 10: Impact of CS24 (Royal Portbury Dock) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[1]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]		Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	Dock located approximately 3 km from site. Dock uses unlikely to be significant sources of point source air emissions. Significant effects unlikely.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Dock located approximately 3 km from site. Dock uses unlikely to be significant sources of point source air emissions. Significant effects unlikely.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	Dock located approximately 3 km from site. Dock uses unlikely to be significant sources of point source air emissions. Significant effects unlikely.	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Dock located approximately 3 km from site. Dock uses unlikely to be significant sources of point source air emissions. Significant effects unlikely.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	Dock located approximately 9 km from site. Furthermore dock uses unlikely to be significant sources of point	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

				source air emissions. Significant effects unlikely							
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	16.1 **(107%)**	Dock located approximately 9 km from site. Furthermore dock uses unlikely to be significant sources of point source air emissions. Significant effects unlikely	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Located nearby to SAC but policy not likely to be enough of a source of NOx to have a significant effect.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Located nearby to SAC but policy not likely to be enough of a source of NOx to have a significant effect.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Located nearby to SAC but policy not likely to be enough of a source of NOx to have a significant effect.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Located nearby to SAC but policy not likely	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below

	covered by seawater all the time								to be enough of a source of NOx to have a significant effect.		objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Located nearby to SAC but policy not likely to be enough of a source of NOx to have a significant effect.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Located nearby to SAC but policy not likely to be enough of a source of NOx to have a significant effect.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Located nearby to SAC but policy not likely to be enough of a source of NOx to have a significant effect.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Located nearby to SAC but policy not likely to be enough of a source of NOx to have a significant effect.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Located nearby to SAC but policy not likely to be enough of a source of NOx to have a significant effect.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	Royal Portbury Dock located > 10 km from site, unlikely to have significant effect.	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	Royal Portbury Dock located > 10 km from site, unlikely to have significant effect.	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	Royal Portbury Dock located > 10 km from site, unlikely to have significant effect.	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance for point/area source emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. Impacts of a point or area source may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the objective or critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold).

[3] Impacts are likely to be significant if the source contribution is greater than 1% of the relevant objective or critical load and where the total (background + source) deposition or concentration is greater than 70% of the relevant objective or critical load. Where no information exists to calculate the impact, impacts of a point/area source could potentially be significant when located within 10 km of international designated sites (or 15 km for coal or oil fired power stations). Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

CS28 – Weston-super-Mare

Table 11: Impact of CS28 (Weston-super-Mare) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Lower	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic/energy centre impacts.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic/energy centre impacts.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic/energy centre impacts.	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic/energy centre impacts.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	Habitat not thought to be present on nearest SAC component site to the Weston Urban Extension (Banwell caves). Therefore impact unlikely to be significant.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

				Other component sites are further than 2km from Weston Urban extension (Design Manual for Roads (DMRB) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic.))							
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	16.1 **(107%)**	As above	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	The closest part of the SAC, SSSI units 4 and 5, are designated for littoral sediment in favourable condition. Effects on this feature are unlikely to be significant.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below

	seawater at low tide										objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	The closest part of the SAC, SSSI units 4 and 5, are designated for littoral sediment in favourable condition. There are no salt meadow features located near to Weston town centre[5]. Effects on this feature are unlikely to be significant.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Sandbanks do not occur within close proximity of the coast at Weston[6]	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Reefs do not occur within close proximity of the coast at Weston[6]	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	The closest part of the SAC, SSSI units 4 and 5, are designated for littoral sediment in	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

									favourable condition. Effects on this feature are unlikely to be significant.		
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	The closest part of the SAC, SSSI units 4 and 5, are designated for littoral sediment in favourable condition. There are no salt meadow features located near to Weston town centre.[5] Effects on this feature are unlikely to be significant.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Sandbanks do not occur within close proximity of the coast at Weston	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

				nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant							
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance for point source emissions and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality guidance for road traffic emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. For point source emissions, impacts may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the objective or critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold). Following Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 207/07), Air Quality, road traffic impacts on NO_x may be significant if the NO_x concentration is close to or in excess of the air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).

[3] Impacts on deposition and SO_2 and NO_x for point sources are likely to be significant if the increase is greater than 1% of the critical load or objective, and where the total (background + source) deposition is greater than 70% of the critical load or objective. Road traffic impacts on NO_x are likely to be significant where the increase is greater than 2 µg m^{-3}, and where total concentrations are close to or in excess of the annual mean air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).). Where no information exists to calculate point source emissions, impacts of a point source could potentially be significant within 10 km of international designated sites (or 15 km for coal or oil fired power stations). Where no information exists to calculate road-traffic pollutants, impacts could potentially be significant within 200 m of affected roads. Affected roads are defined according to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality, as roads with a change in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow of 1000 or more, or a change in HGV (AADT) flow of 200 or more or a change in annual average speed of 10 km/hr or more as a result of a proposal. Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk
[5] Source of mapping: http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/App5and5a-salt_meadows_tcm6-11836.pdf
[6] Source: JNCC: http://www.jncc.gov.uk/ProtectedSites

CS29 – Weston-super-Mare Town Centre

Table 12: Impact of CS29 (Weston-super-Mare Town Centre) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[1]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]		Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	Town centre located > 20 km from nearest component site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	Located > 20 km from nearest component site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	Located >4km from nearest component site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates	15	16.1 **(107%)**	Located >4km from nearest component site. Unlikely to be significant traffic impacts.	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

	(*Festuco-Brometalia*)										
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	The closest part of the SAC, SSSI units 4 and 5, are designated for littoral sediment in favourable condition. Effects on this feature are unlikely to be significant.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	The closest part of the SAC, SSSI units 4 and 5, are designated for littoral sediment in favourable condition. There are no salt meadow features located near to Weston town centre.[5] Effects on this feature are unlikely to be significant.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd	10.7 (36%)	Sandbanks do not occur	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd

	slightly covered by seawater all the time			well below CL)			well below CL)		within close proximity of the coast at Weston[6]		well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Reefs do not occur within close proximity of the coast at Weston[6]	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	The closest part of the SAC, SSSI units 4 and 5, are designated for littoral sediment in favourable condition. Effects on this feature are unlikely to be significant.	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	The closest part of the SAC, SSSI units 4 and 5, are designated for littoral sediment in favourable condition. There are no salt meadow	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

									features located near to Weston town centre.[5] Effects on this feature are unlikely to be significant.		
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Sandbanks do not occur within close proximity of the coast at Weston[6]	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	Weston town centre located about 3km from the nearest component site. However, Design Manual for Roads (DMRB) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant.	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates	15	13.2 **(88%)**	Weston town centre located about 3km from the nearest component	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

	(*Festuco-Brometalia*)			site. However, Design Manual for Roads (DMRB) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant.							
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	Weston town centre located about 3km from the nearest component site. However, Design Manual for Roads (DMRB) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant.	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality guidance for road traffic emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. Deposition impacts may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold). Following Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 207/07), Air Quality, impacts on NO_x may be significant if the NO_x concentration is close to or in excess of the air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 $\mu g/m^3$).

[3] Road traffic impacts on deposition are likely to be significant if the increase is greater than 1% of the critical load, and where the total (background + source) deposition is greater than 70% of the critical load. Road traffic impacts on NO_x are likely to be significant where the increase is greater than 2 $\mu g\ m^{-3}$, and where total concentrations are close to or in excess of the annual mean air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 $\mu g/m^3$). Where no information exists to calculate road-traffic pollutants, impacts could potentially be significant within 200 m of affected roads. Affected roads are defined according to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality, as roads with a change in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow of 1000 or more, or a change in HGV (AADT) flow of 200 or more or a change in annual average speed of 10 km/hr or more as a result of a proposal. Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

[5] Source of mapping: http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/App5and5a-salt_meadows_tcm6-11836.pdf

[6] Source: JNCC: http://www.jncc.gov.uk/ProtectedSites

CS30 – Weston Urban Extension

Table 13: Impact of CS30 (Weston Urban Extension) on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[1]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]		Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significacne[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic/energy centre impacts.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic/energy centre impacts.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic/energy centre impacts.	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Located > 20 km from site. Unlikely to be significant traffic/energy centre impacts.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	Habitat not thought to be present on nearest SAC component site to the Weston Urban Extension (Banwell caves). Therefore impact unlikely to be significant.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

				Other component sites are further than 2km from Weston Urban extension (Design Manual for Roads (DMRB) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic.))							
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	16.1 **(107%)**	As above	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below

	by seawater all the time								objective)		objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

				NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant. On site energy generation may require project level HRA.							
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant. On site energy generation may require project level HRA.	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	Weston urban extension generally located over 2km from nearest component site at Uphill Cliff. DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) (2009) guidance suggests a 2km zone for NOx impacts from traffic. Therefore impact unlikely to be significant .On site energy generation may require project level HRA.	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance for point source emissions and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality guidance for road traffic emissions. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. For point source emissions, impacts may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the objective or critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold). Following Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 207/07), Air Quality, road traffic impacts on NO_x may be significant if the NO_x concentration is close to or in excess of the air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).

[3] Impacts on deposition and SO_2 and NO_x for point sources are likely to be significant if the increase is greater than 1% of the critical load or objective, and where the total (background + source) deposition is greater than 70% of the critical load or objective. Road traffic impacts on NO_x are likely to be significant where the increase is greater than 2 µg m^{-3}, and where total concentrations are close to or in excess of the annual mean air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).). Where no information exists to calculate point source emissions, impacts of a point source could potentially be significant within 10 km of international designated sites (or 15 km for coal or oil fired power stations). Where no information exists to calculate road-traffic pollutants, impacts could potentially be significant within 200 m of affected roads. Affected roads are defined according to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality, as roads with a change in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow of 1000 or more, or a change in HGV (AADT) flow of 200 or more or a change in annual average speed of 10 km/hr or more as a result of a proposal. Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

SW Bristol Urban Extension **(Note: This is not supported by or proposed in the Core Strategy. Halcrow were asked to consider it since the Consultation Draft Core Strategy November 2009 invited comment on options for locating development there, in view of the proposal in the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy at that time).**

Table 14: Impact of SW Bristol Urban Extension on nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) in international designated sites.

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Qualifying Interest Features	Nitrogen CL (kg N/ha/yr)[1]	Nitrogen deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		Acidification CL (keg/ ha/yr)	Acid deposition (keg/ ha/yr)		NO_x (µg/m^3)		SO_2 (µg/m^3)	
			Bd[2]	Significance[3]		Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]	Bd[2]	Significance[3]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	23.4 **(234%)**	Bristol City Council Core Strategy HRA (2010) showed that traffic impacts associated with SW Bristol urban extension (Core Strategy policy BCS4) are likely to be non-significant. Project Level HRA may be required.	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Bristol City Council Core Strategy HRA (2010) showed that traffic impacts associated with SW Bristol urban extension (Core Strategy policy BSC4) are likely to be non-significant. Project Level HRA may be required.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	15.4 **(103%)**	Bristol City Council Core Strategy HRA (2010) showed that traffic impacts associated with SW Bristol urban extension (Core Strategy policy BCS4) are likely to be non-significant. Project Level HRA may be required.	4.0	2.1 (53%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	39 **(130%)**	Bristol City Council Core Strategy HRA (2010) showed that traffic impacts associated with SW Bristol urban extension (Core Strategy policy BSC4) are likely to be non-significant. Project Level HRA may be required.	7.1 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	27.6 **(276%)**	SSSIs of this SAC in North Somerset's administrative region not known to contain these qualifying features. Therefore no likely significant effect	5.8	3.3 (57%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	16.1 **(107%)**	SSSIs of this SAC in North Somerset's administrative region not known to contain these qualifying features.	4.0	1.8 (45%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

				Therefore no likely significant effect							
Severn Estuary SAC	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary SAC	Reefs	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Estuaries	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Mudflats and sandflats not covered seawater at low tide	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary Ramsar	Atlantic salt meadows	30	11.1 (37%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	4.0	1.4 (35%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	10.7 (36%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	2.4 (12%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Severn Estuary	Sandbanks	30	11.1	Unlikely to be	4.0	1.4	Unlikely to be	10.7	Unlikely to be	2.4	Unlikely to be

Ramsar	which are slightly covered by seawater all the time		(37%)	significant (Bd well below CL)		(35%)	significant (Bd well below CL)	(36%)	significant (Bd well below objective)	(12%)	significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines[4]	10	22.5 **(225%)**	Located > 15 km from the site. Traffic and energy centre impacts likely to be non significant.	5.7	2.9 (51%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)	15	13.2 **(88%)**	Located > 15 km from the site. Traffic and energy centre impacts likely to be non significant.	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	European Dry Heaths	10	13.2 **(132%)**	Located > 15 km from the site. Traffic and energy centre impacts likely to be non significant.	4.0	1.6 (40%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below CL)	9.9 (33%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)	1.7 (9%)	Unlikely to be significant (Bd well below objective)

Bd = Background, CL = Critical Load. UK air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems: NO_x = 30 µg/m^3; SO_2 = 20 µg/m^3 (both as annual mean). The impact significance presented in the table is based on Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance for point source emissions and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality guidance for road traffic emissions. Impact significance of road traffic on air quality in Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC based on Bristol City Council, Habitats Regulation Assessment (2010) which considered growth in traffic between 2010 and 2020 on major roads within 200 m of the site, taking into account SW Bristol Urban Extension (assuming an additional 500 houses) and the expansion of Bristol city centre. The DMRB Screening Tool was used to predict NO_x and nitrogen deposition in the site. It should be noted that the study did not account for the additional houses in N. Somerset (potentially 9000) under the policy. All data derived from UK Air Pollution Information System – www.apis.ac.uk

[1] Critical loads for nitrogen deposition are expressed across a range (lower and upper value is given by APIS). The lower value represents the lowest critical load, and is therefore worst-case in terms of significance when nitrogen deposition is expressed as a percentage of the critical load value. Critical load for nitrogen deposition in this matrix is based on the lowest estimate.

[2] Background deposition or concentration expressed as percentage of critical load or objective in parenthesis. For point source emissions, impacts may be significant if the background + source contribution is greater than 70% of the objective or critical load (cases where this applies are highlighted in bold). Following Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 207/07), Air Quality, road traffic impacts on NO_x may be significant if the NO_x concentration is close to or in excess of the air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).

[3] Impacts on deposition and SO_2 and NO_x for point sources are likely to be significant if the increase is greater than 1% of the critical load or objective, and where the total (background + source) deposition is greater than 70% of the critical load or objective. Road traffic impacts on NO_x are likely to be significant where the increase is greater than 2 µg m^{-3}, and where total concentrations are close to or in excess of the annual mean air quality objective for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems (30 µg/m^3).). Where no information exists to calculate point source emissions, impacts of a point source could potentially be significant within 10 km of international designated sites (or 15 km for coal or oil fired power stations). Where no information exists to calculate road-traffic pollutants, impacts could potentially be significant within 200 m of affected roads. Affected roads are defined according to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality, as roads with a change in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow of 1000 or more, or a change in HGV (AADT) flow of 200 or more or a change in annual average speed of 10 km/hr or more as a result of a proposal. Potentially significant impacts are highlighted in bold.

[4] Habitat feature is listed as sensitive to acidity but it tends to occur on limestone soils where it is not sensitive. Source: www.apis.ac.uk

In-combination impacts

The following matrix shows other plans and projects that could potentially cause 'in-combination' impacts on the international sites within and around North Somerset and some possible avoidance and mitigation measures. The table includes projects that fall within the North Somerset administrative area but were not specifically included in the 2009 Core Strategy document.

Table 15: In-combination impacts

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Likely significant effect from Core Strategy alone?	In-combination plans or projects	Potential impacts and receptors	Avoidance/mitigation measures	Residual 'likely significant effect'?[1]
Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Uncertainty of significant effects from CS1, CS10, CS11, CS24	Bristol Core Strategy West of England Joint Local Transport Plan	Increased air pollution if traffic growth on roads near SAC (A4, A369, A4176, B3129): nitrogen deposition on qualifying habitats However Bristol City Council, Habitats Regulation Assessment (2010) showed that traffic impacts are likely to be non- significant.	Sustainable transport policies in Bristol Core Strategy[6] (Policy BCS10) and West of England Joint Local Transport Plan Implementation of measures to promote non-car travel modes as promoted in Core Strategy policies such as CS10.	No

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Likely significant effect from Core Strategy alone?	In-combination plans or projects	Potential impacts and receptors	Avoidance/mitigation measures	Residual 'likely significant effect'?[1]
		West of England Joint Waste Core Strategy - Energy from Waste (EfW) Sites	Increased point source air pollution from EfW Sites: nitrogen deposition on qualifying habitats	Mitigation through design of EfW/ regulation by Environment Agency	No
		Seabank Power Station, Hallen, Bristol (<10km distant)	Increased point source air pollution of NOy[7]: nitrogen deposition on qualifying habitats	Mitigation through design of EfW/ regulation by Environment Agency	No
North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC	No	None thought to be significant	N/A	N/A	No
Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Uncertainty of significant effects from CS1, CS7, CS10, CS11, CS13, CS14, CS20, CS30	West of England Joint Local Transport Plan Somerset Local Transport Plan Sedgemoor District Council Core Strategy Mendip District Council Core Strategy	Increased air pollution if traffic growth on roads near SAC (A38, A371): nitrogen deposition on qualifying habitats	Sustainable transport policies within JLTP	No

International Site (SAC, SPA, Ramsar)	Likely significant effect from Core Strategy alone?	In-combination plans or projects	Potential impacts and receptors	Avoidance/mitigation measures	Residual 'likely significant effect'?[1]
		West of England Joint Waste Core Strategy (EfW Sites)	Increased point source air pollution from EfW Sites: nitrogen deposition on qualifying habitats	Mitigation through design of EfW/ regulation by Environment Agency	No
Severn Estuary SAC/ Ramsar	No significant effects from CS28, CS29 Uncertainty of significant effects from CS24	Bristol Core Strategy West of England Joint Local Transport Plan	Increased air pollution if traffic growth on roads near SAC: nitrogen deposition on qualifying habitats	Sustainable transport policies in Bristol Core Strategy (Policy BCS10) and West of England Joint Local Transport Plan and Core Strategy	No
		West of England Joint Waste Core Strategy - Energy from Waste (EfW) Sites	Increased point source air pollution from EfW Sites: nitrogen deposition on qualifying habitats	Mitigation through design of EfW/ regulation by Environment Agency	No
		Proposed Renewable Energy Plant at Royal Portbury Dock	Increased point source air pollution – however the ES for this project concluded no LSE for nearby international sites (Eon, 2009).	Project level HRA	No

[1] This is dependant upon the avoidance and mitigation measures being implemented

Summary of Core Strategy air quality impacts

The air quality assessment showed that several Core Strategy policies have the potential to cause likely significant effects (LSE) on the qualifying interest features of the international sites through air pollution.

Table 16: Summary of Core Strategy policies and the international sites that could have LSE

Core Strategy Policy	International sites with potential LSE (before mitigation)	Air pollution source	In-combination plans*
CS1 – Addressing climate change and carbon reduction	Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Possible future renewable energy facilities	Bristol Core Strategy Ashton Park
CS7 – Planning for waste	Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Energy from waste facilities	Seabank Power Station
CS10 – Transportation and movement CS11 – Parking	Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC	Road transport on A4, A369, A4176 and B3129	Weston Town Centre Area Action Plan
	Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC	Road transport on A38 and A371	West of England Joint Local Transport Plan West of England Joint Waste Core Strategy - Energy from Waste (EfW) Sites Somerset Local Transport Plan Sedgemoor District Council Core Strategy Mendip District Council Core Strategy

* The Natural England (2009) guidance states that these plans and projects should be identified in a *targeted* way and not list every conceivable plan or project. The list in this table does not mean that every one of these plans or projects will cause LSE on all international sites – the relevant plan or project for each international site is shown in table 15.

The largest potential for air-pollution impacts, principally Nitrogen oxides, on international sites comes from the following potential sources;

- Point source pollution sources, such as energy facilities; and
- Road traffic

Avoidance and mitigation measures are site specific but will, of necessity include sustainable transport policies, including demand management. New energy facilities may also need to be located further than ten kilometres from international sites unless they can demonstrate that pollution emissions will not cause likely significant effects on international sites (and other potential receptors to comply with separate regulations). For all Core Strategy policies the assessment has concluded that avoidance and mitigation measures can prevent likely significant effects on international sites. The Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC may be affected by various potential pollution sources, not necessarily associated with North Somerset's Core Strategy, and hence there are many variables to take into account for assessing impacts on this site. Due to the site being in 'unfavourable condition' and the high background levels of NOx the site is known to be vulnerable to any increase in air pollution levels. However, monitoring at the site to assess the impacts of air pollution on vegetation, which is now taking place, can assist in developing appropriate mitigation measures. HRA is likely to be needed at project level for individual planning applications, to be agreed with Natural England.

References

Bristol City Council, 2010. Bristol Core Strategy. Website: http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Environment-Planning/Planning/planning-policy-documents/bristol-development-framework/core-strategy.en

Bristol City Council, 2010. Core Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment. Received by email 10/5/2010.

Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB, 2007) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1. Air Quality (HA 207/07).

Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB, 2009) Volume 11, Section 4, Part 1. Assessment of Implications (of Highways and/or Roads Projects) on European Sites (including Appropriate Assessment) (HD 44/09).

Entec, 2009. Bristol International Airport: Development and Enhancement of Bristol International Airport Environmental Statement (ES), June 2009.

Environment Agency, 2010. H1 Environmental Risk Assessment. Annex (f) air emissions.

Eon, 2009. Proposed Renewable Energy Plant at the Royal Portbury Dock. Environmental Impact Assessment – Air Quality.

JNCC, 2010. Website: http://www.jncc.gov.uk/ProtectedSites

Landtrust Developments, 2009. Outline Planning Application for Ashton Park: Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report.

Mendip District Council Core Strategy. Website: http://www.mendip.gov.uk/CouncilService.asp?id=SX9452-A7816E06

Natural England, 2010. 'Nature on the Map' website: http://www.natureonthemap.org.uk/map.aspx

Natural England, 2010. The Habitats Regulations Assessment of Local Development Documents. David Tydlesley and Associates (for Natural England), January 2010.

North Somerset Council Core Strategy. Consultation Draft, November 2009.

Sedgemoor District Council Core Strategy. Website: http://www.sedgemoor.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=5856

Somerset County Council Local Transport Plan. Website: http://www.somerset.gov.uk/irj/public/services/directory/service?rid=/wpccontent/Sites/SCC/Web%20Pages/Services/Services/Environment/Local%20Transport%20Plan

South West Councils. South West Regional Spatial Strategy. Website: http://www.swcouncils.gov.uk/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=836

UK Air Pollution Information System. Website: http://www.apis.ac.uk/cgi_bin/query_sitebased1.pl?SiteType=SAC

West of England Partnership, 2010. West of England Joint Waste Core Strategy. Website: http://www.westofengland.org/waste/planning/joint-waste-core-strategy

Planning application references

1. Weston Urban Extension
Planning application no. 09/P/1614/F Locking Parklands
07/P/1950/O Weston Park, Weston Airfield

2. SW Bristol Urban Extension
10/P/0066/OT2 University of Bristol land
09/P/1455/OT2 Ashton Park, including ES and HRA report with underpinning information
09/P/1486/O Land East of Failand

3. Other
09/P/1020/OT2 Bristol International Airport, including ES.
09/P/1479/F2 Land at Royal Portbury Dock, including ES and air pollution modelling

Air Quality in Designated Sites – Assessment Methodology

1. Introduction

Air pollution can cause direct damage to vegetation and can affect plant productivity and heath. Furthermore, deposition of pollutants to the ground can indirectly affect vegetation through modifying soil characteristics such as pH and nitrogen availability. For road traffic and combustion sources, the main pollutants of concern with regards to vegetation and ecosystem effects are oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), sulphur dioxide (SO_2), nitrogen deposition, and acidification. Table 17 lists the effects air pollutants can have on vegetation and ecosystems.

Table 17. Air Pollutants and their Effects on Vegetation and Ecosystems

Pollutant	Vegetation/Ecosystem Effects
Nitrogen oxides	Leaf and needle damage. Reduced growth.
Sulphur dioxide	Degradation of chlorophyll. Reduced photosynthesis. Raised respiration rates.
Nitrogen deposition	Eutrophication and acidification leading to loss of biodiversity.
Acidification	Change of soil characteristics leading to loss of biodiversity.

A matrix has been formulated to screen the potential air quality effects of North Somerset Core Strategy on the following international designated sites within the council's district:

- Avon Gorge Woodlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC
- North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC
- Severn Estuary SAC and Ramsar site (see section 4 for rationale for not including SPA designation).

The sources of information and assessment methodology used to examine the potential air quality effects associated with each Core Strategy Policy are outlined here.

2. Air Quality Objectives and Critical Loads

Air quality objectives and critical loads have been established in order to reduce the damage to ecosystems associated with air pollution. Table 18 shows the UK air quality objectives and EU limit values introduced for NO_x and SO_2 for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems.

Table 18. UK Air Quality Objectives (AQO) and EU Limit Values for the Protection of Vegetation and Ecosystems

Pollutant	EU Limit Value	UK AQO	Measured as	Date to be Achieved (EU Limit Value)	Date to be Achieved (UK AQO)
Nitrogen oxides	30 µg m^3	30 µg m^3	Annual mean	19/07/2001	31/12/2000
Sulphur dioxide	20 µg m^3	20 µg m^3	Annual mean	19/07/2001	31/12/2000

Critical loads for nitrogen deposition and acidification represent the threshold level below which there should be no significant harmful effects on the sensitive elements of an ecosystem (according to current knowledge). Critical loads differ depending on the sensitivity of the habitat or species, and are shown in Table 19 for the features of the designated sites in North Somerset. The critical loads have been determined using the Air Pollution Information System (APIS), as outlined in Section 3 of this methodology.

Feature	CL N. Deposition (kg N/ha/yr)	CL Acidification (keg/ ha/yr)	Designated Site
Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines	10 to 15	5.8	Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC, Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC, North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC

Table 19. Features Critical Loads for	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates	15 to 25	4.0	Avon Gorge Woodlands SAC, Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC, North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC **and**
	European dry heaths	10 to 20	4.0	Mendip Limestone Grasslands SAC
	Salt Meadows	30 to 40	4.0	Severn Estuary SAC/Ramsar

Acidification (keg/ ha/yr) and Nitrogen Deposition (kg N/ha/yr) in International Designated Sites in North Somerset

3. Determination of Air Quality and Critical Loads

Air pollutant concentrations, rates of nitrogen deposition, acidification and critical loads have been determined in international designated sites in North Somerset using APIS and the UK Air Quality Archive (UKAQA).

The site specific critical loads function of APIS provides information on nitrogen critical loads and rates of nitrogen deposition for specific features in international designated sites throughout the UK. Rates of nitrogen deposition are available for the years 2003 and 2010. The more recent 2010 rates have been used here.

The site specific critical loads function does not provide information on total acidification, NO_x and SO_2 in each site. Rates of acidification and SO_2 concentrations have been derived using the search by location, habitat and pollutant function of APIS. Table 20 shows the Landranger coordinates used for each designated site, as obtained from the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC). It should be noted that JNCC coordinates for Severn Estuary are based on the centre point of the estuary, and as such are likely to underestimate pollutant concentrations associated with terrestrial activities. The ordnance survey coordinates 331500, 162500 have been used to determine NO_x, SO_2 and acidification in Severn Estuary. The coordinates correspond with the portion of the site alongside Weston-super-Mare, and are likely to be worst case in terms of air quality.

Table 20. Landranger Coordinates for International Designated Sites (JNCC)

International Designated Site	Landranger Coordinates
Avon Gorge Woodlands	ST560741
Mendip Limestone Grasslands	ST401557
North Somerset and Mendip Bats	ST480544
Severn Estuary	ST321748*

* Based on OS coordinates 331500, 162500

APIS only provides rates of acidification as a 3 year average over 2003 to 2005, and only provides SO_2 concentrations for the year 2005. Rates of acidification and SO_2 are likely to be overestimated relative to 2011, as emissions of SO_2 and acidifying gases are declining year on year in response to improving emission technologies and air quality legislation. The rate of acidification and SO_2 concentration presented in the air quality matrices can be considered as worst-case. NO_x concentrations have been determined in designated sites for the year 2011 using the UKAQA (according to the coordinates presented in Table 20).

4. Determination of Impact Significance

The significance criteria for changes in air quality in designated sites differ between point source and road-traffic emissions.

Following Environment Agency, H1 Environmental Risk Assessment, Annex (f) Air Emissions guidance for point source emissions, impacts can be considered to be potentially significant if the long term process (source) contribution is greater than 1% of the long term environmental standard (objective or critical load). Where no information exists to calculate the process contribution, impacts could potentially be significant when the sum of the background concentration and process (source) contribution is greater than 70% of the long term environmental standard, and the source is located within the screening distance of the designated site. For SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites, point sources could potentially be significant when located within a distance of 10 km (or 15 km for coal or oil fired power stations) of the site.

Following Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07), Air Quality guidance for road traffic emissions, impacts are likely to be significant where there is an increase in NO_x of 2 µg m^{-3} and the predicted concentrations (including background) are very close to or exceed the criterion. Changes in nitrogen deposition should be compared against critical loads. Where no information exists to calculate road-traffic pollutants, impacts could potentially be significant within 200 m of affected roads. Affected roads are defined according to DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 20/07) Air Quality guidance, as roads with a change in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow of 1000 or more, or a change in HGV (AADT) flow of 200 or more or a change in annual average speed of 10 km/hr or more as a result of a proposal.

The Severn Estuary SPA has not been included in the air quality assessment due to the qualifying features of the SPA, various overwintering bird species, not being directly vulnerable to air pollution. However, the habitats that support these populations are included in the matrices in the Severn Estuary SAC and Ramsar assessments.

This publication is available in large print,
Braille or audio formats on request.

Help is also available for people who require council
information in languages other than English.

Please contact 01934 426 942

For further information please contact
Planning Policy and Research
North Somerset Council, Somerset House, Oxford Street, Weston-super-Mare, BS23 1TG

Email: planning.policy@n-somerset.gov.uk
Tel: 01934 426 942
Fax: 01934 426 678